STATE OF DELAWARE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

JACK MARKELL
GOVERNOR

PO BOX 778
DOVER, DELAWARE 19903

JENNIFER COHAN
SECRETARY

(302) 760-2030
FAX (302) 739-2254

VIA WEBSITE POSTING

November 30, 2016

Contract No. T201607002
Design-Build Project for Statewide Pipe Replacements
Statewide

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Enclosed is Addendum No. 1 for the referenced contract consisting of the following:

1. The Bid Proposal Cover, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Proposal.
2. The Pre-Bid Meeting Sign-In Attendance Sheet has been posted.
3. During the Pre-Proposal Meeting questions were asked, please see the below questions and answers.

Question: Who is responsible for preparing and submitting environmental documents.

Answer: Design-Build Team will be responsible for preparing the environmental documents, including permit applications, NEPA checklist, and any other documents outlined in the RFP. The documents will be submitted to DelDOT for QA. Documents requiring outside approval, such as permit applications, will be submitted to the respective entity by the Design-Build Team. Submittals to and reviews by DelDOT will be in accordance with the requirements outlined in the RFP.

Question: Clarify items for Form KP as outlined in Special Provision 108.

Answer: As part of Addendum 1, the language in SP 108 has been corrected to remove DDI language and clarify roles required for submission.

Question: When submitting questions must we use the CF Form.

Answer: Questions during the advertisement period should be submitted to the email address shown in the Proposal. The use of Form CF is not required.

Question: Clarify public involvement requirements.

Answer: The Public Involvement Performance Specifications have been modified. The Design-Build Team will work with the Department on materials to be distributed as part of the public outreach effort. The Department will be responsible for the mailings.

Question: Can you provide any additional materials, such as archive plans.

Answer: Information including available archive plans are posted as "Archive Plans".

Question: Can you provide list of approved right-of-way firms.

Answer: Department-approved full service right-of-way firms include Century Engineering, Johnson Mirmiran & Thompson, and Colan Associates. Since Century Engineering is ineligible to participate on a D-B Team, we will allow the D-B Team to submit other potential firms for approval prior to the proposal submittal due date. Additional information for pre-approval will follow.

Question: Is there a chance the contract would not be awarded if the bids come in significantly higher than the estimate.

Answer: As discussed at the pre-proposal meeting, all advertised contracts have some risk of not being awarded

4. One (1) page, Request for Proposals, Section 2.2 Request for Proposal Documents and Information, page 5, paragraph 2.2.1, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the proposal.

5. One (1) page, Request for Proposals, Appendix C, Proposal Forms, Form KP-Key Personnel, revised, to be substituted for the same form in the Proposal.

6. One (1) page, Request for Proposals, Part 2, Section 100, page 149, Design Reviews, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Proposal.

7 One (1) page, Request for Proposals, Part 3, Design Requirements, paragraph 2.2.1 General Responsibilities, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Proposal.

8. One (1) page, Request for Proposals, Part 3, Design Requirements, paragraph 3.0 Requirements, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Proposal.

9. One (1) page, Request for Proposals, Part 4, Table of Contents, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Proposal.

10. One (1) page, Request for Proposals, Part 4, Special Provision 252501-Anionic Polyacrylamide Block, has been added to this section.

11. One (1) page, Request for Proposals, Part 4, Special Provision 712531-Channel Bed Fill, has been added to this section.

12. One (1) page, Request for Proposals, Part 4, Special Provision 108C, Key Personnel Qualifications and Requirements, page 4, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Proposal.

13. One (1) page, Request for Proposals, Part 4, Special Provision 401502-Asphalt Cement Cost Adjustment, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Proposal.

14. Request for Proposal, Part 3, Appendix F, Utility Documents. Additional information has been added to the end of this Appendix. Appendix F, Utility Mark-ups have been posted.

15. Request for Proposal, Part 3, Appendix G, Right-of-Way Documents, have been added to the Proposal and posted.

16. Request for Proposal, Part 3, Appendix H, Environmental Documents, have been added to the Proposal and posted. Also, information regarding endangered species for the first 4 bridge locations, has been added to this Appendix.

17. The Pre-Proposal Meeting Transcript has been posted.

Please note the revisions listed above and submit your bid based upon this information.

Sincerely,

~signature on file~

Robert A. Kovacs

Competitively Bid Contracts Coordinator

STATE OF DELAWARE

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT

for

STATEWIDE PIPE REPLACEMENTS

State Contract T201607002

Federal Aid Contract EBROS-2016(26)

REQUEST FOR ~~QUALIFICATIONS~~ PROPOSALS

- INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS -

Advertisement Date: October 31, 2016

A MANDATORY PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING WILL BE HELD AT THE
DelDOT ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 800 BAY ROAD, DOVER, DELAWARE 19901 AT:
10:00 A.M. on NOVEMBER 15, 2016

Responses must be delivered to the Delaware Department of Transportation, Administration Building, 800 Bay Road, Dover, Delaware, 19901 Attention: Contract Administration, by dates shown in Section 1.5

Pre-Proposal Meeting — Page 1

Project No. T201607002

Design-Build Project for Statewide Pipe Replacements

November 15, 2016, 10:00 A.M.

Name	Company	Address	E-Mail Address	Phone #
MICHAEL ALESTER	PENNONI		MALESTRA@PENNONI.COM	302-351-5247
Mike Davis	Diamond Materials	242 N. James St. Newport. DE 19804	mdavis@diamondmaterials.com	6586524
BRAD HERB	JMT	181 CONTINENTAL DR STE 300 NEWARK, DE 19713	BHERB@JMT.COM	302 266-9600
GREG SAUTER	GTA	21133 Sterling Ave. Georgetown, DE 19947	gsauter@gtaeng.com	302-530-2761
CHRIS BAKER	George: Lynch	150 Lafferty Lane Dover DE 19901	cbaker@geelyn.com	736-3031
KULVEEN GULATI	WBCM	1407 N. 9th Ave King of Prussia PA 19406	Kgulati@wbcm.com	484-429-2197
Jason Vendetti	A.D. Marble	2280 Renaissance Blvd King of Prussia PA	MKD jvendetti@adMarble.com	484-533-2550
GARY THURMAN	MA ENGINEERING	400 LaSalle Rd TOWSON, MD 21286	GThurman@MAEC.com	877-623-2123
PHILIP HORSEY	PENNONI	121 CONTINENTAL DR NEWARK, DE	phorsey@pennoni.com	302.218.8876
JAKE YOHE	A-DEL	10 Adel Dr. Newark, DE 19702	JYOHE@A-DEL.com	302.453.8286
ALEX MEITZLER	AMT	200 CONTINENTAL DR. ST.211 NEWARK DE 19713	AMEITZLER@AMTENGINEERING.COM	302.737.1627
Peter Crony	Mumford & Miller	1001 Industrial Drive Middletown. DE 19709	pcrony@mumfordandmiller.com	302-378-7736
Bob Perrone	Rinker Materials	800 INDUSTRIAL DRIVE MIDDLETOWN, DE 19709	Robert.j.Perrone@cemex.com	302.378-8920
Ryan Becraft	T.Y. Lin International	222 S Dupont Hwy, Suite 103 Dover, DE 19901	ryan.becraft@tylin.com	302-734-8001
Jason Casler	WRA	801 S. Caroline St Baltimore, MD	jcasler@wrallp.com	443-224-1559

Pre-Proposal Meeting — Page 2
Project No. T201607002
Design-Build Project for Statewide Pipe Replacements
November 15, 2016, 10:00 A.M.

