

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**T201607002**

**DESIGN BUILD PROJECT FOR STATEWIDE PIPE REPLACEMENTS**

**Thursday, January 19, 2017**

*Note revised answer to Q50A.  
Q99 through Q101 have been answered.*

Q #	Question	Answer
<b>Wednesday, January 18, 2017</b>		
101	The DelDOT Bridge Design Manual Section 103.3.5 indicates a 4' minimum vertical opening is required for box culverts and rigid frames. Due to the limited clearance between the top of roadway and the top of structure at some locations, will DelDOT waive this criteria?	The Department will consider waiving this criteria. The DB Team will have to submit a Design Variance as outlined in the Bridge Design Manual. This should be highlighted in the scope of work narrative.
100	Regarding the first sentence of the answer to question #79, what does the Department consider as a significant alteration of the vertical profile – anything greater than 1-foot? What is the limit of the D/B team's liability in regard to potential vertical profile changes?	A significant alteration of the profile would be more than 2-3 inches. The DB Team should not anticipate any vertical profile changes at the 28 locations included in the contract.
99	For certain culverts preliminary H&H analysis, with the extremely limited data available to us, indicates significant flow overtopping the roadway in the existing condition, and sizing for proposed culverts to achieve 6" minimum freeboard requires significant additional capacity that would not line up with approach channel geometry. If proposed culvert options expand beyond the approach channel geometry, does that meet the condition of the response to Q#79 -- i.e. the size is "limited by the maximum hydraulic opening that will fit the site constraints?" We request that this be clarified in an Addendum, as this is a fairly significant issue.	The Department feels that the 28 locations all fit within the constraints outlined in the RFP and discussed at the pre-proposal meeting, meaning the pipes can be replaced with pipes without changing the roadway profile. If the proposed culvert options extend further in the channel than the existing pipes, this still falls within the constraints of the project.
98	Will the Technical Proposal submission deadline and Price Proposal submission deadline be extended with Addendum 4?	No.
97	Will the questions deadline be extended with Addendum 4?	No.
96	Addendum 4 has been referenced in Q&A. When will it be posted?	Addendum No. 4 was posted on January 18, 2017.

Q #	Question	Answer
-----	----------	--------

**Tuesday, January 17, 2017**

95	<p>Please clarify the right-of-way requirements regarding the pipe and riprap limits. Must the extents of the pipes be within right-of-way, or would a permanent easement be acceptable to encompass the pipes?</p> <p>Must the limits of the riprap be within a permanent easement, or would a temporary construction easement be acceptable to encompass the riprap?</p>	<p>The pipes and any wingwalls must be within the right-of-way. Riprap must be within a permanent easement or right-of-way.</p>
94	<p>Q77 response states that guardrail is required to be upgraded if necessary at all locations (even rehab locations). Please confirm whether the guardrail only has to be upgraded within the Project Limits as defined in Q70 response as "...length of staging area or 200' either side of the pipe culverts, whichever is greater" or the entire guardrail run, which may extend beyond those limits.</p>	<p>All locations except Bridge 3-923 have guardrail runs that end within or close to the project limits, so the existing guardrail should be upgraded at every location except Bridge 3-923. For Bridge 3-923, the guardrail upgrade can be restricted to within the project limits provided it is appropriately tied into the existing guardrail at the limits.</p>

**Friday, January 13, 2017**

93	<p>Does DelDOT anticipate a separate wetland/waterway permit for each site?</p>	<p>Permit coordination will be required for each site individually.</p>
92	<p>Please confirm that DelDOT does not anticipate any cultural resource activities for this project and if they are required will provide those services.</p>	<p>This is correct.</p>
91	<p>Please confirm that DelDOT will providing wetland delineations.</p>	<p>This is correct.</p>
90	<p>Upon D/B team completion of the CE checklist, If the CE is found by DelDOT staff not to be applicable for a site, will that site be removed from the project?</p>	<p>We will discuss with the DB Team at that time and agree on the path forward, whether to keep it in or remove it.</p>

Q #	Question	Answer
89	<p>There is no threshold for permanent stream impacts listed in the CE specific conditions. Since it is possible that new culverts will be longer than the existing culvert (for example where a box culvert may be used and will be designed current clear zone requirements), this may create impacts to streams/waters of the US that are deemed permanent. How much permanent stream impact will be allowed per site while still meeting the CE criteria? This information is not stated in the DelDOT/FHWA Programmatic Agreement.</p>	<p>0.1 ac of permanent impacts to wetlands/waters combined is the threshold where some type of mitigation becomes required.</p>
88	<p>There are numerous other scope related statements in the “SITE ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING NOTES” document that do not appear in the RFP, such as avoiding certain properties, possible existence of historic features, and archaeological assessments. It is unclear what items are prescriptive requirements in this accompanying document. Please clarify the D/B team’s scope for 4f property assessments, archaeological study, contaminated material assessment/disposal, and stand pipe replacements.</p>	<p>The Environmental Notes were provided to give the DB Teams an idea of what items will require discussion during the environmental coordination. DelDOT is responsible for the 4f assessments and archaeological studies, though none are anticipated. These issues were highlighted so the DB Team can plan to avoid them when laying out their LOC. Contaminated material disposal responsibilities are outlined in the special provision. The 30 locations identified have a low probability of needing additional HazMat assessments, and it will be DelDOT’s responsibility as part of the plan submission and review process. There is a standpipe at BR 3-923 that is in the way of the work, so we highlighted that it needs to be removed and reset or replaced in kind (DB Team’s choice).</p>
87	<p>Will DelDOT be taking action with the Army COE to have the dam removed downstream of B 3-681? If not, the sizing of these culverts will be impacted greatly as the capacity is reduced by at least half with the dam being in place.</p>	<p>BR 3-681 and 1-449 are no longer eligible for federal funding, so we are removing them from the contract as part of Addendum 4. The Department does not anticipate any changes in funding eligibility to any remaining locations.</p>
86	<p>The “SITE ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING NOTES” document calls for several areas of channel improvements as much as 100 feet beyond the culvert replacement. Examples include BR 1-420 “re-align upstream approach to culvert” and BR 2-066A “channel will need to be shaped and graded for approximately 100 feet downstream from the existing pipe outfall to remove a drop of 18-24 inches in the channel bottom.” Is the DB team expected to make these improvements?</p>	<p>At BR 2-066A, the DB Team is expected to include the channel shaping/grading as part of the proposal. For BR 1-420, the DB Team should assume normal scour protection and limits. Should additional needs become required through design coordination, the Department would be responsible for those changes.</p>

