

## FINAL RFP – ADDENDUM NO. 4

### CHANGES TO INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS

#### SECTION 3 – PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

##### 3.1 Format and Quantities

*Delete last paragraph and substitute the following:*

The Proposer shall provide one complete original hardcopy of the entire Proposal clearly labeled “Original” along with one complete electronic copy of the Proposal with appendices on a compact disc(s) (the electronic copy may include Proposal forms that are not executed and may be in PDF format) for each Volume. In addition the Proposer shall submit duplicate hardcopies as follows: Twelve duplicate hardcopies of Volume 1 Executive Summary; four duplicate hardcopies of Volume II Proposer Information and Certifications; twelve duplicate hardcopies of Volume III Technical Proposal (excluding the Basic Configuration Diagram); four duplicate hardcopies of Volume IV Approved ACCs and Technical Approaches; four duplicate hardcopies of Volume V Price Information; and four duplicate hardcopies of Volume VI Options Proposals. Each duplicate hardcopy must be identified in the upper right-hand corner of its front cover as “Copy \_\_\_ of (DEFINE NUMBER OF COPIES) Copies

#### Section 6.0 – CONTRACT EXECUTION

*Delete paragraph 7. and substitute the following:*

7. Opinion of counsel for the Contractor, which counsel shall be approved by CDOT (which may be in-house or outside counsel, provided that the enforceability opinion shall be provided by attorneys licensed in the State of Colorado), in substantially the form attached hereto as Form M.

### CHANGES TO BOOK 2 – TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

#### SECTION 1 - GENERAL

##### 1.2 Basic Configuration

###### 5. Pavements and Laneage

*Delete paragraph C. and substitute the following:*

- C. Construct composite HMA pavement sections with widths and laneages as shown in the drawings in the Reference Documents on Destination Drive, Wadsworth Boulevard (including intersection with 118<sup>th</sup> Avenue), Wadsworth Place, and 118<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Commerce Street if these AREs are constructed with the Basic Configuration.

## SECTION 7 – UTILITY RELOCATIONS

### Appendices

C. Utility Relocation Agreement (Xcel Energy- Electric Distribution)

*Delete “ – Pending”.*

*Signed Utility Agreement with Xcel is provided electronically with this addendum.*

## SECTION 8 – RIGHT OF WAY

### 8.5 Appendices

B. ROW Schedule

*Delete Appendix B Right of Way Schedule and substitute the following:*

APPENDIX B RIGHT OF WAY SCHEDULE		
Parcel No.	Owner	Access Date
1	THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT, a political subdivision of the State of Colorado	<b>May 31, 2010</b>
1A, 6, 6A, 6B, PE-6, PE-6A, PE-6B, SE-6, SE-6A, SE-6B, SE-6C, TE-6, TE-6A	THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT, a political subdivision of the State of Colorado	May 29, 2009
2, 2A, 2B, 2C	COUNTY OF JEFFERSON, STATE OF COLORADO, a body politic and corporate	May 1, 2009
3, 3AR, 3R	MORELAND PROPERTIES, LLC, a Colorado Limited Liability Company	May 29, 2009
TE-14, TE-15	PARK 36 INVESTMENT, LLC, a Colorado limited liability company	May 29, 2009
AP-5	ROBERT L. SAUER and SYLVIA SAUER	Available
7, 7A, SE-7, SE-7A, TE-7	RTD	May 29, 2009
8, 8A, PE-8, PE-8A, SE-8, SE-8A, SE-8B, TE-8, TE-8A, TE-8B	JERE JILL MOCK	April 15, 2009
9, TE-9	R.F. HOLDINGS, LLC, a Colorado limited liability company	April 15, 2009

10, 10R, 10A, SE-10, TE-10	HIXON M. ELLIOTT AND DOROTHY R. ELLIOTT	Available
11, TE-11	CLIFFORD R. PARKER	May 1, 2009
12, TE-12	EVAN CHARLES PROPERTIES, a Colorado Limited Liability Company	May 1, 2009
13	CITY AND COUNTY OF BROOMFIELD	Available
PE-16	FLEISCHLI ENTERPRISES, INC., a Wyoming company	Available
PE-17, TE-17	BNSF RR	June 30, 2009

C. ROW Demolition Schedule

*Delete Appendix C Demolition Schedule and substitute the following:*

APPENDIX C		
SCHEDULE OF IMPROVEMENTS TO BE DEMOLISHED		
Address of Improvement	Parcel Nos. on CDOT ROW Plans for Underlying Ownership	Owner from Whom Underlying Property shall be Acquired
One residential house and two other buildings used for storage, all of which are located at 8520 West 120 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Broomfield, CO 80020	2, 2A, 2B, 2C	COUNTY OF JEFFERSON, STATE OF COLORADO, a body politic and corporate

**SECTION 13 – ROADWAYS**

**13.3.1.2 Roadways**

*Delete the second paragraph and substitute the following:*

The Contractor shall remove abandoned portions of the frontage road between the RTD Park-n-Ride and Transit Way, smooth to blend into adjacent terrain, and topsoil and seed. Leave existing roadway berm in place as necessary to control drainage at existing culvert crossing of US-36 west of 120th.

