Maura Healey, Governor
Kimberley Driscoll, Lieutenant Governor
Monica Tibbits-Nutt, Secretary & CEO
Jonathan L. Gulliver, Highway Administrator

MassDOT
Massachusetts Department of Transportation
Highway Division

October 23, 2024

605311-128035

ADDENDUM NO. 4

To Prospective Proposers and Others on:

MARION-WAREHAM
FAP No. HIP(NGB)-003S(786)X
Bridge Replacement, M-05-001=W-06-013 & W-06-016, Marion Road/Wareham Road (Route 6) over Weweantic River
Design-Build

TECHNICAL & PRICE PROPOSALS DUE: Thursday, December 19, 2024, by 2:00P.M.

Transmitting revisions to the RFP Documents as follows:

RFP Volume II of III – Technical Provisions (September 12, 2024)
Revised pages 49 and 89.

Please take note of the above, substitute the revised pages for the originals, and acknowledge Addendum No. 4 in your Expedite Proposal file before submitting your bid.

Sincerely,

Eric M. Cardone Digitally signed by Eric M. Cardone Date: 2024.10.23 16:28:46 -04'00'

Eric M. Cardone, P.E.
Construction Contracts Engineer

EMC\ltp
cc: Narayana Kolla, P.E., Manager Alternative Procurement and Delivery
Valerie Kilduff, P.E., Design-Build Project Manager

Ten Park Plaza, Suite 4160, Boston, MA 02116
Tel: 857-368-4636, TTY: 857-368-0655
mass.gov/massdot

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

④ ADDENDUM NO.4, October 23, 2024
② ADDENDUM NO. 2, October 4, 2024
① ADDENDUM NO. 1, September 30, 2024

4.3.2 ATC Restrictions

ATCs will be evaluated and either accepted or rejected per guidelines presented in Volume 1 of the RFP. The Design-Builder shall provide a design in all ATCs presented to the Department that is equal to or better than the BTC design it intends to supersede. The following is a list of ATC restrictions.

① • Any ATC reducing the vertical clearances below Route 6 over the Weweantic River.

① • Any ATC that proposes a steel superstructure.

• Any ATC reducing the horizontal clearances of the Weweantic River.

• Any ATC which incorporates the re-use of existing substructure elements for a permanent structure.

④ • Any ATC where a Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) wall or reinforced soil slope is proposed and requires external tensile elements such as fabrics or grids or strips that extend beneath or adjacent to the roadway for stability and may impact existing and future utilities and guardrail installations and associated maintenance.

④① • Any ATC where Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE), Modular, or other wall type is used and whose primary design is as an earth retaining structure, and the superstructure is not supported on an independent deep foundation.

① • Any ATC where a modular wall abutment is proposed, and the abutment beam seat is not cast integrally with the top module as indicated in AASHTO Section 11.11.7.

• Any ATC which proposes GRS-IBS structures.

• Any ATC which proposes “lean on bracing”.

• Any ATC which does not maintain the required number of vehicular lanes and shoulder dimensions in the final condition on Route 6 shown in the BTC.

• Any ATC that does comply with the proposed low chord identified in the USCG Advanced Approval.

• Any ATC which does not maintain the required Shared Use Paths in the final condition on Route 6 shown in the BTC.

• Any ATC using precast butted box beams or partial depth precast deck panels.

• Any ATC which incorporates lightweight concrete on the bridge deck and/or CF-PL3 or CP-MTL3 barriers.

• Any ATC which does not allow for continuous two lanes of traffic, one in each direction on Route 6 during construction except where allowed in Section 4.9.1.

• Any ATC which does not allow for continuous access to abutting properties except where allowed in Section 4.9.1.

② • Any ATC which does not achieve a minimum 45 mph design speed on temporary roadway configurations carrying Route 6. Short term lane shifts and tapers for lane closures on Route 6 shall meet or exceed 45 mph design speed.

• Any ATC will comply with the proposed low chord identified in the USCG Advanced Approval.

• Any ATC that does not maintain the roadway cross section provided in the BTC in the final condition.

④ ADDENDUM NO. 4, October 23, 2024
① ADDENDUM NO. 1, September 30, 2024

The Design-Builder shall ensure the geotechnical investigations and analyses are both thorough and complete, so as to provide accurate information for the design and construction of roadways, pavements, foundations, structures, and other facilities that result in a Project that is safe and meets operational standards and final acceptance requirements.

The Design-Builder shall be responsible for all grading and related work such as remedial excavation and embankment/foundation settlement monitoring required for construction of the Project. No grading operations and foundation construction for the Project shall commence until the Geotechnical Report(s) for the area of grading and foundation construction has been approved by MassDOT and, as applicable, local agencies.

The Design-Builder shall design all bridge foundations such that unsuitable/organic soils are removed, bypassed, or improved. The Design-Builder shall design causeway embankment widening and grade increase to meet all settlement, stability (including global stability) requirements using lightweight fill and/or structural support walls. The Design-Builder may use ground improvement techniques to improve poor ground conditions when traditional over-excavation and replacement is not feasible for environmental, technical, or economic reasons. Ground improvement methods must meet the limitations provided herein.

4.11.2 Use of Geotechnical Information

The Design-Builder shall use the subsurface information and all Reference Documents provided in Appendix C at their own risk. While the MassDOT provided information does identify subsurface conditions at the exact location of specific borings, test pits, probes, and/or geophysical lines, any further interpretations of subsurface conditions beyond or in addition to that information are the Design-Builder's sole responsibility.

④ It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to review soil samples and rock cores from the subsurface explorations, which are located at the MassDOT Storage Facility, 223 Winthrop Avenue in Lawrence, MA.

4.11.3 Subsurface Investigations by the Design-Builder

Subsurface explorations shall be conducted for any new and modified structures so that the requirements of AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications Article 10.4 and Table 10.4.2-1, MassDOT's LRFD Bridge Manual and the requirements below are met. The BTC plans show borings based on assumed structures and span arrangements. Any changes to this may require additional borings as needed to meet the requirements of AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, MassDOT's LRFD Bridge Manual, and the requirements below. The Design-Builder acknowledges that it may be necessary to supplement the existing subsurface information, and that MassDOT may require additional borings, test pits, probes, geophysical surveys or cone penetration tests in connection with any of MassDOT's reviews.

- If an ATC proposes to shift a substructure (piers or abutments) and its proposed location is more than 15 feet away from BTC boring locations, additional borings are required.
- If an ATC proposes to shift a substructure (piers or abutments) and its proposed location is within 15 feet of the BTC boring locations, additional borings are not required.
- A minimum of two borings, drilled within 15 feet of the substructure, are required at each end of proposed pier and abutment locations regardless of the pier width.
- ① Perform construction phase borings along the proposed retaining wall alignment. Refer to Special Provision Subitem 190.01 Borings. Design-Builder to identify additional boring locations along wall alignment based on final retaining wall design.