Q #	Question	Answer
85	The "SITE ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING NOTES" document has several instances stating "No Stream Stats". Please explain what is meant by these statements, as they seem to be inconsistent with the RFP Performance Requirement for H&H.	The Stream Stats referenced in the Environmental Scoping Document is the delineation of the channel bottom performed by DelDOT's Environmental Section. Where it is mentioned that no Stream Stats is required, channel bottom can be matched to the current conditions. Where it is required, some modification, such as a low-flow channel for fish passage, will be required of the channel. The StreamStats mentioned in the H&H Performance Specification is the computer program used to determine the peak discharge at the culvert locations. These are two different references.
84	It has been our experience that DelDOT prefers pavement replacement to a distance of 100 feet on either side of the culvert trench limits, however this requirement is not stated in the performance specifications for pavement or roadway. Please clarify if the 100 feet of pavement replacement will be required.	See response to question 70. Additional information will be provided in Addendum 4.
83	A pedestrian detour Is required during construction of B 2-066. Please confirm for all offerors whether a temporary pedestrian bridge is required across the stream as part of this detour.	The Department is not limiting the pedestrian accommodations to only a pedestrian bridge. We have used varying means to accommodate pedestrians through/around work zones in the past. A pedestrian detour is one option that we have used multiple times in similar situations.

**Thursday, January 05, 2017**

82	In the Right of Way Services performance specification, section 3.6, Appraisal Services, in the case where the appraisal fee is less than \$15,000, the DB team shall prepare the Appraisal Waiver, which must be signed by the property owner waiving the right to a formal appraisal. There is no way of knowing how many (if any) property owners will sign the waiver and thereby the costs to include for appraisals and appraisal reviews. Can DelDOT consider assuming the appraisal cost and appraisal review costs or provide a range or budget for each DB team to use assuming the property owners refuse to sign the waivers?	DelDOT is responsible for the appraisal and appraisal review costs.
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

Q #	Question	Answer
81	One of the approved title companies from DeIDOT's list is requiring the title searches be ordered from a Delaware licensed attorney. Can DeIDOT order the title searches to avoid this additional cost and uncertainty of the cost?	See response to question 66.
80	In the Right of Way Services Performance Specification, Section 3.5, Title Services, title reports are required for each property acquisition. Can you define "acquisition"? Does acquisition include TCE's?	Title reports will be the responsibility of DeIDOT.
79	There are some sites where an existing mill pond is located just downstream. It is likely that these ponds will create a backwater condition that will control the tailwater elevation of culvert(s) often making it difficult to meet the design criteria solely by increasing culvert number and/or size. In cases where this occurs (approximately 4 locations in Sussex County), could DeIDOT consider removing these locations or providing direction on design assumptions. The backwater condition will likely require the roadway elevation be raised with potential adjacent property implications.	The Department does not intend to significantly alter the vertical profile of the roadway at any of the 30 locations. At these 4 locations, the DB Teams should perform the hydraulic analysis using the normal tail water elevation at each location. There should be available head to push the water through. If the design criteria cannot be met, the Department will require a proposed hydraulic opening up to 10% larger than the existing opening for BR 3-323. If additional opening is required after getting into detailed design, the Department will be responsible for the change. For the other 3 locations mentioned, the DB Team is only limited by the maximum hydraulic opening that will fit the site constraints.
78	Consider extending the question deadline to be more closely coordinated with the extended submission deadlines.	The last day to submit questions is extended to January 17, 2017.

**Tuesday, January 03, 2017**

77	This project has been characterized as maintenance work to replace deteriorated pipe culverts. The answer to question #62 adds the requirement to upgrade guardrail to meet current design standards at rehab/re-line locations. As this is would not normally be considered under maintenance work, especially when re-lining, please elaborate on the extent and scope that guardrail will need to be upgraded at both rehab and replacement locations. (ie replace just what is disturbed vs replace entire lengths of guardrail, adding new guardrail, etc).	We are committed to bringing our roadside safety devices up to current safety standards, so we upgrade guardrail whenever we have an opportunity. Given that the DB Team will be working at these locations, even the rehab locations, we are requiring the guardrail to be upgraded.
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Q #	Question	Answer
76	<p>The Mfg.'s design for the cementitious mortar product requires less material than the new requirement of the specification. (1.5"). As they are different materials, why must we place more material than required by the Mfg. when this may actually have a deleterious effect?</p>	<p>The Department is comfortable with the material thickness requirement as specified.</p>
75	<p>Although the addendum states the Department will consider the Milliken Ecocast Geo Spray, the current product does not meet the technical provisions of the specification in the special provision. We understand these are complex systems and that the technical requirements are critical if the Department is to receive a long lasting impermeable liner. The Department originally noted there has been limited use of this material.</p> <p>a. For example, If Geo Spray is now claiming to meet a coulomb rating of 75, has that design been used before and is there science documenting it is viable long term?</p> <p>b. Does the delivery meet ASTM A979 that says all corrugations must be filled and that a symmetrical lining must be in place to deliver a minimum wall thickness?</p> <p>c. "Troweling to achieve this is not acceptable as it changes the water chemistry of the mix design." What is the experience concerning the long-standing data regarding high level of alkalis, especially in an environment like culverts?</p> <p>d. We would appreciate a clarification of this position and whether the contractors will be held harmless should this new product not perform adequately.</p>	<p>The DB Team will be responsible for the work they and their subcontractors perform as with any DelDOT contract. The Department is satisfied with the performance of the Milliken Ecocast Geospray product in similar environments and considers it an Approved Alternative Product.</p>
74	<p>Please clarify exactly what the Department will do under ROW spec 3.2 f) – Provide property settlement services. Does this mean that the department will be responsible for all closing related services (i.e. closing, recording, etc.) after an agreement is prepared by the ROW consultant and signed by the property owner?</p>	<p>Correct. DelDOT will be responsible for settlement services once an agreement with a property owner has been signed.</p>

