DESIGN BUILD

302 - JUDITH RIVER TRESTLE

The Montana Department of Transportation is soliciting construction and design services for the
JUDITH RIVER TRESTLE - CALL 302 Design-Build project. **JUDITH RIVER TRESTLE RFQ & ATTACHMENTS**

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

RFQ Advertisement	~~April 11, 2013~~
~~SOQ Response Due~~	~~May 3, 2013 by 11:00 am~~
~~Short List~~	~~May 17, 2013~~
~~RFP Issue~~	~~May 20, 2013~~
~~Technical Proposal Due~~	~~July 1, 2013 by 11:00 am~~
~~Online Q&A Forum Closes~~	~~July 19, 2013 by 10:00 am~~
~~Bid Price Proposal Due~~	~~July 24, 2013 by 11:00 am~~
~~Final Selection~~	~~July 24, 2013~~
~~Anticipated Award~~	~~July 25, 2013~~
~~Anticipated Notice to Proceed~~	~~August 8, 2013~~

****
Updated Schedule: Mon, 10-Jun-2013 9:32 MDT

UPDATED SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

RFQ Advertisement	~~April 11, 2013~~
~~SOQ Response Due~~	~~May 3, 2013 by 11:00 am~~
~~Short List~~	~~May 17, 2013~~
~~RFP Issue~~	~~June 10, 2013~~
~~Written Question Deadline for the Pre-Proposal Meeting~~	~~June 17, 2013 by 3:00 pm MDT~~
~~Pre-Proposal Meeting in MDT Auditorium West Conference Rm~~	~~June 19, 2013 by 1:00 pm MDT~~
~~Technical Proposal Due~~	~~August 15, 2013 by 11:00 am~~
~~Online Q&A Forum Closes~~	~~August 28, 2013 by 10:00 am~~
~~Bid Price Proposal Due in Contract plans~~	~~September 4, 2013 by 11:30 am~~
~~Public Bid Price Proposal Opening in MDT Commission Rm~~	~~September 4, 2013 at 11:30 am~~
~~Final Selection~~	~~September 5, 2013~~
~~Anticipated Award~~	~~September 19, 2013~~
~~Anticipated Notice to Proceed~~	~~October 3, 2013~~

****
Updated Schedule: Mon, 05-Aug-2013 11:45 MDT

UPDATED SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

RFQ Advertisement	April 11, 2013
SOQ Response Due	May 3, 2013 by 11:00 am
Short List	May 17, 2013
RFP Issue	June 10, 2013
Written Question Deadline for the Pre-Proposal Meeting	June 17, 2013 by 3:00 pm MDT
Pre-Proposal Meeting	June 19, 2013 1:00-3:00 pm MDT Auditorium West Conference Rm
Technical Proposal Update Due	August 15, 2013 by 11:00 am
Online Q&A Forum Closes	August 28, 2013 by 5:00 pm
Bid Price Proposal Due in Contract plans	September 4, 2013 by 11:30 am
Public Bid Price Proposal Opening	September 4, 2013 MDT Commission Rm
Final Selection	September 5, 2013
Anticipated Award	September 19, 2013
Anticipated Notice to Proceed	October 3, 2013

****
-1-
Clarification:
Submitted: Fri, 12-Apr-2013 11:30 MDT
Please note the RFQ has been updated and two additional attachments can be found at the following link:
JUDITH RIVER TRESTLE RFQ & ATTACHMENTS
****
-2-
Clarification:
Submitted: Fri, 12-Apr-2013 11:30 MDT
Please note the RFQ has been updated and can be found at the following link:
JUDITH RIVER TRESTLE RFQ
****
-3-
Clarification:
Submitted: Thu, 18-Apr-2013 13:35 MDT
The following Special Provision is hereby made part of this contract:

SPECIAL FUEL USER'S PERMIT REQUIREMENT [102]
Senate Bill 116, passed by the 2013 Montana Legislature, eliminates the requirement to obtain a Special Fuel User
Permit. This bill became law upon the signature of the Governor on April 12, 2013. Rescind Subsections 102.18

and 103.07(D). The requirement of Subsection 108.01.2 that subcontractors obtain a Special Fuel User Permit is
also rescinded. All other requirements of that Subsection still apply.
****
-4-
Clarification:
Submitted: Mon, 22-Apr-2013 16:18 MDT
Please contact Carla Allen for arrangements to visit the project site:
Carla R. Allen
Central Montana Rail, Inc.
PO Box 868
Denton, MT 59430
Ph. & Fax: 406-567-2223
****
-5-
Clarification:
Submitted: Thu, 16-May-2013 9:19 MDT
The Judith River Trestle Design Build Project RFP issue date has been delayed. A new schedule will be posted to
this Q&A as soon as information is available.
****
-6-
Clarification:
Submitted: Thu, 04-Apr-2013 13:25 MDT

The Ranked Short List for this project is listed below:

1

Ames Construction Inc. / HDR

2

DOWL HKM / COP Construction / Hanson

3

Sletten Construction Company / TD&H Engineering

****
-7-
Clarification:
Submitted: Tue, 04-Jun-2013 14:18 MDT
The tentative RFP issue date is June 10th 2013.
****
-8-
Clarification:
Submitted: Tue, 18-Jun-2013 15:00 MDT
The linked Lead Based Paint - Removal and Disposal Special Provision is hereby made part of this contract.

