



## CITY OF ATLANTA

SUITE 1900

55 TRINITY AVENUE, SW

ATLANTA, GA 30303

(404) 330-6204 Fax: (404) 658-7705

Internet Home Page: [www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

Kasim Reed  
Mayor

DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT  
Adam L. Smith, Esq., CPPO, CPPB, CPPM, CPP,  
CIPC, CISCC, CIGPM, CPPC  
Chief Procurement Officer  
[asmith@atlantaga.gov](mailto:asmith@atlantaga.gov)

January 27, 2016

Dear Potential Proponents:

**Re: FC-8430, Design-Build Northside Drive Pedestrian Bridge**

Attached is one (1) copy of **Addendum No. 10**, which is hereby made a part of the above-referenced project.

For additional information, please contact Lloyd A. Richardson, Contract Administrator, at (404) 864-8504, or by email at [larichardson@atlantaga.gov](mailto:larichardson@atlantaga.gov).

Sincerely,

Adam L. Smith

ALS/lar



**ADDENDUM NO. 10**

This Addendum No. 10 forms a part of the Request for Proposals and modifies the original solicitation package and any prior Addenda as noted below and is issued to incorporate the following:

- **Questions and Answers**  
Total of thirty-four (34) questions attached hereto as Attachment No. 1.
- **Proposal Due Date**  
The Proposal due date has been extended to **Wednesday, February, 3, 2016 at 2:00 P.M. EST.**
- **Revision of Part 3, Evaluation of Proposals**  
Part 3, Evaluation of Proposals is hereby removed and replaced with a new Part 3 dated 1/27/15 attached hereto as Attachment No. 2.

Addendum No. 10 for FC-8430, Design-Build Northside Drive Pedestrian Bridge is available for pick-up in the Plan Room: City Hall, 55 Trinity Avenue, Suite 1900.

**The Proposal due date HAS been modified and Proposals are due on Wednesday, February, 3, 2016 and should be time stamped in no later than 2:00 P.M. EST and delivered to the address listed below:**

Adam L. Smith, Esq., CPPO, CPPB, CPPM,  
CPP, CIPC, CISCC, CIGPM, CPPC  
Chief Procurement Officer  
Department of Procurement  
55 Trinity Avenue, S. W.  
City Hall South, Suite 1900  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

**\*\* All other pertinent information is to remain unchanged\*\***

**FC-8430, Design-Build Northside Drive Pedestrian Bridge**  
**Addendum No. 10**  
**January 27, 2016**  
**Page 3**

**Acknowledgment of Addendum No. 10**

Proponents must sign below and return this form with your proposal to the Department of Procurement, 55 Trinity Avenue, City Hall South, Suite 1900, Atlanta, Georgia 30303, as acknowledgment of receipt of this Addendum.

This is to acknowledge receipt of **Addendum No. 10, FC-8430, Design-Build Northside Drive Pedestrian Bridge** on this the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 201\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Legal Company Name of Proponent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Authorized Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# **Attachment No. 1**

---

QUESTIONS

&

ANSWERS

Question 1: Has a SUE investigation been performed by the City of Atlanta? If so, will the city make that report available to the bidders?

*Answer: SUE was performed by Arcadis and it is incorporated into the utility plan (addendum #7) and scope of work (addendum #8).*

Question 2: Is the contractor responsible for any of the cost of the utility relocations?

*Answer: No.*

Question 3: Please confirm that the liquidated damages for this project will be \$1,500 per day.

*Answer: Yes.*

Question 4: Has the City contacted anyone at the Georgia DOT about this project? If so, will the city provide a point of contact?

*Answer: City has contacted GDOT and GDOT contact person is:  
J. Brad Humphrey  
GDOT, District 7 Traffic Operations Manager  
(City of Atlanta, Clayton, Douglas, S. Fulton Counties)  
5025 New Peachtree Rd.  
Chamblee, GA 30341  
770-986-1768 (Office)  
770-986-1407 (Fax)  
[jhumphrey@dot.ga.gov](mailto:jhumphrey@dot.ga.gov)*

Question 5: Has the City had discussions with the GDOT specifically about the lighting of the bridge and how that may affect the visual approach to the traffic signal for drivers?