Q #	Question	Answer
73	<p>ROW Performance Specification, 3.6 – Appraisal Services and Contract for services:</p> <p>a. (Appendix G): The contract with the Fee Appraiser in Appendix G is a contract between DelDOT and the appraiser. Please confirm if this means that the appraisal fee will be paid directly through DelDOT if a fee appraiser is used? If not the Proposer will need to estimate potential appraiser fees which at this point would be an arbitrary estimate.</p> <p>b. 3.6 f) Appraisal Services: this states that “any fee in excess of \$15,000 must be approved by the DDR”. 1) Can you confirm that you are referring to the value of the property relative to the \$15,000 waiver limit (not fee, or fee taking)? And 2) regarding the statement “if the estimated appraisal fee is less than \$15,000, the assigned DB shall...” please confirm this is providing the choice for the consultant to either prepare waivers or use an appraiser (i.e. if complexity warrants).</p> <p>c. Regarding Review Appraisers. There is no contract form in Appendix G for contracting with a review appraiser. Will the review be performed by DelDOT staff and/or directly contracted by and paid for directly through the Department?</p> <p>d. 3.6 c): Please clarify if the cost of studies and special reports, if necessary, will be paid for directly by DelDOT or if the Proposer will need to establish a placeholder for such a cost that may occur.</p>	<p>DB Team is responsible for making agreements with DelDOT approved appraisal firms. The agreement will be between the DB Team and the appraiser, but DelDOT will be responsible for the cost. If the cost of an appraisal for an individual parcel is greater than \$15000, the agreement must be approved by DelDOT. If the cost of an appraisal is less than \$15000, the DB Team can execute the agreement without requiring DelDOT approval. DelDOT will be responsible for the cost of the appraisal regardless of value.</p>
72	<p>Are legal descriptions required by the Proposer for all interests, both permanent and temporary, or just for condemnation? They are mentioned in 3.3.5 Acquisition relative to condemnation but not anywhere else. If so, what type?</p>	<p>Legal descriptions are required for permanent acquisitions (permanent easements and fee acquisitions) but are not required for temporary construction easements.</p>
71	<p>ROW Performance Specification, item 3.5 – Title Services: will title searches be required for temporary interests as well?</p>	<p>60-year title searches are required for all parcels within the project limits per the Utility Performance Specification. These searches will cover the ones needed for acquisition.</p>

Q #	Question	Answer
70	How does DelDOT define “within the project limits” for each of the 31 locations?	The Project Limits for each site are defined as the limits along the roadway facility containing the culvert, inside of which the Design-Builder may perform work. These limits are the length of the staging area or 200’ to either side of the pipe culverts, whichever is greater. The Design-Builder shall develop his design and construction activities to minimize the Project Limits at each location. Additional clarification will be added as part of Addendum 4.
69	In the Utility Performance Specification, 3.2, a) “The D-B Team responsibilities include obtaining 60 year title searches on all parcels within the project limits and potential areas of relocation needed by Utilities.” The wording leaves this open to many 60 year title searches may be requested for the 31 locations. Will DelDOT consider limiting the required 60 year title searches to a certain number per site so we can price accordingly and additional title searches requested at a later date can be considered added scope or beyond the project limits?	60 year title searches are required for all parcels within the project limits as defined in the response to question 70.
68	Are appraisal services to be performed by pre-approved DelDOT appraisal firms or will appraisals required for the project and any appraisals in excess of \$15000 be performed by DelDOT?	DB Team is responsible for making agreements with DelDOT approved appraisal firms. If the cost of an appraisal for an individual parcel is greater than \$15000, the agreement must be approved by DelDOT. If the cost of an appraisal is less than \$15000, the DB Team can execute the agreement without requiring DelDOT approval. DelDOT will be responsible for the cost of the appraisal regardless of value.
67	Based on Addendum 2, DelDOT is allowing additional right-of-way firms to be considered to perform work. The pre-approval process is explained with Addendum 2. Will DelDOT confirm the work DelDOT is requiring a pre-approved “right-of-way” firm to perform? Upon review of the Right-of-Way Performance Specification, in 1.1 definitions, d) Consultant – A prequalified firm that provides right-of-way services. We do not see the word Consultant referenced again. For example, under 3.1 a) “attend project related meetings as required.” Does the right-of-way manager have to attend meetings where another D-B representative is in attendance.	The intent of the requirement is for the right-of-way manager to attend meetings related to property acquisitions with property owners.



