

December 19, 2018

CONTRACT NO. 4400014913
STATE PROJECT NO. H.010155
FEDERAL AID PROJECT NO. H010155
US 90 RAILROAD OVERPASS SE OF LA 85
ROUTE US 90
IBERIA PARISH

Questions and Answers

- Q1. MPR 4 states that the professional civil engineer must be a prime consultant but the note at the bottom indicates that MPRs 4-8 can be met by a sub-consultant. This contradicts MPR 4, please clarify?
- A1. Addendum No. 1, issued on December 19, removed “of the prime consultant” from MPR 4.
- Q2. Please post Stage 0 Studies for this project so we can better understand the scope?
- A2. The Stage 0 Studies, issued on December 19, can be found under Adden. No. 1 link with the Addendum No. 1 pdf file.
- Q3. Is a QA/QC bridge design plan document required as part of the submission?
- A3. No.
- Q4. The fee set aside for a box culvert design of this nature approximately 350’ in length seems relatively low. Please reevaluate the overall fee and Bridge Design fee.
- A4. The compensation remains as stated in the advertisement.
- Q5. The Department has established, based on the Performance Rating Category Table in the advertisement, that only 10% of the project experience is assigned to the Bridge Design, Structural Category. Also DOTD has established that this is a small project. Is it the intent of MPR 2 to establish that the Prime consultant have a person on staff with 10 years’ experience designing bridges for LADOTD? Although the bridge design score is only 10%, is it the Department’s intent for this project be performed by a bridge design firm instead of a road design firm?
- A5. It is the intent of the department for the prime consultant to have at least ten (10) years of experience in using the Louisiana Standard Specifications for Roads and Bridges and the Louisiana DOTD Bridge Design Manual.

January 8, 2019

Q6. Is it the intent of DOTD to utilize a precast or cast in place Reinforced Concrete Box (RCB) for the access tunnel structure?

A6. Precast

Q7. The Geotechnical scope references a total of 6 soil borings of both Deep and Shallow types. How many of each are required and how much lab testing was included in the budget?

A7. 6 deep borings. Standard lab testing is included in the fee.

Q8. The Geotechnical scope references Bridge Design Foundations: with driven pile, drilled shaft, and other foundations. The scope also refers to a Bridge Foundation Load Test Program. If this is an RCB what is the purpose of these Bridge Design Foundation Scope elements?

A8. The geotechnical scope is an all-encompassing scope of work. All items listed may not be needed for this project.

Q9. The Geotechnical scope references M.S.E., concrete and sheet pile walls which we interpret to be utilized for the permanent and temporary retaining walls which will retain the embankment of the elevated US 90 and frontage roads within the existing US 90 right of way. The concrete and steel sheet pile walls will require structural analysis and detailing deliverables which would typically be part of the bridge/structural scope instead of the geotechnical scope. In this case, however, the scope and compensation for some of the bridge/tunnel/structural component appears to be within the geotechnical component. Can this be clarified?

A9. It is assumed that if a wall is needed it would be a temporary MSE or sheet pile wall or a permanent MSE wall. Hours for analysis and plan development have been included under the geotechnical fee.

Q10. Could a pile supported foundation possibly be required for the access tunnel? Has this been considered in the work scope and fee development?

A10. It is assumed that the RCB will be ground supported. If it is determined otherwise, then the additional work will be handled via supplement.

Q11. Can the detailed estimated sheet counts utilized to generate both the preliminary and associated final plan design fees be provided to the consultants to review the basis of the plan development scope and proposed compensation?

A11. DOTD does not provide the sheet counts; however, the fee breakout is as follows: preliminary plans - \$283,425, final plans - \$159,870, geotechnical - \$171,728 and contract management - \$36,412.

Q12. Can the existing Railroad and/ or proposed utility lines in the tunnel be out of commission during construction of the project? If the service needs to remain, this will probably entail complicated and expensive temporary traffic sequencing. If yes, was this taken into consideration when determining the fee?

A12. YES. This was taken into consideration when the fee was determined.

Q13. There appears to be 8 active travel lanes crossing the proposed tunnel (4 on US 9, and 4 for the two Frontage Roads). Can the travel lanes be reduced to 4 during construction?

A13. YES

Q14. In attachment A scope of services page 12, there is no mention of scope of preliminary & final plans for structures (box, retaining walls or MSE walls etc.) and estimate of required sheets for preliminary & final plans for these structures. Can this information be provided?

A14. If a wall is needed it would be a temporary MSE or sheet pile wall or a permanent MSE wall. Hours for analysis and plan development have been included under the geotechnical fee.