

**RFP-484-04202018DB**  
**FY18 Bridge Replacement Projects**  
**Design-Build RFP Questions and Responses**  
**PI #'s 0015912 & 0015913**

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Volume/ Section</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	4/27/2018	RIDs	Concerning Batch 1, 233-5040 Polk Co., when can we expect costing plan info as provided for the other sites?	RID documents for Polk County have been posted to the GDOT Sharepoint Site.
2	4/27/2018	RIDs	We have downloaded the RID documents but the Polk County, Mountain Home Loop Road folder doesn't seem to contain all the RID documents. The missing files include the costing plans, Bridge Hydraulics, LIBP checklist, survey database, and Microstation files. Will these files be provided?	See Question 1 response.
3	5/4/2018	ITP Section 1.4 Procurement Schedule	The Procurement Schedule matrix listed in section 1.4 of the Instruction to Proposers indicates that the Proposal Due Date and Letting is 6/18/2018 at 11:00 A.M. After reviewing the calendar, 6/18/2018 is a Monday which is non-typical for a GDOT letting. Please confirm that the Proposal Due Date and Letting is on Monday, 6/18/2018.	Proposal Due Date and Letting have been confirmed for Monday, June 18, 2018 and shall be submitted in accordance with ITP Sections 4.2.3 & 4.3.
4	5/4/2018	RIDs	<p>After a site visit to the Dewey Hogan Road Bridge over Wolf Creek site in Walton County. The following items were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The SUE Plans provided by GDOT and dated 7/31/2015 do not show any utility infrastructure being present on this site.</li> <li>2. The Costing Plans for this location dated 10/23/2015 denote the presence of aerial power facilities (only) adjacent to the bridge and crossing over Dewey Hogan Road.</li> <li>3. There are no Utility Owner MOU's for this location in the RFP.</li> <li>4. There are no completed Utility Impact Analysis Documents compiled by facility owners in the RIDs.</li> </ol> <p>We physically identified that the following utility owners have facilities located within limits of the project and could potentially be in conflict with construction.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Walton EMC</li> <li>2. City of Lawrenceville Gas</li> <li>3. Windstream Communications</li> </ol> <p>Please provide executed MOU's and Utility Analysis Report for each of the above listed utility facility owners</p>	The Department will provide executed MOU's for Walton EMC, City of Lawrenceville Gas, and Windstream Communications with an amendment. Utility Analysis Reports for each utility have been uploaded to Sharepoint.
5	5/4/2018	RIDs	On bridge number 047-5023-0 (Catoosa County), the log of borings is missing page 1 of 2 for the first boring. Can you please post that?	The Department has confirmed that no pages are missing from the boring log for bridge 047-5023-0, and that all relevant pages have been posted.
6	5/11/2018	MOUs	For structure 105-5022-0 in Elbert County, the UAS provided for Georgia Power and AT&T both have zero cost. This is not standard, as the Utilities usually provide a relocation cost and the Bidder can use the cost if they are unable to mitigate the conflict in their design. Is the relocation cost really zero? If not, please provide an updated Utility Analysis with the relocation costs.	AT&T has stated that the line in question is a service drop that would be relocated at no cost responsibility to the DB Team. Georgia Power has stated that they anticipate no conflict from their utilities, unless impacted by DB Team equipment. Further coordination with the utilities will be required to confirm potential impacts.
7	5/11/2018	Volume 2 Attachment 1-1/ Volume 1 Section 2.2.1	Several locations require easements for construction and maintenance of slopes, construction of slopes, and driveways and potential utility relocation. Are Right of (sic) Plans necessary? And, who will handle the negotiations and procurement?	All easements shown in the RIDs will be acquired by local officials prior to November 1, 2018. The project shall also be constructed on and within Existing Right of Way and Proposed Easements, as shown in the RIDs, per Volume 1 Section 2.2.1. No Right of Way plans will be necessary under the current scope of the project.
8	5/18/2018	Volume 1 Exhibit 9	Exhibit 9 of the RFP Milestone Schedule lists durations for the max closure of the Batch 1 projects. These times will be very hard to meet because each site has a considerable amount of approach roadway rebuild, walls, etc. to complete along with the bridge work. Would the DOT consider increasing these times so that liquidated damages will not need to be added? One of the locations has been closed for years already so it should not make any difference.	FY18 Bridge closure durations have been reviewed against previous successful bridge replacements, and approved by the GDOT Construction Office. Closure durations will remain as listed in the Volume 1 Exhibit 9 'Milestone Schedule'.