Q #	Question	Answer
66	<p>ROW Specifications, Title Services – 3.5. We were advised by a title company on the DelDOT list that they will not do title searches directly with non-attorneys. This is based on a DE Supreme Court Decision in 2000 that places this information within the realm of state attorneys because of its legal nature. This is apparently an issue for all title companies that we would contact. Some consultants proposing to do this work may not have Delaware attorneys on staff, but DelDOT does have an attorney and does order these reports.</p> <p>a) Is there a mechanism by which DelDOT can resolve this issue i.e. finding a means satisfactory to the title company to authorize the consultant to order the reports directly; or having DelDOT place the order for title searches on behalf of the Proposer/ROW consultant under a contract?</p> <p>b) If DelDOT must order these directly, will the costs for searches/updates be paid directly by DelDOT, or should the consultant estimate these costs in the proposal?</p>	<p>DelDOT’s legal counsel notes the ambiguity in the Supreme Court decision that is leading the title search companies to take the stance that they have. While we disagree with their stance, we acknowledge this hardship on the DB Teams. As such, DelDOT will be responsible for obtaining the title searches.</p>
65	<p>Per Utility Performance Specification, 3.1 Department’s Responsibilities, last paragraph, “The Department will be responsible for all costs associated with the utility relocation coordination activities that it is responsible for pursuant to Chapter 5 of the DelDOT Utility Manual and per Delaware Code, except that the Design-Build team will responsible for all costs associated with carrying out Incorporated Work and all items identified in Section 3.2 – Design Build Team’s Responsibilities”. Per Section 3.2 – Design Build Team’s Responsibilities, u) “performing construction of Utility incorporated work and under 3.4 Cost, “The Design-Build team shall be responsible for the Utility costs of incorporated Utility Work”. Will the Department clarify the intent of “carrying out” and other wording associated with this specification that reads as if the Department is asking the Design Builder to identify costs now for utility coordination, relocation and construction activities. Please clarify.</p>	<p>DB Team will be responsible for subsurface utility engineering (SUE) and utility coordination during design. DB Team will also be responsible for MOT and clearing/grubbing for any relocations. To minimize the risk to the DB Team, the Department will be responsible for the cost of utility relocations.</p>

Q #	Question	Answer
64	RE: Per ROW specification 3.7 b): Are individual plat maps, and legal descriptions (metes and bounds) required or can the Design Builder create project plans and provide areas of acquisition to include in offer letters? ROW specification 3.7 b) says, “the DB may prepare property descriptions and individual plat maps per the ROW manual” and Appendix G form samples seem to require only areas of acquisition required.	Legal descriptions are required for permanent acquisitions (permanent easements and fee acquisitions). Temporary easements require only project plans and areas of acquisition.
63	Regarding settlement services being provided by DeIDOT under 3.2 f): How long does DeIDOT anticipate Settlement Services to take from the time that the DB team ROW consultant submits a negotiated settlement agreement to the time that DeIDOT closes on the property and the Design Builder can gain access to the parcel?	Settlement usually occurs between 30-60 days after an agreement has been signed.
<b>Thursday, December 29, 2016</b>		
62	For the 5 locations that rehab is permitted, will the DB Team be required to address bank stabilization, outlet protection, etc or can the culvert simply be clean & rehabbed? If the scope is required to be more than clean & rehab, please elaborate for these 5 locations.	Proper scour countermeasures including addressing erosion issues within the scour countermeasure limits must also be included. Scour countermeasures must be designed in accordance with the design manuals laid out in the RFP. Guardrail must also be upgraded to meet current standards.
61	Crossing 2-303a consists of two (2) reinforced concrete pipes and one (1) corrugated metal pipe (CMP). Is it DeIDOT’s intent to replace all three (3) culverts or just the existing CMP?	It is the intent to address all 3 pipes.
60	Regarding Part 2 Section 100, DB111-4, the Department requires a minimum of 17 working days to review each submittal package which can include up to 2 submissions in review at one time. An example listing a preliminary and a semi-final submission is given. Can final submissions be reviewed in less time? If so, how much time will the Department require to review a final submission?	The intent of the final submission is to receive the formal “Release for Construction” approval which means that all requirements (including r/w acquisitions and permits among other things) have been met and all design comments have been addressed. The final plan review time can be shortened to 10 working days.

Q #	Question	Answer
59	In Appendix A, page 1 of 11, it says proposals shall be submitted in separate volumes. Please clarify that you want each volume separately bound or can we submit one bound document using tabbed dividers to separate each volume?	Regarding the different volumes, see response to question 24. Reference to form CF was deleted in Addendum 1.

**December 22, 2016**

58	Can you re-evaluate the inclusion of Bridge 1-178 in the contract?	Bridge 1-178 shall be deleted from the contract. Despite the existing pipes being small, the location does not work hydraulically for any option that could be included under this contract, due to the hydraulic complexities that extend beyond the crossing. All references to Bridge 1-178 shall be ignored, and all references to 31 locations shall be assumed to be 30 locations.
57	Given that this work is considered maintenance, will the energy dissipators at the pipe outfalls be required to be enlarged to accommodate current design standards (which will require widening the existing stream channel & banks) or can they be fit to the existing channel?	Riprap aprons shall be designed and constructed per the DelDOT Bridge Design Manual. The width of the channel must be wide enough to accommodate the structure and can adjust over the length of the apron to tie back into the existing channel.

