



STATE OF DELAWARE  
**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**  
800 BAY ROAD  
P.O. Box 778  
DOVER, DELAWARE 19903

CAROLANN WICKS, P.E.  
SECRETARY

(302) 760-2030  
FAX (302) 739-2254

May 2, 2008

Interested Design Builders:

**RE:** Contract No. 26-073-03 Readvertised  
Federal Aid Project No. BRN-S050(14)  
Bridge 3-156 on SR-1 over Indian River Inlet  
Sussex County

Attached is Addendum No. 4 to the RFP for the referenced contract consisting of the following:

1. Three (3) pages, Scope of Services Package Response Comment Form, Form RCF – Questions 79 through 88, pages 1 through 3, new, to be added to the Request For Proposal.
2. Two (2) pages, Scope of Services Package, ITP, pages 3 of 25 and 9 of 25, revised, to be substituted for the same pages in the Request For Proposal. (Please Note: The page numbers in the ITP incorrectly state “of 25.” The correct statement should be “of 24.” There are 24 pages exclusive of the cover and the Table of Contents.)
3. Five (5) pages, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 1 - Project Scope, pages i, and 2 of 6, and 4 of 6 through 6 of 6, revised, to be substituted for the same pages in the Request For Proposal.
4. Three (3) pages, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 2 - DB Section 102 – Appendix A, pages 1 of 3, through 3 of 3, revised, to be substituted for the same pages in the Request For Proposal.
5. One (1) page, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 2 - DB Section 108, page 3 of 11, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Request For Proposal.

6. Two (2) pages, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 3 - Appendix A – Bridge Design Requirements, pages 10 of 16, and 11 of 16, revised, to be substituted for the same pages in the Request For Proposal. (Part 3 – Appendix A sequence pages 12 and 13.)
7. One (1) page, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 3 - Appendix A – Bridge Drainage System, page 2 of 4, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Request For Proposal. (Part 3 – Appendix A sequence page 20.)
8. One (1) page, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 3 - Appendix A – Engineering Requirements, page 3 of 4, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Request For Proposal. (Part 3 – Appendix A sequence page 45.)
9. Six (6) pages, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 3 - Appendix A – Geotechnical Requirements, page 7 of 13 and 9 of 13 through 13 of 13, revised, to be substituted for the same pages in the Request For Proposal. (Part 3 – Appendix A sequences pages 53, and 55 through 59.)
10. Eight (8) pages, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 3 - Appendix A – Inspection Maintenance, and Construction Requirements, pages 5 of 12, through 11 of 12, revised, to be substituted for the same pages in the Request For Proposal. (Part 4 – Special Provisions sequence pages 66 through 70.) Page 12 of 12, new, to be added to the Proposal (Part 4 – Special Provisions sequence page 70A.)
11. One (1) page, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 3 - Appendix A – Roadway Geometrics, page 3 of 4, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Request For Proposal. (Part 3 – Appendix A sequence page 83.)
12. Thirteen (13) pages, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 4 - Special Provisions, 618519 - Drilled Shafts, pages 11 of 24, through 23 of 24, revised, to be substituted for the same pages in the Request For Proposal. (Part 4 – Special Provisions sequence pages 133 through 145.)
13. One (1) sheet, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 6 - Plans, Appendix B – Directive and Indicative Plans, sheet B-06, Construction Phasing, Staging Areas, and Milestones, revised, to be substituted for the same page in the Request For Proposal.
14. Two (2) sheets, Scope of Services Package, Contract Documents - Part 6 - Plans, Appendix B – Directive and Indicative Plans, sheet B-07, Proposed Conditions at South Embankment, B-08, Proposed Conditions at North Embankment, new, to be added to the Request For Proposal.

Addendum No. 4  
May 2, 2008  
Page 3 of 3

Please note the revisions listed above and submit your Proposal based upon this information.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John V. Eustis, Jr.", written in a cursive style.

John V. Eustis, Jr.  
Contract Services Project Manager

:jve, jr.  
attach.