Name	Company	Address	E-Mail Address	Phone #
Meghan Lester	Geo-Technology	18 Boulden Circle, Suite 36 New Castle DE 19720	mlester@gteeng.com	302 326 2100
Joseph A Cochran	Joseph A Cochran + Son	1483 Red Lion Rd Bear DE 19701	Joe@CochranExcavating.com	302-652-6628
Natalie Barnhart	RK&K	110 S. Poplar St., Suite 102 Wilmington, DE 19809	nbarnhart@rkk.com	302-685-1226
Doug Robb	GPI	10971 Guilford Road Annapolis Junction, MD	drobb@gpinet.com	502-595-8526
Matt Tarr	Guardian Environmental	70 Acre Dr Newark, DE 19702	MTARR@GIBSONCALL.com	302 757-2683
Alex Summit	Century Eng.	4134 N. DuPont Hwy Dover, DE 19901	ASchmidt@CenturyEng.com	302-734-9189
Felicia Enuha	Bristol Ind. Corp	1010 River Rd New Castle, DE 19720	Fenuha@Bristol-indcorp.com	302-322-1100
Victoria Malaszecki	DBE-WBE-SBE Envision Consultants	3 Wheatley Blvd. Millcreek Hill, NJ	victoriamalaszecki@eclimited.com	856-223-0800
Ryan Kimble	ZACK Excavating Inc	2935 S. DuPont Blvd Smyrna DE 19966	ryan.kimble@ZACKEXC.com	302 223 6223
Juni Alam	GPI	200 Continental Dr Suite 401, Newark, DE	jalam@gpinet.com	302-203-6100
Chad Groat	IPR Northeast	10555 Tucker St Beltsville MD	CGROAT@TEAMIPR.com	301 274 1819
Carter Hyde	Rossin Towne Group	19 Clarion Ct. Cockeysville MD	carter.hyde@rossintg.com	410 262-9029
Pat Kearney	Baker Corp	6408 Arundel Center Baltimore, MD 21226	PKearney@BakerCorp.com	410-980-2783
MO Conteh	JJID	100 Julian Ln	MConteh@JJID	302-897-0537

Pre-Proposal Meeting — Page 3
Project No. T201607002
Design-Build Project for Statewide Pipe Replacements
November 15, 2016, 10:00 A.M.

Name	Company	Address	E-Mail Address	Phone #
MICHAELENA HAYES	MILLBROOK ENGINEERING	PO BOX 966 DOVER DE 19903	MICHAELENA@MILLBROOKENG.COM ~~MICHAELENA@~~	302-312-4716
Pat MCNELIS	REYBOLD CONSTRUCTION	116 E. SCOTLAND DR BEAR DE	PMCNELIS@REYBOLD.COM	302-388-6712

The Design-Builder will be selected based on both pass/fail evaluation factors and technical evaluation of Technical Proposals and Price Proposals that result in the highest Total Score.

2.2 REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION

The RFP and other information may be obtained by Proposers from the person designated as the Department point of contact in Section 2.2.1. The Department will provide electronic access to the RFP to each of the Proposers.

2.2.1 Delaware Department of Transportation Designated Point of Contact

The Department will only consider questions regarding the RFP, including requests for clarification and requests to correct errors, if submitted in writing. All such requests must be submitted via E-mail ~~in the format shown on Form CF (see ITP Appendix C) and E-mailed~~ to:

DOT-ask@state.de.us.

Enter "CMP-DB" on the subject line and send no later than the date specified in Section 1.5.1. Only written requests to the above addressee will be considered. No requests for additional information or clarification to any other Department office, consultant, or employee will be considered. All responses to inquiries are posted on-line at http://www.bids.delaware.gov.

In general, the Department will not consider any correspondence delivered in any other way except as specified above, except the Department may convene informational meetings with Proposers, as it deems necessary. (See Section 4.1.)

Questions received by the date and time specified in Section 1.5.1 will be considered by the Department. Proposers will be provided responses to select questions that will be available at the site where the RFP documents are located. The final Questions and Answers document will be posted no later than the date shown in Section 1.5.1.

It is the responsibility of the Submitter to check the above Webpage often for Addendums, Questions and Answers, and other information concerning this solicitation.

All Questions and Answers posted by the Department on the Project's solicitation webpage are included by reference and become part of this RFP.

If you feel you are having trouble sending or receiving communications, or are a Proposer that does not have access to the internet, you may contact the Department's designated representative:

Jim Hoagland, Contract Services Administrator
jim.hoagland@state.de.us
302-760-2036

2.2.2 Rules of Contact

The following rules of contact shall apply during Contract procurement for the Project, commencing on the RFP advertisement date and concluding with execution of the Contract. Contact includes face-to-face, telephone, facsimile, Electronic-mail (E-mail), text message, or formal written communications.

FORM KP – Key Personnel

Name of Proposer:					
KEY PERSONNEL INFORMATION					
Position	**Name**	**Years of Applicable Experience**	**Education/ Registration**	**Parent Firm Name**	**Percent of Time Dedicated to Project**
Design-Builder's Principal In Charge					
Design-Builder's Construction Project Manager					
Construction Superintendent					
Design Manager					
~~Bridge~~ Highway Design Engineer					
H&H Engineer					
Environmental Compliance Manager					
Utility Manager					
Right-of-Way Manager					

Use additional sheets as needed.

DB 111-8 DESIGN REVIEWS

The Design-Builder shall submit to the Department for Consultation and Written Comment plans, reports, calculations and specifications, at the following stages of design development for all work elements:

a) Preliminary Design
b) Semi-Final Design
c) Final Design
d) Working Drawings
e) Record Drawings

The Department may invite other Project Stakeholders to participate in Consultation and Written Comment. Stakeholders outside DelDOT are not able to be held to the design review timeframes listed within this RFP.

~~The Design-Builder shall stagger design review submittals such that the Department shall only undertake one design review at a time. Multiple sites will not be reviewed concurrently.~~

The Design-Builder shall address and/or resolve the Department's comments in consultation with the Department prior to the Design Review process being considered complete. Any Stakeholder comments will be forwarded to the Design-Builder by the Department and shall be addressed and/or resolved by the Design-Builder.

Except where otherwise noted in the Part 3, Design Requirements, only the Final Design and Record Drawings require Approval.

DB 111-8.1 Preliminary Design Review

Preliminary Design Review is held when Design Plans are at the 50% stage of completion. The Preliminary Design Review is intended to verify that the design concepts proposed by the Design-Builder meet Contract requirements. The Preliminary Design Review shall verify the following:

A) The design concepts governing future design development are defined consistently with Contract requirements;
B) The final Basic Project Configuration;
C) The design concepts are substantiated and justified by adequate Site investigation and analysis, and are constructible;
D) Existing Right-Of-Way, property information and proposed impacts;
E) Town Agreements, Detour Agreements, and Tax Ditch Agreements;
E) Utility impacts;
F) Draft NEPA, permit and consultation documents;
G) Railroad coordination (if necessary);
H) The specific standards applicable to the proposed concepts are identified and appropriate;
I) The design meets Project quality requirements and required design QC procedures have been followed.

See also DB Section 111-12 regarding design deviations and exceptions.

DB 111-8.2 Semi-Final Design Review

Semi-Final Review is held when the Design Plans and Project Specifications are at the 90% stage of completion.

The Design-Builder and the Department shall use the Semi-Final Design Review(s) to verify that the concepts and parameters established and represented by Preliminary Design are being followed and that

PUBLIC OUTREACH PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATION

1 INTRODUCTION

The Department will require assistance from the Design-Builder related to public outreach. This performance specification outlines the responsibilities of the Design-Builder with respect to public outreach, communication, and notification responsibilities and establishes communication protocols for the implementation.

2 REQUIREMENTS

The Department will develop and lead the effort for public outreach on this Project, which will be intended to keep the public and media informed of major activities, decisions, and Project changes through design and construction. Public Workshops will be held for each site through the use of "virtual workshops", which are posted on the Department's website.

2.1 DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

The Department's will have primary responsibility for the following public outreach activities:

a) QA/QC of any approved Design-Builder communication efforts;

b) Secure facilities for meetings;

c) Review and distribute meeting minutes, when appropriate;

d) Compile information provided by the Design-Builder for use in printed materials;

e) Coordinate all printed materials including, but not limited to, newsletters, informational maps, press releases, public notices, advertising and correspondence;

f) Review, approve, and distribute responses to inquiries and comments;

g) Issue and advertise Public Meeting Notices;

h) Provide official spokespersons for the Project; and

i) Host and maintain the Project Website.

2.2 DESIGN-BUILDER RESPONSIBILITIES

2.2.1 General Responsibilities

The Design-Builder shall coordinate and cooperate with the Department on all public outreach-related activities including, but not limited to, attending meetings, providing responses, drawings, technical information, status updates, and responding to requests for information as request by the Department, elected officials, or the public.

The Design-Builder shall help to prepare all mailing lists and to develop all workshop notification materials. ~~The lists shall be submitted to Department for approval.~~ The Department will ~~supply necessary workshop notification materials. The Design-Builder shall~~ mail all letters.