**Tuesday, December 20, 2016**

56	Regarding the legal information required for Appendix A of the Technical proposal, if the Proposer is an existing corporation already registered with DelDOT and all other team members are subcontractors (as opposed to partners), are the Organizational Documents required?	Yes.
55	Regarding the legal information required for Appendix A of the Technical proposal, if the signer of the Proposal is an officer of the Proposer (President or Vice President) is the Notarized Power of Attorney required?	Yes.
54	Pursuant to Section 2.2.1, on 10/18/2016 the Department received bids for contract T201407205 and on 10/28/2016 the Department received bids for contract T201507301. Both of these contracts utilized flowable fill as backfill material to just over the pipe tops. Will the Department require flowable fill to be used as backfill for any of the new pipe installations? If so, what is the criteria for determining when/where flowable fill is to be used?	Flowable fill is one backfill type allowed by the Department around multi-cell pipe culverts. B-borrow, C-borrow, and stone are other alternatives as outlined in the Bridge Design Manual. We do not have a preference for this contract, provided proper compaction is obtained between the pipes and around the bottom haunches.

Q #	Question	Answer
53	Per the ITB, Table A – Outline for Submittal of the Technical Proposal, Volume 4 Section 1 requires the Project Component Description Form SP to be submitted. This is the Schedule of Prices form for the Pricing Proposal and is not due until after the technical proposal is submitted. As such, can the requirement for this form be eliminated?	Price information should not accompany the Technical Proposal, so the inclusion of Form SP in Volume 4 is incorrect and should not be included.

**Friday, December 16, 2016**

52	<p>Page 9 of 11 of the ITP, Section 6.2.2.3 – Organization Charts and Staff</p> <p>Would it be permissible to submit a unified organization chart on a single page identifying both the design and construction team, rather than two separate charts?</p>	Yes, a unified organization chart is acceptable.
51	<p>Regarding spec 612553- Spray applied Cementitious Mortar for Pipe, Greater than 48”:</p> <p>Paragraph B under design thickness states that the minimum thickness should be ½” and then later states that it should be 1”. The industry standard for a structural liner is 1” min. under 54” diameter and 1.5” minimum for 54” or greater. Please clarify the minimum design thickness. All 3 rehab pipes have pipe openings over 54” so I would anticipate this to be 1.5” minimum. It is good to state minimums that are reasonably within the range of the final anticipated design thickness. This levels the playing field and decreases the incentive to make less conservative design assumptions to skinny the design to the minimum ½” stated in the spec.</p>	The minimum liner thickness will be updated as part of Addendum 3 to be 1.5”. This was originally the intent but was not captured in the document before it was advertised.

Q #	Question	Answer
<b>Tuesday, December 13, 2016</b>		
50	<p>A. Regarding spec 612553- Spray applied Cementitious Mortar for Pipe, Greater than 48". Attached are cut sheets for Milliken's GeoSpray and also Millikens Invert Repair Mortar. These are 8000 and 12000 psi products that I would like pre approved for use on this project.</p> <p>Our product is a Geopolymer mortar which looks and feels like Portland cement but is a different animal in that it reacts through condensation rather than a hydration reaction which Portland cement goes through. The way the spec is written, it excludes Geopolymer materials for several reasons.</p> <p>B. I am reaching out to all the design build teams to work with them. Currently I only know of the teams below. Do you know of any more?</p> <p>C. In addition, I know the 11/15/16 preproposal meeting was mandatory. Does that mean a representative from both the design and construction side needed to be present, or just at least one of the 2?</p>	<p><b>A. The Department will consider Milliken's Ecocast system as an approved equal to Special Provision 612553 Spray Applied Cementitious Mortar for Pipe, Greater than 48". The product must meet the wall thickness, design, and submittal requirements outlined in the Special Provision.</b></p> <p><del>The Department has no experience with geopolymer materials and has concerns about the condensation process. The Department does have experience with the material specified in the Design-Build RFP. We do not want to rush into accepting a product for such a large project without first using it successfully. We have approximately 200 other bridge-size corrugated metal pipe culverts in our inventory. We would be open to discussing the product and processes further and potentially trying it out on a location outside this contract.</del></p> <p>B. The Department will not comment on potential teaming arrangements among potential bidders.</p> <p>C. One member of the submitting team must have attended the preproposal meeting.</p>
49	<p>DelDOT has issued some of the bid forms in Word, but not all of them. Will Bid Bond Form, and Forms C, CR, KP, LSI, NS, and OC also be issued in Word format?</p>	<p>Forms C, CR, KP, LSI, and NS will be added in Word form to the bid website. Form OC is guidance on what should be included in the letter from outside counsel and is not a form to be filled in like the others.</p>
48	<p>If large trees require removal, is the DB Team responsible for any required replacements?</p>	<p>DelDOT will assume responsibility for tree/shrub plantings required as mitigation for environmental impacts.</p>
47	<p>For the individual CatEx checklists the DB Team needs to prepare, is a similar level of detail required as provided in the two approved project CatEx checklists?</p>	<p>The CatEx checklists the DB Team will prepare for each location will be a similar level of detail as the two project-level CatEx checklists included with Addendum 1.</p>
46	<p>Can DelDOT confirm how many pipes are tidal?</p>	<p>We do not anticipate any locations being considered tidal.</p>
45	<p>Does DelDOT anticipate the majority of the Corps permits will be NWP # 3 with no PCN required?</p>	<p>Yes. Typically, pipe replacements projects fall under the ACOE NWP #3 with no PCN.</p>

