

**Answers to Bidders Questions and Comments
pertaining to the
Draft Request for Proposal (RFP) and Division 100 Issued on January 27, 2010
NHDOT Design-Build Project Bedford 13527
February 17, 2011**

1) Question/Comment:

(We) assume that all costs for relocation of utilities will be borne by the individual utility companies. Please confirm.

Answer:

No, utility relocation costs are as-specified.

In general, for private utilities that: are located within the Department's right-of-way, do not have any easements to the contrary, and that must move as the result of the project as presented in the Department's Public Hearing; the respective utility is responsible for the cost of relocating their facilities.

For utilities that have existing easements or property rights, NHDOT will be responsible to execute a force account agreement between the utility and the Department that will identify the responsibilities for the relocation costs. These costs will be borne by the utility or the Department and will not be the responsibility of the Design-Builder.

Public (municipal) utilities may have rights to partial reimbursement for relocation costs. A force account agreement between the municipal utility and the Department will determine the costs. These costs will be borne by the municipality or the Department and will not be the responsibility of the Design-Builder.

All other costs, including but not limited to: utility coordination including writing force account agreements, relocations as a result of the Design-Builder's convenience, relocation as a result of the Design-Builder's changes to the approved Public Hearing Plan layout that have a greater impact to the utilities are the responsibility of the Design-Builder and should be included in the Bidder's Price Proposal.

2) Question/Comment:

What is the anticipated turnaround time for reimbursement of right-of-way acquisition costs? Is the reimbursement request to be included in the monthly pay requisition from the D-B Team or can separate reimbursements be submitted as parcels are acquired?

Answer:

There is no difference in the reimbursement of right-of-way acquisition costs and other project costs submitted by the Design-Builder in their monthly or twice-monthly pay requisitions.

3) Question/Comment:

Section 1.5 Procurement Schedule: Given that the Technical Proposal must include NHDOT Preliminary Plans (which is more effort than we normally perform at this stage); and we are awaiting the final version of the RFP, a 3-4 week extension in the due date for the submission of Technical and Price Proposals is requested. The process outlined in the Draft RFP also has a "Confidential Proprietary Meeting" scheduled for March 3, 2011, which is an additional step in the D-B process that may affect schedule for submittal of the Technical & Price Proposals. We ask that NHDOT consider extending the final completion date into the 2014 construction season?

Answer:

The schedule has been revised in the Final RFP.

4) Question/Comment:

Scoring: We understand the NHDOT will clarify the scoring process which will determine the "Best Value". Will NHDOT use the formula (BV=P/TS) in section 103.03.1.2? Is there a minimum "Technical Score"? (Section 103.02.2.4-C does not have a value.)

Answer:

The scoring has been revised in the Final RFP and the revised Division 100.

5) Question/Comment:

We understand from the meeting on Feb.1st that the Plan pages will not count toward the 75 page restriction. Please confirm.

Answer:

This is correct. The 75-page limit for the Technical Proposal does not include the required submittal of the Preliminary Plan level Highway and Bridge Plans. If the Bidder chooses to incorporate other plans and graphics in the Technical Proposal, either 8 ½" x 11" or 11" x 17" folded, these will count toward the 75-page limit.

6) Question/Comment:

We understand that NHDOT will be responsible for all acceptance testing. Will that include all QA/QC concrete testing/rebar survey/permeability testing?

Answer:

NHDOT will be providing acceptance testing only, not Quality Assurance and Quality Control. This acceptance testing is limited to soils, concrete and pavement and is for payment only. The Design-Builder is responsible for all Quality Assurance and Quality Control for the project.

7) Question/Comment:

Does NHDOT intend to provide a Facilitator at the Partnering meetings?

Answer:

Per Division 100 the cost of the Facilitator at the Partnering meetings will be agreed to mutually and shared equally between the Department and the Design-Builder. Division 100 Section 110.04.1 has been clarified to indicate that partnering will be required for this project.

8) Question/Comment:

Does NHDOT intend to provide an allowance for asphalt and fuel adjustments? The market seems to be volatile, particularly given the Egypt instability.

No, the Department will not be providing an allowance for asphalt and fuel adjustments.

