

# STATE OF COLORADO

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

4201 E. Arkansas Ave.  
Denver, Colorado 80216



**JULY 8, 2011**

**INVITATION FOR CONSULTANT SERVICES ADDENDUM #1  
For Colorado Department of Transportation Region 6  
Project Specific Traffic Engineering & Planning  
I-70 Kipling Environmental Linkage (PEL)**

**This Addendum shall supplement information erroneously submitted in the original SOW, resulting from questions submitted regarding the project.**

**The SOI Submission Due Date will now be pushed back 1 week to July 21.**

**Interested firms shall submit the Statement of Interest/Work Plan no later than 12:00 noon local time Thursday July 21<sup>st</sup> 2011 to:**

David A. Wells  
Contracting Officer  
Colorado Department of Transportation  
4201 E. Arkansas Ave., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor – West  
Denver, CO 80222

**STATEMENT OF INTEREST/WORK PLANS RECEIVED AFTER THE TIME AND DATE SPECIFIED WILL BE REJECTED. THE STATEMENT OF INTEREST/WORK PLAN MUST COMPANY WITH CDOT'S STANDARDIZED FORMAT REQUIREMENTS. PLEASE REFER TO THE INSTRUCTIONS. FAILURE TO FOLLOW THE REQUIRED FORMAT AS PROVIDED IN THE STATEMENT OF INTEREST/WORK PLAN INSTRUCTIONS MAY RESULT IN YOUR SUBMITTAL BEING REJECTED.**

**The following information is being offered as clarification of the requirements of this solicitation after submission of the following questions. Comments may have been edited. Any supplemental statements were not included in the following questions. Any information that vendors would like considered as part of their SOI/WP response must be included in their response.**

**Please See Mandatory Signature Page at the End Of This Document**

I-70/Kipling Interchange PEL

Project #: C 0703-333

SA #: 16549

**Question #1:** The project schedule is shown as 365 calendar days on pg. 4 and 18-24 months on pg. 12. Which should we assume is the desired project schedule?

**Answer:** 365 calendar days, the statement “The work in this scope is expected to take approximately 18 to 24 months to complete” shall be deleted from the project scope.

**Question #2:** Page 4 – Consultant Responsibility and Duties includes “specifications, and estimate, and post design services”. Are these included in the project scope?

**Answer:** No, the statement “specifications, and estimate, and post design services” shall be deleted from the project scope.

**Question #3:** Page 14 – The second paragraph mentions “toll feasibility”. Is that part of the project scope?

**Answer:** No, the statement “and toll feasibility” shall be deleted from the project scope.

**Question #4:** Page 15 – b. Initial geology investigation – This cope is quite detailed and included eight borings. Is that part of the PEL scope?

**Answer:** No, the following task shall be deleted from the project scope:

b. Initial geology investigation

The Consultant shall conduct and document a thorough investigation of the project area to determine existing geologic conditions including but not limited to soil maps, major excavations, unsatisfactory sub-grade materials, present and potential subsidence, consideration and description of the water table (depth/gradient), etc. Preliminary borings (assume 8) will be taken to evaluate the condition of the pavement sub-grade structure.

**Question #5:** Page 15 – c. Initial utility investigation – This is at a high level of detail, including researching easements and field survey. Is that part of the PEL scope?

**Answer:** No, the following task shall be deleted from the project scope:

c. Initial utility investigation

The Consultant shall conduct and document an investigation of the project area to determine existing utility conditions within the project limits. As part of this investigation the Consultant will collect utility location key maps for all utilities in the project area in coordination with CDOT Region 6 utilities specialist, identify all known utilities, ownership, type, size, and special conditions to consider should utility relocation be required, and research and obtain copies of utility easements (public and private) and utility franchise agreements to determine conditions under which the utility was established in its present location (e.g. by revocable permit or by a privately owned easement).

As part of the preliminary field survey planimetric mapping requirements, above ground utilities such as poles, manholes, valves, pedestals, guy wires, and other visible utility features will be located.

**Question #6:** Page 18 – f. Document – This section mentions a Feasibility Study to be prepared under a later task order if the NEPA process determines that major interchange improvements are necessary. But later the scope includes a System Level Feasibility Study, Project Level Feasibility Study, and an IAR. Are the feasibility studies and IAR part of this project contract, or later phases?

**Answer:** No, the following task shall be deleted from the project scope:

f. Documentation

The Consultant shall use the information from the traffic study to create a summary report that will be used in the CDOT 1601 Feasibility Study to be prepared under a later task order for submittal to the Transportation Commission if the NEPA process determines that major improvements to the I-70 and Kipling St. interchange are necessary.

