

In accordance with the ITP for the Project, CDOT has received the following questions from the Proposers and hereby issues the following responses to each question.

Question #	Document	Section	Question / Comment from Proposer	CDOT Response	Response Date
1	Book 1	Section 1	Section 1.3-Order of Precedence-"...CDOT shall have the right to determine, at its sole discretion, which requirement(s) apply." If in dispute, can Book 1, Section 19.2 (Dispute Resolution) apply?	Change will be made in future addendum.	11/9/2012
2	Book 1	Section 2	Section 2.4.3-Necessary Design Change-"Contractor shall not be entitled to an increase in Contract price or an extension of Completion Deadlines in connection to errors, omissions, inconsistencies or other defects related to modifications of the Contract Drawings/ROW plans as the result of Approved ATCs or ACCs". It further states"...in order to correct an error, omission, inconsistency or other defect therein, and such modification decreases the cost and/or time to perform the Work, the Contract Price and/or Completions Deadlines shall be decreased accordingly." This is not consistent and changes shall be negotiated in accordance with Book 1, Section 12, Value Engineering and Negotiated Changes.	CDOT has considered this request and does not believe that the two sections are inconsistent. CDOT will not be making any changes to Section 2.4.3.	11/9/2012
3	Book 1	Section 4	Section 4.5-Recovery Schedule-States that if Contractor fails to provide an approved Recovery Schedule within 30 days of the Contractor's receipt of a notice to do so,"the Contractor shall have no right to receive progress payments". The submission of a recovery schedule will depend on the complexity of the schedule and the re-sequencing or acceleration of work. The submittal time frame should be negotiable. We request that CDOT allow progress payments with some form of retention during this period.	CDOT will be adding additional language in a future addendum.	11/9/2012
4	Book 1	Section 4	Section 4.6-Prerequisites for Start of Construction Item 4. "All necessary rights of access for such portion of the Project have been obtained"-Has all the ROW or rights of entry been obtained?	No. Per Book 2 Section 8 ..."The Contractor shall be allowed access to each parcel identified in Appendix A as each parcel is acquired. CDOT will provide the Contractor with status reports, written notice of parcel access, and any applicable restrictions that may apply. The Contractor shall not access any parcel on which access has not been provided."	11/9/2012
5	Book 1	Section 6	Section 6.1.1.2-Right of Way Access Requirements-We request to add language that the Contractor and CDOT jointly agree to revise the ROW schedule before entering into a no cost change order.	No change will be made to the Technical Requirement language.	2/12/2013

6	Book 1	Section 6	Section 6.1.1.4-Obligation to Provide Written Notice-A necessary condition for obtaining an increase in Contract Price or extension of a Completion Deadline related to CDOT's delivery of access to the parcels identified on the ROW plans, the Contractor shall provide CDOT written notice within three working days after receipt of a revised projected date if it affects schedule. We request this be changed to at least ten working days to allow a schedule review.	The referenced section has been modified to reflect the change	2/12/2013
7	Book 1	Section 6	Section 6.2.1.2-Inaccuracies Increasing the Work-Item 2-Please define "Service Line".	There is already a definition of "Service Line" included in Book 1, Exhibit A.	11/9/2012
8	Book 1	Section 6	Section 6.2.4. - Please provide definition of Utility Delay.	Refer to the URAs, Section 17, included in the Reference Documents of the RFP	11/9/2012
9	Book 1	Section 7	Section 7.3-Limitation on Subcontracted Work-states "The Contractor shall sublet no more than 30 percent of the construction work". We request that this requirement be the same as CDOT's Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction, Section 108.01 requiring the Contractor to perform at least 30% of the total contract. CDOT should not exclude subcontracts with Major Participants from the total dollar value of the subcontracted work.	A change will be made in a future addendum to reflect that Contractor may sublet up to 70 percent of construction work and up to 70 percent of design work.	11/9/2012
10	Book 1	Section 11	Sections 11.1.3 & 11.3.2 Refers to NTP 1 Payment Cap-What is payment cap?	The NTP 1 Payment Cap will be added to Book 1, Exhibit A in a future addendum, but the amount will be \$1.6 million.	11/9/2012
11	Book 1	Section 13	Section 13.7.6- Mark Ups-States that Contractor will be paid mark ups in accordance with Standard Specification 109.04. Since jobsite overhead costs for design/build work are different than conventional work, we request that the mark up percentages be negotiated.	CDOT has considered this request and will not be deviating from Standard Specification 109.04.	11/9/2012

12	Book 1	Section 13	Section 13.11-Hazardous Substance Management- states "the Contract Price includes all Activities to be performed by the Contractor as described in Book 2, Section 5." "....compensation for certain Activities required under Book 2, Section 5.0, including investigating, monitoring, characterizing and testing, are included in the Contract Price and the Contractor shall not be entitled to additional payment under Section 13.11.1 therefore." Does this work for hazardous substance management just include the investigation, monitoring and testing? With CDOT being the generator for all existing hazardous materials found within the project (Standard Specification Section 250.03), it is CDOT's responsibility to designate the treatment, storage and disposal (TSD) facility in writing by the Engineer (CDOT). Need to emphasize that transport costs to the disposal facility and disposal fees will be paid for in accordance with subsection 109.04. Also reference in Book 2, Section 5.1.9 is to Standard Specification for Road and Bridge Construction (1999). Should be 2011.	CDOT will analyze this section and will make clarifications in a future addendum if necessary.	11/9/2012
13	Book 1	Section 16	Section 16.1.2-Rights to Cure-Section alleges that a failure to provide and maintain the required insurance and payment and performance bonds are "not curable". This is a concern because, if through inadvertence, insurance expires/lapses, then we have an incurable event of default. Recommend changing Line 8 "....events described in Section 16.1.1(8) and (11) through (14)...	CDOT will ask for CDOT Risk Management's input into this request and if a change is made it will be reflected in a future addendum. However, CDOT is not inclined to change this language at present.	11/9/2012
14	Book 1	Section 16	Section 16.2.1-Rights of CDOT-In the event of Default.....Request to remove statement in Item No. 8, "(either with or without the use of Contractor's material, equipment, tools and instruments)".	CDOT has considered this request and is not prepared to delete this statement.	11/9/2012
15	Book 1	Section 17	Section 17.1.1.2-Multiple Assessments of Liquidated Damages-Suggest rewriting "Liquidated damages may be assessed simultaneously under subsection 17.1.1.1.1 and 17.1.1.1.3 or under subsection 17.1.1.1.2 and 17.1.1.1.3	Changes will be made to the liquidated damages amounts and language and the changes will be reflected in a future addendum.	11/9/2012
16	Book 1	Section 21	Section 21.1.1 Project Warranties. From a legal and insurance perspective, professional design services are unable to be warranted. We request wording be revised such that "warrantee" is replaced by the word "represents".	This change will be reflected in a future addendum.	11/9/2012
17	Book 1	Section 22	Section 22.1-Escrowed Proposal Documents-States "Within three days after the Proposal Due Date, the Contractor shall deliver the Escrowed Proposal Documents to CDOT..." Conflicts with ITP 1.11 Procurement Schedule that allows five days. With Proposal due on a Friday, can this be modified to possibly five working days after Proposal due date? Where are the Escrowed Proposal Documents to be delivered?	We will change to 5 Working Days in the ITP. The EPDs are considered part of the Proposal and shall be submitted to the same location as shown in the ITP, Section 2.5 - Submission of Proposals.	11/9/2012

18	Book 1	Section 23	Section 23.2-Interference by Other Contractors-If it is CDOT work, we request CDOT's assistance in resolving conflicts.	This language is standard for CDOT road and bridge projects and CDOT will not be making a change to this section.	11/9/2012
19	Book 2	Section 10	Geotechnical, Roadway Pavements, and Structure Foundations-Reference documents included soil borings, but no geotechnical reports. When will the geotechnical report(s) be available?	These has been released as part of Addendum No. 1	11/9/2012
20	Book 2	Section 15	Is there a Structure Selection Report available for the pedestrian/bicycle bridge?	No.	11/9/2012
21	Book 2	Section 15	Section 15.2.5.1-Geometry-"Where 12 feet (minimum)... is not available between the wall and ROW line for maintenance access, the wall shall be located a minimum of 10 feet inside the ROW line." Will this 10-foot requirement apply to cut walls that can be maintained from CDOT's ROW?	All features of all walls shall be within CDOT ROW. ROW requirements specify minimum needs for CDOT to Maintain the wall. These minimum requirements shall be maintained regardless of a "cut" or "fill" condition.	2/12/2013
22	ITP , Form Q, Book 2, ARE's	Section 1	Repairs to Bridge Structure F-16-OG (EB US6 to NB I25) is not included in the Structures ARE listings for either of these documents, but is discussed in the Reference Documents, for Book 2, Section 15, Bridge ARE - reports and photos, "Bridge ARE.pdf". Please clarify if the work on Structure F-16-OG is to be included as an ARE.	The Reference Documents will be updated to delete this information. Please refer to Book 2- Section 1 and Form Q of the ITP instead.	11/9/2012
23	ITP	Section 1	Sections 1.11 & 2.33-ATC/ACC Submittal- We request that the submittal deadline for ATCs and ACCs be December 7, 2012, one week after last one on one meeting for reviewing potential ATCs/ACCs.	ATC's and ACC's must be formally submitted for consideration. The Contractor should prepare and submit their ATC's and ACC's in consideration of the published date schedule. CDOT's last date to Approve, Reject or Approve with Conditions as of December 7, 2012. Earlier submittals are allowed (and encouraged). However, CDOT may consider delaying the date by an additional week, but would still hold to all subsequent dates shown. Final decision pending.	11/9/2012
24	ITP	Section 1	Section1.11-Procurement Schedule-As discussed, we respectfully suggest submitting the price component of the proposal one week after the technical proposal.	The price component is an integral part of the overall Proposal evaluation process and cannot be delayed for separate submittal.	11/9/2012
25	Book 2	Section 10	Geotechnical, Roadway Pavements, and Structure Foundations-Page 10-4 specify that a Pavement Design Report is required for non-CDOT roadways and it is listed as a deliverable in Section 10.4. Since this requirement uses MGPEC, have the design ESALs as specified in Table 10.1.1 been determined using MGPEC or CDOT criteria? Given the short bidding timeframe, are we to base our bid on the thicknesses as specified in Table 10.1.1?	Yes	2/12/2013