9) Question/Comment:

Section 1.5 – Procurement Schedule, of the draft RFP indicates the NHDOT ATC responses will be issued on March 24, 2011 and subsequently the Technical and Price Proposals are due April 28, 2011. This only provides approximately one month for the Design – Build teams to perform the required design and complete the required proposals. Please consider adjusting the schedule to allow more time (6 weeks) between the responses to ATC proposals and the deadline for Technical and Price Proposals.

Answer:

The schedule has been revised in the Final RFP.

10) Question/Comment:

Section 1.5 – Procurement Schedule, of the draft RFP indicates the Technical and Price Proposals are due April 28, 2011. Please consider extending the Price Proposal submission date to two weeks after the Technical Proposal submission date to allow for a more complete cost estimate to be performed. As many of the same people are involved with both the Technical and Price Proposals a time separation between the two is beneficial to both parties.

Answer:

The schedule has been revised in the Final RFP. Technical and Price Proposals are both due at the same date and time per the revised schedule.

11) Question/Comment:

The draft RFP requires all bidders to prepare and submit plans at the NHDOT preliminary plan level as part of the Technical Proposal. The amount of effort to prepare these plans, especially for the highway plans, is more information than what is required for the Design Builder to estimate the project and clearly present its technical concepts. Additionally in our experience, this level of detail does not follow standard industry practices for design-build projects. Please consider revising this requirement to include roadway plans that generally meet

the pre-preliminary plan level of detail and other preliminary design plans provided in sufficient detail to accurately satisfy the requirements of the Technical and Price Proposal submissions.

Answer:

The Department has determined that preparation of Bridge and Highway Preliminary Plan level submission is appropriate and, with the other required submittal information, will provide NHDOT the needed information to properly evaluate the Bidders' Technical Proposals. One change to the requirement for the Highway Preliminary Plans is that cut sheets (11" x 17") will be required.

12) Question/Comment:

Section 3 – Proposal evaluation process states NHDOT will evaluate the proposals based on a weighted approach with the Technical Proposal representing 25% and the Price Proposal representing 75%. Division 100 section 103.03.1.2 states the NHDOT will evaluate the proposals based on a best value calculation dividing the technical score into the price. It is not clear how the weighted values factor into the best value calculation. Could the Department please clarify the proposal evaluation process? An example calculation would also be beneficial in understanding the process.

Answer:

The scoring has been revised in the Final RFP and the revised Division 100.

13) Question/Comment:

Section 2.2.1 number 8 states that the Technical Proposal shall be no more than 75 pages. At the mandatory pre proposal meeting on February 1, 2011 NHDOT stated that the plan set would not be counted toward the 75 page limit. Can the Department please clarify whether the plans are included in the 75 page limit for the Technical Proposal?

Answer:

The 75-page limit for the Technical Proposal does not include the required submittal of the Preliminary Plan level Highway and Bridge Plans. If the Bidder chooses to incorporate other plans and graphics in the Technical Proposal, either 8 ½" x 11" or 11" x 17" folded, these will count toward the 75-page limit.

14) Question/Comment:

NHDOT provided through the Project website a document titled NHDOT Guidelines for Geotechnical Engineering and Geological Requirements. The term "Bidder" is used throughout the document. Can the Department please confirm the term "Bidder" should be revised to "Design Builder" throughout? As currently written and defined, this document implies that all bidders would be required to perform these tasks as part of the RFP phase, and not the final design phase as is typically required.

Answer:

The "NHDOT Guidelines for Geotechnical Engineering and Geological Requirement" on the project website has been revised to clarify this.

15) Question/Comment:

Section 7.1 of the draft RFP states that the bidders are not to include any right-of-way costs for the construction of the project. Can the Department please clarify precisely which ROW costs are included in the Right-of-Way allowance defined in section 1.15B and which costs should be carried separately by the bidder in their Price Proposal? Is the intent to only use the allowance for the actual payment of property rights or are other property acquisition and document preparation costs also included in the allowance?

Answer:

The Right-of-Way allowance is for NHDOT-approved acquisition payments and qualified relocation expenses only. The Bidders should carry all other costs such as abstracting, right-of-way plans, appraisals, negotiations, deed preparations, and recording.

16) Question/Comment:

Please clarify which environmental permits will be provided to the successful Design – Build Team.