LEAD BASED PAINT - REMOVAL & DISPOSAL SPECIAL
****
-9-
Clarification:
Submitted: Fri, 21-Jun-2013 12:23 MDT
PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING MINUTES
PRE-PROPOSAL SIGN IN SHEET
ATTACHMENT A
ATTACHMENT R
ENVIROMENTAL
AS-BUILTS
RIGHT OF WAY
****
-10-
Clarification:
Submitted: Wed, 03-Jul-2013 11:39 MDT
Linked are the Updated Pre-proposal Meeting Minutes from July 3rd, 2013.
UPDATED PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING MINUTES
****
****
-1-
Notice:
Mon, 10-Jun-2013 10:00 MDT
Linked are the Requests for Proposals and attachments for the Judith River Trestle Design Build project:
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
RFP ATTACHMENTS
****
-2-
Notice:
Thu, 01-Aug-13 14:28 MDT
The Montana Department of Transportation has postponed the Bid Price Proposal Opening for the Judith River
Trestle Design Build project. In the interest of being good stewards of the taxpayers money and fair to all
proposing firms, it was determined that further analysis is warranted.

The following RFP scope item will be deleted:
~~Install sheet pile cofferdams, driven into bedrock around 14 concrete piers. There are 8 damaged~~
~~(#43 to #50) and 6 at risk (#39 to #42, #55 and #56). Protect cofferdams from overtopping by river.~~

And be replaced with:
Protect the 8 damaged piers (#43 to #50) and the 6 at risk piers (#39 to #42, #55 and #56) from scour.

The firms will have 2 weeks to consider any modifications to their design based on the updated scope.
Any updates to the Technical Proposal are due August 15, 2013 at 11:00 am. The page limit for any
updates is 20 pages. The stipend will be increased by $5,000 to $45,000.

An updated schedule will be posted to the project Q&A.
****
-3-
Notice: Thu, 29-Aug-2013 09:36 MDT
The following checklist of items must be included with the Bid Price Proposal:

1. Completed Bid Price Proposal Form
   a. DB Firm Members
   b. Completion Date
   c. Bid Price Proposal Due Date
   d. DB Price Plus Contingency
   e. Signature
2. Design Build Proposal Bond Form
3. Power of Attorney
4. DBE Requirements
5. Schedule of Participation by DBE's
6. Proposers List

****
-4-
Notice: Wed, 04-Sep-2013 14:25 MDT

FIRM	BID PRICE PROPOSAL AMOUNT	TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE	"APPARENT" AJUSTED SCORE *
Ames / HDR	$ 5,685,100.00	66,900	11.77
COP / DOWL / Hanson	$ 3,920,245.00	63,995	16.32
Sletten / TD&H	$ 4,387,913.00	55,910	12.74

*Note: "Apparent" adjusted score is contingent on Selection Committee review and approval and Transportation
Commission review and approval of recommended award. The highest adjusted score is the best value.
****

-1-
Submitted: Thu, 25-Apr-2013 10:07 MDT
Company: FLATIRON Constructors
Contact: 10188 E. I-25 Frontage Road, Firestone, CO, 80504
Question:
Please indicate if the resumes count towards the fifty page count for the SOQ?
Answer:
Submitted: Thu, 25-Apr-2013 10:45 MST
Yes, the resumes count towards the fifty page count for the SOQ.

-2-
Submitted: Wed, 01-May-2013 11:13 MDT

Company: DOWL HKM
Contact: Matt Mettler
Question:
The insurance requirements in the RFQ state the Design Professional members of the team must provide evidence in the SOQ that they have the ability to obtain Professional Liability Insurance covering errors and omissions in the amount of $1,000,000. Will MDT accept our standard E&O policy or is a project specific policy required? The last sentence in paragraph defines what project specific insurance is but does not specify if it is required. Further, these types of policies are expensive and time consuming to procure.
Answer:
Submitted: Thu, 02-May-2013 08:45 MST
The intent in the RFQ is for the Firm, or the Design Professional members of the Firm's team, to provide project specific evidence of their ability to obtain the required insurance. The actual policy is required to be in place when the Firm executes the Contract.