26	Reference Document & Book 2	Section 12, Section 15	Replacement of Weir Gulch CBC under US 6, west of Federal. Book 2 Section 12.0 (p. 12-1), Section 12.2.6.2 (p.12-18), and Section 15 (pp.15-14, 15-15) discuss the replacement of this box culvert under US 6: however it has not been included in Book 2, Section 1 as part of the Basic Configuration. Please clarify.	This is a drainage structure. Replacement of all the Project's existing drainage infrastructure is required as part of the overall Technical Criteria and further described in those Sections of Book 2.	11/9/2012
27	?	?	Please provide the CORSIM micro-simulation files created for the US 6 portion of the Valley Highway EIS. The relevant files include AM and PM peak hour simulation of existing, future No Action, and future alternatives. Files should include, as a minimum, the input files for all modeled scenarios (.trf extension).	Response pending further investigation from CDOT of potential modelling that may have been done as part of past projects.	11/9/2012
28	Book 2	Section 1	Missing Exhibit A, can we expect this in the next addendum?	See Addendum No. 1	11/9/2012
29	Book 2 Section 1 Reference Documents	Modifications_Fed_US 6_US6DB	Explain the Book 2, Section 1 Reference Document. Information seems to contradict.	Current version of RFP has rectified any previous contradiction	11/9/2012
30	Book 2	Section 2	2.1.3.3.C (Page 2-8) All Activities that start or complete out of sequence shall be rescheduled (logic corrected) to reflect the actual sequence of events. It is our understanding that this requirement would only pertain to major WBS elements that affect the CPM schedule, correct?	No. The intent is that any activity that affects the Critical Path that start or complete out of sequence.....	11/9/2012
31	Book 2	Section 2	2.1.3.3.E (Page 2-8 and 2-9) If any logic is changed after the Approval of the Original Initial Schedule or Revised Initial Schedule, if one exists, a narrative by Activity code shall accompany the Monthly Progress Schedule stating the reason the logic changed and the benefit to CDOT. If CDOT does not agree with the reason for the logic change, the Monthly Progress Schedule will not be Accepted. It is our understanding that this requirement would only pertain to major WBS elements that affect the CPM schedule, correct?	No. The intent is that logic affects the Critical Path.....	11/9/2012
32	Book 2	Section 2	2.1.5.2 Pre-Construction Photographs: If a dispute arises where no or insufficient photographic or video evidence of its existing condition is available, the disputed area shall be restored to the extent directed by CDOT at no additional cost to CDOT. What about on undisturbed facilities/areas?	Facilities or areas that have not been disturbed do not require restoration.	11/9/2012
33	Book 2	Section 2	2.2.1 Telephones and telephone service with at least two lines for CDOT Offices, conference rooms, break room, and filing room, including five cordless phones. Total or per office?	The intent is two phone lines, two phone numbers, all accessible in every CDOT Office.	11/9/2012

34	Book 2	Section 2	2.2.1 One color laser printer, copier, with additional 11- by 17-inch tray or Approved equal, including paper, toner, parts, service, and repairs. This printer shall be capable of networking to all CDOT personnel offices. The printer shall be capable of scanning documents to 11- x 17-inch size and transmitting the scanned file to multiple email addresses 2.2.1 One black and white copier capable of 45 ppm input and output at 600 x 600 dpi and at least two paper drawers accepting 8-1/2- x 11-inch up to 11- x 17-inch paper and paper weights from 16 to 24 lb. bond, including paper, toner, service and repairs. It would be a cost saving to the Project and CDOT if we could supply 1 copy machine that performs the requirements listed above is this acceptable to CDOT?	Yes.	11/9/2012
35	Book 2	Section 2	2.2.2 Can the Field Laboratory be shared with the contractor? Co-location?	The Lab space may be shared however none of the Lab Equipment shall not be shared.	11/9/2012
36	Book 2	Section 2	2.1.3.4.3 Second paragraph of to item # 1 states in parenthesis (need list of special events from CCD and others). Will CDOT be providing the number of Special Events each Proposer should include in their schedule?	No. See Addendum No. 1	11/9/2012
37	Book 2	Section 2	2.1.5.2 Deliverable is defined to be due "immediately after NTP1". Suggest removing this language, as further in paragraph it appears intent is for this deliverable to be complete prior to NTP2.	The intent is to have the documentation prior to NTP2.	11/9/2012
38	Book 2	Section 2	2.3 Deliverable table shows that Original Initial Schedule is to be submitted for approval 15 days prior to issuance of NTP2. This statement appears to be in conflict with Book 1, Section 4.2.2.	Refer to the most recent documents - addendums have corrected the conflict	2/12/2013
39	Book 2	Section 3	3.3.1 2nd paragraph states that schedule for RFC and As-built documents are included in QMP. This is not typically included, as each schedule change would require a rev of the QMP. Suggest removing this language.	The reference to 'scheduling' is intended to identify the sequencing/coordination of associated Activities that would then be shown in the subsequent Project Schedule. The actual schedules/updates do not need to be included in the QMP.	11/9/2012
40	Book 2	Section 4	4.7.3 Public Meetings and Personal Contact, 1. Public Information Meetings: The Contractor shall host public meetings five (5) days prior to commencement of initial construction, and commencement of each subsequent phase of construction. Can Public Meetings be held "at least" 5 days prior?	The intent is the meeting(s) shall be held no later than 5 days prior.	11/9/2012

41	Book 2	Section 5	5.4.1.1 The Contractor shall not maintain, reconnect, or otherwise allow discharge of improperly disposed materials into the storm sewer system within the limits of the Project. Will CDOT consider removing the following language "otherwise allow" from that sentence? It will nearly impossible for Contractor to enforce this requirement on third parties.	Development of Book 2 Section 5 - Environmental remains under progress and will be clarified in upcoming Addenda. Language is being considered to reflect the requested change, and may state..."knowingly permit discharge..."	11/9/2012
42	Book 2	Section 7	7.5 Numbering correction. Top of page 7-9: #4 is a continuation of #3 and #5 should change to #4.	Will revise in future Addendum	11/9/2012
43	Book 2	Section 10	Can CDOT please define Milepost 282.3 referenced in this section by station number? A milepost is not specific enough.	A stationing equivalent for this project will not be provided. The description is further defined in Book 1, Section 1 - General as..."mill and overlay of US 6 from the eastern reconstruction limits of CDOT Project No. 1854, FBR 006A-49 (for replacement of the existing US 6 Bridge Structure over Sheridan Boulevard)..."	11/9/2012
44	Book 2	Section 10	Section 10.1, Paragraph 6 indicates a structural coefficient of 0.15 and an elastic modulus of 20,000 should be used for Class 6 ABC. Please verify the elastic modulus of 20,000?	The information is verified and correct per the Technical Requirement	2/12/2013
45	Book 2	Section 11	11.2 This table indicates that the geotech recommendations and supplemental investigations be submitted a minimum of 2 months prior to start of any related work . This is in contradiction with Section 10.2, we recommend following Section 10.2.	submittals required and identified in a technical requirement section shall be submitted in conformance with the technical requirement section.	2/12/2013
46	Book 2	Section 11	11.1.2.1.1 Please verify minimum subgrade R-Value of 20 on US 6 between Bryant St. and South Platte River	The proper R-value is as reflected.	11/9/2012
47	Book 2	Section 12	12.2.4.7 BMPs shall be designed for the 0.6-inch one-hour rainfall depth. Typo? BMP .5 not .6?	The BMP requirement is 0.6 one-hour rainfall depth for this project.	11/9/2012
48	Book 2	Section 12	Will CDOT please verify which version of Hydro Flo software is being used on the Project?	The Hydraflow version we are using is Hydraflow Storm Sewers Extension for AutoCAD Civil 3D 2011, Version: 8	11/9/2012
49	Book 2	Section 13	13.1.1 Do the references, codes and standards listed in Section 13.1.1 have their own order of precedence?	No.	11/9/2012
50	Book 2	Section 13	13.2.10 The text indicates the Design Exceptions identified in Table 13.2-2 have NOT been approved by CDOT; please confirm. It is assumed that the Design-Builder is not obligated to mitigate these design exceptions, please confirm.	The referenced information had been submitted to CDOT and is pending their approval. There is no expectation the Proposer would need to mitigate these design exceptions	11/9/2012

51	Book 2	Section 13	13.4 Timeline for approval of design exceptions is not provided. To schedule the design and RFC process, the timeline for approval of design exceptions is needed. Please provide additional specifics regarding the timeline for submittal / approval of design exceptions.	The process for approval of design exceptions is according to established/published CDOT procedures. CDOT will do its best to expedite any additional requests. However, the responsibility to coordinate/schedule any required submittals for approval as part of their work should be expected to remain an obligation of the Proposer.	11/9/2012
52	Book 2	Section 14	14.3 <i>This table lists several plans (pavement marking, signing, etc) that are noted to be submitted to CDOT for approval 60-90 days prior to issuance of RFC documents.</i> We request that the review time for acceptance or approval be reduced to 10 days as to not impact the Project schedule	This is under consideration. The number of days will not be less than the required number of days for review/acceptance/approval required by CDOT and CCD.	11/9/2012
53	Book 2	Section 15	Is there a better copy of the as-builts for structure F-16-OG?	No.	11/9/2012
54	Book 2	Section 20	Is this language applicable to this Project or is it a hold over from another project?	The referenced SSP in Book 2, Section 20 reflects CDOT's present policy.	11/9/2012
55	ITP	Section 4.2.3	Evaluation Criteria – Please clarify the scoring criteria for the ARE's, e.g. will CDOT provide information on how each individual ARE will be weighted	AREs shall not be weighted	2/12/2013
56	Book 2	Section 7	The Utility Matrix indicates the water line work on Federal will be scheduled with Denver Water for an outage in the January –March 2014 time frame. What is the specific duration these lines can be out of service for re-connection?	The Contractor will have the opportunity to coordinate the outage duration if they desire. CDOT is simply providing them with a scheduled outage now since the DWD master outage schedule takes 8- 12 months in advanced to schedule.	11/29/2012
57	Book 2	Section 17	Are there seasonal constraints for the Barnum Park East reconstruction / River / general Park activities? This will be needed for schedule & phasing.	The Contractor shall assume there will be seasonal constraints that will need to be coordinated with Denver Parks. Given enough advance notice by the Contractor, Denver Parks is anticipating they may need to reschedule activities to other locations/times.	11/29/2012
58	Reference Documents		In reviewing the RFP Reference Files and Addendum 1, we do not find that CDOT provided the individual sheet files for the structures plan sheets (general layouts and typical sections). We request that CDOT provide these files as well. Having these files as well will aid us in preparation of drawings for our proposal submission such that we present the same sheet areas and information as the RFP documents.	This will be issued in a future addendum	11/29/2012
59	Book 2	Section 15	15.2.10.2.1.1 requires a 75 year life cycle cost analysis for each proposed bridge type. If it is a conventional bridge used by CDOT and we design to a 75 year life as required by AASHTO LRFD, is a life cycle cost analysis still necessary?	Yes.	11/29/2012