Q #	Question	Answer
44	The RFP and approved CatEx Checklist states wetland impacts cannot exceed 0.1 acre. Can DelDOT provide some direction at this stage if impacts do exceed 0.1 acre?	It is expected that all locations will keep wetland impacts to less than 0.1 acres. If a location cannot be designed to be under that threshold, it will be removed from the contract. The DB Team should assume there will be no wetland mitigation costs when preparing a bid.
43	If required, is the DB Team responsible for wetland mitigation and associated costs?	See Response to Question #44.
42	For costing purposes can we assume no RTE species or habitat surveys will be required?	No RTE species or habitat surveys are anticipated for these locations.
41	For Br-681 there was a hit for the RTE species Swamp Pink. Was clearance received for this pipe or do we need to conduct a habitat and species survey?	A habitat and species survey will not be required. Proper erosion and sediment controls must be installed and maintained during construction to ensure sediment is not discharged downstream. Otherwise, no special approvals are required.
40	On the DelDOT bid website under Utility Mark-Up's, DelDOT provided Utility information for 12 bridges: 1-183, 1-420, 2-066A, 2-113B, 3-132, 3-139, 3-323, 3-564, 3-626, 3-630, 3-681, 3-923. Based on the DelDOT Project Utilities spreadsheet (see RFP Part 3 – Design Requirements pg. 852/1160) additional utilities are present within the project locations. Of the 12 bridges where utilities are provided, additional utilities are present based on DelDOT's Project Utilities spreadsheet compared to the information provided. What do the highlighted boxes on the DelDOT Project Utilities spreadsheet represent? Should we assume that all of the other utilities have responded, ALL CLEAR, for these 12 locations? Should we assume that more information is forthcoming for the other 19 bridges?	The highlighted boxes on the spreadsheet mean that the utility is present within the project limits, although it does not necessarily mean there is a conflict. Information provided for the 12 locations is what has been received back from the Utility companies, but it does not mean anything has been cleared. The DB Team is responsible for obtaining appropriate SUE during the design phase of each location. Please review the Utility Performance Specifications for how the utility relocation responsibilities are divided between the Department and the DB Team.
39	Pursuant to Section 2.2.1 in the Request for Qualifications, we submit the following question for clarification: Please confirm the location of Bridge ID 3914 016. The inspection report and plans shown in the Archived Plans 39148606311, cp_000 (sheets 13, 24 and 25) do not match the location circled in red on the map shown on page 29 of the location maps shown in RFP Part 1, Appendix A, Project Site Locations. Is 3914 016 located further west between Wisseman Road/Century Farm Road and Oakley Road?	The map for BR 3-914 (3914 016) is incorrect. An updated map will be provided as part of Addendum 2.

Q #	Question	Answer
<b>Monday, December 05, 2016</b>		
38	Under Utility Performance Specification, 3.2, the D-B Team is required to obtain minimum 60 year title searches. Will the Department provide the D-B Teams access to the Department's title search companies and known pricing for these searches to be used for pricing these required costs.	The Department has used the following companies: First American Title Insurance, Old Republic, and Fidelity Group. We cannot provide cost information.
37	If the Department's stream bed elevation adjustments cause an impact to utilities, will the Department reconsider the elevation adjustment requirement? Please provide how the D-B Team should handle this unknown condition.	The permitting agencies have been flexible at times on streambed elevations when other factors, such as utility impacts, have come into play. While this does not guarantee a similar outcome at every location, the likely streambed adjustments for the locations included in this contract are minor so flexibility is anticipated. DB Team's assumptions should be spelled out in the description of work activities per location.
36	Per Survey Performance Specification, the D-B Team is required to shoot elevations and provide information to DelDOT for determining proper streambed elevations. Please provide an anticipated turnaround duration to be used for scheduling purposes. The D-B Team is required to survey the OHW on both sides of the culvert but no direction will be given to after award. Direction on how to survey OHW is required now, so D-B Team can adequately scope and price what will be required, please provide direction.	The turn-around time for the "Streamstats" will generally be 3 business days, provided they are not submitted in bulk. Regarding the OHW, there is a distinct line on the stream banks where the vegetation changes, due to higher flows during normal rain events. This line is generally 12-16 inches above the base flow elevation.
35	Per Public Outreach Performance Specification, under 2.2.2 Virtual Workshop, "and as necessary a rendering showing finished site conditions." Does the Department not consider "a plan sheet showing proposed site conditions", as meeting the rendering requirement? If not, please state how many and which locations will require renderings in order for the D-B Team to scope properly.	For this project, plan sheets showing site conditions should suffice for the virtual workshop finished site requirements.
34	Per Public Outreach Performance Specification, "The D-B Team shall prepare all mailing lists. The lists shall be submitted to the Department for approval. The D-B Team shall mail all letters." We request the Department provide the required mailing lists in advance so the D-B Team can cost the number of anticipated mailings required for each site.	The Public Outreach Performance Specification has been modified as part of Addendum 1. Mailings will be done by the Department.

Q #	Question	Answer
33	Per Design Criteria 3.1.1 Typical Section, shall the D-B Team assume that no guardrail will be required or later requested by DeIDOT if existing guardrail does not exist today and if the proposed typical section matches the existing typical section.	The Department does not anticipate adding guardrail at locations that currently have no guardrail, provided the clear zone requirements of 3.1.1a are met. However, if the DB Team proposes a different structure type than pipes in the proposed condition, the requirements of 3.1.1b would have to be met, which may require guardrail. In either case, the proposed guardrail must meet current standards. DB Team's assumptions should be spelled out in the description of work activities per location.
32	Will DeIDOT provide the channel bed/riprap requirements as standard details that shall be used standard for each county as mentioned at the mandatory pre-bid meeting.	The Channel Bed Fill Special Provision was added to the RFP as part of Addendum 1.
31	Please state which culverts/locations DeIDOT will provide utility markups/information as mentioned at the mandatory pre-bid meeting.	This information was included as part of Addendum 1.
30	Please confirm DBE % is 11% as shown on DB 102-19, pg. 35 of 165 as this was not discussed at the mandatory pre-bid meeting.	11% is correct.
29	Section DB 108-6 and DB 109-4.5 refer to Liquidated Damages that will be deducted from monies owed the Design-Builder for failure to complete the project within the Contract Time. What is the Contract Time in calendar days? What is the anticipated notice-to-proceed date from which calendar days will start being counted?	The Contract Time is 4 years, which is 1461 Calendar Days. NTP will be issued within 15 days of holding the Design Mobilization Workshop outlined on Section 105-12.1, which will be scheduled within 30 days of execution of the contract. Language to clarify these times will be included in Addendum 2.
28	Paragraph 2 of Section DB 104-4 indicates that the Design-Builder is responsible for costs associated with repairing pavement on detour routes. These costs are impossible to determine until each detour route is no longer taking detoured traffic at which point the severity of pavement deterioration can be determined. Will the Department consider dictating an allowance to be included in the Price Proposal as a contingency for detour route pavement repairs? If so, please provide contingency amount for all Proposers to include.	Recognizing this is too ambiguous to include in the price proposal, this will be corrected as part of Addendum 2 so that the DB Team will not be responsible for these costs.