-3-
Submitted: Mon, 24-Jun-2013 11:29 MDT
Company: TD&H Engineering
Contact: Chris Ward
Question:
Has MDT conducted a Biological Resources Report (which includes a Biological Assessment) for this project? If not, is the Firm expected to conduct a BRR? If so, should the effort be a Full BRR or Modified (BA not required) given the limited footprint of the project?
Answer:
Submitted: Tue, 25-Jun-2013 11:45 MDT
The Firm is responsible to conduct a general Biological Resources Report excluding the Biological Assessment which was completed by MDT and is attached. Also attached is the USFWS concurrence letter.
BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT
USFWS CONCURRENCE LETTER

-4-
Submitted: Mon, 24-Jun-2013 11:31 MDT
Company: TD&H Engineering
Contact: Chris Ward
Question:
It is our understanding that though there are no wetlands within the project boundary, a water of the U.S. delineation will be required in support of a Section 404 application. Likewise, an SPA 124 is also required.
Are these assumptions in line with MDT's expectations?
Answer:
Submitted: Wed, 26-Jun-2013 8:47 MDT
Yes, the successful firm will provide draft environmental permit applications for all temporary and permanent facilities and construction activities that trigger permit requirements to MDT for review.

-5-
Submitted: Thu, 27-Jun-2013 17:30 MDT
Company: DOWL HKM
Contact: Matt Mettler
Question:
The as-built drawings provided contained the erection plan and bill of material for the concrete deck slabs but no detail drawings. Is it possible to obtain a couple of detail sheets particularly drawing numbers C-6937 and D-2043?
Answer:
Submitted: Mon, 15-Jul-2013 10:50 MDT
All available as-built information has been provided.

-6-
Submitted: Tue, 09-Jul-2013 07:16 MDT
Company: Ames Construction, Inc.
Contact: Dan Ferris
Question:
In reference to Attachment C - Proposal Bond; What is the correct Project Number?
Answer:
Submitted: Tue, 09-Jul-2013 08:11 MDT
In reference to Attachment C - Proposal Bond; the Project Number is: SF 14(39)

-7-
Submitted: Tue, 09-Jul-2013 07:30 MDT
Company: Ames Construction, Inc.
Contact: Dan Ferris
Question:
In reference to the Updated Meeting Minutes; Page 2: Question 4 - Response. "following the latest edition of AREMA part 7...". The 2012 edition is referenced in the RFP on page 12 of 42 section V.A.1. Is the 2012 manual still required, or will the the new 2013 manual be required?
Answer:
Submitted: Tue, 09-Jul-2013 10:35 MDT
Use the 2012 AREMA Manual for Railway Engineering.

-8-
Submitted: Tue, 09-Jul-2013 09:59 MDT
Company: Ames Construction, Inc.
Contact: Dan Ferris
Question:
In reference to the RFP page 6 of 42 anticipated scope of work the last bullet states “Prepare all steel surfaces in the limits of construction (including removal and disposal of lead based paint), prime surfaces and paint.”

Please clarify that removal and painting of all steel surfaces within the bent project limits for the towers will

be part of the base bid, not subject to the DB teams interpretation.
Answer:
Submitted: Tue, 09-Jul-2013 11:05 MDT
For the base bid, the steel surfaces to be prepared, primed and painted are those within the bent project limits.
(Bent No. 22 to Bent No. 25)

-9-
Submitted: Wed, 10-Jul-2013 10:31 MDT
Company: Ames Construction, Inc.
Contact: Dan Ferris
Question:
In reference to the RFP page 6 of 42, bullet 4 of the anticipated scope of work items - and additionally in reference to the Updated Meeting Minutes page 3 answer to question 6.

1.) Piers 51 thru 54 already have been upgraded for scour protection, is it the intent of the RFP to have the design-build contractor verify existing conditions, compared to the as-built information and include repairs to these piers if necessary assuming full responsibility for meeting the 75 year design life requirements in the RFP?
2.) Or is the intent to replace the castings as deemed necessary at these locations, but leave the piers as-is in the base bid?
Answer:
Submitted: Thu, 11-Jul-2013 10:03 MDT
1.) No.
2.) Yes.

-10-
Submitted: Wed, 10-Jul-2013 11:34 MDT
Company: COP Construction LLC
Contact: Nick Patch
Question:
The RFP states "Prepare all steel surfaces in the limits of construction (including removal and disposal of lead based paint), prime surfaces and paint.

A question was answered (8) regarding painting the trestles, stating the limits of the project are Bent 22 to Bent 25.