60	Book 2	Section 6	6.2.4- 3rd Party Design Reviews- states that "Contractor shall allow 15 days for review and comment by the Railroad for all design reviews". We have been informed that this review process is typically 30-45 days.	Required review time frames, as identified by the RR, shall be reflected in the requirements. Any changes to the current review time frames shall be reflected in future addenda.	11/29/2012
61	Book 2	Section 6	6.2.6- Colorado Public Utilities Commission-Need clarification that it is the Contractor's responsibility in preparing and assisting CDOT in all applications to the PUC. CDOT will submit the application to the PUC with the Contractor's exhibits.	CDOT will submit the application. The Design Builder will assist by preparing and providing supporting PUC application documents.	11/29/2012
62	ITP	Section 4	Technical Proposal Format. The Instructions to proposers appears to require Volume III, the Technical Proposal, to be in an 8½ x11 format. Given the fact that numerous 11x17 drawings will be included in the Technical Proposal, would CDOT allow the Technical Proposals to be in an 11x17 format such that the drawings would not have to be folded for submittal, and hence unfolded for review by CDOT? Or as an alternate, could all required drawings be submitted in as separate volume as an Appendix to Volume III in an 11x17 format?	Will clarify as a future addendum that in the ITP 11x17 drawings can be submitted separately as an Appendix to Volume III, unfolded.	11/29/2012
63	Book 2	Section 5	Table 5-6 Deliverables by the Contractor Change – We would like to request to change all "approval" to "acceptance" in Table 5-6.	No. Will keep 'Approval' for deliverables shown	11/29/2012
64	Book 2	Section 7	7.5 Failure of Utility Owner to Cooperate or Timely Perform - The Contractor shall document any incurred costs as a direct result of the Utility Owner's failure to cooperate or perform its obligations under the applicable URA in a timely manner. Should include shchedule impacts	Yes. Schedule impacts should also be documented.	11/29/2012
65	Book 2	Section 13	13.4 Deliverables - No prescriptive review process is described (i.e., Preliminary / Final, 30%, 60%, etc). Is the number of reviews to be defined at the design-builder's discretion?	The QMP should identify the Design Builder's design review process for all disciplines. Not all disciplines require the level of review noted. The Design Builder should identify the level necessary to ensure adequate review with submittal of their QMP for CDOT's 'Approval'.	11/29/2012
66	Book 2	Section 18	18.1.3 Maintenance Responsibilities of the Contractor - Can we add language to: Except as specifically assigned to CDOT in Section 18.4 below, the Contractor shall perform all required maintenance Activities for all roadways within the project limits, including, but not limited to...In equal condition to NTP 2	Maintenance responsibilities shall be completed as identified in the requirement.	2/12/2013

67	Book 2	Section 19	19.0 - Third paragraph references Appendix A as describing the new devices that are required. However, Appendix A appears to contain project special provisions but not a specific description of the devices to be replaced. Will CDOT be providing a list of devices that are to be replaced?	The Contractor shall prepare an inventory and submit it for review and determination in accordance with the technical requirements.	2/12/2013
68	Book 2	Section 19	19.1.2 Locations and Protection of ITS Elements - States that ITS elements shall not be located in the highway median. Does this include any conduit or pull boxes?	Yes	11/29/2012
69	Book 2	Section 19	19.3 Deliverables - States ITS plan sheets and details are to be submitted for acceptance four weeks prior to RFC. Please consider removing this requirement. Typically approval is a direct predecessor to RFC.	The QMP should identify the Design Builder's design review process for all disciplines, including ITS. The Design Builder should identify the level necessary to ensure adequate/timely review and coordinate acceptance of those with submittal of their QMP for CDOT's 'Approval'.	11/29/2012
70	ITP	Section 1	Sections 1.11 & 2.3 ATC/ACC Submittal – We request that the submittal deadline for ATCs and ACCS be December 7, 2012, one week after the last one-on-one meeting with CDOT. We acknowledge that this would delay the CDOT response date by at least seven days.	Any and all revisions of the Procurement Process Schedule, as identified in the ITP, will be identified in a future Addendum.	11/29/2012
71	ITP	Section 1	Sections 1.11 & 2.3 ATC/ACC Submittal – We request an abbreviated follow-up confidential one-on-one meeting (Session # 4) in early January 2013 to present/discuss up to 3 additional ATCs to CDOT.	Any and all revisions of the Procurement Process Schedule, as identified in the ITP, will be identified in a future Addendum.	11/29/2012
72a			Questions associated with I-25 over the BNSF Spur (F-16-EG) widening. a. Will CDOT please provide As-Constructed Plans / Inspections Reports for F-16-EG, I-25 over BNSF spur?	Yes. Will be issued as future addendum	11/29/2012
72b			Is CDOT Planning to survey the BNSF Spur tracks to the requirements of the Grade Separation Guidelines (1000 feet in each direction either side of structure)? Or is the Contractor responsible?	No.	11/29/2012
72c			How will Historic Clearance be handled with respect to widening of F-16-EG? Has it been cleared for modification? (constructed in 1958)	The Contractor shall coordinate all environmental clearance requirements, including anticipated historic clearances for widening, as part of the Work for this ARE. CDOT has not initiated any actions concerning this matter.	11/29/2012
72d			Can you provide C&M Agreements for the existing bridge?	CDOT will investigate further and provide the document in a future addendum.	11/29/2012
72e			Can you provide Easement records for the existing easement?	Response pending	11/29/2012

73a			Questions associated with US6 east of I-25 a. What is the lane configuration requirement for WB US6 from the Osage/Seminole on-ramp through the BNSF Bridge? There is one fewer lane than exists today.	The Contractor shall design any necessary transitions beyond the limits of the the Basic Configuration, or submit an ACC requesting a change to the Basic Configuration.	11/29/2012
73b			Has CDOT tested the lane configuration with the City and County of Denver? CCD owns 6th avenue from approximately 2534+50 to the east.	CCD has reviewed the current RFP. Additionally, see the response for Question 73a.	11/29/2012
73c			Did the EIS or CDOT provide operational backup for any lane configuration requirement? If available please provide data and clarity of operational requirements.	Additional traffic analysis for the original VHFES is available and will be issued as a future addendum. Other information has already been issued with the current RFP.	11/29/2012
73d			Please provide clarity on design requirements for geometry limits and ties in on the East end of the project east of the BNSF Bridge limits.	See response to question #73a	11/29/2012
74			Will CDOT please provide Inroads DTM's for all pond and infill grading areas?	No. All available information has already been released.	11/29/2012
75			Will CDOT please profiles for lines 54, 74-80, 88-100, 103, 111-113, and from structure 411L to 411C. These profiles are missing from the RFP Reference documents.	Profiles and design of lines 54 and 74-80 were included in the design of the 6th and Federal (Project No. IM 088A-024). Other profiles were not generated. All invert elevations were included in the hydraulic modeling (Hydraflow), and the invert elevations and results were included in Appendix B of the US 6 Bridges Master Plan Hydrology and Hydraulics Report.	11/29/2012
76			Will CDOT please provide the profile the 90-inch storm sewer at 7th Avenue?	The profile can be found on-line in the Technical Appendices of the CCD Drainage Master Plan.	11/29/2012
77			What is the purpose of the 5-year and 100-year detention volume calculations provided in the Master Plan Hydrology and Hydraulics report?	Disregard this information as it should not have been included. Will clarify as a future addendum	11/29/2012
78			The Outlet from the US6 WQ Pond is not located within CDOT ROW, and the ROW plans do not show this parcel that the outlet that is shown in as being acquired, should teams plan on routing the outlet pipe with a different alignment within the ROW provided in the reference drawings?	Final right-of-way plans are still under development and will accommodate the necessary ROW. Refer to plan sheets 18 and 19. The east end of the outlet concrete box culvert alignment is within a proposed permanent easement. ROW plans are to be issued as a future addendum	11/29/2012

79		16.2.5.1.3	Section 16.2.5.1.3 states "The contractor shall maintain two through lanes of traffic on Federal Boulevard at all times." Please clarify does this mean 2 through lanes in each direction?	Yes, 2 through lanes in each direction. Further clarification to be issued as future addendum	11/29/2012
80			Please provide contact list for all utilities.	Will issue as a future addendum	11/29/2012
81	Book 1	6.2.3.1	please clarify how utility betterments are paid?	Betterments are paid by the Utility Owner directly to the Contractor. Refer to the Book 2 Section 7 and the URA for definitions.	11/29/2012
82			Will CDOT please provide MicroStation sheet files and for the bridge layouts and typical sections?	Yes	11/29/2012
83			Will CDOT please provide all information available on Utility Potholing?	We have provided all information available	11/29/2012
84			There is no information on the EB-US-6 to Federal Off ramp in the Region 6 lane closure strategy an no specific RFP requirements what are the requirements for this ramp during phasing and MOT?	Refer to Book 2 Section 16. Ramp closure restrictions and requirements are identified. Closures require approved detours using approved detour routes.	11/29/2012
85		10.2	Section 10.2 fourth Paragraph states "The Contractor shall be responsible for constructing Safety Edge as specified in Book, 2 Section 13.3.6." Please refer to section 13 Roadways there is no specific section 13.3.6 please clarify requirement.	Refer to Book 2, Section 20, Exhibit A, Revision of Section 401 and 412 - Safety Edge. The cross reference cited will be corrected in a future addendum	11/29/2012
86		13.3.4.2	Section 13.3.4.2 Permanent Fencing states "Provide Permanent Fencing of types and at locations in Table 13.3-1." Row 2 has Access control between Bikeway and US 6/ I-25 please clarify where there is bikeway that needs access control along US 6 and I-25. Is this meant to be for the South Platte Bikeway?	Further clarification to be provided in a future addendum.	11/29/2012