2.2.2 Virtual Workshop

A virtual workshop is required for each site. The virtual workshops will be hosted on the Department's website. The Department will develop a home page for the overall project with separate pages posted for each site. The Department will be responsible for reviewing and approving materials, and for posting materials to the website. The Design-Builder shall prepare all necessary materials for the virtual workshops. Materials will generally include a plan sheet showing the proposed site improvements, a construction traffic control plan, an expected construction schedule and, as necessary, a rendering showing finished site conditions. The virtual workshop shall be posted after the site Right of Way Plans have been recommended for approval.

HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Performance Specification specifies the minimum hydrology and hydraulic requirements to be considered and addressed by the Design-Builder during the design development of the project.

20 STANDARDSAND REFERENCES

The design and construction of the Project elements in this section shall be in accordance with this Performance Specification and the relevant requirements of the following standards, unless otherwise stipulated in this Performance Specification. Standards and references specifically cited in the body of the Performance Specification establish requirements that have precedence over all others. All Standards and Specifications utilized by the Design-Builder shall be the most recent version available at the time of advertisement of the RFP. Should the requirements in one standard conflict with those in another, the standard highest on the list shall govern.

21 STANDARDS

Specific codes and standards include, but are not limited to, the following listed in order of governing precedence.

2.1.1 Design

a) Delaware Department of Transportation "Bridge Design Manual,"2015;
b) AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 7th Edition
c) AASHTO Manual for Bridge Evaluation, 2nd Edition with interims through 2015.
d) Delaware Department of Transportation Design Guidance Memorandums

2.1.2 Specifications

a) Delaware Department of Transportation "Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction" 2016
b) Delaware Department of Transportation "Standard Construction Details" including revisions through the date of advertisement

2.1.3 References

a) FHWA, 2006, HEC-14, "Hydraulic Design of Energy Dissipators for Culverts and Channels", Third Edition, FHWA-NHI-06-086
b) FHWA, 2012a, HDS-5, "Hydraulic Design of Highway Culverts", Third Addition, FHWA-12-026 April
c) USACE, 2001, "River Analysis System, HEC-RAS, User's Manual", Version 3.0, Hydrologic Engineering Center, Davis, CA.
d) USACE, 2010, "HEC-RAS River Analysis System Hydraulic Reference Manual"
e) USGS, 2006, "Magnitude and Frequency of Floods on Nontidal Streams in Delaware", Scientific Investigations Report 2006-5146

3.0 REQUIREMENTS

The Design-Builder shall provide hydrologic ~~analysis~~ and hydraulic ~~design~~ analyses for each site in accordance with the design codes, standards and specifications listed in Section 2.1.

The Design-Builder shall prepare a Hydrologic and Hydraulic Report for each site.

The Design-Builder shall perform a hydrologic analysis at each site using the "Delaware Regression

PART 4 - SPECIAL PROVISIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

252501 - ANIONIC POLYACRYLAMIDE BLOCK

Description:

This work consists of water and soil sampling, procuring and placing an anionic polyacrylamide (PAM) block in the inlet box as shown on the construction details.

Materials:

The PAM block shall consist of an anionic polyacrylamide co-polymer gel block with an attached cord. The PAM block shall meet ANSI/NSF Standard 60 Drinking water treatment chemical standard, shall have passed EPA/600/R-98/182 168-hr. Chronic Toxicity Test (Pimephales promelas) and EPA/600/4-90/027F 48-hr. Acute Static Toxicity Test (Daphnia Magna). PAM block shall have a maximum of 40% moisture content, pH of 6 to 8 in 0.5% solution, and shelf life of four to twelve months. Cationic or other insufficiently documented forms of polyacrylamide shall not be permitted for use.

The PAM blocks shall be provided with an installed anchor chord for placement and stabilization of the blocks. The PAM blocks shall have general dimensions of 12-inches by 8 inches by 2.5 inches.

Installation Method:

Prior to ordering of the polyacrylamide blocks, the Contractor shall prepare and submit water quality and soil samples to the polymer vendor for testing. The water and soil samples shall be collected in a manner and at locations specified by the engineer. Four (4) to six (6) water and soil samples are anticipated to be collected. The samples shall be submitted to the vendor for soil analysis to determine the appropriate polyacrylamide formulation for use at this facility. The results of the vendor testing and the vendor recommendation shall be submitted to the Engineer and DelDOT for review and approval prior to purchase of the PAM blocks.

The PAM block shall be tied to the inlet grate allowing sufficient length of cord for the block to sit at the center of the inlet bottom without blocking the 6” drainage pipe when there is flow. The cord shall be tied multiple times and the tied loops shall be reinforced with plastic ties. Contractor shall provide site testing results to assure proper performance of PAM block. PAM block shall be replaced when the gel block material has been expended to the degree at which it can no longer function adequately.

Safety and Handling:

The Contractor shall be fully responsible for proper use and safe handling of the polyacrylamide blocks and for development and enforcement of a safety plan for handling of the materials. The Engineer and the Department of Transportation shall not be responsible for any safety issues arising from the Contractors misuse or improper handling of the polyacrylamide material.

Measurement and Payment:

The PAM block shall be measured and paid for at the contract unit price per each. Price and payment will constitute full compensation for all labor and incidentals necessary to complete the work.

712531 - CHANNEL BED FILL

Description:

Furnish and place Channel Bed Fill to the limits specified in the construction plan set.

Materials:

Provide aggregate material meeting the following requirements:

Provide natural, rounded, unwashed and uncrushed aggregate material meeting the gradation of Table 1 when tested in accordance with AASHTO T-11 and T-27.

a. Aggregate material meeting this requirement may be located within the excavation area of the project. The Contractor may salvage this material at his/her discretion by separating and stockpiling the material meeting the requirements of Table 1 and Notes 1&2.
b. Angular quarried aggregate is unacceptable.
c. The cost of salvaging and stockpiling existing material and removing excess stockpiled material is incidental to 712531 - Channel Bed Fill.

Table 1

Percent Passing	Light [3]	Medium [4]	Heavy
5-inch	100	90-100 [1]	Gradation to be noted on Plan sheets
1-inch	70-100 [1]	0-20 [2]	
3/4-inch	30-95		
3/8-inch	0-10 [2]		

Notes:

[1] Salvaged materials may contain material exceeding this size and be acceptable.
[2] Salvaged materials may contain up to 20% passing the 3/8-inch sieve but not to exceed 10% passing the #200 sieve when tested in accordance with T-11.
[3] Unless noted otherwise on plan sheets, Light gradation shall be used in locations in Sussex County
[4] Unless noted otherwise on plan sheets, Medium gradation shall be used in locations in Kent and New Castle Counties.

Method of Measurement:

Quantity of Channel Bed Fill will be measured by cubic yards of material acceptably placed.

Basis of Payment:

The quantity of Channel Bed Fill will be paid for at the Contract unit price per cubic yard. Price and Payment will constitute full compensation for all labor, equipment, and other incidentals required to salvage, stockpile, maintain, furnish, haul, place, and remove and dispose of all material necessary to complete the work.

Excavation of existing streambed material will be paid under its respective item.

SPECIAL PROVISION 108C
KEY PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

In the qualifications specified below, the word "shall" indicates a required minimum qualification. The word "should" indicates the Delaware Department of Transportation's preferred qualifications, but such qualification is not a mandatory requirement.

Principal-in-Charge

The Principal-in-Charge ~~S~~shall have a minimum of 20 years of experience in transportation construction projects that included work on projects with similar scope, nature, and complexity as this Project. The Principal-in-Charge shall have served in a similar role on a minimum of one prior project of similar scope, nature, and complexity as this Project.

Construction Project Manager

The Construction Project Manager ~~S~~shall have a minimum of 15 years of experience in management of transportation construction projects that included work of a similar scope, nature, and complexity as this Project. The Design-Build Construction Project Manager shall have served in a similar role on a minimum of one prior project of similar scope, nature and complexity as this Project. The Design-Builder's Construction Project Manager shall be the Design-Builder's representative and single point of contact for all project management and administrative activities during execution of the Work.

Construction Superintendent

The Construction Superintendent ~~S~~shall have a minimum of 10 years of experience in overseeing construction of transportation construction projects that included work of a similar scope, nature, and complexity as this Project. The Design-Build Construction Superintendent shall have served in a similar role on a minimum of one prior project of similar scope, nature and complexity as this Project. The Design-Builder's Construction Superintendent shall be assigned and available on the project site while construction work is being performed and be the Design- Builder's representative and single point of contact in the field during execution of the Work.