Could MDOT please clarify if the intent of the RFP is to include removing lead based paint and coating of the girders within the project limits?
Answer:
Submitted: Thu, 11-Jul-2013 10:01 MDT
Yes, the intent of the RFP is to include removing lead based paint and coating of the girders within the project limits.

-11-
Submitted: Thu, 18-Jul-2013 15:31 MDT
Company: Ames Construction, Inc.

Contact: Dan Ferris
Question:
In the RFP section V. Project Requirements and Provision for Work subsection M. Contract Duration states that the
contract duration will not exceed 300 calendar days. The Supplemental Specs states in section 101.03 DEFINITIONS
(No Work Days) that no work will be done during the winter shutdown unless approved by the Engineer.
The Standard Specs mentions that every day shown on a calendar is a calendar day.

Is the winter shutdown considered part of the calendar days for this RFP schedule?
Answer:
Submitted: Fri, 19-Jul-2013 13:33 MDT
For the Judith River Trestle Project, rescind winter shutdown from the Supplemental Specifications - 101.03 No
Work Days definition. Time assessment will not be suspended for this time period.

-12-
Submitted: Fri, 19-Jul-2013 15:27 MDT
Company: TD&H Engineering
Contact: Erling A. Juel
Question:
One additional question on the Project Limits. Previous Q&A discussions have defined the Project Limits as
being from Bent 22 to Bent 25 and this would then also define the limits of LBP removal and painting. Knowing
that the long girder bearing plates are damaged at Bents 21 and 26 and that the girders must be removed in order
to repair them, should not the Project Limits be extended out, but not including, Bents 21 and 25 to inlcude
those long girder repairs, LBP removal and painting?
Answer:
Submitted: Mon, 22-Jul-2013 9:00 MDT
For the purposes of the Technical Proposal and the Bid Price Proposal use the previously stated project limits.

-13-
Submitted: Fri, 02-Aug-2013 15:05 MDT
Company: DOWL HKM
Contact: Matt Mettler
Question:
How many copies of the Technical Proposal update need to be submitted?
Answer:
Submitted: Mon, 05-Aug-2013 10:20 MDT
Submit 10 hard copies and 1 electronic copy of the Technical Proposal Update.

-14-
Submitted: Wed, 07-Aug-2013 14:44 MDT
Company: Ames Construction, Inc.
Contact: Dan Ferris
Question:

In the technical proposal we have outlined several alternatives, are these alternatives to be priced and submitted
with the bid form?
Answer:
Submitted: Wed, 07-Aug-2013 15:25 MDT
No, alternatives are not to be priced and submitted with the bid forms.

-15-
Submitted: Fri, 09-Aug-2013 14:32 MDT
Company: Ames Construction, Inc.
Contact: Dan Ferris
Question:
The Preliminary Engineering Report, Judith River Trestle, in Section 8.6, identifies a concentration scour of
1.3, 2.1, and 2.0 feet for the 100, 200, and 500-year flow rates, respectively. Are the scour values provided in
said Section 8.6 suitable for existing and proposed pier scour, or should the industry standard (HEC-23 guidance)
including pier scour and channel migration be taken into account?
Answer:
Submitted: Fri, 09-Aug-2013 15:47 MDT
The scour values provided in section 8.6 of the Preliminary Engineering Report are not suitable. Use the
guidelines in HEC 18 & 23.

-16-
Submitted: Wed, 14-Aug-2013 15:26 MDT
Company: TD&H Engineering
Contact: Erling A. Juel
Question:
The RFP states that the Project Duration is 300 calendar days.
For this Project, is a calendar day a calendar or a working day per Section 101.03?
Sundays and Holidays are no work days but do they count as calendar days towards the 300 calendar days?
Answer:
Submitted: Fri, 16-Aug-2013 14:10 MDT
~~No, Sundays and Holidays do not count as calendar days as per 101.03.~~
Revised Answer:
Submitted: Mon, 26-Aug-2013 9:10 MDT
Sundays and Holidays are no work days, however, they are counted as Calendar Days per 101.03.

-17-
Submitted: Mon, 26-Aug-2013 15:25 MDT
Company: Ames Construction, Inc.
Contact: Dan Ferris
Question:
Section VI. Section B - Bridge Plan Sheets, 5th bullet; The RFP indicates 'Right of Way Coordinate Data' is a plan
sheet that is anticipated. Please clarify what is required for a 'Right of Way Coordinate Data' plan sheet. Are a
full set of Right of Way plans necessary for this project?
Answer:

Submitted: Wed, 28-Aug-2013 14:21 MDT
A full set of Right of Way plans are not necessary. Right of Way Coordinate data is necessary if the Firm utilizes
any temporary construction easements or permits.