87			<p>Please clarify Design Speed for US-6 West of the South Platte RFP Reference Design only provides for 47 MPH design speed over the BNSF Rail Road and through additional design and research it appears unfeasible to increase the profile to meet a design speed of 55 as required by Exhibit 13-1 6th Ave (East of the Platte River). Will CDOT consider revising the design speed or taking ownership of a design exception for this vertical curve?</p>	<p>Design variances/exceptions required for the Basic Configuration have been identified. CDOT does not intend to coordinate any additional requests for variances/exceptions. The Consultant shall optimize design of the Project and is obligated to notify CDOT of any further concerns in conjunction with specific requirements of the Contract associated with the Basic Configuration. All other design variances/exceptions, and Approval of design variances/exceptions resultant of the Consultant's design, are solely the responsibility of the Consultant. The Proposer is encouraged to evaluate this aspect further and resubmit this question, if necessary, with the appropriate contractual basis according to CDOT's obligations related to the Basic Configuration.</p>	11/29/2012
88			<p>Will CDOT please provide the South Platte Hydraulic Model associated with the Preliminary Bridge Hydraulics Report - US Bridges Design Build Project BR 0061-083, Sub Account Number 18838 (CN) prepared by Olsson Associates, dated August 22, 2012.</p>	<p>The requested RAS Model will be included in Addendum #2</p>	11/29/2012
89			<p>The WB US-6 to Federal Off Ramp near the Federal tie currently has a horizontal clearance from edge of shoulder to ROW less than 1 foot with no easement past the PC/PT of ROW Take 102A shown to be acquired. Will CDOT consider a design exception for Shoulder width to allow for a wall cross section with adequate structural capacity?</p>	<p>Design variances/exceptions required for the Basic Configuration have been identified. CDOT does not intend to coordinate any additional requests for variances/excpetions. The Consultant shall optimize design of the Project and is obligated to notify CDOT of any further concerns in conjunction with specific requirements of the Contract associated with the Basic Configuration. All other design variances/exceptions, and Approval of design variances/exceptions resultant of the Consultant's design, are solely the responsibility of the Consultant. The Proposer is encouraged to evaluate this aspect further and resubmit this question, if necessary, with the appropriate contractual basis according to CDOT's obligations related to the Basic Configuration.</p>	11/29/2012

90			Will CDOT please provide Environmental Tech Report for Section 6F	Environmental technical reports will be included as they become available for release from CDOT and included as addendum materials. This report is currently still under development and not available for release.	11/29/2012
91			For the proposal will CDOT please consider allowing organizational charts to be on 11"X17" and still count as one page in the overall limit?	Yes, organizational charts can be submitted as 11"x17" pages which will be counted as one page	11/29/2012
92			For Interstate and Arterial roadways where the shoulder width is less than 6-feet, can the apron around the standard CDOT Vane Grate inlet be excluded/deleted?	No	11/29/2012
93			What is the status of the most current ROW plans? The only ROW plans are PDF's included in the Reference sections. There are easements shown in the ROW file included in Book 4 that are not shown in the PDF's in the reference documents there are questions with these easements and their prescribed use that would benefit from receiving the current ROW plans.	Current versions of ROW plans will be included in each addendum as they become available. Completed ROW plans will be included in the Final RFP when released.	11/29/2012
94		8.5.2	Section 8.5.2 paragraph 3 requires the contractor to apply for and obtain a CCD Parks Permit for work outside the CDOT acquisition parcels or the ROW identified in paragraph 2. Sentence 2 of Paragraph 3 states "If Contractor needs to work in any of this park land outside of CDOT acquisition parcels from such park land shown on the ROW plans included in Book 4, it must apply for and obtain a permit from the CCD parks for that activity. The question is since the acquired ROW is on the back of curb line on the SE corner and it appears the proposed sidewalk will be on parks property as well as the pedestrian bridge being on park property, would CDOT and CCD consider streamlining the process and providing a permit for work that is required in the CCD Parks Land and only require a permit from the contractor if they step outside the CCD parks Permit?	The Contractor will be required to obtain a CCD parks permit for all Work.	11/29/2012

95		15.2.5.1	Section 15.2.5.1 Geometry. Paragraph 1 ... 4th Sentence states "Where 12 feet (minimum) of generally level terrain is not available between the wall and the ROW (no mention of easement) line for maintenance access the wall shall be located a minimum of 10' inside the ROW. In many cases the Walls as designed in the reference documents and based upon lane requirements in the basic configuration there is minimal opportunity to adjust the roadway geometry to accommodate the maintenance access width. Will CDOT please evaluate this criteria and provide clarification on where insufficient ROW is available to meet this criteria (Federal Ramps: Federal to WB US-6 ~Sta 410+50 to 417+00; WB US 6 to Federal ~ Sta 5990+25 to Sta 5998+00;Federal to EB CD road 4990+00 to Sta 5000+00 and Federal to Bryan 500+00 to 501+00 EB CD Road near Sta 3015+00)	See response provided to question 21	2/12/2013
96	Book 1	Section 1.9	Will CDOT specify durations for approvals so the Contractors schedule baseline can be established and monitored?	No, CDOT will not specify these durations.	12/10/2012
97	Book 1	Section 2.1.3	Performance as directed is not a normal condition under a GMP project. It should be understood that the Contractor will perform within the guidelines of the requirements but does not expect to get day to day direction from CDOT without being compensated for any cost and schedule impacts associated with such direction	Please see response to Question 14; CDOT will not be making changes.	12/10/2012
98	Book 1	Section 2.3.7	Does this only apply to management staff or does this clause cover craft personnel as well?	Yes, it applies to craft personnel.	12/10/2012
99	Book 1	Section 4.2.1	Requiring acceptance of a 30 day delay from contract execution to NTP1 seems excessive. Will CDOT entertain reducing this time frame to 14 days? Also, the contract extension, if required, needs to consider time in kind for schedule extension.	No, CDOT will not not change to 14 days.	12/10/2012
100	Book 1	Section 4.2.2	If a delay in issuance of NTP 2 occurs the delay needs to be evaluated similarly to Section 4.2.1.	The section already provides for when a CDOT-caused delay will occur. Please refer to change order process.	12/10/2012
101	Book 1	Section 6.1.1.3	If a delay to receipt of access occurs and the Contractor performs work around activities, is the Contractor required to resubmit a schedule with altered logic as required by Book 2 Paragraph 2.1.3.3.C?	Yes, Contractor will need to resubmit a schedule to demonstrate impact.	12/10/2012
102	Book 1	Section 7.7	Besides being informed, is there any other intent on the part of CDOT with the request for notification of Subcontractors no less than 14 days from scheduled initiation of the work, i.e. acceptance or approval?	CDOT does not accept or approve subcontractors.	12/10/2012

103	Book 1	Section 7.10	Does this only apply to management staff or does this section cover craft personnel as well?	Yes, this section covers craft personnel.	12/10/2012
104	Book 1	Section 9.0	We believe that the reference to Insurance Requirements should be Exhibit F and not Exhibit J which refers to DBE requirements.	Change will be made in future addendum.	12/10/2012
105	Book 1	Section 11.1.3	Requiring acceptance of a 30 day delay from contract execution to NTP1 seems excessive. Will CDOT entertain reducing this time frame to 14 days? Also, the contract extension, if required, needs to consider time in kind for schedule extension.	See response to question 99.	12/10/2012
106	Book 1	Section 11.3.2	What is the value of the Notice to Proceed 1 Payment Cap?	The NTP 1 Payment Cap will be added to Book 1, Exhibit A in a future addendum, but the amount will be \$1.6 million.	12/10/2012
107	Book 1	Section 11.3.3.2	We believe that the reference to Section 11.3.4.1 should be 11.3.3.1.	Agree. Change will be made in future addendum.	12/10/2012
108	Book 1	Section 11.4.1	The CDOT standard specification reference for Mobilization is missing. Please provide the appropriate reference number.	This is Section 626 of the Standard Specifications. Change will be made in future addendum.	12/10/2012
109	Book 1	Section 11.5.3.2	This sentence should be deleted. The Contractor will have not been paid for any non-conforming work, this work will have to be repaired at his own cost, and it is unnecessary and unwarranted to withhold additional monies for the cost of repair when that money could be used to effect that repair.	No change will be made as CDOT will not pay for any Work that has not met the requirements of the Contract	12/10/2012
110	Book 1	Section 13.3.2.4	What constitutes a sworn certification as opposed to a signed certification? Does a letter from the Project Manager that he has reviewed the documentation and is in agreement that the Subcontractor is entitled to a change and that he is essentially agreeable to the value of the change suffice? Will CDOT remove the word "sworn"?	The certification needs to be sworn before a Notary Public.	12/10/2012
111	Book 1	Section 13.4.4	Again, will CDOT remove the word "sworn"?	See response to question 110.	12/10/2012
112	Book 1	Section 13.9.2	Please define or provide the criteria for a "qualified professional" mentioned in the 4 th line of this paragraph.	A definition will be provided in a future addendum.	12/10/2012
113	Book 1	Section 13.15.2	Will CDOT provide the name or list of names for persons authorized as it relates to the paragraph to remove any confusion that may exist with respect to authorization in excess of authority?	The CDOT Project Director is the only person who is authorized to direct work.	12/10/2012