**Question #7:** Page 24 – B. Project Feasibility Study – This section includes 20%-30% level design and base mapping at 1-foot contours. Is this level of design and survey included in the project scope?

**Answer:** No, the following task shall be deleted from the project scope:

- 4 System/Project Feasibility Study And Interchange Management Plan

As part of the PEL process, the Consultant shall prepare a system and project feasibility study and interchange management plan for the I-70 and Kipling St. interchange analysis. This study shall be in accordance with CDOT's most recent Procedural Directive 1601. The Consultant shall make clear in any materials prepared as an official record and for distribution, that the NEPA process shall be followed, and that the Consultant and the Agencies have no preferred alternative which will influence their activities, to reach an appropriate conclusion under NEPA.

A. System Feasibility Study

The system feasibility study must consider, as a minimum, alternate routes, accident history, congestion, effects of interchange on the existing interstate and highway system, effects on the adjacent interchanges, economic development impact, and local commitment to improving local roadways. Key information from the data collection and alternatives analysis will be included in the feasibility study document. A draft study will be reviewed by the City of Wheat Ridge, the City of Arvada, CDOT, FHWA, and other jurisdictions as appropriate and then submitted to CDOT for review and comment prior to final submission. If it is determined that the system feasibility study will go to the Transportation Commission separately from

the project feasibility study, the Consultant shall prepare the needed documentation and graphics, and present for approval before the Transportation Commission.

#### B. Project Feasibility Study

Either in conjunction with or following approval of the system feasibility study, a project level feasibility study shall be completed. In addition to refinement of items identified in the system feasibility study, the project feasibility study will determine precise location and extent of traffic impacts to the state transportation system. It will identify all necessary improvement alternatives to the interchange configuration at a conceptual design level, as well as any improvements to Kipling St. to accommodate the anticipated traffic. Preliminary engineering will be completed to the 20% to 30% level and total costs will be outlined at that level. Base mapping will be to one (1) foot contour interval resolution. All design standards will be addressed and agreed upon by WHEAT RIDGE, ARVADA, CDOT and FHWA. This feasibility study will be submitted to CDOT for review, and summarized in the Planning and Environmental Linkage Report.

#### C. Feasibility Study Report

This report will be prepared in accordance with Procedural Directive 1601 to obtain access approval from FHWA for the I-70 and Kipling St. interchange. The Consultant shall make clear in any materials prepared as an official record and for distribution, that the NEPA process shall be followed, and that the Consultant and the Agencies have no preferred alternative which will influence their activities, to reach an appropriate conclusion under NEPA. The report will include, as a minimum:

- Project purpose
- Relationship to other highway improvement plans and programs
- Distances to and size of communities or activities directly served
- Description of existing and proposed access:
  - Configuration of the existing and proposed interchange
  - Distances to adjacent interchanges
  - Alternatives that have been considered-description and layout
  - Description of any substandard features, with justification
  - Main line and crossroad traffic volumes (ADT), (DHV), including turning movements, for current year, implementation year, and design year
  - Number of main line and crossroad lanes; including any auxiliary lanes or C-D roads
- Traffic and operational analysis including crossroads and other roads and streets as required to assure their ability to effectively collect and distribute traffic from the new access. Operational analysis shall consider adjacent interchanges. Traffic simulation will likely be needed to present information and allow for analysis of the alternatives

- Any other information that might help explain and/or support the proposal, e.g., cost-effectiveness analysis, source of funding, implementation schedule, etc
- Plan and profile, interchange geometrics, typical sections, roadway alignments.
- Preliminary signing plan
- Construction Phasing

D. Interstate Access Request/Minor Interchange Modification Request

The consultant shall prepare an Interstate Access Request or a Minor Interchange Modification Request document as appropriate, using the results of the Feasibility Study and environmental analysis for submittal to FHWA.

The following task shall be **ADDED** to Section 7, part a – Traffic data collection:

The Study shall include alternate routes, accident history, congestion, effects of interchange on the existing interstate and highway system, effects on the adjacent interchanges, economic development impact, and local commitment to improving local roadways.

**Question #9:** Section 7 page 17 item c – Please clarify the scope of work item regarding the use of the Dynasmart/DynusT Model is required.

**Answer:** Yes, this was requested by FHWA.

**Interested firms must acknowledge receipt of this addendum by returning a signed copy with the SOI/WP documents.**

**I hereby certify receipt of this addendum and have incorporated its changes in preparation of my bid.**

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name (Print) \_\_\_\_\_

Vendor Name \_\_\_\_\_

Vendor Address \_\_\_\_\_

City/State/Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Vendor FEIN \_\_\_\_\_