Q #	Question	Answer
27	Section B2.0 indicates that a Baseline Schedule is to be included with the Price Proposal. Section 3.1 does not show a Baseline Schedule as part of the Price Proposal. A Baseline Schedule is to be included in Volume 2, Section 3 of the Technical Proposal and, per section A1.0, will be used to evaluate the Technical Proposal for scoring. Per the ITP, the Baseline Schedule is not part of the Price Proposal evaluation. Please confirm that a Baseline Schedule is to be submitted with the Price Proposal.	The baseline schedule will be evaluated as part of the technical proposal, so a baseline schedule should not be included with the price proposal.
26	Section B2.0 & B3.1 refers to a Form SOV that is to be submitted as part of the Price Proposal. However, Form SOV is not included in with the proposal forms in Appendix C. Please provide Form SOV or clarify Price Proposal submittal requirements.	References to Form SOV should be disregarded. The form is not needed for this project due to the way the price proposal is being identified on forms PC1 through PC3.
25	Section A6.2.1 is for the description of work activities included in the PCs. Based on DB Section 109-1.1, this is a breakdown of activities for PC1, PC2 & PC3. Activities for each location will be similar, if not the same, and seems repetitive. Is the Department expecting this to be done for each location?	Due to the repetitive nature of the work, a list of activities that are common to all locations can be grouped. However, activities specific to individual locations (i.e., pipe rehabilitation instead of replacement, guardrail installation, etc.) should be broken down with each respective location.
24	Section A1.0 of the ITP indicates that the Technical Proposal is to be submitted in separate volumes. Is each volume to be bound separately or can all volumes be bound together with dividers clearly separating the volumes?	Separate volumes are preferred but not required.
23	Section 2.8.4 of the ITP indicates that Price Proposal will be opened publicly at 2:00 PM. However, Section 1.5.1 of the ITP does not give a date for the Price Proposal Opening. Please provide a date for the public opening of Price Proposals.	On the date that the price proposals are due, the prices will be read publicly and combined with the technical proposal scores. An apparent best value will be shown publicly. However, as with all contract bids, they will be reviewed after the bid opening and official notification will be sent out after the review.
22	Will you provide all of the Bid Forms in editable Word format?	An editable word document of the Bid Forms has been posted.
21	In several locations in the RFP, Form SOV is referenced; however, this document was not included in the original release of the RFP. When will you be issuing this document?	References to Form SOV should be disregarded. The form is not needed for this project due to the way the price proposal is being identified on forms PC1 through PC3.

Q #	Question	Answer
<b>Tuesday, November 29, 2016</b>		
20	Will the sign-in sheet be made available from the pre-proposal meeting?	The sign-in sheet from the pre-proposal meeting will be made available as part of Addendum 1, which will also include the transcript of the meeting and responses to the questions raised at the meeting.
19	Will DelDOT provide us with a copy of the Categorical Exclusion (CatEx) document that was included with this contract?	The Categorical Exclusion is being made available as part of Addendum 1 in Section 3 Appendix H Environmental Documents. Also, the CatEx checklist has been included in Appendix H as well.
18	Part 2 Section 100 DB 108-6 states Road User Delay Costs will be assessed for each Calendar Day beyond 28 days that traffic is not restored to a site utilizing a detour route. With the degree of variance in size, scope, existing conditions, and required detour routes for these 31 locations, 28 days seems to be arbitrary and may not be reasonable for every location requiring a detour.	The 28 days should be reasonable for this type of work across the 31 locations. Note that any utility relocations are not included in the 28 days. Time estimates provided by the utility companies during design coordination will be added day for day to the 28 day restriction if necessary.
17	The cost to repairing slope failures may vary greatly based on the option chosen. What are the design requirements to repair slopes?	Slope repairs generally involve riprap placement and standard streambank treatment if on the channel bank. The sites selected did not have slope failures that would require anything beyond typical repair methods.
16	Is the page count for the Summary Statement included in the 10-page limit for the Executive Summary?	No. The Summary Statement can be excluded from the 10-page limit in the Executive Summary.
15	Are the organization chart(s) included in the 15-page limit for Vols. 2-4?	Yes, the organization chart(s) is/are included in the page limit.
14	Can the organization chart(s) be as large as 11" x 17" in size?	That would be acceptable.
13	The amount of pre-bid engineering to prepare a responsible bid for this project is extensive. The Design Build Institute of America recommends stipends be offered. This is part of their Design-Build Best Practices Transportation Sector publication. The typical stipend on design build projects range from 0.2% to 0.3% of the contract value. Please consider providing stipends in this project procurement.	Stipends were given consideration during the RFP preparation, but the Department felt they were not warranted for this project. We may re-evaluate this for similar projects in the future.