Answer:

Environmental permits will not be provided by the Department. They are the responsibility of the Design-Builder

17) Question/Comment:

Per Section 106.11.3, can multiple engineers stamp the plans, e.g. a structural and highway engineer for the bridge and roadway elements?

Answer:

The requirement for a single, responsible Engineer-of-Record remains unchanged. If the Design-Builder and /or their Designer require additional discipline PE stamps on the record design deliverables in accordance with professional licensing requirements this is not precluded.

18) Question/Comment:

Is the Design Build Team required to follow the Department's standard utility relocation process, including forms and letters?

Answer:

Yes, the Design-Builder will follow the standard utility relocation process. The Department expects that the utility companies will follow the same process. If the Design-Builder, after award of the contract, wants to propose a different way the Department would consider it but the Bidders should prepare their technical and Cost Proposals assuming that the standard utility relocation process will be followed.

19) Question/Comment:

Are the Teams allowed to access existing plans from the NHDOT's record section during the RFP phase? If not, can the existing bridge, roadway and signal plans be made available to the Consultants?

Answer:

No. The Department will provide, as available and as specifically requested, existing plans from the NHDOT Records Section in Concord. Plans of the existing bridge have been provided on the web site. Survey that includes existing information has been provided on the .FTP site. Other plans may be available from the Town of Bedford.

20) Question/Comment:

Are the costs of lighting installation elements that must be done by the utility born by the Design Build Team, the utility, or the Department?

Answer:

The cost of highway lighting installation shall be paid by the Department under a separate, not part of the Design-Builder's contract, force account agreement with the utility. Operational costs will be paid by the Department or the appropriate entity and will not be the responsibility of the Design-Builder.

21) Question/Comment:

Please clarify level of lighting required through the project corridor.

Answer:

The required lighting for highway purposes is identified in the Lighting Manual.

22) Question/Comment:

Form B attached to the RFP is indicated as the Design Build Contract, Section B of the Contract indicates that the Contract consists of a number of documents including Division 100 — General Provisions for Design-Build Projects. Division 100 has been issued on a title sheet for Bedford 13527 which implies that it is specific to the Project; in addition the RFP in numerous instances refers to Division 100 for specific information. There are a number of questions that follow that are based on items within Division 100 that do not seem to apply to the Project. If Division 100 is intended to be part of the Design Build Contract we would like clarification as to what parts of Division 100 do not apply to the Project and would hope that Division 100 could be revised to be specific to Bedford 13527.

Answer:

The Division 100 General Provisions for Design-Build Projects was written for both the Bedford, 13527 project and for potential use on future Design-Build projects. The entire document applies to this contract except those elements that are specifically indicated to not apply as presented in the RFP or other contract documents, such as these answers to questions and comments on the Draft RFP.

23) Question/Comment:

- a. *RFP Section 1.2.2 indicates the Department is seeking input as to the reasonableness of the procurement schedule presented in Section 1.5 of the RFP. Based on the volume of material being requested for the Highway Concept under Section 3.2.2 this schedule is extremely tight.*
- b. *The volume of information being requested for the Highway concept is disproportionate to that being required for the Bridge concept.*

Answer:

- a. The schedule has been revised in the Final RFP.
- b. The Department has determined that preparation of Bridge and Highway Preliminary Plan level submission is appropriate and, with the other required submittal information, will provide NHDOT the needed information to properly evaluate the Bidders' Technical Proposals. One change to the requirement for the Highway Preliminary Plans is that cut sheets (11" x 17") will be required.

24) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 1.13 indicates that there are no DBE participation goals for the project. Form E which is included with the RFP appears to be intended to outline the Design Builders DBE Utilization Plan. Within Division 100 the sections relating to DBE requirements are focused on Federal Aid projects which as we understand are not being used on Bedford 13527 which is using Turnpike funds. Form E does not seem to be included in the Proposal Content Requirements of RFP Section 2.2. Please clarify the Technical Proposal related DBE submission requirements and if Form E needs to be included with the Technical or Price Proposal?

Answer:

As stated in the RFP, there are no specific DBE participation goals for this project but the Department encourages the use of DBE's in the completion of the project. Form E is not required to be submitted. Bidders are reminded that the Technical Proposal becomes part of the contract documents.