*Answer: City of Atlanta will be responsible for the traffic signals.*

Question 6: Who is the owner/operator of the traffic signal on the project?

*Answer: City of Atlanta*

Question 7: There is a parking lot on the east side of Northside Drive between the old and new dome that appears to be within the needed construction zone. Are there any restrictions or considerations to take into account concerning this parking lot when preparing our proposals?

*Answer: After visiting the site, we expect that this parking lot will eventually be changed into a brick paver. City is not aware of any restrictions as at now, but coordination with Stadium contractors will be needed during bridge construction.*

Question 8: To what extent will the bridge contractor be required to "tie in" to the site work being done by the stadium contractor on the east side of Northside drive (regarding sidewalks/brick pavers/etc)?

*Answer: Repair the sidewalk/brickpavers that was damaged during bridge construction.*

- Question 9: What considerations or restrictions should the bidders make concerning the demolition of the old Georgia Dome and how that may interfere with our work?  
*Answer: There is about 20ft clearance between new bridge footprint and old dome. The bridge contractor needs to coordinate with demolition contractor about the schedule when they are on board.*
- Question 10: To what extent has the city discussed the relocation of the utilities with the utility owners in the area?  
*Answer: Concrete deck*
- Question 11: Who is determining the amount of the landscape allowance?  
*Answer: The Design Builder should make this determination. The allowance should be part of the proposed lump sum amount.*
- Question 12: Does the city own the vacant lot across the street (south) from the MARTA parking lot?  
*Answer: This is private property.*
- Question 13: Page 7 of addendum #8 requires the contractor to provide an equal number of parking spots for MARTA as their current lot and within 100 yards of the existing lot during construction. Is the city going to identify and provide easements/ROW for this parking area? Will these parking spaces have to be paved? (Please note that the entire block where the parking lot is now will be needed by the contractor for construction. This requirement may not be achievable due to lack of public ROW in the area.)  
*Answer: This requirement will be removed.*
- Question 14: Page 8 of addendum 8 states the MARTA parking lot must be reconstructed as part of the project. Can the city identify the ground clearance requirements under the bridge which will be required for this parking lot.  
*Answer: The contractor need to work with design consultant to determine this issue.*
- Question 15: Will MARTA require railroad flagmen for any portion of the work on this project?  
*Answer: No.*
- Question 16: Tabel 4-1 starting on page 11 of addendum #8 lists over 330 days of review time for submittals, 150+ of those days could not be reviewed concurrently due to sequencing of submittals. Considering these review times, the likelihood of completing the project by the desired completion date is unlikely. Will the city consider reviewing these durations and commit to a shorter review period for submittals?  
*Answer: Yes. COA will expedite the review as soon as we can.*
- Question 17: Page 24 of addendum 8 requires the use of Class D concrete. Since this is a design build project, can alternate concrete mixes be used?  
*Answer: No. The contractor is required to follow design specifications.*
- Question 18: Page 28 of addendum 8 states that the bridge and ramp sections shall be clad with the custom standoff structure. Does this mean the entire face of the ramp walls is to receive the custom paneling or can we leave portions of the mse wall face exposed?  
*Answer: No.*

Question 19: Page 10 of addendum 8 states that no work is to begin until plans are issued for construction. Considering the timeframe of this project, we must be able to start on foundation and substructure work prior to the final plans being completed. Please address whether or not the city will allow work to begin prior to final plans being completed.