*Add the following subsection:*

**13.3.1.3 Water Wells**

In addition to the demolition of the existing structures required under Book2 Section 8, Appendix C, the Contractor shall properly plug and abandon the existing water well on Parcels 2, 2A, 2B, 2C.

**Exhibit 13.1 - ROADWAY DESIGN CRITERIA TABLE**

*Delete the column labeled "Frontage Rd. Access"*

**SECTION 16 – MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC**

**16.2.5.2 US-36 South Frontage Road**

*Delete the subsection text and substitute the following:*

Access to the frontage road southwest of US-36 between the RTD Park-n-Ride and Transit Way may be closed at NTP2. Provide Road Closed barriers at limits of road removal within project limits.

**CHANGES TO BOOK 4 – CONTRACT DRAWINGS**

*Delete Report # 4.1 and substitute the following:*

4.1	Right-of-Way Plans dated March 25, 2009	S/E
-----	---	-----

*Revised Right-of-Way Plans are provided electronically with this addendum.*

## **CHANGES TO REFERENCE DOCUMENTS**

Report # 5.1 - Preliminary Design Plans and Cross Sections of Proposed Federal Aid Project No. STA C800-001, State Highway No. 128

*The following revisions are provided electronically in PDF and DGN formats with this addendum:*

- Sheet 1 – Delete Sheet 23 from Index, remove frontage road access from Location Map.
- Sheet 3 – Delete frontage road access criteria from table.
- Sheet 5 – Delete frontage road access typical section.
- Sheet 7 – Delete frontage road access from Key Plan.
- Sheet 8 – Delete frontage road access geometry and curve data.
- Sheet 23 – Delete sheet.
- Cross Sections Sheet 001 – Delete frontage road access from index
- Cross Sections Sheet 084 – Delete sheet.

Report # 5.2 - CADD/design/Mapping Files/Photos – CD #02

*The following revisions are provided electronically in DGN format with this addendum:*

Report # 5.4 - Utility Information Sheets (UIS)

*The following are provided electronically with this addendum:*

*EXECUTED UIS's/Xcel Energy- Electric*

*EXCEL ELEC. 07-001.pdf*

*EXCEL ELEC. 07-002.pdf*

*EXCEL ELEC. 07-003.pdf*

*EXCEL ELEC. 07-004.pdf*

*EXCEL ELEC. 07-005.pdf*

*EXCEL ELEC. 07-006.pdf*

*EXCEL ELEC. 07-007.pdf*

**RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION**

The following are responses to additional written Requests for Information received:

RFI No.	REQUEST	RESPONSE
22	<p>When evidencing coverage for the Owner, is it acceptable to show Primary General Liability Policy Limits at:</p> <p>\$1,000,000 each Occurrence                      \$2,000,000 General Aggregate                      \$2,000,000 Products/Completed Operations Aggregate</p> <p><b>Plus</b></p> <p>Excess limits evidenced at:</p> <p>\$3,000,000 each Occurrence                      \$4,000,000 Aggregate</p> <p><b>For a total of \$4,000,000 Occurrence; \$6,000,000 Aggregate?</b></p>	<p>Proposed limits are acceptable.</p>
23	<p>When evidencing coverage for the Owner, is it acceptable to show Primary Auto Liability Policy Limits at:</p> <p>\$1,000,000 Combined Single Limits</p> <p><b>Plus</b></p> <p>Excess limits evidence at:</p> <p>\$3,000,000 Occurrence                      \$4,000,000 Aggregate</p> <p><b>For a total of \$4,000,000 Occurrence and \$6,000,000 Aggregate?</b></p>	<p>Proposed limits are acceptable.</p>