Design Manager

The Design Manager shall be a registered ~~p~~Professional ~~Project Manager~~ Engineer in the State of Delaware and shall have a minimum of 15 years of experience in transportation design, including coordination of all required Project ~~Managering~~ Management disciplines. The Design Manager shall have served in a similar role on a project of similar scope, nature, and complexity as this Project. ~~Diverging Diamond experience is desirable but not required.~~

~~Roadway Project Manager~~ Highway Design Engineer

The ~~Roadway Project Manager~~ Highway Design Engineer shall be a registered ~~p~~Professional Engineer ~~Project Manager~~ in the State of Delaware and shall have a minimum of ~~5~~ 10 years of experience on roadway design or bridge design ~~on~~ projects of similar scope, nature, and complexity as this Project. ~~Diverging Diamond experience is desirable but not required.~~

Hydrology and Hydraulics (H&H) Engineer

The H&H Engineer shall be a registered Professional Engineer in the State of Delaware and shall have a minimum of 10 years of experience performing highway and culvert hydraulics on similar projects.

Environmental ~~and Permits~~ Compliance Manager

The Environmental ~~and Permits~~ Compliance Manager shall have a minimum of 10 years of experience managing environmental planning, design, permitting and compliance including NEPA, stormwater, drainage, erosion and sediment control on projects of similar scope, nature, and complexity as this Project.

Utility Manager

The Utility Manager shall have a minimum of 10 years of experience managing utility coordination, design and construction on projects of similar scope, nature, and complexity as this Project.

401502 - ASPHALT CEMENT COST ADJUSTMENT

For Sections 304, 401, 402, 403, 404, and 405, payments to the Design-Builder shall be adjusted to reflect increases or decreases in the Delaware Posted Asphalt Cement Price when compared to the Project Asphalt Cement Base Price, as defined in these Special Provisions.

The Delaware Posted Asphalt Cement Price will be issued monthly by the Department and will be the industry posted price for Asphalt Cement, F.O.B. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The link for the posting is http://www.deldot.gov/information/business/bids/asphalt_cement_english.shtml.

The Project Asphalt Cement Base Price will be the Delaware Posted Asphalt Cement Price in effect on the date of advertisement.

All deviations of the Delaware Posted Asphalt Cement Price from the Project Asphalt Cement Base Price are eligible for cost adjustment. No minimum increases or decreases or corresponding percentages are required to qualify for cost adjustment.

Actual quantity of asphalt cement qualifying for any Asphalt Cement Cost Adjustment will be computed using the weight of eligible asphalt that is shown on the QA/QC pay sheets as a percentage for the delivered material.

If the mix was not inspected and no QA/QC pay sheet was generated, then the asphalt percentage will be obtained from the job mix formula for that mix ID.

The asphalt percentage eligible for cost adjustment shall only be the virgin asphalt cement added to the mix.

There shall be no separate payment per ton cost of asphalt cement. That cost shall be included in the Lump Sum Contract Price~~, and Unit Prices listed on Form SOV for those items that contain asphalt cement (mentioned above)~~.

The Asphalt cement cost adjustment will be calculated on grade PG 64-22 asphalt regardless of the actual grade of asphalt used. The Project Asphalt Cement Base Price per ton for the project will be the Delaware Posted Asphalt Cement Price in effect on the date of project advertisement.

If the Design-Builder exceeds the authorized allotted completion time, the price of asphalt cement on the last authorized allotted work day, shall be the prices used for cost adjustment during the time liquidated damages are assessed. However, if the industry posted price for asphalt cement goes down, the asphalt-cement cost shall be adjusted downward accordingly.

NOTE:

Application of Asphalt Cement Cost Adjustment requirements as indicated above shall apply only to those contracts involving items related to bituminous base and pavements, and with bitumen, having a total of 1,000 tons or more of hot-mix bid quantity in case of Sections 401, 402 and 403; and 15,000 gallons or more in case of Sections 304, 404 and 405.

5/05/15

In The Matter Of:

Department of Transportation

In re: State Contract T201607002

Pre-proposal Meeting

November 15, 2016

Wilcox & Fetzer, Ltd.

1330 King Street

Wilmington, DE 19801

email: depos@wilfet.com, web: www.wilfet.com

phone: 302-655-0477, fax: 302-655-0497

Original File Deldot State Contract T201607002 11-15-16 Proposal Meeting.txt

Min-U-Script® with Word Index

STATE OF DELAWARE

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

IN RE: DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT :
FOR STATEWIDE PIPE :
REPLACEMENTS - STATE CONTRACT:
T201607002 :

Pre-proposal meeting taken pursuant to notice at the Delaware Department of Transportation, 800 Bay Road, Dover, Delaware, beginning at 10:00 a.m., on Tuesday, November 15, 2016, before Gloria M. D'Amore, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public.

- - -

WILCOX & FETZER
Registered Professional Reporters
1330 King Street - Wilmington, Delaware 19801
(302) 655-0477
www.wilfet.com

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the State of Delaware
Department of Transportation:
ROBERT A. KOVACS
JASON HASTINGS
MICHAEL A. ANGELO, P.E.
ANNA SMITH

- - - - -

MR. KOVACS: Good morning, everybody. My name is Bob Kovacs. I'm a Contracts Coordinator here with DelDOT.

This is a mandatory Pre-proposal Meeting. It is for our Design-Build Project for Statewide Pipe Replacements. Again, this is a mandatory meeting. So, please, everybody that is in this room, aside from DelDOT folks, please sign in the sign-in sheet, wherever it's at.

I would just ask that you print as neat as you can just in case we need to contact you and also so we can get a clear recording.

If anybody has any questions after the meeting, we ask that you send them to our dot-ask E-mail address. If you don't have that, it's up here. You can grab that on your way out.

Before I turn it over to the Project Manager, I just want to mention a few things regarding this project.

It is, more or less, a reminder. Just to make sure that you fill out our

certification page and our bid bond page completely and accurately, the certification page requires it to be notarized. And actually, any forms that you need to fill out, just make sure you fill them out completely. We still have instances where people are turning in forms that are not completed. So, I just wanted to reiterate that.

With that being said, I would like to turn it over to our Project Manager, Mr. Jason Hastings.

MR. HASTINGS: Good morning. My name is Jason Hastings. I'm the State Bridge Design Engineer.

This project is coming through my section, the Bridge Design section.

Mike Angelo, who is with McCormick Taylor, is actually going to be the day-to-day Project Manager for the project. He has helped us put the RFP together, and he'll help us and support us through the extent of the project.

A little bit of background on the project. Why did we choose to put

together a package of 31 locations replacing corrugated metal pipes?

Back in the late 1970's, early 1980's DelDOT went through and replaced a lot of old timber bridges with corrugated metal pipes to the tune of several hundred. And, of course, they were all done at the same time. And now 25, 30, 35 years later, they are all coming to the end of their service life at the same time.

When they did that, they actually took them out of our bridge inventory. So, in DelDOT, we consider anything greater than a 20-square foot opening to be a bridge. So, it gets treated with the same standards as a normal highway bridge following the National Bridge Inventory or Inspection Standards. So, it gets inspected every two years.

So, when they pulled them out of the inventory, they were no longer being inspected. No one was keeping an eye on them. And in the early 2000's, we started to see a lot of sinkholes or failures. And we found

that we actually had way more corrugated pipe culverts in our inventory than we anticipated.

So, at that time, we started kind of an ambush on replacing as many of these metal pipes as we could.

We've done a pretty good job since the early 2000's. We've gotten through over a couple hundred of them. We still have about 200 left in our inventory.

And so, we're looking at this project as an opportunity to team up with the design-build team, contractor consultant team, to kind of do additional work above and beyond what our resources are capable of doing in-house through traditional methods.

As you see with the RFP, there is a lot of responsibility being put on the design-build team that normally would be done by DelDOT or its consultant during the design phase. We see that as an opportunity to kind of condense, streamline the process, condense the time frames, and get a lot of these pipes out of our inventory.

We recently had a closure on SR

14 west of Harrington. It was a metal pipe. It failed. It was in our program. We didn't get to it fast enough. So, we're trying to get ahead of these.

So, what we did in putting this contract together was, we actually didn't pick structurally deficient pipes. We picked ones that are in fair condition, the ones that are kind of the next bubble that would make it into our program.