25) Question/Comment:

The Department is delegating the ROW acquisition process (except condemnation) to the Design-Builder. RFP Section 1.15.B indicates an allowance will be paid to Design Builder as reimbursement for settlements with property owners. Section 104.01.1.2 of Division 100 indicates that these costs are not to be included in the Price Proposal. Please confirm that the allowance will be added to the Price Proposal and will be adjusted as necessary depending upon the results of the negotiations.

Answer:

The allowance for right-of-way acquisitions shall not be included by the Bidder in the Lump Sum Price Proposal. The Department will add the allowance to the Bidder's Price Proposal. The Final RFP has been clarified.

26) Question/Comment:

Division 100 is silent with regards to ROW abstracting; will the Department provide title abstracting for the affected parcels?

Answer:

Right-of-Way abstracting will be required of the Design-Builder. The hearing plan shows approximate location only. No title work has been done beyond current owner information for public hearing notification. A clarification will be made to the RFP documents.

27) Question/Comment:

Section 104.15.15.1.5 of Division 100 indicates that the Design-Builder will develop a ROW tracking system. Does the Department have a tracking spreadsheet available from other projects that can be made available for use by the Design-Builder?

Answer:

The Department does not have a tracking system that can be made available to the Bidders. NHDOT considers

it important to have a ROW tracking system to the parcel level. The Design-Builder will be required to develop their own form.

28) Question/Comment:

Section 104.15.15.2 of Division 100 indicates that the Department will be responsible for completing the administrative process for land acquisition required for the Project. This section indicates that after the Department has approved final ROW plans that the Department will be provided with a 6 month window to obtain possession of the properties. This timeframe is not suitable for a project that will contractually require a completion date of December 31, 2013. The Department needs to recognize that the ROW process is a significant schedule risk for the Design-Builder and that the RFP documents do not reflect a balancing of this risk between the Department and the Design-Builder.

Answer:

Section 104.15.15.2 of Division 100 pertains only for eminent domain (condemnation) proceedings that may be required by the Department. The six month window should be accounted for in the Bidder's schedule.

29) Question/Comment:

Section 108.07.B of Division 100 includes Excusable, Non-compensable Delay. Based on the risk that the Department is passing on to the Design-Builder for ROW acquisition we feel it would be appropriate to include ROW acquisition within this section of Division 100.

Answer:

The six month eminent domain acquisition window will not be part of the Excusable, Non-compensable Delay.

30) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 2.2.1 bullet number 5 indicates a number of items required to be submitted with the Technical Proposal. These items note that they are to be separately indexed. Please define what separately indexed means.

Answer:

Separately indexed means listed in the Table of Contents and a tab provided.

31) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 2.2.1 bullet number 8 indicates that the 75 page limit includes the "cover letter, charts, schedules, exhibits, forms, plans and other illustrative and graphical information..." At the mandatory pre-bid meeting the Department indicated that the plans do not count towards the page limit. Can the Department please clarify this section as to what will count towards the page limit?

Answer:

The 75-page limit for the Technical Proposal does not include the required submittal of the Preliminary Plan level Highway and Bridge Plans. If the Bidder chooses to incorporate other plans and graphics in the Technical Proposal, either 8 1/2" x 11" or 11" x 17" folded, these will count toward the 75-page limit.

32) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 2.2.1 bullet number 12 imposes, with several exceptions, an 8.5" x 11" white paper requirement on the document. The cover is not included in the exception list. Will the Department allow the use of heavy weight color covers that are slightly oversized to protect the index tabs from damage or bending?

Answer:

Yes.

33) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 2.2.1 bullet number 13 indicates that "charts, schedules, exhibits and other illustrative and graphical information may be on 11" x 17" paper..." please clarify that the Organization Chart required under Section 3.2.3 bullet number 1.b can be presented as 11" x 17". We are asking because during the SOQ phase it was mandated that Organizational Charts be presented as 8.5" x 11".

Answer:

Yes, the organizational chart may be 11" x 17" and folded to 8 ½" x 11".

34) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 3 indicates that "the Technical Proposal will have a weight of twenty-five percent (25%) and the Price Proposal will have a weight of seventy-five percent (75%)." The RFP is silent with regards to how this process will be implemented or applied. Section 103.03.1.2 of Division 100 indicates that the Best-Value will be determined by dividing the Lump Sum Price by the Technical Score. Please clarify how the Department intends to determine Best-Value.