**RFP-484-04202018DB**  
**FY18 Bridge Replacement Projects**  
**Design-Build RFP Questions and Responses**  
**PI #'s 0015912 & 0015913**

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Volume/ Section</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
9	5/18/2018	Volume 2 Section 13.2.1	In Vol. 2, Section 13.2.1, it is stated that "Bridges shall be designed either in accordance with AASHTO Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, 17th Edition 2002 or the current AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications (LRFD Specifications)". In Vol. 3, Section 13.2.1, it is stated that all new or widened bridges must be designed to carry an HL-93 vehicle live load. It is also stated that Seismic Design and Fatigue Design must be designed in accordance with AASHTO LRFD. If the DB Team chooses to design bridges in accordance with AASHTO Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, 17th Edition 2002 (per Vol. 2 Sec. 13.2.1), are HL-93 Live Load, Seismic Design, and Fatigue Design per AASHTO LRFD required?	See Volume 1, Article 1.2.1 for DB Documents; Order of Precedence. If DB Team selects AASHTO Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, 17th Edition - 2002, follow all requirements for AASHTO Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, 17th Edition - 2002 per the Bridge Manual and typical Bridge Office practices. If DB Team selects AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, follow all requirements for AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications in the Bridge Manual, Volume 3, and typical Bridge Office practices.
10	5/18/2018	RIDS	The Elbert county controlling criteria table states the speed design is 20 mph however the bridge preliminary layout states 55 mph. Please clarify the correct speed design for the road.	The design speed of Ed Webb Road over Doug Creek is 20 mph, which will be clarified in the contract in a forthcoming amendment.
11	5/18/2018	RIDS	Will the substandard vertical curves shown on Elbert, Walker, and Polk county costing plans be allowed to remain even though design variances are not listed in attachment 1-1?	A design variance is not needed for substandard vertical curves to tie into existing on off-system, low speed roadways.
12	5/18/2018	RIDS	Can the DB team get the Inroads design files for the costing plans?	Inroads design files will not be provided as Reference Information Documents for this project.
13	5/18/2018	RIDS	The Costing plans provided in the RIDS do not appear to match the provided SUE information. Will the Department provided the digital SUE files?	Additional digital SUE files will not be provided as Reference Information Documents for this project.
14	5/18/2018	RIDS	"Controlling Criteria" was provided in the RIDS, but not included in the RFP. Will The Department include this in the RFP as a contract document, since these criteria are the basis of design?	A forthcoming amendment will include 'Controlling Criteria' tables as part of Attachment 1-1 in Volume 2 of the RFP.
15	5/18/2018	Vol. 2, 13.2.2	Vol.2, 13.2.2 states, "The location of the low-point of a vertical curve on a bridge or approach slab shall not be allowed, unless noted in Attachment 1-1". The provided costing plans for Elbert County show the vertical low point on the approach, but is not allowed in Attachment 1-1. Given the restrictive nature of the site, will the low point be allowed on the bridge or approach slab for this site?	A forthcoming amendment will allow a low point on the approach slab. The low point on the approach slab shall be located at least 20 feet from the begin or end bridge.
16	5/18/2018	RIDS	295-5029-0 Captain Wood Road has an existing dry fire hydrant. The RFP does not address the owner or if the hydrant is to be relocated/replaced. Will the Department provide a MOU for the dry hydrant?	A forthcoming amendment will add language to the RFP stating the need for coordination with the local fire department, and that the pipe will need to be adjusted as needed.
17	5/18/2018	RIDS	295-5029-0 Captain Wood Road has an existing 60" pipe at Sta. 104+00 +/- . There are notes on drawing 35-0001 that indicate the pipe is to be removed. The pipe also contains perennial stream 4 and is near the proposed bent 5. There are no notes to address the final location of stream 4. Please provide information on the final location/condition of perennial stream 4.	Stream and impact information has been included on page 47 of the approved ecology report provided as a Reference Information Document for Walker County.
18	5/18/2018	RIDS	The 047-5023-0 Cattoosa County Boring Log appears to be missing sheet 1 of 2 for Boring # B-1. Will GDOT provide the missing sheet?	See Question 5 response.