And as part of that, we recognize that it's not a -- we're not looking at a rush project. We're giving the team four years to complete these 31 locations, like I said, to supplement our resources.

So, we see this as a way to -- you know -- we'll maintain our normal projects internally. We're replacing 25 or 30 of these through a combination of contract projects, as well as maintenance forces. That's 25 or 30 per year. And then we see this as an opportunity to then increase that number over the next four years.

So, from our standpoint, we're

excited about the opportunity of really increasing or improving our bridge infrastructure.

As I mentioned, we have over 200 that are still -- 200 CMPs in our inventory. So, that makes up about 15 percent of our bridge inventory, but it's over two-thirds of our structurally deficient bridges. So, you can kind of see there's a skew toward these metal pipes.

So, in putting this contract together, like I said, we're looking at fair -- bridges in fair condition.

We also looked at other metal pipes in the area that were built in similar time. Maybe they were in better condition. But even through economics of proximity, you know, we think we can get a better price if you're already working in an area and you go and replace the next one upstream or downstream or an adjacent roadway. We can see some economic benefit there as well.

We've picked locations that -- so, our metal pipes have a wide range of

sizes, anywhere five-foot diameter or multiple four-foot diameter pipes all the way up to steel pipe arches that are 20 feet spans.

So, we kept this project simple to locations that we think could be easily replaced with other pipes. We're not looking at the big ones, the 20-foot spans that you're going to be putting a bridge or make a big frame or even a big box on. We're thinking pipes with pipes is kind of the idea that we had when we identified the locations.

We cut out locations that had specific issues, such as pipes on Route 1. We want to keep these relatively simple. So, a lot of them are rural back roads or have very minimal environment or utility or right-of-way impacts. Trying to keep it to something that could be packaged pretty easily.

So, with that, we got it down to about 36 locations, and then we went out and did a site visit to each one of the locations with all of our support sections, and we paired it down by another five, to 31, which is currently included in the package.

A couple of items of note, though. We did include, and you'll see that in Section 1 of the Instruction to Proposer, as well as Section 3 of Scope Part 1.

We did include a language in there where we can add and delete locations. It's certainly not DelDOT's desire to delete any locations. But what we fear is, we may run into something where there are issues that just were not anticipated when we put the RFP together or when you put your bid together. So, in fairness, we want to have the ability to remove those locations.

Throughout the next four years, if we find similar locations in nearby areas, we would consider them working with the successful design-build team to add those locations through the negotiation process. So, we wanted to keep that option in there for flexibility in the contract.

Let's see. We have two firms that are ineligible to participate in submitting a bid.

One is, obviously, McCormick

Taylor, who helped us put the RFP together.

The other is Century Engineering, who is serving as our CCR and stormwater inspection and review consultant and construction QA review as well.

There's a proposed procurement schedule in Section 1.5 of the Instruction to Proposers, the ITP.

Note that we have included optional one-on-one meetings with the design-build teams during the week of December 12th through 16th.

So, if you're interested in meeting one on one just to get clarification on any specific ideas that you have for preparing your bid, please schedule a time, I guess, through the dot-ask E-mail.

Is that how we'll do it?

MR. KOVACS: Sure.

MR. HASTINGS: Through the dot-ask E-mail, and we'll set up a time so you can meet with Mike and I and we'll cover whatever clarifications you need for your bid.

Let's see. I wrote down several

items I wanted to highlight in the RFP. Obviously, you're not going to read, or you're not going to sit down today and read, what, 1,300 or 1,400 pages. I recognize that. But there's a lot of really good information, obviously, a lot of important information in there I wanted to highlight. So, I'll bring that to you now.

Schedule information. So, part of the proposal includes your design and construction schedule. And that's shown in ITP Appendix D in the example score sheets, as well as ITP Appendix A, Section A 4.2.3.

Specifically, we are requiring a detailed schedule for the first four locations. We identify four locations that are most critical. So, these actually, as we were putting the RFP together, these locations dropped to become structurally deficient. So, we want those to be the top priority as you're developing the project.

Their locations are noted. I'll give them to you. 2-066A, 3-132, 3-576 and 3-681.

And so, those will need detailed schedules. We want to see a detailed schedule included with your proposal.

And then for the remainder, just milestones. We want to kind of see what your thought process is in putting together your design and construction schedule throughout the four-year process. How you're prioritizing? How you're addressing locations? Is there going to be overlap, that sort of thing to really see how you're thinking that project through?

We also have a note that we might reprioritize throughout the design project, or throughout the project if a bridge inspection notes that another location becomes structurally deficient. So, we want to make you aware as we go through the project, there may be times where through a bridge inspection, you might have to kind of readjust your priority as we go through.

There is a section on payment, which is in Part 2, Section 109-2. It kind of outlines how the payment schedule would be

made throughout the project.

We are submitting a cost for design for each location, as well as cost for construction for each location. And then you'll invoice certain amounts for each milestone.

So, for example, when you submit preliminary plans for a location, you can bill up to 50 percent of your design cost for that location. So, it's broken down in that section for you.

Obviously, the next most important thing besides money is time. So, we have the design reviews spelled out in Part 2 Section 111-4.

We've called for a 17 working day turnaround for comments from DelDOT. Now, we've included the first two days in that 17 days as a review by Mike and I just to ensure that we have a complete submission. But if we don't have the complete submission, the 17 days doesn't start until we get a complete submission.

We also noted that we're

allowing for two submittals to be in DelDOT's shop at a time. So, you can have one preliminary and one semi-final submission at a time. If you go above that, we're going to add five days for each submittal that's above that limit.

So, for example, if you have two prelim and two semi-final plans all in DelDOT, then all four of those will have 27 working days instead of 17. So, it's just so that you don't come in day one and give us 31 preliminary plans and think we're going to get them back to you in 17 days. Kind of why we gave you four years. We don't expect 31 locations done in six months. We have plenty of time to get these done.

Back in the Performance Specs, under the Bridge Requirements, that's in Part 3, Appendix A, we are requiring the use of re-enforce concreted pipe. If you go into our bridge design manual, it shows we do not allow corrugated metal pipe for obvious reasons. I don't think I have to explain that one.

So, we're requiring the use of

reenforced concrete pipe. We will, in some situations, consider the use of ACPE or SRPE, steel re-enforced polyethylene pipe, if the design-build team can justify why you cannot use RCP.

There has been one or two incidences where we've allowed the use of ACPE, or SRPE, instead of RCPE just simply because of some other constraints that weren't consistent with most of our locations.

We have also included three locations where we are allowing rehab to be considered. Specifically, bridges 1-183, 1-615 and 1-616. Those three locations have other constraints. Specifically, they have a sewer line running over top of the pipes for high traffic volumes. So, we have included the special provision for the centrifugally cast concrete liner, if the design-build team chooses to go in that direction.

Obviously, we've left it flexible. It's not a requirement. We'll talk a little bit more about utilities in a second. Other constraints may direct you toward one

solution over another.

Also, in the Performance Specs under Traffic Requirements, we've outlined what MOT is required. Specifically, there are time restrictions in the table in Section 3.5, as well as note that there are two locations 1-615, 1-616 that require a TMPB.

A TMPB requires a -- it's more than just a traffic control plan. It requires a write-up and analysis of what potential impacts to traffic there are, what delays there are, what mitigation efforts are required. And so, obviously, that would come into play in figuring out what is the best solution for that location.

Also note in Appendix B, we require pedestrian detour only at one location which is 2-66 A. Pedestrian detour is required wherever there's an existing pedestrian facility. And for the most part, we picked locations that did not have pedestrian facilities. We have one. So, that would have to be included in your MOT plan.

For HAZMAT considerations, we

included special provision 202560 for contaminated material. So, like I mentioned in the beginning, we replaced a lot of old timber bridges with these metal pipes.

And so, what we found in, probably, about 20 to 30 percent of the locations where we've replaced metal pipes is that there may be an old timber abutment that is buried. Now, the timber has creosote.

So, typically, what we've done, the plan is very simple. The contractor removes it, stockpiles it on a couple of pieces of plastic, covers it up and then our consultant DelDOT's HAZMAT consultant comes and removes it and disposes of it. That is all outlined in the special provision.

So, the contaminated material testing and disposal is going to be on DelDOT. It is not going to be a requirement of the design-built team. But you should anticipate that there may be locations where you have to set up a little stockpile area for any pieces of timber abutment that comes out so that our guys can get it.