Answer:

The scoring has been revised in the Final RFP and the revised Division 100.

35) Question/Comment:

Section 103.02.2.4 bullet C of Division 100 indicates that a minimum percentage for the Technical Score would be indicated in the RFP. We have been unable to find where the RFP indicates the minimum Technical Score.

Answer:

The scoring has been revised in the Final RFP and the revised Division 100.

36) Question/Comment:

Numerous locations within the RFP and Division 100 indicate that plans shall be drawn to an identifiable scale. Does the Department have any specific requirements for the scale to be used to develop the plans presented in the Technical Proposal?

Answer:

Bridge and Highway Preliminary Plans should be developed to scales that best allow the Department to clearly understand and score the Bidder's proposed project.

37) Question/Comment:

The RFQ indicated that superior scores would be afforded to firms exhibiting significant strengths or advantages to the Department while average scores would be afforded to those firms providing conventional capabilities, The RFP evaluation criteria indicated in Section 3.2 only carries 5 points for innovation. This implies that the Department is looking for conventional solutions for the Project and that innovation will have little bearing on the selection, this appears contrary to the concept of Design-Build or the short-listing criteria of the REQ.

Answer:

The scoring items are presented in the RFP as the Department's understanding of the best way to score the Technical Proposals. Section 3.2.5 is Innovation/Added Value.

38) Question/Comment:

The RFQ indicated that the designated Design Manager was to be the Engineer of Record while Section 106.11.3 of Division 100 indicates that the Design Manager shall designate an Engineer to stamp the plans. Please clarify.

Answer:

Section 106.11.3 of Division 100 updates the information found in the RFQ. The requirement for a single, responsible Engineer-of-Record remains unchanged. If the Design-Builder and /or their Designer require additional discipline PE stamps on the record design deliverables in accordance with professional licensing requirements this is not precluded.

39) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 3.2.1.1 indicates that the Technical Proposal will be considered the "Preliminary Plan Submission as noted in Section 540 of the Bridge Design Manual." Under RFP Section 3.2.2.1 the plan submission requirements for the Highway Concept are more consistent with a Slope and Drainage submission than a Preliminary design submission. It appears that many of the plans being required are not really necessary for the Department to evaluate the highway concept being proposed by the Design-Builder. In addition, based on the volume of information being requested the stipend is inadequate to balance the risk of not being selected.

Answer:

The Department has determined that preparation of Bridge and Highway Preliminary Plan level submission is appropriate and, with the other required submittal information, will provide NHDOT the needed information to properly evaluate the Bidders' Technical Proposals. One change to the requirement for the Highway Preliminary Plans is that cut sheets (11" x 17") will be required.

The Department has determined that the stipend is appropriate for this project.

40) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 3.2.3.1.b indicates that the Preliminary Schedule for the Project should demonstrate consideration of utilities, constructability, MOT and minimization of impacts to traffic. Does the Department have any expectations for the Preliminary Schedule to include a Work Breakdown Structure identifying the work packages that will be used to design and construct the project, to indicate milestones such as design review submissions, witness and hold points, as well as items specified in Section 108.03.A.1.2 of Division 100?

Answer:

The Department does not have any specific requirement for the schedule. As presented in the RFP NHDOT will score the Technical Proposals based on the Bidder's clear and complete demonstration of the various items of scoring.

41) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 3.2.3.1 bullet number 1.c indicates that an approach to managing the scope and budget for the project while Section 3.2.3.2 bullet number 2 indicates this will be an evaluation criteria. This is a Lump Sum project for which the Design-Builder will be expected to deliver the scope of work presented in the Technical Proposal for the as bid lump sum Price Proposal. Can the Department elaborate on what the expectations are for this element in particular how it relates to any regular submissions that may be required?

Answer:

The Department is not expecting and the Bidders are not to provide any information regarding their Price Proposal in their Technical Proposal. However, the Department expects that the Bidder will present in the Technical Proposal how they will manage the scope of the work, including cost control elements.

42) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 3.2.3.1 bullet number 1.d indicates an approach to partnering is to be provided for dispute resolution while Section 110.04 of Division 100 indicates that "if the Design Builder and Department elect to participate in partnering". Can the Department elaborate on what the minimum acceptable scope for partnering is for the project.