*Answer: The Design Consultant agrees and submit written request to the COA, COA will accept.*

Question 20: Part 1, Page 6, Item 2, Scope of Work – RFP states “Work to be rendered by the proponents to complete the project are provided in more detail in the Exhibit B – scope of work documents herein.” Is there an Exhibit B available for review? In addition, please confirm it is the intent of this RFP that each design-build proponent has the flexibility to create their own design solutions to achieve the program objectives outlined in the RFP.

*Answer: Exhibit B is no longer valid or relevant. Addendum #8 is latest scope of work. Yes, design-build proponent has flexibility to create their own design as long as the design meets the profile grade and alignment requirements of the bridge plan (addendum #7).*

Question 21: 2. Part 1, Page 4, Section 11, Georgia Utility Contractor’s License – The RFP states that the Proponent must have a Utility Contractors license and that the avenue for this license cannot be through a Utility subcontractor. The work outlined in this RFP looks to be work requiring the involvement of a General Contractor, not a utility contractor. Traditionally, a Utility Contractor’s License is not carried by the General Contractor but would in fact, be carried by the Utility Subcontractor. Therefore, please confirm it is acceptable to respond as a General Contractor Proponent with the Utility Contractor’s license being carried by the Subcontractor performing any required utility work.

*Answer: Yes, it is acceptable to have utility license carried by subcontractor.*

Question 22: 3. Part 2, Page 21, Item 3.2.4, Overall Experience, Qualification and Performance on Previous Projects – The RFP states “It is a requirement that the proponent have successfully completed at least three contracts involving pedestrian bridges with a construction value of not less than \$7,000,000 within the last ten years. In addition, one of the projects completed through a design-build delivery method with a “fast-track” construction approach.” It is believed this specific type of qualification may severely limit participation. Please confirm it is the City’s intent to engage a qualified Contractor with significant experience in pedestrian bridges and fast-track construction and that the City is open to reviewing these qualifications as part of proposal evaluation even if the qualifications do not meet all of the specific stipulations.

*Answer: We require the contractors to have bridge building experience and need not meet the qualifications described above.*

Question 23: 4. Part 2, Page 22, Item 3.2.4.3, Overall Experience, Qualification and Performance on Previous Projects – The RFP “Request that the proponent is able to identify design and/or construction contracts that involved recreational and aquatic facilities having a construction value at or exceeding \$10,000,000.” Please confirm if having construction experience in aquatic facilities of over \$10,000,000 a requirement to pursue the project.

*Answer: The contractor does not need to meet this requirement.*

- Question 24: 5. Exhibit B Scope of Work, Page 109, Project Description– References TVSDesign concept sketches as a basis of the proposal. The RFP also states that “this scope of work is limited to what is on the concept plan, any change from the concept drawings under the City’s direction shall be in change of scope.” Please confirm it is the intent of this RFP that each design-build proponent has the flexibility to create their own design solutions to achieve the program objectives outlined in the RFP.  
*Answer: Exhibit B is no longer valid or relevant. Refer to Addendum #7 and #8 as new design criteria. Yes, design-build proponent has flexibility to create their own design.*
- Question 25: 6. Exhibit B Scope of Work, Page 110, Item 6 – States the steel tube and steel mesh materials of the TVSDesign and add “The original architect may be involved in the review and approval process of the final shop drawings due to its look and complexity.” Please confirm if Proponent shall request Professional Services fees from TVSDesign to include in Proponent’s design-build proposal for the services referenced above. In addition, please confirm it is the intent of this RFP that each design-build proponent has the flexibility to create their own exterior skin design solutions to achieve the program objectives outlined in the RFP.  
*Answer: Refer to Addendum #7 and #8 as new design criteria. Yes, design-build proponent has flexibility to create their own design.*
- Question 26: 7. Exhibit B Scope of Work, Page 110, Exclusions from Proposal Scope, Item 6 – The RFP states to exclude any “Additional architectural features not shown in the concept plan.” Please confirm it is the City’s intent for designbuilders to include a complete design that accomplishes the program objectives outlined in the RFP.  
*Answer: Refer to Addendum #7 and #8 as new design criteria. Yes, design-build proponent need to provide a complete design to accomplish the project.*
- Question 27: 8. Scope of Work, Page 2, Item 10, Removal of Hazardous Waste or Contaminated Soils – The RFP requires removal of hazardous waste and contaminated soils by the Proponent. It does not seem feasible that the Proponent can conduct sufficient sub-surface exploration to determine the scope involved. Please confirm the City will accept a stipulated allowance for this potential scope of work pending award and further geotechnical studies.  
*Answer: Please refer to addendum #8 for latest scope of work.*
- Question 28: 9. Location of the bridge –Please confirm the City’s desired location for the East and West Bridge locations. Please confirm that the land on the East and West side are available without any land acquisition costs or lead time to Proponent.  
*Answer: Yes, no land acquisitions are required by proponent.*
- Question 29: 10. Eastern Site Boundary – The eastern landing for the Bridge will land on the current site for the Mercedes-Benz Stadium. It is important that each Proponent understand the site logistics for the Construction of the East side of the bridge given there is significant activity on-going in this area for the Mercedes-Benz stadium. Please provide a site logistics drawing showing the limits that Proponent will have available free and clear of stadium activities. Please confirm that provided site logistics plan is coordinated with Stadium Contractor as any misunderstanding could have significant cost and schedule impacts associated with this Proposal.