Any other HAZMAT issues that are identified during design, a similar plan would be developed, specifically for that site. We don't anticipate there being anything significant. Like I said, we scoped all 31 locations. We feel pretty comfortable with what we included in the package.

One of the biggest constraints on our projects is always utilities. So, we've outlined what the responsibilities of the design-build team, as well as DelDOT are in the Performance Specs, as well as Appendix F, which includes a lot of documentation required as part of the process.

So, in the Appendix F, we have several documents that include the spreadsheet identifying utilities that are present at each location.

I mentioned the sewer line at three locations that we identified before. But then, we have a spreadsheet showing which utilities are specifically at least located within each location.

We have other forms and

checklists that are required for the design process. We have utility mark-ups that are available for some of the locations. And we got to figure out -- Mike and I were talking before -- we have to make sure we have them for all of them.

We know that we have -- when we scoped the locations -- we identified all of the visible evidence of utilities. We included that in our scoping sheets. But we also got some mark-up from utility companies already. We can provide that information as well.

We are requiring the use of a utility conflict matrix for each location. It's a pretty simple form to be filled out. It is a good communication tool back and forth with the utility companies. It is something that we are beginning to use on most of our projects internally. So, we have included that in the appendix.

And in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the performance spec, it outlines DelDOT's responsibility and the design-build team's

responsibility for coordination.

And then in Section 3.4 it talks about payment. Specifically, I want to highlight that the design-build team is responsible for incorporated work.

So, for example, the municipal sewer line, New Castle County sewer line, that's at those three locations that I mentioned before, should relocation be required, that would need to be included in the design build price because that is reimbursable work that would be done under contract.

And it actually goes into a little more detail in that section. So, I wanted to highlight that section for you.

And Eric, did I miss anything? Anything big you wanted to highlight?

MR. CEMO: No. Eric Cemo. Utility engineer.

So, in general, the gist is, the majority of the responsibility is to make that coordination effort and to figure out what's going on with the utility companies that's

going to be able to design build team issues.

DelDOT is just there to help facilitate should there be a lack of cooperation.

And then from an agreement standpoint, the Department is responsible for putting agreements together and putting them in place.

Like Jason said, those sections in the documentation outlines very specific information. This is not information that we used on past projects. So, pay close attention to it because it is very detailed.

MR. HASTINGS: Thanks.

Regarding right-of-way, there's a right-of-way performance spec section in Part 3, Appendix A, as well as documentation in Appendix G.

Just note that currently on the website, the documents for Appendix G are not included. We'll have to include those as part of an addendum.

So, we're putting the acquisition process on the design-build team,

which, like some of the utility information, is also a little bit new.

We are requiring that the design-build team use one of the DelDOT approved consultants. So, we will get that list.

Bob, I think you have that list?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

MR. HASTINGS: We have that list. We have to get that part as of the RFP.

That is a little bit different than what we typically have done in design-build projects in the past.

Now, the specs outline kind of what the responsibilities are and where it crosses over into what DelDOT has to take over.

Obviously, we can't turn over condemnation and appraisal reviews and certain things to the design-build team. But we're going to expect that the design-build team does prepare all of the documentation. There is going to be an approval process as part of that going through Bob's shop to make sure

that the documentation is in line with what we require.

But that is all outlined in the Performance Specs. It is actually a pretty detailed spec. I know Bob and I went back and forth on it. I think Mike probably had more conversations about it than I.

Just one note. It is not spelled out anywhere in there. But early outreach to property owners is key. We found that if we just start talking with them early, they are much more friendly than when you show up at their door with an offer to take their property. Just a little PR.

Design build is responsible for, like I said, appraisals, title searches. The appraisal waivers have to get reviewed and approved by Bob's shop.

And then, we carry out, or DelDOT will carry out the settlement, the condemnation and make the payments. The actual cost of right-of-way acquisition is on DelDOT. It is not going to be part of your proposal.

Obviously, the incentive for you guys is to keep a minimum footprint to make the right-of-way process go smoother.

Environmental. Obviously, environmental is always a big concern. So, we've laid it out pretty detailed as well. Also in Part 3, Appendix A, the Performance Specs, as well as Appendix H for documentation.

Just like with the right-of-way documents, they did not get included with an appendix, so we will submit those as part of appendix or an addendum.

So, we had a general categorical exclusion. We need the document done for the project in order to advertise. And we made certain assumptions in the CAT EX. So, we're requiring a checklist be done for each location. If it doesn't meet the certain requirements that are outlined in there, then, there may be a modification to the CAT EX that has to be done as part of the process.

We have included, or we will include a lot of the documentation that would

be required. For example, permit applications. Example, RTE letters, which is rare, threatening endangered species letter. Several other items that needed to be done as part of the environmental process.

But like I said in the beginning, we selected locations that we think are going to be minimal. And so you will see as part of the CAT EX and what the requirements are, most of the locations should be fairly streamlined in terms of environmental coordination.

Let's see. The documentation is going be prepared by the design-build team.

But, I think, Anna, correct me if I'm wrong, the permits will actually have to be submitted from DelDOT to the permit applications, or did we include that on the design-build team?

MS. SMITH: I'll have to clarify. I think we said that the design build team would prepare, and we would review, and then they could send it in. But oversight is by us.

MS. HASTINGS: We will confirm that. But at the very least, the permit applications, documentation would have to go through our environmental section and whether they submit it or you guys submit it, we will clarify that.

We also included our scoping notes, or will include our scoping notes in that appendix for environmental highlights, any kind of issue, potential issues at any of the locations, any of the 31 locations. That will need to be coordinated throughout the design process.

One thing of note. In the survey section, we require the top of the existing corrugated metal pipes to be surveyed, so we get survey elevations there. And that is for a process we call stream stats, which is done by our environmental section.

And so what they do, we have a couple of folks, Ken Dunn, Kristy Bonnewell, who go out and do cross sections of the stream for low flow conditions.

So, normally you're doing design for hydraulics and storm events. But we also have certain unwritten and written agreements with our environmental friends to put the stream back in a friendly manner.

And so, part of that comes from what they prepare through this process called StreamStats. In order to get the information for StreamStats, which tells kind of the stream elevations, what elevation we need to -- sometimes we reset one -- or we recess one pipe versus the adjacent pipes in order to allow a low flow channel for fish passage. And also, in kind of integrating the stream, what kind of streambed materials goes back.

So, they need the elevation of the top of the pipe when a survey is being done. That is included in the survey section of the Performance Specs. And then the StreamStats process, once you get that elevation to our environmental study section, they can give all of the StreamStats information.

It's not a significant concern

in terms of footprint or material type or changing excavation and quantities, that sort of thing, it is just more very fine details of the channel at the end.

Most of them are pretty similar. Most of them are pretty standard. We have highlighted a couple in the scoping notes that need extra attention paid to them. You will see that when the addendum comes out.

But for the most part of the 31 locations, they all should be relatively cookie cutter.

Stormwater requirements. As I mentioned, Century Engineers is performing our CCR and stormwater reviews for us. And so, we have stormwater Performance Specs developed, as well as in Appendix D, there are documents that need to be filled out for each location.

As a general rule, we looked at locations where we are going to have a small footprint so we can use what we have, the agreement that we have with DNREC, which is to use a standard plan. Standard plan is just your ENS Sheet with your construction sequence

included. And it actually outlines in the Performance Specs all that is included in that plan. But in general, it's just the ENS Sheet that is included in our normal contract documents that get advertised.

The limits for that is, as long as we have less than 5,000 square feet of additional impervious, so we're not adding lanes or anything like that, as well as under one acre of disturbed area. And the disturbed area is wherever you're excavating and you get to -- or you're disturbing soil, essentially.

So, if you mill pavement, that doesn't count. As long as there is still a basic pavement underneath. It is only when you actually touch the soil.

So, as long as we stay under those two thresholds, a standard plan would be the only thing that is needed, which you would have to do an ENS sheet anyway as part of the process. So, nothing above and beyond would be needed.

One thing to note, because it's design build, normally for an ENS Sheet, we'll

put together a footprint that kind of allows for flexibility and the design-build team for the design bid build contractor.

In the design-build situation, we want to see, as part of the ENS Sheet, what you're actually going to be using. So, your stockpile area, where it's going to be, if you're going to use sheet pile, instead of sandbags for your stream diversion. Where you're going to put your sump pits or watering bags, that sort of thing.