114	Book 1	Section 22.4	Second sentence in the 1 st paragraph requires the Contractor to maintain all records at the "Contractor's Project Manager's office in the State". The PM's office will be gone after project completion. Assume that the records can be stored at the Contractor's Corporate or Regional office within the State.	A clarification will be made in a future addendum.	12/10/2012
115	Book 1	Section 24.9.3	Does CDOT really want to be copied on all correspondence to suppliers, vendors, etc?	Suppliers and vendors would be considered subcontractors and CDOT does not need to be copied on this correspondence.	12/10/2012
116	Book 1	Section 1.4 4.2.2	States that within 10 days of submitting "Initial Schedule" to CDOT, schedule will be accepted and NTP2 issues, or CDOT will provide comments. Please clarify if this "Initial Schedule" is referring to the "Preliminary", "Original" or other schedules described in Book 2, Section 2.1.3.	Section 4.2.2 of Book-1 refers to the Initial schedule. This should be "The Original Initial Schedule". This is a requirement to obtain NTP-2 and it is an Approval not Acceptance. The Preliminary Initial Schedule is a NTP-1 requirement. Clarification will be made in a future addendum	12/10/2012
117	Book 1	Section 18.4	Section 18.4 refers to section 18.1.1(g) which appears to be a typographical error given there is no section 18.1.1(g).	Correction will be made in a future addendum.	12/10/2012
118	Book 1	Section 3.2	Section 3.2, item 3 indicates that Contractor cannot rely on information provided by CDOT except to the extent specifically permitted by the Contract Documents. For clarity, will CDOT consider adding an exhibit to Book 1 compiling the list of documents upon which Contractor can rely?	Per the terms of the contract, the Contractor can rely on Books 1-4. The informaton within these documents detail/clarify the context of what the Contractor can rely on and cannot be adequately described by simply providing a list.	12/10/2012
119	Book 1	Section 2.1.2	Section 2.1.2 includes a standard of care that has changed since the last issuance of an RFP for similar design-build work (i.e., I-25). The new standard of care is a departure from the standard of care commonly used in design-build contracts, engineering and construction contracts, and case law. Contractor suggests that "all professional engineering principles" is not an established standard of care, and requests that the phrase be replaced with CDOT's prior language, "the skill, prudence, judgment and diligence as like situated members of the engineering profession commonly possess and exercise".Also, Contractor suggests that the requirement that work be "free from defects" be removed given it is an unattainable and uninsurable standard.	CDOT is not prepared to change this language at this time.	12/10/2012
120	Book 1	Section 13.1.2	Section 13.1.2 indicates that a condition precedent to a Change Order is Contractor's receipt of a Directive Letter. Will CDOT clarify that such Directive Letter will not unreasonably be withheld.	A change will be made in a future addendum.	12/10/2012

121	Book 1		In order for Contractor to minimize the contingencies in its pricing and lower CDOT's cost of the project, Contractor suggests that a waiver of consequential damages be added to the contract. Will CDOT include a waiver clause in the contract?	CDOT will not include a waiver of this clause in the contract.	12/10/2012
122	Book 1		In order for Contractor to minimize the contingencies in its pricing and lower CDOT's cost of the project, Contractor suggests that a limitation of liability be added to the contract. Will CDOT include a limitation of liability clause in the contract?	CDOT is not willing to limit Contractor's liability.	12/10/2012
123	Book 1	Section 18.1.1	The indemnification is a broad indemnity covering all claims and not limited to third party personal injury and property damage claims to the proportionate extent of Contractor's negligence. Will CDOT limit the indemnity obligation to third party personal injury and property damage claims to the proportionate extent of Contractor's negligence?	CDOT is not willing to alter any portion of the indemnification clause.	12/10/2012
124	Book 1	Section 6.3.2.1	Section 6.3.2.1 indicates that Contractor will not be compensated for performance of support services. Contractor requests Section 6.3.2.1 be modified so that Contractor will be compensated by Change Order for support services.	This is a standard CDOT provision and no change will be made.	12/10/2012
125	Book 2	Section 6.2.2.3	Cost for Flagging, Inspection, Design Plan Reviews - "The estimated cost for one (1) flagger is ranges between \$800-\$1,600 for an eight (8) hour basic day with time and one-half or double time for overtime, rest days and holidays." Please clarify that the normal day for a RR flagger is the standard eight (8) hour work day, plus one (1) hour each side of the eight (8) hours for the flagger to set up and to remove the flags put up for the trains.	The language reads "...an eight (8) hour basic day with time and one-half or double time for overtime..." The hours identified in the question are by definition outside the identified number of hours for a basic day.	12/10/2012
126	Book 2	Section 6.2.4	Design Reviews & 6.3 Deliverables - The Contractor shall allow 15 days for review and comment by the Railroad for all design reviews. Please clarify that this is actually 4 weeks for each of the following: design reviews for Conceptual, 30% and 100% plan reviews, shoring, demolition, falsework, erection, erosion control and construction phasing plans.	See response to question #60	12/10/2012
127	Book 2	Section 6.2.5	Construction Requirements - BNSF requires a permanent clearance of 23'-4" instead of 23'-3.5" as shown in the RFP. Please confirm.	This will be clarified by Addendum	12/10/2012

128		Structures-Reference Drawings	<p>The as-built plans for the existing (widened) US 6 bridge over I-25 (F-16-DU & F-16-DY) indicate that the wingwalls from the previous structures were left in place when the new (existing) wingwalls were constructed. The wingwalls presumably left in place are over 40-foot-long concrete counterfort walls founded on steel piles. These appear to conflict with the proposed Abutment 3 for the US 6 over I-25 structure (F-16-ZC) and Abutment 1 for the NB I-25 to WB US 6 Tunnel (F-16-ZD). Please verify that these wingwalls were left in place and are buried as shown in the as-built plans or if they were removed at a later date.</p>	<p>It is the responsibility of the Contractor to verify existing conditions and reflect the findings in their approach and design. No further action will be taken by the Owner to verify as-built conditions.</p>	12/10/2012
129	Book 2	Section 15 - Structures	<p>Pedestrian Bridge connecting Barnum Park North and South: CDOT Staff Bridge policy for pedestrian bridges crossing over highways, with the adoption of the AASHTO LRFD Specifications, has typically required that an impact load be applied to the lower chord of pedestrian bridge superstructures to insure that an overheight vehicle on the highway would not cause collapse of the pedestrian bridge. The Bridge Design Manual (3.3.1) states: "Exposed supporting elements that can be hit by errant vehicles shall be designed for the CT impact load. Generally this will include ... non-redundant through type superstructure elements, such as thru trusses or thru arches." It is our belief that the pedestrian structure type as shown on the RFP Plans (prefabricated open-style truss) would typically not be capable surviving such an impact, and as such a more expensive thru-truss type structure would be required.</p> <p>Since a structure selection report was not done for this bridge, and hence the specific design criteria was not documented, please confirm if the Collision Load (CT) is a requirement for this bridge.</p>	<p>The CT "impact load" requirement may be waived dependent on review and approval of the Contractor's submitted design identifying the minimum critical vertical clearance.</p>	12/10/2012

130	Book 2	Section 15 - Structures	<p>Retaining Wall along south side of US6, West of Federal: Roadway Plan Sheets 016 and 017 of the RFP Reference Drawings indicate a retaining wall along the EB US 6 to Federal off-ramp, running from the beginning of the ramp to ramp station 307+50 (EB US6 Sta. 2671+25 to Sta. 2680+50). It is also shown on the Sheet 2, Typical Sections, US 6 Sta 2175+00.</p> <p>The Pedestrian Bridge General Layout on Sheet 085, and the Storm Drain Profiles for Lines 24 through 20 on Sheet 065 do not indicate this retaining wall, and instead show a cut slope along the south side of the ramp. The RockSol RFP Geotechnical Report for Structures does not appear to document, include borings for, or provide design recommendations data for this wall.</p> <p>It appears that the inclusion of a retaining wall on the south side of US6 at this location would preserve the existing trees and park grade along the south side of the ramp. A cut slope would take out many of the trees, and could extend outside of the CDOT right-of-way. Please clarify whether or not a retaining wall should be assumed in the base configuration at this location, as indicated on Reference Documents, Sheets 016 and 017.</p>	The intent of this wall was to preserve the existing trees and park grade along the south side of this ramp. Originally this slope was graded out but it was determined that would have an adverse affect on the trees in the park so this wall was added to the roadway plan sheets, however it is not identified on the structure layouts or geotechnical report.	12/10/2012
131	Book 2	Section 10.1.2	States "The top two inches of all flexible pavement alternatives shall be Stone Matrix Asphalt (Fibers)(Asphalt)". The City of Denver Specifications allows Grading SX HMA. Can Grading SX HMA be used on non CDOT roadways?	The top two inches of all flexible pavement shall be constructed as specified in the contract documents.	12/10/2012
132	Book 2	Section 19	Subsection 19.1.4.1 requires a new VMS at NB I-25 mile marker 209. Subsection 19.2.4 requires the contractor to protect the existing NB I-25 VMS sign near mile marker 209. Is this the same sign? Is a new VMS required?	This is the same sign that will need to be replaced as part of the Work.	12/10/2012
133	Book 2	Section 19.2.13	Are all fiber splices to be in manholes vs. pull boxes?	CCD allows the use of Pull Boxes for fiber splices on their system. CDOT requires all splices on its system to be completed in manholes.	12/10/2012
134	Book 2	Section 19	Monitoring of the NB I-25 to WB US 6 tunnel-Is there a need for CCTV, VMS, Fire Prevention, etc. similar to the I-225 to SB I-25 tunnel on TREC?	The Contractor shall determine the nature of whether these elements are required in conjunction with their design	12/10/2012
135	Book 2	Section 19	There is an existing EPA test monitoring station on the SB to EB loop ramp. Is this required to be part of the ITS network?	The Contractor is required to coordinate the Work with the Department of Health for DOH's relocation of the EPA test monitoring station. The station is not part of the ITS network.	12/10/2012

136	Book 2	Section 19.1.3	There are currently discussions by CDOT to install new manufacturer's equipment for network switches in the field. Is this plan by CDOT to be used on this project or is it still in the research phase by the CTMC?	Current project Technical Requirements reflect CDOT's requirements - modifications were made from previous technical requirements.	2/12/2013
137	Book 2	Section 19	Need clarification for requirements concerning the City of Denver fiber optic line and incorporation into total ITS system.	The CCD fiber optic network is independent and is not incorporated or otherwise connected into the CDOT fiber optic system.	12/10/2012
138	Book 2	Section 12	Section 12.0.1 or 12.0.2 - Does not list OSHA, but any inlet or manhole over 20-feet deep, will require a platform, correct?	Correct.	1/14/2013
139	Book 2	Section 12	Section 12.2.4.2 – States “In some locations, the existing cross drainage may be via porous, open-graded, free draining fill, rather than cross drains. The contractor shall provide cross drain in these locations.” Can these locations be identified and provided to the contractor?	No such locations have been identified within the project limits. If any locations are identified, the contractor shall provide cross drains in those locations.	1/14/2013
140	Book 2	Section 12	Book 2, Section 12.2.4.7 – Access road into the pond is not clearly defined, generally CDOT wants a maximum 10-percent grade and 10-foot wide access road. Is this the criteria that shall be used for the access road?	Correct.	1/14/2013
141	Book 2	Section 12	Is there a variance for the retention pond to be 3:1? If not, then are 4:1 slopes allowed for the lower portion and then 3:1 above retention elevation? Is there a variance for the 6th Ave Interchange Water Quality Pond to be 3:1? If not, then are 4:1 slopes allowed for the lower portion and then 3:1 above water quality elevations?	The slopes of the retention and detention ponds shall follow the criteria listed in the CDOT Drainage Design Manual, Section 12.4.4. Vegetated embankments shall have side slopes no steeper than 3:1. Slopes flatter than 4:1 are preferred and shall be used whenever possible.	1/14/2013
142	Book 2	Section 12	Section 12.2.4.7 – Does not talk about low flows being diverted to the US 6 Water Quality Pond, but the drainage report refers to “the orifice plate being sized to direct the water quality storm runoff.” Is the water quality storm runoff equivalent to the 2-year storm?	No. The water quality storm runoff is equivalent to a storm with a precipitation value of 0.6 inches, per Volume 3 of the Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual, by the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District.	1/14/2013
143	Book 2	Section 12	Section 12.2.4.6 mentions existing underdrains – Are there as-builts that identify the locations of these?	Yes. They are shown in the following construction documents: Colorado Department of Highways, Federal Aid Project Number U 012-2(3), Colorado Department of Highways, Federal Aid Project Number U 012-2(13).	1/14/2013