**RFP-484-04202018DB**  
**FY18 Bridge Replacement Projects**  
**Design-Build RFP Questions and Responses**  
**PI #'s 0015912 & 0015913**

Comment Number	Date	Volume/ Section	Comment	Response
19	5/25/2018	RIDs	<p>On Bridge No. 097-5037-0 (Douglas County) – the Utility Impact Analysis for Douglas County Water and Sewer under comments it states “Up-Size 350 LF of 8 – inch Water line to 12 Inch”. Also on the MOA for this site it states under New Utility Facilities Proposed (Betterment) “DCCWSA desires to up-size the 8-inch DIP water line to 12-inch DIP. Reviewing the preliminary costing plans it does not appear that 350 LF of new waterline will be sufficient to reach the end of the TP 2 retaining wall and that the existing waterline would likely conflict with construction of the retaining wall. Is the contractor’s responsibility limited to furnish 350 LF of 12” Restrained Joint DIP? Should additional length be required to avoid conflict with the TP 2 retaining wall, will this piping be required to be 12” restrained joint DIP?</p>	<p>The contractors responsibility would be to furnish sufficient pipe to avoid any conflict. The 350 LF was an estimate. The cost difference between the 8” and the 12” is Douglas Counties responsibility. And should additional length be required to avoid conflict, piping shall be 12” restrained joint DIP.</p>
20	5/25/2018	RIDs	<p>On bridge number 097-5037-0 (Douglas County), the Utility Impact Analysis for Douglas County Water and Sewer states that the existing 8” water line should be upsized to a 12” water line. According to the GDOT Bridge and Structures Manual section 3.14 (Utilities on Bridges), water mains greater than 8” in diameter shall be supported by channels bolted to adjacent beams which would require the water line to be placed between girders instead of on the outside of the bridge overhang similar to the existing water line on the bridge. Table 3.14.1.4-1 also states that the Maximum Pipe Diameter Allowed for a structure using Type I Mod beams is 6”. Can these requirements be waived for this structure to allow the new 12” water line to be supported by inserts/sleeves in the Tp 1 mod girders on the new bridge? Is it allowable to support the new waterline on the bridge overhang using cast-in place inserts in the bridge deck overhang or support the waterline between the girders using cast-in-place inserts in the bridge deck?</p>	<p>For bridge 097-5037-0, the costing layout will be revised to show Type III beams in the end spans. All Bridge Manual guidelines shall be followed for a 12” waterline attached to a bridge.</p>
21	5/25/2018	RIDs	<p>Can the design build team inspect/look at the soil/rock samples that were collected by GDOT and access field drilling notes/logs for all Counties.</p>	<p>The soil samples are available for a Proposer to inspect upon request to <a href="mailto:fy18bridges@dot.ga.gov">fy18bridges@dot.ga.gov</a>, as long as no destructive testing is being performed. A representative of GDOT will be onsite while inspecting.</p>
22	5/25/2018	RIDs	<p>The MOU from AT&amp;T for relocation work on project 097-5037-0 Douglas only lists the approved design firms. Please provide the list of approved contractors to perform work on AT&amp;T facilities since relocations will be required.</p>	<p>AT&amp;T performs all aerial work and relocations, in lieu of using a contractor.</p>
23	5/25/2018	RIDs	<p>The RIDs for Project 233-5040-0 Polk does not contain the Utility Impact Analysis for Polk County Water. Please provide the missing document since relocations will be required.</p>	<p>A Utility Impact Analysis for Polk County Water will be provided as a Reference Information Document.</p>