RFI No.	REQUEST	RESPONSE
24	<p>Under the insurance requirements section 9, item 9.2.6 Professional Liability Insurance, you require that the contractor provide a “Project Professional Liability Coverage” for the protection of all design professionals associated with the project. The limit required is \$2,000,000 each claim and in the aggregate. Can a bidder substitute an Owners Professional Protective Indemnity Policy (OPPI Policy) in the name of CDOT with limits of \$2,000,000 and an SIR of \$100,000 payable by the contractor? This approach is typically cheaper and the CDOT has a first party coverage grant with limits dedicated to this project, excess of the design professionals proactive program limits or the SIR, whichever is greater. The coverage trigger, term and other requirements will be as dictated by the current section 9.2.6. Typically, this approach is 30-40% cheaper than a Project Professional Liability program. In either event, both the OPPI and the Project Professional Liability coverage consider one policy covering pollution and professional on for the project?</p>	<p>Proposed approach is acceptable, provided CDOT is first named.</p>
25	<p>Will CDOT accept a Contractors Pollution Legal Liability coverage with a per occurrence limit of \$5 million and the total aggregate of \$5 million for this project?</p>	<p>No.</p>
26	<p>On RFP Sheets 17 thru 22, main trunk sewers are shown to be 18 inch RCP along Wadsworth, 118<sup>th</sup> Street and Commerce Street. According to Broomfield’s standard specification for storm drainage facilities, main trunk sewers must have a minimum inside of 21 inches. Will Broomfield’s standard specification govern on these minor arterial and connector streets?</p>	<p>18" pipes may be used in locations where an 18" is already shown, provided that final flow calculations support use of an 18".</p>
27	<p>Where is Form M (Opinion of Counsel) to be inserted in to the technical proposal.</p>	<p>Section 6.0, Item 7. of the ITP identifies the requirements for Opinion of Counsel. Reference to Form I is changed to Form M with Addendum #4.</p>
28	<p>Reference: Addendum 2, Page 2, Section 11, SH-128 (130<sup>th</sup> Avenue Connection), “...and in the zone delineated by a 1:1 slope as defined in Book 2, Section 19 (Section 203- Embankment),...: We cannot find anything in Book 2, Section 19, Section 203, or in the Standard Special Provisions that delineates or defines the 1:1 slope. Please advise where this information can be obtained.</p>	<p>Please refer to Book 2 Section 19.1.2.1. The Section 203 being referred to is Section 203 of the 2005 CDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction. The 1:1 slope is defined in Section 203.06 Embankment.</p>
29	<p>Reference Book 2, Section 13, Page 5, 13.3.1: We are unable to find a Section 202. Please provide a Section 202 for Section 19 – Modifications to Standard Specifications.</p>	<p>Please refer to Book 2 Section 19.1.2.1. The Section 202 being referred to is Section 202 of the 2005 CDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction.</p>

RFI No.	REQUEST	RESPONSE
30	<p>Instructions to Proposers, Section 1.1, Major Participants states that any Subcontractor performing work valued at 10% or more of the overall contract value will be considered a Major Participant. Section 3.4.9.1 defines the organizational documents required for all Major Participants along with a variety of Forms that need to be submitted for each Major Participant.</p> <p>In the event that Subcontractor quotes are received in the last days before proposal due date and that Subcontractor would carry work valued at 10% or more of the contract value, could the Major Participant Documentation be submitted after the proposal due date due to time constraints for incorporating this documentation in the technical proposal?</p>	<p>Yes. When the 10% threshold is reached the required documentation for a Major Participant must be submitted.</p>
31	<p>The RFP ask for 12 copies. Is CDOT looking for the first copy marked "original" then eleven copies of that original, i.e. 1 of 11, 2 of 11 etc or is it 1 original and 12 copies marked 1 of 12, 2 of 12 etc?</p>	<p>The Proposer shall submit one original hardcopy of the entire proposal, and additional duplicate hardcopies of each Volume (I – VI) as identified in section 3.1 of the ITP. This section is clarified with Addendum #4.</p>
32	<p>Are there any utility info sheets avail for OH elect on existing 120<sup>th</sup> and Park Street?</p>	<p>The UA and UIS's for all of Xcel's electric facilities are provided with Addendum #4.</p>
33	<p>Are there any special requirements regarding the closure of the Frontage Road like advance public notice, special signing, etc.</p>	<p>No.</p>
34	<p>Are there any special requirements regarding the ditch abandonment outside of the 120<sup>th</sup> slope limits?</p>	<p>Abandoned portions of ditches outside slope limits but within R.O.W. shall be obliterated, topsoiled, and seeded. Offsite surface drainage which still enters the R.O.W. via abandoned ditches must be accommodated by the project improvements, and drainage from the project controlled in such a way that properties downstream of the abandoned ditches are not damaged.</p>



RFI No.	REQUEST	RESPONSE
35	<p>Section 3.3 Organization and Key Personnel            3.3.3 Minimum Requirements of Key Personnel</p> <p>A. Design Build Project Manager-If the contractor elects to have the Construction Manager as the registered engineer for the project, is it allowed for the Construction Manager to be responsible for the Contractor's quality program, quality personnel, quality assurance activities independent of production, and quality systems procedures etc vs. the Design Build Manager?</p> <p>D. Environmental Compliance Manager- Would it be allowed for the Environmental Compliance Manager to work under the direct supervision of the Construction Manager?</p>	<p>Section 3.3.3 is in the RFQ. This phase of the project is complete. Refer to Section 3 and Section 5 of Book 2 of the RFP for clarification.</p> <p>Book 2 Section 3.2.2 states that "The Quality Manager and Quality Assurance staff shall be shown on the organizational chart to report to the Contractor's executive management and be independent of the Contractor's Project Manager."</p> <p>"The Quality Manager and Quality Assurance staff shall have no responsibilities in the production of the Work."</p> <p>Book 2 Section 5.0 states that "The Contractor shall prepare an Environmental Compliance Work Plan for the Project, specifically identifying all of the environmental compliance requirements for the Project and the Contractor's approach for complying with those requirements. The Environmental Compliance Work Plan shall be submitted to CDOT for Acceptance within 60 days of NTP1. The Contractor shall employ and utilize on the Project an Environmental Compliance Manager. It is acceptable for the Environmental Compliance Manager to serve as the erosion control supervisor."</p> <p>The Work Plan would show your reporting hierarchy.</p>

**END OF ADDENDUM NO. 4**