Q #	Question	Answer
12	Should the DBT assume a standard depth of pipe embedment/ stream bank material at every location when sizing the proposed culvert to meet the hydraulic equivalent to the existing culvert.	The DB Team should assume similar depth of replacement pipes as the existing, except that one of the pipe cells should be recessed 6-12” (per the Bridge Design Manual). The channel material should conform to the Chanel Bed Fill special provision, which is being added as part of Addendum 1.
11	In absence of detailed H&H reports, the DBT will provide a technical proposal and cost estimate to replace the existing culvert with a more structurally sound culvert of similar hydraulic capacity. If a detailed H&H assessment demonstrates that the existing culvert, and subsequently the improved culvert, do not meet the current design standards, will the Department re-evaluate and reimburse the contractor the additional cost to upsize the proposed culvert to meet the design requirements?	The D-B teams should base their bid on providing replacement culverts based on meeting the hydraulic needs outlined in the Hydrology & Hydraulics Performance Spec, which refers to the DelDOT Bridge Design Manual and other tools to use in determining the appropriate size. Preliminary H&H based on the info provided and the tools available should be able to determine an approximate culvert opening with sufficient accuracy.
10	In accordance with Section 104.3.1 Culverts in DelDOT’s Bridge Design Manual, the designer appears to have the option for evaluating culverts using either HY-8 or HEC-RAS. Are there any anticipated non-tidal locations as part of this contract where DelDOT may require a HEC-RAS analysis as opposed to an HY-8 analysis? The HEC-RAS analysis tends to increase design/survey time and costs. The DBT would need to account for this in the cost proposal.	The Department does not anticipate requiring a HEC-RAS analysis over an HY-8 analysis at any location non-tidal locations. Should the need arise unexpectedly, we would discuss additional compensation at that time.

**Tuesday, November 15, 2016**

9	Appendix C. Form KP does not match key staff positions identified Special Provisions 108C.	Special Provisions 108C and Form KP have been modified as part of Addendum 1 to be consistent.
8	Appendix A6.2.1 Please provide additional clarity regarding the requirements of this section.	The Department is looking for a brief description of the DB Team’s anticipated work at each location. This should include rehabilitation versus replacement (where allowed), stream diversion type, estimated culvert size, sheeting and shoring (if necessary), and other pertinent construction activities. It should also include design needs anticipated, such as subsurface utility engineering (SUE), additional soil borings and testing, etc. The narrative should be brief, given that most of this information is covered in Volume 2 (Technical Solutions). No mention of proposed costs should be included.

Q #	Question	Answer
7	Appendix A1.0, last paragraph states “The Quality Plan is also excluded from the page count.” Please clarify, as no requirement to submit a full Quality Plan could be found elsewhere in the requirements for the Technical Proposal.	ITP Section A6.2.3 outlines requirements of the Quality Plan.
6	ITP, 6.1.1.6 and Appendix A4.2.3 require a proposal schedule with key milestone dates, durations of work, including design and reviews, for each location. Considering that construction scheduling cannot be accurately known until a greater degree of design is performed, can this requirement for a proposal schedule be revised or postponed?	The Department wants to know how the D-B team is prioritizing and scheduling the 31 locations among the 4 years of the contract, so this is one of the elements being considered in evaluating the D-B proposers. A detailed schedule is needed for the first 4 locations, while a schedule including only key milestones is needed for the remaining 27 locations. Given the similarity of work among the 31 sites, a milestone schedule should be easily generated given the timelines outlined in the RFP documents.
5	Please confirm that the Design-Build team will only be responsible for the stability of the receiving channel at the exit from the replacement culvert and is not responsible for identifying or remediating potential downstream stability issues due to increased flow from the replacement culvert.	The Design-Build team will only be responsible for channel stability immediately upstream and downstream of the culverts in accordance with the design requirements in the H&H Performance Spec. There is one exception. Bridge 2-066A has been identified as needing about 100’ of channel grading and riprap on the downstream side of the culverts. See Site Scoping Notes in Section 3 Appendix H (Environmental Documents). The channel will need to be sloped 18-24” over the 100’ length.
4	If H&H analysis performed after award demonstrates the need to increase culvert size relative to the existing culvert, please confirm that the Department will be responsible for any additional cost.	Additional compensation will not be provided for changes in culvert size after award.
3	Please confirm that Design Build teams should base their bid on providing replacement culverts with the same hydraulic capacity or same size as the existing culverts.	The D-B teams should base their bid on providing replacement culverts based on meeting the hydraulic needs outlined in the Hydrology & Hydraulics Performance Spec, which refers to the DelDOT Bridge Design Manual and other tools to use in determining the appropriate size.
2	The RFP requires that a hydrologic analysis and hydraulic design be performed for each site such that replacement culverts have hydraulic capacity meeting current design standards. Will the Department provide sufficient information (surveys of existing culverts including inverts and cross sections) to allow Design Build teams to size the replacement culverts before bid?	It is the proposers’ responsibility to estimate culvert sizes needed using the information provided. Preliminary H&H can be run relatively quickly using the tools available. Field surveys are part of the D-B team’s responsibility once a contract is executed.

Q #	Question	Answer
1	<p>This is called a “statewide pipe replacement” project, however it includes a specification called: <u>612553-Spray Applied Cementitious Mortar for Pipe, Greater Than 48"</u></p> <p>This spec is for rehabilitation on pipe. So are the pipes to be replaced or rehabilitated?</p>	<p>Per Section 3.0 of the Bridge Performance Specification in Part 3 – Design Requirements Appendix A, 3 locations (BR 1183 276, 1615 021, and 1616 021) will be considered for rehabilitation if the D-B team chooses. This Special Provision provides the requirements for the rehabilitation option that we have used in the past.</p>