144	Book 2	Section 11 & Section 15	Section 11.1.2.1.1, "Federal Boulevard, Mainline I-25 and US 6, Ramps, and Collector-Distributor Roads," indicates that the soils information included in Book 3 together with (Contractor supplied) supplemental information shall be used by the Contractor to determine adequate subgrade support characteristics. Also, Section 15.2.2.3 "Geotechnical Data," indicates that geotechnical information provided in Book 3 shall be used by the Contractor together with (Contractor supplied) supplemental information, to complete the final design of the project. We interpret these technical requirements to mean that CDOT intends for the Contractor to rely upon the data provided in the referenced reports, which necessarily includes boring locations, logs of lithology, in-situ test data, laboratory test results, water levels, etc. for their use in developing supplemental geotechnical investigations and in engineering characterizations of the subsurface materials for final design. However, the Contractor is not obliged to comply with the geotechnical recommendations contained therein (bearing capacity etc.). Please confirm this understanding.	The Contractor should use all the geotechnical information provided in the associated Book 3 documents; including geotechnical recommendations. However, the associated Book 2 documents allow the Contractor to further refine/change Book 3 geotechnical recommendation satisfying specific requirements in Book 2	1/14/2013
145	ITP		Roadway ARE #2 and #3 – Resurfacing of existing flyover bridges (F-16-OG & F-16-OL). Book 2, Section 1.3. - By "resurfacing" we presume this ARE work requires the removal of existing HBP to within a minimum of 1-inch, leaving the existing waterproofing membrane intact, and resurfacing with 2-inches of SMA. Please confirm that this is the intent of these two AREs.	The intent of the ARE is for the Proposer to make this determination.	1/14/2013
146	ITP		Roadway ARE #4 - Clarification of Limits of US 6 Reconstruction. Book 2, Section 1.3 - states that the pavement reconstruction is to extend from the Basic Configuration west to Knox Court. The Reference Documents, Sheets 017 indicates the limits of full depth reconstruction (heavy dashed line) ending at approximately US6 WB Station 2180+50, however the beginning point on Sheet 16 does not appear as well defined. Does this ARE reconstruction begin at approximately US6 WB Station 2167+75? Please provide the required station limits of pavement reconstruction.	The intent of this ARE is for the Proposer to make this determination. The Proposer's determination of Quality, per ITP requirements require the Proposer's submittal of scope for AREs they intend to provide.	1/14/2013
147	ITP		CCD Parks and Rec ARE #4 – Community Garden Book 2, Section 1.3 – Please provide the number of required parking spaces.	Parks will require 10 parking spaces for the community garden. Will include this requirement as a future addendum.	1/14/2013
148	Book 2	Section 5	Section 5.1.9 Recognized Hazardous Materials – References a Phase II investigation. Can a map of all test drill locations be issued even if the results have not yet been determined?	Yes. Will issue as future Addendum	1/14/2013

149	Book 2	Section 14	Section 14.1 Lighting - refers to both AASHTO and Local Jurisdiction Design Standards as criteria for this project. Both standards offer design criteria for light levels on the roadway surface, but the standards conflict. Which lighting design standard should be used on this project?	CCD Standards shall be utilized to determine adequate lighting coverage and lighting spacing. AASHTO Standards shall be utilized for structural / wind loading.	1/14/2013
150	Book 2	Section 17	Section 17, Appendix A – Barnum Park East – Sheet L1 states the existing baseball field lighting will be relocated. Is as-built information available for these lights? Ball field lighting is designed specifically for a particular ball field with aiming diagrams, etc. The as-built information would reflect this information and could be adjusted accordingly. Depending on the age of the equipment, it may be in the best interest of the project to replace this lighting.	As-built information is not available.	1/14/2013
151	Book 2	Section 14	Section 14.1.4.1- The permanent lighting shall be provided from the outside edges of the roadways unless otherwise approved by CDOT. High mast lighting will not be allowed. Please confirm that the existing high mast lighting located within the US 6 and I-25 interchange can remain.	Existing high mast lighting is intended to remain in place and service. Proposer impacts to high mast lighting, resultant from the Proposer's design, are the responsibilities of the Proposer to rectify utilizing existing concepts (high mast lighting) meeting current standards	1/14/2013
152	Book 2	Section 14	Section 14.1.4.1- If answer to previous question regarding existing high mast lighting, are we allowed to relocate the existing high mast lighting to avoid conflicts with the new ramp alignment? If the existing high mast lighting is relocated, will it need to be brought up to current design standards?	Refer to pervious question response.	1/14/2013
153	Book 2	Section 14	Section 14.1.4.3 Temporary Lighting- states "The Contractor shall provide installation, maintenance, and removal of all temporary lighting devices. The Contractor shall maintain temporary lighting at a level equivalent to existing lighting provided within the project limits." Typically, temporary lighting is allowed to be at 50% of the initial light levels of the project. Please clarify or confirm these requirements.	The requirement states ".... The Contractor shall maintain temporary lighting at a level equivalent to existing lighting provided within the project limits." The statement reflects the lighting requirement required.	1/14/2013
155	Book 2	Section 14	14.1.4.1 Mentions the max to min, average to min and max to min (foot-candles and uniformity) to design to, but does not state the specific numerical value. Please provide the specific numerical value for each (min, max, and uniformity). Are the same values to be used for US 6/I-25 main lanes and ramps/interchanges?	The Proposer shall determine the specific application and the associated values to be used.	2/4/2013

156	Book 2	Section 14	14.1.4.3-states the contractor shall maintain temporary lighting at a level equivalent to existing lighting". Please provide a specific value (min/max/uniformity-foot-candles) of the existing lighting currently in use.	It is up to the Proposers to obtain the specific values of the existing lighting currently in use. CCD does not have this information currently for Federal or other city streets. The number of street lights and the wattages should be maintained to meet this criteria.	2/4/2013
157	Book 2	Section 14	Please provide City of Denver photometric performance criteria for roadway lighting.	<p><i>This information, if not already included in the RFP, shall be obtained from current published CCD literature and the following guidelines:</i></p> <p>Denver photometric performance criteria is as follows: 1.0 foot-candles average, .5 footcandles minimum, Uniformity Ration 4:1.</p> <p>All permanent lighting on Denver roadways shall be at locations and spacing as accepted by Denver Public Works, Traffic Engineering Services.</p> <p>Denver spacing criteria is as follows: local and collector roadways: 250' staggered pattern Arterial roadways: 130' staggered or 180' opposite pattern</p> <p>Denver intersection lighting criteria is as follows: Arterial roadways(signalized) : 4 lights required Arterial roadways(unsignalized) : 2 lights required Collector and Local streets: 1 light required</p> <p>All new street lights in Denver should be Curvilinear Cutoff: 250 watt HPS installed on 35' poles.</p>	2/4/2013
158	Utility Matrix	W-05	W-05 Denver Water would like to replace 54" water line crossing US 6 west of Federal (approx. station 124+28.47). If Contractor can design around this conduit and protect in place, is the replacement part of the US 6 Design/Build contract or would replacement (if required by Denver Water) be a "betterment" and paid for by Denver Water?	As described in the URA (Betterment)- CDOT will determine if a betterment will be allowed based on project schedule. If contractor can design around and protect in place the betterment would be paid for by DWD.	2/4/2013
159	Utility Matrix	W-06 & W-07	W-06 & W-07-12 Inch and 36 Inch Water Lines on Federal-Please provide the limits of replacement outside the bridge area.	Limits are shown on the utility plan sheets and Matrix. "Final limits" need to be determined during final design.	2/4/2013
160	Book 2	Section 17	Addendum 2 states that "All work within Denver Park properties must adhere to the requirements of Section 17 Appendix A". Does this include site lighting for new pedestrian walkways at the South Platte Trail and in Barnum North and Barnum South? If yes, please provide lighting photometric requirements for the path.	Paths are only lit at specific areas, e.g. structures according to CCD requirements, and are not generally subject to lighting applications otherwise.	2/4/2013