**FORM RCF**

**SCOPE OF SERVICES PACKAGE RESPONSE COMMENT FORM**

Q No.	Part Number	Section Number	Comment(s)	Reserved for Response
Q – 79	2  Contract Documents	108-2.1  Progress Schedules	Addenda #2 indicates that the project schedule needs to be signed and sealed by the Design Builder’s Project Manager. The DB’s Project Manager qualifications are then described in Part 4, section DB 108C with no requirement to be a licensed Engineer with credentials to “seal”. Please consider deleting the “sealing” of the project schedule by the DB’s Project Manager.	“Sealing” the project schedule submission is not required. This will be addressed by Addendum No. 4.
Q – 80	3  Appendix A Performance Specification & Addendum #2	Bridge Design Requirements Paragraph 2.1.F & 3.6.H.5 Materials  Question #5	The Design-Builder may utilize stay-in-place metal deck forms for conventional approach spans where partial and/or complete deck replacement can be performed using conventional rehabilitation methods. Stay-in-place metal deck forms shall be in accordance with the requirements of the DelDOT Bridge Design Manual.  Please clarify if the SIP metal deck forms have to meet the requirements of “exposed” steel?	No. SIP metal deck forms need not satisfy the stainless steel requirement of Section 3.6.H.5 of the <i>Bridge Design Requirements Performance Specification</i> . However, SIP metal deck forms shall have corrosion-resistant properties or coatings.
Q – 81	General		Please provide the load restrictions (if any) on the existing bridge which may currently exist or which may be imposed during the construction of the new Indian River Inlet Bridge.	The existing bridge is currently rated to safely carry all Delaware Legal Loads. Any special loads exceeding the Delaware Legal Loads would require permit approval.

**FORM RCF**

**SCOPE OF SERVICES PACKAGE RESPONSE COMMENT FORM**

Q No.	Part Number	Section Number	Comment(s)	Reserved for Response
Q – 82	ITP	2.8.1 A)	The answer to Q-44 indicates that paragraph 2.8.1 A) is corrected by Addendum No. 3. However, updated paragraph 2.8.1 A) does not appear in Addendum No. 3.	It will be added to Addendum No. 4.
Q – 83	ITP	A1.0	The proposer requests permission to submit drawings and renderings for the technical proposal in a separate, bound volume- in a manner similar to the submission for the initial technical concept presentation.	It is acceptable to submit the drawings and renderings bound together in either 8 1/2” x 11” or 11” x 17” (11” x 17” preferred)
Q – 84	Addend. # 2 Part 3 Appendix A  Performance Specifications	Bridge Design Requirements Paragraph 3.1.F	Please confirm if the back face of the combined use walkway barrier is the limit of the 2’6” cable stay clearance or if the 2’6” cable stay clearance applies to the back face of the traffic barrier.	The 2’-6” clearance requirement shall be applied from the back face, or outermost face of the concrete portion of the barrier system proposed. Not from any railing mounted on top of the concrete unless the railing extends towards the cable stay beyond the concrete.
Q – 85	Addend. # 3 Part 4  Performance Specification	Cable Supported Bridge System Requirements Paragraph 5.0 & 5.6	Section 5.0 “Cable Testing” implies two Axial Fatigue tests to be conducted on the cable stay material. Section 5.6 “Fatigue Strength Testing of Cables” states three Axial Fatigue tests are required. Please clarify.	Please refer to response to Question #73 in Addendum No. 3.

**FORM RCF**

**SCOPE OF SERVICES PACKAGE RESPONSE COMMENT FORM**

Q No.	Part Number	Section Number	Comment(s)	Reserved for Response
Q – 86	4	605500	Throughout this section 0.60” diameter strand is referenced. Is 0.62” diameter strand allowed as a substitute in lieu of the 0.60” strand?	Yes, 0.62” diameter strand is acceptable.
Q – 87	ITP	A1.0	When stating “Proposals shall be submitted in separate volumes”, Volume 1-5, can the referenced volumes mean separate tabs vs. separate volumes (books)?	Separate tabbed sections is acceptable.
Q – 88	ITP	A1.0 & 3.6.3	Rather than submitting 1 original and 7 copies of the schedule in 24x36 or 22x34, can we submit one original large format (24x36) schedule and the copies be in 11x17 format?	A single full size schedule and seven half-size schedules is acceptable.