*Answer: The latest bridge footprint (addendum#7) has no conflict with the stadium construction.*

Question 30: 11. Existing Street Utilities – Based on existing conditions, it appears as though overhead power utilities are located within the relative footprint of the future pedestrian bridge. There is not sufficient time to work with utility companies to determine relocations required and routing options. Please confirm the City intends to carry the cost for any overhead electrical / telecommunications relocations.

*Answer: Yes. Utility owners will do relocation as required.*

Question 31: 12. Zoning – Please confirm that the City will secure any required Zoning, Planning, Downtown District DRC, NPU-M or other required Entitlement approvals for the pedestrian bridge required prior to submission of a building permit. It is our understanding that pedestrian bridges are not allowed in the zoning district SPI-1 (code sec. 16-18A.019). Additionally, please confirm that the City will lead any required public meetings.

*Answer: If necessary, city will obtain a variance for the pedestrian bridge.*

Question 32: 13. Permits – Please confirm if typical City of Atlanta demolition, land development, and building permits are required. Please confirm that permitting with the State Fire Marshall Office and GSFIC is NOT required.

*Answer: Design-build proponent is responsible for all construction permits. But permits with State Fire Marshall Office and GSFIC are not required.*

Question 33: 14. Permit Fees – Please confirm if the City will levy City of Atlanta Building permit fees for this project.

*Answer: No. No Building Permit Fees required*

Question 34: 15. Storm Ordinance – Please confirm if this project will be required to comply with the City of Atlanta ordinance for storm water improvements.

*Answer: No.*

# **Attachment No. 2**

---

## **Part 3, Evaluation of Proposals**

### Part 3; Evaluation of Proposals

All Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the City's Code of Ordinances and the criteria specified on the Percentage Evaluation Form and considering the information required to be submitted in each Proposal. An Evaluation Committee will review the Proposals in accordance with this RFP.

All Proposals will be evaluated using the following Evaluation Form:

<b>RELATIVE WEIGHT</b>	<b>GRADED ITEM</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
<b>5%</b>	<b>Executive Summary/Organizational Structure</b>	
<b>25%</b>	<b>Key Personnel, Overall Experience, Qualifications and Performance on Previous Projects</b>	
<b>5%</b>	<b>Management Plan</b>	
<b>20%</b>	<b>Conceptual Submittal (Project Approach)</b>	
<b>20%</b>	<b>Cost Proposal</b>	
<b>15%</b>	<b>OCC Programs</b>	
<b>10%</b>	<b>Financial Capability</b>	
<b>100%</b>	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	