I mean, every one of you guys knows, that once you get into construction, you have to make a change, then there is additional time that is required. If we get it done through the design process, then it will certainly streamline the construction time.

There is a section on Public Involvement. We will have a project website up within the next couple of weeks. And on that website we'll have a location for -- a site for -- a page for each location.

We'll want some general ideas

for schedule from the design-build team, once we get the design-build team under contract.

Obviously, things are subject to change, but we want to be able to have that information out there for any of the public who is interested.

For each location, we will have to do a virtual workshop. That is just an online workshop where we include certain information and give a 30-day comment period.

We also send out notifications to potentially impacted residents. All of that is outlined in the Performance Specs.

We also will have a certain understanding that the design-build team will have to be available to talk with legislators and citizens if any major concerns come up through the process.

I'm sure many of you have experienced that on projects before. And then, again, just reiterate early outreach to residents and other groups. It's always beneficial for any of these projects.

The last big item I have, I'm

sorry I'm talking so long, but there is like 1,400 pages in this document. So, I condensed it to 35 minutes.

Additional design information in, I think it's Part 2 -- Part 2 alone is over 1,100 pages. That's before we add in the additional information, Appendix G and H.

But I want to highlight Payment Design Information in Appendix C. That just gives you what the structural number is for the payment that has to go back.

We included initial borings and testing at all of the locations. And that is in Appendix E. It doesn't mean that that's all the information you need. But we want to help minimize the risk that you have as you put together your bids.

And inspection reports may include inspection reports for all of the bridges, at least the most recent reports. Obviously, they are getting inspected on a two-year cycle. We will have to update those reports throughout the project. At least we want to give you some idea.

Just note, ignore the sufficiency rating because you're probably going to see some really very high numbers and wonder why we are replacing these pristine bridges.

Metal pipes, like I said in the beginning, we treat them using NBIS Standards. However, not everything fits like a glove. So, the sufficiency rating formula doesn't quite work out as well with metal pipes. It's not until it starts to fall into the fair and poor category does the sufficiency rating actually start to drop.

So, forget that number. Just look at the pictures. Look at the quantities of what part of the pipe is in poor condition and use that information as you need.

And then just to kind of wrap up. Compile the addenda items. So, I had mentioned that there is a little bit of additional information that we have to add in Appendix F under utilities. There are a couple of things that went missing, as well as Appendix G and H, which were right-of-way and

environmental. We'll get those up this week.

We are going to add, at LaTonya's request, a special provision for -- I'm going to say this wrong -- anionic polyacrylamide blocks, PAM blocks. Basically, it is another tool to use for ENS. They're available at most suppliers. Just another option for you for your ENS control. You don't have to stick with the standard control.

The transcript of this meeting and then as well as any additional clarification that come out of any questions that you guys have today, and questions after this meeting would have to go back through the E-mail as Bob mentioned at the beginning.

All right. I think I am done talking.

Mike, did you have anything?

MR. ANGELO: I think you got it covered.

MR. KOVACS: Everybody that is here, aside from DelDOT employees, signed in. Is that correct? We're good. Thank you.

MR. HASTINGS: All right. So,

with that, I will open it up to any questions that you have.

MR. MEITZLER: Alex Meitzler with AMT.

For the purposes of bidding, is it intended that the pipes be placed in kind as far as the opening? Or do you anticipate for the bid purpose to do some hydraulic analysis if they're undersized? What is your intention?

MR. HASTINGS: We did kind of an initial screening in order to get down to our 31 locations where we think all of the locations can be replaced with pipes of some size.

We think that you could probably do a preliminary hydraulic analysis pretty quickly with some of the tools that are outlined in the RFP just to get a general idea of what sizes you will need at these locations.

But I wouldn't necessarily assume that it would be in kind. There's probably going to be some difference in size.

It is metal pipe. You get a benefit of a smoother pipe when you go with concrete or a liner. But then, we also have different rainfall numbers than we did when those pipes were put in.

We have found in some cases in Sussex County that the existing pipes were oversized and found in some cases they were undersized.

A relatively quick analysis could be done just to get a ballpark for a project like this.

MR. VENDETTI: Jason Vendetti with A.D. Marble.

From the environmental perspective, I believe I read in the RFP that the Department would do all of the wetland delineations, would handle Section 4F, Section 6F coordination, all that documentation. We don't need to worry about any of that?

MS. SMITH: That's correct.

MR. VENDETTI: The consultant would be responsible for any threatened endangered species surveys that may be

required. There shouldn't be any?

MS. SMITH: There shouldn't be any. I think we pre-screened a lot of them. There shouldn't be any. But the letters will be drafted, reviewed by us, and then that's the part that we need to clarify.

MR. VENDETTI: Basically, the checklist verification. Changes on your CAT EX I already have and then the permitting side of things.

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. ERONY: Peter Erony of Mumford and Miller.

Could you explain, Jason, what differences, if any, you're going to handle with inspection or QAQC? Is the lab going to play their traditional role, or is it going to be more on the build team?

MR. HASTINGS: So, we included information in the RFP about the QAQC. And part of it is that the design-build team is supplying the day-to-day construction oversight for doing certain testing.

I think our lab is doing QA

testing, but we do have certain requirements for what the design-build team is to perform.

It should be outlined in the QAQC section. I think it is in Part 2, one of the later sections, 110, 111, 108, somewhere in that area. And it should be outlined in there.

MR. ERONY: How about inspections? Are you going to have a full time --

MR. HASTINGS: Century Engineer is going to do a QA inspection as part of their CCR inspection. When they come out to look at CCR, they are going to make sure the design-build team's QC inspector has been doing the IDR's and that sort of thing. That is also outlined in, basically, the same section, the quality control section.

MR. ERONY: Thank you.

MR. COSLER: Jason Cosler.

Is there a fee that speaks at all how the locations are to be packaged, maximum number of pipes per submittal package and the time frame per package, obviously?

One package of 30, or 30 packages of one, probably not what you're looking for. Does it speak to that and how that fits into the permitting?

MR. HASTINGS: We call each location a site. So, each one is separate. Now, I know there are a few that are close by, close to each other.

But in terms of submittals, each location will get each submittal. And so, when I talked about the number of submittals and the review time frames, that's all assuming that it's one submittal per site.

MR. COSLER: So, in terms of standard planning criteria, you're looking at that per site?

MR. HASTINGS: Yes.

MR. HERB: Brad Herb with JMT.

You mentioned some of the existing data provided in the RFP.

Does DelDOT plan to provide as-built plans in each of its reports, right-of-way plans?

MR. HASTINGS: So, we do not

have any H&H reports from the existing structures. We have our archived plans of some locations.

Most of those pipes, when they were replaced, were done by maintenance. So, they were not really contract documents. They were archived plans. So, we don't have a lot of the archived information from what is actually there.

We have old plans that could at least give you some idea on right-of-way and baseline and that sort of thing. Maybe even whether or not where a timber abutment might be. We can provide that as well. But we don't have archived plans for each location.

Thank you.

MR. DAVIS: Michael Davis. Diamond Materials.

You had mentioned about the timber abutments and we are to have a hazardous material consideration.

Is that supposed to be all inclusive in the pricing of this RFQ, or are we dealing on a case-by-case basis as it's

discovered since it is unknown?

MR. HASTINGS: We included the special provision which outlines the plan for what happens in the event that you come across that.

It outlines what DelDOT's responsibilities are, what the contractor responsibilities are, what kind of the costs -- risk and cost benefit to the design-build team is for those situations.

Because you don't have to dispose of it, there's a benefit to you, whereas, if it's not there, obviously, you don't have to worry about it.

If there is a creosote abutment there, all you have to do is stockpile it, and then our consultant comes in and takes it. We pay our consultant directly.

MR. DAVIS: So, no additional compensation to the contractor regardless of how many times it occurs?

MR. HASTINGS: Right.

MR. DAVIS: You said it is about 25 percent of the location?

MR. HASTINGS: General. That's what we've seen. 20 to 25 percent of the locations. Once we have some additional archived plan information, you may be able to rule out some of the locations specifically, too.

MS. BARNHART: Natalie Barnhart. RK&K.

Jason, you mentioned the survey spec where the team has to service the top of the pipe and then give it to Ken Dunn.

Is that expected to happen prior to submitting a bid?

MR. HASTINGS: No.

MS. BARNHART: But that could change what you have to do out there?