Answer:

Division 100, Section 110.04.1 presents the scope for partnering on this project. The Section has been clarified to indicate that partnering will be required for this project.

43) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 3.2.4.1 requires the submission of detailed outlines for the DQMP and CQMP to be used on the project and it is indicated that the proposed table of contents for these documents is unacceptable. Section

3.2.4.2 indicates the evaluation criteria will award superior scores for plans that demonstrate "well- defined and effective" plans. We do not see how this is consistent with an outline, detailed or not. Can the Department elaborate on specific requirements for the detailed outlines beyond the information requested in items 3.2.4.1 bullet numbers 1.a thru f and 3.2.4.1 bullet numbers 2.a thru f? It would appear that a detailed table of contents would provide a greater understanding of these documents than the items mentioned under these sections. As an alternative will the Department be willing to make these items not count towards the page limit and let the Design-Builder submit example documents as appendices?

Answer:

The Department is not indicating any preferred presentation that demonstrates the Bidder's response to this proposal submittal requirement. We have determined that the information provided in the RFP in the sections indicated in this question provide sufficient direction for the Bidder to develop the Technical Proposal. The Department will not waive the requirement for the Bidder's response to this section to be included in the 75-page Technical Proposal page limit and sample documents may not be submitted as appendices.

44) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 2.1.2 through 2.1.4 indicates the overall packages that are to be submitted under separate cover. There are also a number of proposal content requirements indicated in RFP Section 2.2.1 bullet numbers 1 through 15 include a number of items that are to be submitted in one of the overall packages. Can the Department confirm that all items except 2.2.1 bullet numbers 3 and 4 are to be submitted as part of the Technical Proposal package?

Answer:

Yes, this is correct.

45) Question/Comment:

The RFP includes Form H - Opinion of Counsel that does not seem to be included in the RFP Section 2.2 Proposal Content Requirements. Can the Department confirm the purpose of this form and if it needs to be submitted with the Technical Proposal?

Answer:

Form H has been removed and is not required.

46) Question/Comment:

Has the Department presented any wall types to the owners of Parcel 11-1 where an existing Redi-Rock retaining wall was used to retain a portion of the Route 3 embankment while developing the building and parking lot that occupies the parcel? The face of the proposed wall on the Hearing Plan for the project will be visible from Parcel 11-1. Did the Department evaluate the interaction between the existing wall and the proposed retaining wall in development of the Hearing Plan?

Answer:

No, the Department did not present any wall types to the owners and did not evaluate any interaction between any existing and proposed walls.

47) Question/Comment:

There is an existing sanitary sewer system located along the easterly side of Route 3 adjacent to Parcel 11-1. It services Parcel 12 and ultimately extends down Hawthorne Drive to the pump station located adjacent to the Merrimack River. This sewer system is not shown on the Hearing Plan. Has the Department surveyed this system or is the Design-Builder to include this in his scope of work?

Answer:

No, the Department has not surveyed any existing sanitary sewers. Yes, the Bidder should include any utility coordination and investigation for work that may be required to the sewer in their Technical and Price Proposal.

48) Question/Comment:

The Hearing Plan shows a proposed easement on Parcels 16 and 25. Please clarify the intent of this easement.

Answer:

The easements shown in the Hearing Plan on parcels 16 and 25 are for drainage. This was identified as a possible location for a BMP basin, along with Parcels 11 and 20. It will be up to the Design-Builder to determine if any, all, or other locations are needed for their design.

49) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 5.1.3 indicates that the NH Stormwater Manual shall be used for the design of BMP's and Erosion Control. Please confirm that BMPs are to be designed to remove pollutant loads in addition to attenuating discharge rates.

Answer:

The BMPs shall be designed to remove pollutant loading in addition to attenuating discharge rates.

50) Question/Comment:

The proposed BMP on Parcel 20 is situated in an eroded gully littered with toppled trees and debris. There is an intermittent channel from this area that discharges onto Parcel 24. The proposed easement for this BMP and the associated outlet ends at Parcel 24, which is a condominium development. RFP Section 5.1.3 indicates there shall be no net increase in discharge flows while Section 104.15.11.2 indicates systems "shall be designed to accommodate the surface runoff generated by the new facility, offsite drainage...and seasonal high water" which implies a pass through. During the RFQ phase questions were asked about the availability of information pertaining to the preliminary drainage design and the response was "No additional information is available at this time..." Did the Department develop a preliminary (or any) design of the BMP shown on Parcel 20 to result in no net increase in discharge as well as address pollutant loading?