161	Book 2	Section 16	16.2.5.1.2 -Addendum 1 removed the statements "Closure of the ramp from I25 northbound to US6 eastbound, and the ramp from I25 southbound to US6 eastbound shall not be closed concurrently. During non-closure periods of time one lane on all ramps shall remain open at all times." 16.2.6.2 (items 2 and 3) allow closure of these ramps with a temporary detour, but not concurrently. Please clarify the intent.	Simultaneous closure is not allowed. Section 16.2.6.2 provides the specific requirement to be adhered to.	2/4/2013
162	Book 2	Section 19	Section(s) 19.1.3.2 & 19.1.14.1 "The ITS system for Denver shall include one 72 strand (48SM/24MM) Hybrid Fiber Optic cable backbone..." & "The contractor shall design new and separate conduit systems..." & "3. Two 3" conduit for the Denver backbone & laterals..." Please confirm that the "Denver conduit & Fiber Optic cable is only required where existing City of Denver conduit & fiber exists that will be disrupted by construction activities of the project (north & south along Federal Blvd.).	New Denver Conduit (2 - 3" conduits) and fiber is required across the bridge structure to tie into existing fiber.	2/4/2013
163	Book 2	Section 19	19.1.3.2 & 19.1.14.1 "The communications system shall include a backbone of a 144-strand SMFO..." & "The contractor shall design new and separate conduit systems..." Please confirm that the "CDOT backbone conduit & Fiber Optic cable" is only required where existing CDOT conduit & fiber exists that will be disrupted by construction activities of the project (east & west along 6th Ave).	CDOT backbone conduit & Fiber Optic cable is only required where existing CDOT conduit & fiber exists that will be disrupted by construction activities of the project (east & west along 6th Ave)and (North & South along I-25). However, if the fiber optic backbone is cut/disrupted by construction activities, it shall be replaced and spliced at the nearest existing splice point/location.	2/7/2013
164	Book 2	Section 19	Book 2 Section 19.1.14.1-"The communications system shall include a backbone of a 144-strand SMFO..." & "1. Three 2" conduits for the CDOT backbone" & "2. One 2" conduit for the CDOT Laterals" Please confirm that the "CDOT backbone (only) conduit "may be a minimum requirement of 3-2" conduits where no additional conduit(s) (laterals) are required.	CDOT backbone where no laterals are required shall include a minimum of Three 2" conduits.	2/7/2013
165			If CDOT review cycles for deliverables are not listed in the Technical Requirements, may the design-builder establish review timelines based on the size of the deliverable?	Review cycles shall be no shorter than requirements identified in the Technical Documents and or Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction. The Proposer may in their QMP identify options for consideration by the Owner.	2/7/2013

166	ITP	Section 3	Section 3.2.2: Volume II, Form B (Information About Proposer and Major Participants) - Since the ITP requires us to complete Form B for both the Proposer and Major Participants, can we modify Form B for our Major Participants? For instance, can we replace the word "Proposer" with "Major Participant" so the form reads correctly?	Yes this is acceptable.	2/12/2013
167	ITP	Section 3	Section 3.2.6: Volume II, Form E (Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion) - Please clarify when Form E should be submitted with respect to Subcontractors. Page 12 of the ITP states that it may be submitted up to 10 days after the Proposal Due Date or after the subcontract has been executed. Is it acceptable to submit the information at either one of these dates?	Yes it is acceptable to submit the information at either of these dates.	2/12/2013
168	ITP	Section 3	Section 3.2.8: Volume II, Form G (Equal Employment Opportunity) - Please clarify when Form G should be submitted with respect to Subcontractors. Page 12 of the ITP states that it may be submitted up to 10 days after the Proposal Due Date or after the subcontract has been executed. Is it acceptable to submit the information at either one of these dates?	Yes it is acceptable to submit the information at either of these dates.	2/12/2013
169	ITP	Section 4	Section 4.2.1.2: Would CDOT consider excluding the AREs from the Volume III page count?	No changes will be made with regard to excluding AREs from the page count	12/12/2013
170	ITP & CDOT RFI_RFC	ITP Section 4 and CDOT RFI-RFC Question 62	Technical Proposal Format. Question 62 of CDOT's RFI-RFCs document requests CDOT allow Volume III to be submitted in an 11x17 format such at the drawings would not have to be folded for submittal, and hence unfolded for review. CDOT responded that they would release a future addendum that would allow the drawings to be submitted as an Appendix to Volume III. Please confirm that it is acceptable to submit all Volume III drawings (unfolded) as an Appendix in a separate binder.	Refer to the answer provided in Question 62. The Proposer shall determine how they want to package the proposal. No addendum shall be issued to further clarify. IF the proposer so chooses they may submit all Volume III drawings (unfolded) as an Appendix in a separate binder.	12/12/2013
171	Book 2	Section 2	Section 2.1.1 - Work Breakdown Structure (WBS). This section states that "The Contractor shall submit its Preliminary Initial Schedule specifying WBS Activities and proposed Work segments within 10 days after NTP1" However, Section 2.1.3.4.2 - Preliminary Initial Schedule states "The Contractor shall submit the Preliminary Initial Schedule to CDOT for Acceptance prior to NTP1." Please clarify when the Preliminary Initial Schedule is required to be submitted.	The Propose should refer to and utilize current Technical Requirements. Section 2.1.1 states "...within 10 days prior to NTP 1.." and section 2.1.3.4.2 states "...prior to NTP 1..."	2/7/2013

172	Book 2	Section 10	Section 10.3.1. The milled surface shall have a macrotexture equal to or less than 0.170 inches for single-lift overlays and 0.215 inches for multiple-lift overlays as tested in accordance with CP 77. Please confirm this requirement.	The noted requirement is confirmed.	2/11/2013
173	Book 2	Section 12	The RFP Book 2 Section 12.2.6.2 states that design water surface elevations and detention discharge from Barnum Park shall be maintained. Are we required to meet the existing discharges or the design discharges as listed on the Weir Gulch Reference Document "Weir Gulch Drainage Improv Denver Sch IV Barnum Lake Dam.pdf"? Existing discharge rate does not meet design rate listed in reference documents.	The permanent pool elevation of Barnum Lake shall not be lowered, and there shall be no increase in the regulatory peak discharges in Weir Gulch downstream of Barnum Lake	2/13/2013
174	Book 2	Section 15	Book 2 Section 15 references a Book 4 Project Aesthetic Treatment Plan in various locations throughout, including 15.2.1.5 (last sentence); 15.2.2.1 (third paragraph); 15.2.2.5 (first paragraph); and 15.2.3.4.9 (third sentence). The Book 4 Project Aesthetic Treatment Plan is missing from the RFP package.	This will be corrected in an Addendum - Aesthetic Technical Reports are located in Book 3 and other Aesthetic documents are contained in Reference Documents.	2/11/13/
175	Book 2	Section 15	Section 15.2.2.1: The RFP requires the design of bridges to be in accordance with the 6th Edition of the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications. These specifications require the application of a Collision load to bridge abutments and piers within the roadway clear zone unless otherwise required by the owner which has increased to 600 KIPs. Does CDOT intend the US 6 Bridges Design Build Project to comply strictly with the Bridge Design Specifications or only at specific locations? There are significant costs associated with collision protection with the new 600 KIP loading.	Project elements shall be designed and constructed in accordance with current Specifications. The following text is extracted for FHWA LRFD manual regarding your question: "Where the design choice is to redirect or absorb the collision load, protection shall consist of one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An embankment; • A structurally independent, crashworthy groundmounted 54.0-in. high barrier, located within 10.0 ft from the component being protected; or • A 42.0-in. high barrier located at more than 10.0 ft from the component being protected." 	2/11/2013
176	Book 2		According to the CDOT Design Build Manual all applicable reference documents are typically listed in Book 3 Applicable Standards, Data and Reports. Will CDOT be supplying a complete list of all applicable reference documents with an order of precedence in a forthcoming Addendum? In its current state, the RFP's Book 2 and Book 3 do not refer to many expected reference documents. Typically references such as the Highway Capacity Manual and the CDOT Bridge Manual and Technical Memorandums are included in the contract documents by reference. There is also no order of precedence when standards conflict. For example, Section 14 of Book 2 lists the AASHTO Standard Specification for Highway Bridges, 16th Edition which is very old.	No. The Proposer shall by standard and customary design practice identify current and applicable standards utilized and followed in development and finalization of their design.	2/7/2013

177	Book 2	Section 7	Book 2, Section 7, Utility Matrix, CDOT's White Paper regarding utilities dated November 29, 2012, Cultural Report Section 4(f) & 6(f) - The utility matrix states that the 44 inch, brick lined Metro Wastewater line (S-01) may be protected or removed and replaced. CDOT's White Paper regarding utilities states that the line is old and its structural integrity is questionable and says the replacement of the line has been added to the project. Section 4(f) and 6(f) of the Cultural Report says 240 LF of this line will be replaced with a reinforced concrete pipe. Please confirm that the replacement of this line is part of the scope of work for this project.	CDOT has secured the environmental clearance necessary for the replacement of this element. The Basic Configuration reflects replacement of this element. The Design Builder is responsible to determine their own approach and assessment of resultant risk with regard to construction impacts to this element, and based on these actions the Design Builder shall determine whether or not to replace the element or avoid impacts to the element.	12/12/2013
178	Book 2	Section 19	1. Book 2, Section 19.1.4.1-states "Contractor shall design a complete VMS system at the approximate location.....NB I 25, mile marker 209...also...RFI/RFC answer No. 132...Can the existing sign support structure remain in place? Does CDOT have the certifications for the support structure?	refer to answer provided to question 132. The Contractor shall remove and dispose of all existing sign structures - this includes support structures. CDOT does not have the certification for the sign support structure.	2/20/2013
179	Book 2	Section 8	1. Book 2, Section 8 Right of Way-Have property owners been compensated for improvements on their property acquired through the right of way acquisition process, i.e., permanent fencing, electrical panels/services, etc.?	Landowners and other interested parties will be compensated for all improvements located in permanent acquisition parcels, including fencing. All improvements located in acquisition parcels, if not moved by the owner prior to CDOT's possession of the parcels, will be allowed to be removed by the contractor.	2/18/2013