MR. HASTINGS: Not significantly. It would be a matter of maybe a pipe needs to be lower, or maybe you need to have the left pipe lower than the right pipe. Some locations you may not need a low flow channel. Some maybe you would. It would be very minimal.

MS. BARNHART: Would that

analysis, even if it's done afterward, include what type of bedding or stream restoration? That is part of that review. Correct?

MR. HASTINGS: One thing that I think is missing is the channel bed fill spec.

So, for the most part, we will stick with that spec. Sussex gets a certain gradation. Kent gets a certain one. And New Castle County gets a certain one.

There may be cases -- it's very rare. It's not very common we have to deviate from that spec. How many -- how often would you say -- maybe -- less than ten percent. It is not like it would go from channel bed fill to huge rock. It would be a minor gradation.

MS. SMITH: I know Sussex County is light grade. Default is light gradation. Kent I think is medium, but sometimes light.

MR. MEITZLER: Alex Meitzler with AMT. Request for addendum.

Can you clarify Special Provision 108 C, design manager, roadway manager? Can you clarify what you're looking for? And similarly, Form 2P, those two kind

of go together.

MR. HASTINGS: Okay.

MR. MEITZLER: Alex Meitzler with AMT again. Just one more quick question.

Is there an inspection report for Structure 3-914 A?

MR. HASTINGS: Thank you for bringing that up.

So, one location 3-914 A. It is a five-foot diameter pipe. It technically does not meet our requirements to be a bridge. So, it has actually not been inspected as a bridge. We found it on our scoping trip, actually.

And so, we wanted to include it since it is in proximity to 913 and 914.

So, it doesn't have inspection reports. It actually doesn't have soil borings either. It's a small pipe. It's in similar condition to 913 and 914.

MR. BAKER: Chris Baker from George and Lynch.

So, there's no short list. I will also take it there is no stipend?

MR. HASTINGS: Correct.

MR. BAKER: Second question.

Is there any incentive or disincentive for ENS reports? CCR reports?

MR. HASTINGS: We are not including that here.

MR. BAKER: Thank you.

MR. HERB: Brad Herb of JMT.

The RFP refers to the Form F, but wasn't included in the original relief. Could you provide that, please?

MR. HASTINGS: All right. Making sure.

MR. MEITZLER: Alex Meitzler with AMT again. Similar vein.

Mark "Piasso" states questions are to utilize Forms CF. That wasn't included either. I know that the last time we just E-mailed questions to dot-ask.

Do we continue that same practice?

MR. HASTINGS: Yes. Use the website.

Where is that form referenced?

Do you have it with you?

MR. MEITZLER: Give me a second. I'll find it.

MR. HASTINGS: I can search for it.

MR. MEITZLER: Section 2.2.1 in Instructions to Proposer.

MR. HASTINGS: Thank you. We will get that clarified.

MR. HYDE: Carter Hyde with Rossi Transportation Group.

Just a quick question and clarification. Part 3, Design Requirements, Section 3.0, it's referring to -- it says that the hydraulic analysis should be done in accordance with using HY8. And then the next sentence says, Shall perform a hydraulic design at each site using FHWA Program.

I'm not really sure what the intent is there. There are two different sentences stating kind of two different requirements. One says analysis. One says design.

MR. HASTINGS: Right. So, I'll

look into it and clarify.

You have to do an analysis to do the design.

MR. HYDE: Right.

MR. KOVACS: Sir, can you send that question to our dot-ask, please?

Thank you.

MR. HORSEY: Philip Horsey. A follow-up to Natalie.

The feedback from Ken, would that be -- we assume that would be coming from that 17-day feedback in the comments that we get back from the preliminary. Is that information provided?

MR. HASTINGS: If it's just providing the elevation, that could be outside of a submittal. They've done the StreamStats for probably about two-thirds of the locations.

So, they just need the elevation in order to be able to turn the information around. So, it could potentially --

MR. HORSEY: Where it fits in the schedule.

MR. HASTINGS: If you just send in the elevation for survey, we can get that turned around outside of any kind of submittal.

If you give us 31 at the same time, maybe it would take a little bit longer. It could be out before or after -- it needs to be before the preliminary submittal or with the preliminary submittal, either one.

MR. HORSEY: Under the Public Outreach Performance Spec under 2.21, it says, Design builder shall prepare all mailing list. The lists will be submitted to the Department for approval and the design builder is responsible for mailing all of that out.

I guess what are you envisioning as the mailing list? How wide of a reach?

MR. HASTINGS: We can get clarification on that.

Most of them are going to be very small, a very small radius. Maybe the houses on the road. Some of the bigger ones, probably, some of the ones in New Castle County might be including larger areas.

So, let me get a little more clarification on that. We can probably add in some kind of guidance in the RFP for that.

MR. KOVACS: Sir, can you send that question to our dot-ask?

Any questions that we are not sure on, and that's going to be my standard at this point, since we got four or five we are going to put in our addendum that I send out, just to keep it condensed as possible. I'm sure there will be multiple addendums on this project. I'm just trying to streamline it as best I can.

MR. HORSEY: The right-of-way, I think it's pretty prescribed in the Performance Specs the right-of-way, of those that we're being required to use, when would those be known?

MR. HASTINGS: We'll include that as part of the addendum. It is probably in the stuff that is missing from the appendix. So, we got it in there.

MR. KOVACS: Okay.

MR. BAKER: Chris Baker again.

George and Lynch.

I assume there is an engineer's estimate?

MR. HASTINGS: Yes.

MR. BAKER: It would not be shared prior to the proposal?

MR. HASTINGS: Correct.

MR. BAKER: Is there a percentage -- in other words, if all of the proposals come in over the estimate, at what point would the project not be awarded?

MR. HASTINGS: I don't know that we have a hard and fast number. I'm not sure.

MR. BAKER: Maybe we want to ask that through the dot-ask. Would we be able to get an answer between now and the proposal date?

MR. KOVACS: I really don't know if we can give an answer. It will be reviewed.

MR. BAKER: There could be a lot of engineering firms that could be spending significant monies toward this if it did not get awarded.

MR. KOVACS: I guess it would be like any other project in that there is an estimate -- bid estimate.

It will be reviewed, obviously. The Department will make that determination whether we can do that.

MR. HASTINGS: We don't have a hard and fast rule. These are needs. We need to replace these pipes.

But at the same time, this is the first time trying this contract method out. So, we feel pretty good about the estimate we put together. We made certain assumptions based on normal estimating rules that we use.

MR. HERB: Brad Herb of JMT.

So, if the bids are significantly over your estimate, would you just remove sites to bring it down within your estimate without throwing it out?

MR. HASTINGS: It is a possibility. We'd have to figure out where the issues were. Maybe it's a couple -- or a few locations that are driving the cost. If

it is high across the board, maybe it is something we are not doing or we are not seeing right.

From our perspective, we pick locations that we thought were pretty straightforward. There was minimal risk to design-build team.

The benefit to us, obviously, is reduction in workload on our resources because a lot of the work is going to our design-build team.

We are not sitting in your seat. So, if you guys see something differently, I guess we will find out in two months.

MR. HORSEY: Philip Horsey with Pennoni.

Is the Department requiring us to use certain right-of-way agents, and it's prescribed in there, taking that chunk maybe out of it? Have you solicited bids on the cost? Is that included in your estimate the cost of the right-of-way associated that you're requiring the team to use?

MR. HASTINGS: So, when we

assumed, or when we put together our cost estimate, we assumed a certain amount of money for our PE, certain amount of money for any coordination that was included, which would be environmental and right-of-way and all of that, not the actual purchase of the right-of-way. That is a separate dollar value outside of the bid cost, as well as construction costs, construction techniques and inspection.

So, the estimate that we put together we thought included all of that.

Obviously, I can't remember there ever being a bid that came in right at the engineer's estimate. There will be some kind of discrepancy there. We will deal with that discrepancy when it comes.

But I feel pretty confident in the amount of money we set aside for the project. The benefit that you guys will provide by streamlining the process and working together between an engineering consultant and a contractor. I mean, I think we will be close.

MR. KOVACS: Does anybody have any other questions?

If not, then, like I mentioned earlier, I'm sure you'll think of some questions when you leave, just send them to our dot-ask E-mail. We will get those answered as quick as possible and get them posted for you.

Everybody signed in. Right? We're all good. No other questions.

This meeting is adjourned. Thank you all very much for coming.

(Pre-proposal meeting was concluded at, approximately, 11:00 a.m.)