Answer:

The design should correct the erosion occurring in the gully on Parcel 20 from the existing drainage outlet to the proposed basin. The preliminary design only identified locations and approximate sizes for treatment basins. It will be up to the Design-Builder to determine if any, all, or other locations are needed. It will be up to the Design- Builder to determine the best design that minimizes impacts and provides the best long term design. In a recent contact with the owner of Parcel 20, the owner requested that the basin be located as far as possible to the rear of the property. This request should be accommodated if practicable.

51) Question/Comment:

The BMP shown on Parcel 11 is situated in what appears to be a flagged wetland and discharges onto Parcel 16 with a new discharge pipe. This appears to extend off the limits of the Hearing Plan. To what extent did the Department evaluate this basin and the proposed outlet which appears to cross the Fairpoint utility line corridor? It is unclear as to how far into Parcel 16 the outlet from this basin extends. Is there any additional information available? Did the Department perform a preliminary (or any) design of the BMP shown on Parcel 11 to result in no net increase in discharge as well as address pollutant loading?

Answer:

There are not any flagged wetlands in the area of the basin on Parcel 11. The dashed and dotted line on the hearing plan indicates the proposed basin. The basin on Parcel 11 was identified as one of a number of potential locations for BMP basins along with basins on Parcels 20 and 16. It will be up to the Design-Builder to determine if any, all, or other locations are needed. The Hearing Plan shows the easement open onto Parcel 26; however, the intent was to only extend the easement a few hundred feet. Easements and proposed right-of-way on the Hearing Plan show the intent of the impacts not the exact impact.

52) Question/Comment:

The Report of the Commissioner from the Public Hearing made commitments regarding parcels, 3, 8 and 9. Please elaborate on what will be expected of the Design-Builder to accommodate the commitments which affect the drainage design effort and the BMP situated on Parcel 9 adjacent to the FEET.

Answer:

The Report of the Commissioner with regard to parcel 3, 8, and 9, indicates that development is planned for these parcels and coordination will be required to work with the property owners regarding details of the design to minimize impacts where possible. A Mini Cooper Dealership has recently been constructed on one of the parcels. The developer has modified some of the existing drainage and the layout to the Lowe's/Target intersection. The Design-Builder will need to update existing conditions and coordinate with the owners.

53) Question/Comment:

During the RFQ phase a question was asked about the fiber optic cable located on the existing bridge. The response indicated that The RFP will provide additional information. Please clarify how the existing fiber optic line is to be handled.

Answer:

The fiber optic cable strung on the existing bridge is a FairPoint cable. It is only temporarily strung on the bridge. FairPoint plans to have it relocated to the pole line by June 2011.

54) Question/Comment:

Division 100 Section 103.08 states the Department may also require Warranty and Maintenance Bonds for items specified in the RFP. The RFP contains forms for a Proposal Guaranty and a Contract Bond. Please clarify what types of bonds will be required from the winning bidder.

Answer:

The information on Warranties, including Warranty and Maintenance Bonds, has been revised in the Division 100 and the RFP.

55) Question/Comment:

Division 100 Section 109.01.3.1 states that a sample form of the Monthly Projected Schedule of Payments is provided as Exhibit B to Appendix B of the RFP. Please confirm this is Exhibit A found in Appendix A of the RFP.

Answer:

Yes, Exhibit A is found in Appendix A of the RFP.

56) Question/Comment:

Section 1.15 of the RFP indicates that a price of \$350/cubic yard will be used to eaten ate QC/QA bonus for the bridge deck. This price is extremely low.

Answer:

This has been revised in the RFP.

57) Question/Comment:

What percentage does the plan set count towards the Technical Proposal Score? Please clarify how the Department intends to include this effort of work in the scoring process.

Answer:

The scoring has been revised in the Final RFP and the revised Division 100.