180	Book 1	F	<p>1. Clarification of Professional Liability Insurance Requirements. If an OCIP is implemented by CDOT that includes Professional Liability Coverage (\$25-million), as specified in Book 1, Exhibit F, Section 2.1.6, the Contractor/Subcontractor is also required according to Book 1, Exhibit F, Section 2.3.5, to provide or maintain a minimum level of Professional Liability coverage of \$5-million per occurrence / \$5-million annual aggregate for the period as specified. Further, Book 1, Exhibit F, Section 2.3.5 specifies that each Architect (interpreted to be the Engineer or Prime Consultant) and all Sub-Consultants shall maintain this coverage: "Should the Contractor's or Subcontractor's work involve design, or a design/build component where professional services are provided or contracted for, Professional Liability insurance as described below in this paragraph shall be required and will be maintained by each Contractor or Subcontractor, their Architect and all Sub-Consultants for the duration of the applicable Colorado Statute of Repose." CDOT Contracts for Professional Design Services only require \$1,000,000 per occurrence. Many smaller design firms, ESBs and DBEs do not have or maintain a \$5,000,000 level of coverage. If CDOT implements an OCIP that includes Professional Liability coverage, why is a "base" of \$5,000,000 required of the design firms, when CDOT Contracts only requires \$1,000,000? Requiring \$5,000,000 for all firms would require the US6 Design Build Project cost to include a separate \$5-million Project Policy or Owners Protective Policy (OPPI), which would cover the entire design team including smaller design firms, ESBs and DBE.</p>	<p>If CDOT covers Professional Liability under an OCIP, no additional Professional Liability Insurance is required from the Contractor or Subcontractors (or Subconsultants). Subsection 2.3.5 Professional Liability (Errors & Omissions where required) would not apply or be required.</p> <p>If CDOT does not cover Professional Liability under an OCIP, Subsection 1.2.6 Professional Liability Insurance would govern.</p>	2/28/2013
181	ITP		<p>Can CDOT please provide the following forms In Microsoft Excel format: Insurance Calculation Worksheet Form OCIP - S(1) and Insurance Worksheet Summary Form OCIP-A</p>	<p>These will be included in Exhibits to the ITP however they will not include calculation formula in the cells. See Addendum #1 to the Final RFP</p>	2/20/2013
182	Book 1	Exhibit F, Section 1.2.6	<p>Section 1.2.6 – Professional Liability Insurance – The requirements are not clear on whether Contractor will be required to provide "Project Specific" Professional Liability Insurance. "Project Specific" Professional Liability insurance can be expensive and we believe it will not be cost effective to procure such "Project Specific" insurance. We can provide the limits of liability required under the Professional Liability insurance using our corporate package policy which is more cost effective for CDOT and the project. Can we use our corporate package policy to provide the Professional Liability insurance or will CDOT require "Project Specific" Professional Liability insurance?</p>	<p>See amended Exhibit F provided as Addendum #1 to the Final RFP</p>	2/27/2013

183	Book 1	Exhibit F, Section 1.2.6	Some of our Subcontractors will have minor design roles with low dollar value subcontracts and we believe it will not be cost effective to require them to procure Professional Liability coverage with such high dollar limits. We would suggest a type of tiered approach to liability dollar limit required for Professional Liability insurance, this tiered approach could be based on Subcontractors work scope and subcontract dollar value. Assuming CDOT requires "Project Specific" Professional Liability insurance, will Subcontractors providing design services to Contractor be required to obtain as well with the same limits?	See amended Exhibit F. Note that the responsibility of meeting the insurance requirements lies first with the Contractor. CDOT requires the Contractor to satisfy the insurance requirements of the contract. The Contractor, at its discretion, may elect to allow for limits less than those imposed upon the Contractor to its Subcontractors; however the Contractor accepts the responsibility and liability for its Subcontractors on the project	2/27/2013
184	Book 1	Exhibit F, Section 1.2.4	Will CDOT require Subcontractors to also carry \$10M of Excess (Umbrella) Liability Insurance should the Subcontractors not be enrolled in the OCIP?	If CDOT elects to cover Excess (Umbrella) insurance in an OCIP, the only "Subcontractors" that will not be enrolled are vendors, manufacturers, suppliers, material dealers, haulers etc. as identified in section 2.1 of Exhibit F.	2/27/2013
185	Book 2	Section 14	Section 14.1.4.1 - Permanent Lighting Design - This section states that roadway lighting for US 6 & I-25 shall be provided from the outside edges of the roadways, unless otherwise approved by CDOT. High-mast lighting will not be allowed." In locations along the CDOT baseline configuration the use of standard roadway lighting from the outside may not be adequate to properly light the roadway. Please confirm that CDOT will allow lighting to be installed in the median or provide alternative.	Section 14.1.41. states "...Roadway lighting for US 6 & I-25 shall be provided from the outside edges of the roadways..." Existing lighting agreements with Xcel Energy do not allow or provide CDOT the authority to grant the requested deviation. Deviation from the stated requirement will require Approval from Xcel Energy and CDOT.	2/20/2013
186			Does CDOT take issue with us modifying forms to fit into our proposal template such as removing their documents header and footers	CDOT does not take issue with modifying forms to fit into Proposal templates. However, the Proposer shall ensure that any modifications do not change the intent of the original form, including providing the basis of Contract requirements.	2/27/2013
187			Does CDOT take issue with us modifying the format and inapplicable text of the forms?	See- response to question #186 above.	2/27/2013
188		Form H - Escrow Agreement	Will CDOT be acting as an escrow agent	CDOT and the Proposer shall act as joint Escrow Agents and the Form H modified accordingly for signature upon receipt of the Escrow Proposal Documents within 5 working days after March 28, 2013 as shown in the ITP.	2/27/2013

189		Form H - Escrow Agreement	Is this signed form required to be submitted within Volume II of the proposal on the proposal due date of March 28th?	Escrow Proposal Documents shall be submitted to the same location designated in the ITP as where the initial Proposals are required to be submitted on March 28, 2013.	2/27/2013
190		Form H - Escrow Agreement	This form and the ensuing instructions is confusing as three signed originals are stated to be required within 5 days of the EPD due date and we are unsure as to who is supposed to be signing this document when the information will be incomplete at that time to satisfy the ITP requirement as it is currently written.	Three signed originals of Form H shall be executed at the time of submittal with one copy of Form H retained by the Proposer, a second copy retained by CDOT, and the third copy included with the Escrow Proposal Documents. CDOT's Project Director will sign for CDOT. The Proposer shall ensure the presence of the Project Director at the time of delivery. The Escrow Proposal Documents shall be secured in a locked container (e.g. lock box) by the Proposer prior to submittal to CDOT. The Proposer shall retain the key to the container. CDOT will further secure the information at the submittal location where access to the locked container is only available to CDOT. Subsequent access will remain the same as further described in the Final Request for Proposal, or a different method agreed to according to Section 3.2.10 of the ITP. The signed Form H and associated Escrow Proposal Documents shall be submitted as being within Volume II.	2/27/2013
191		Form A - Incumbency Certificarte	Secretary is not part of our corporate structure – we require guidance to proceed filling this out with the appropriate individual in lieu of a Secretary.	<p>CDOT can accept the following:</p> <p>Either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A document showing unanimous consent from all members or managers or a certified copy of all of those relevant portions of their management agreement or operations agreement that identify which members or managers have the authority to bind the LLC in contracts. The certification must also show that the signing party is in fact a member/manager or that a manager/member has duly (that is, in accordance with the management agreement or operations agreement) delegated signatory authority to the signing party. Some management agreements and operations agreements place certain restrictions on the authority of a member/manager to bind the LLC. For example, sometimes the agreements require that a majority of managers/members act jointly. We won't be aware of these or any other limitations unless we receive a certified copy of the relevant portions of the agreement. 2. If the company can't find the bylaws or resolutions or can't get the appropriate certificate, we can accept a formal legal opinion from their attorney attesting to the authority of the company to enter into the transaction and the officer's ability to bind the company. 	2/28/2013

192	ITP	3.2.9 Authorization Documents	Will CDOT be providing forms in order to capture this information appropriately and consistently?	No	2/28/2013
193		Right of Way Plans Sheet 4	Right of Way Plans Sheet 4 – Tabulation of Properties – Parcel PE-216 has remarks that state “For the construction, maintenance and use of roadway features and appurtenances.” Please confirm that the Contractor can use this property for the construction of permanent above ground features as indicated by the remarks.	No permanent above surface improvements will be completed within PE - 216. PE - 216 is solely intended for the construction of the outfall. Final ROW plans will reflect the usage.	2/27/2013
194	Book 2	Section 1	Can CDOT please define "Surface Treatment" for non-roadway areas within the right-of-way? An example of a non-roadway area can be seen in the CDOT baseline configuration between EB US 6 CD Road and the EB Federal Ramps.	The Proposer should review the FRFP thoroughly to adequately address this question. Specific attention is suggested as part of the Section 5 Environmental Aesthetic requirements, Section 12 Drainage requirements, Section 13 Roadway requirements, Section 15 Structures requirements, Section 17 Landscaping requirements. A common aspect throughout the FRFP is maintainability/accessibility and the Proposer should take these aspects under consideration accordingly. As such, there is no prescriptive answer to this question as related to the CDOT baseline configuration between EB US6 CD Road and the EB Federal Ramps.	2/27/2013
195	Book 2	Section 5	Section 5.1.3 states the historically significant sewer (S-01) shall be removed and replaced. The section further states, “CDOT has obtained agreement for replacement of 240 ft of removal and replacement of the sewer and any additional impacts shall be the responsibility of the Contractor.” Does the CDOT agreement for removal and replacement include the installation of additional manholes for the sewer line?	The Contractor shall address any conditions as set forth by the impacted utility agency in order to address this question during execution of the Work and to ensure its continued operation and maintenance by that agency.	2/27/2013
196	Book 2	Section 7	Please reference waterline impacts as listed in the utility plans and matrix. Where water services are impacted, if that service is not copper, will that service need to be replaced with copper from the meter to the water main?	It is anticipated that execution of the Work would require replacement with copper unless determined/documented otherwise through further investigations by the Proposer.	2/27/2013
197	ITP	Section 3	3.5 Approved ACCs and ATCs - Due to the volume of the ACC/ATC information (including CDOT Approval Letters and support documentation) requested, would it be acceptable to include the ACC/ATC information in a separate binder as an appendix to Volume III or as an alternative at the end of the technical proposal document as not to disrupt the flow of the proposal?	Yes.	2/27/2013

198	ITP	Section 4.2.3.2	Evaluation Criteria-Is it the intent to include Form J pricing in Volume III for evaluation in addition to having Form J submitted as part of Volume II?	No. Form J is to be submitted as part of Volume II only and not included in Volume III	2/27/2013
199	ITP	Section 2.4.2	Proposal Format-Do 11" x 17" exhibits which are placed within the narrative for reference or clarification count as one page?	This question is assumed to refer to conditions related to Volume III. Any 11"x17" exhibits which are placed within the narrative for reference or clarification shall count as one page.	2/27/2013
200	Book 2	Section 8	ROW-Is it possible to get copies of CDOT's Memoranda of Agreements for the additional ROW being acquired for this project?	Yes, CDOT will provide all available documentation to the <i>Selected</i> proposer once the ROW processes and documentation are completed.	2/27/2013
201		30 Inch Water line on Federal	4. 30 Inch Water Line on Federal- Denver Water wants to extend the 30 inch water line on Federal south to 5th Avenue and replace the existing valve. Please clarify whether this is part of the project or a betterment since this is beyond what is shown on the reference drawings.	Utilities are a reaction to the final roadway design. The executed work order will identify if it is part of the project or a betterment.	2/27/2013