58) Question/Comment:

Section 108.03.A.1.2 of Division 100 states that an initial schedule is to be submitted within (5) days of Notice

to Proceed and that the Department will review and provide comments within five (5) days of receipt. Can these days be designated as Working Days?

Answer:

Yes, these have been revised to indicate Working Days.

59) Question/Comment:

Has the Department surveyed the downstream drainage structures at all the new discharge outlets from the Bedford 13527 project? This information will be critical in determining the pre vs. post flow calculation. If so could that information be passed along to the Design-Build teams?

Answer:

The Department has not surveyed these drainage structures and does not have any information on these for the Bidders.

60) Question/Comment:

Would the Department please provide the high resolution aerial photos that cover this project area and the surrounding area to help with the evaluation of the drainage? The photo coverage will need to large enough to be able to see what is upstream and downstream of the project.

Answer:

The Department does not have high resolution aerial photos that cover this project area that can be provided to the Bidders.

61) Question/Comment:

Would the Department please provide all the existing topography information they have that cover this area to help with the drainage design. The information could include digital or scanned quad maps, etc.

Answer:

All the existing survey that the Department has for this project has been posted on the .FTP site for the Bidders.

62) Question/Comment:

Would the Department allow printing on the separator/divider/tab sheets, such as, "Section 3 Project Management" or the project name, or even a photo, and not have it count towards the page limit?

Answer:

The title of what follows the separator, divider, or tab sheet is acceptable and will not subject the sheet to the page count. Any other information on these tab sheets, including photos, will.

63) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 2.2.1.12 imposes, with several exceptions, an 8.5" x 11" white paper requirement on the document. The separator/divider/tab sheets are not included in the exception list. Will the Department allow the use of heavy weight separator/divider/tab sheets that are slightly oversized to extend beyond the pages for easy identification.

Answer:

Yes.

64) Question/Comment:

RFP Section 5.1.1 bullet number 2 states the design vehicle shall be a WB-50, Should this be a WB-67?

Answer:

A WB-50 is the design vehicle.

65) Question/Comment:

- a. *Section C.1 of the NHDOT Guidelines for Geotechnical Engineering and Geological Requirements identifies a number of requirements for the Design-Builders Geologists that implies submission of additional qualifications information for Department review and approval.*
- b. *Please confirm project specific requirements as the experience needs listed include designing a minimum of 10 rock slopes in excess of 30 feet in height and designing rock slope remediation measures at six project sites. This seems excessive for rock slopes that will be encountered on Bedford 13527.*

Answer:

The “NHDOT Guidelines for Geotechnical Engineering and Geological Requirements” are being revised and the revised version will be posted on the web site in the near future.

- a. The revised guidelines will clarify that the additional qualifications indicated will be required of the Design-Builder during the execution of the Work and not from each Bidder for the Technical Proposal.
- b. The revised guidelines will not change the specific experience requirements regarding rock slopes as currently listed.

66) Question/Comment:

Section 2.2.1 bullet number 7 indicates that the Technical Proposal shall be separated by numbered tabs with Sections corresponding to the order set forth in the RFP. Is this equivalent to the order contained in Section 3.2 Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria? Is the rest of the required information to be included as appendices?

Answer:

Yes to both questions. The Final RFP now indicates this.

67) Question/Comment:

(Section) 104.15.8.4: Leads with the sentence “If an instrumentation program is required.” Who makes the determination of whether or not such a program is required?

Answer:

“NHDOT Guidelines for Geotechnical Engineering and Geological Requirements” include the requirements for the instrumentation program. The Design-Builder’s design and construction will determine if the instrumentation is required.

68) Question/Comment:

(Section) 104.15.8.4: Is there any specification to the content of the pre-construction survey? How is right of entry arranged to conduct said survey? Will post-constructions of the same buildings be required?

Answer:

This is covered in the NHDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction.

69) Question/Comment:

(Section) 104.15.15.1 Indicates that Right-of-Way function will be delivered in compliance with the NHDOT Right-of-Way Manual, which is currently being revised by the Bureau of Right-of-Ways with the expectation of its publication sometime in March. Which edition will be used for this project? If the revision is selected can we received a draft copy to identify changes that may affect this bid?

Answer:

A new, Draft NHDOT Right-of-Way Manual will be in use for this project. The manual is being completed and will be posted to the Project web site in a few weeks.