Project No. WA NP MORA 11(1),
Project Fryingpan Creek Bridge

#	General	Technical	Question	Answer	Date
	Check General or Technical				
1	X		Could you tell me when the Frying Pan Bridge Project is scheduled to be advertised for bid? The original plan was December 2025.	We are now anticipating a Spring 2026 (April/May) advertisement.	2/20/26
2		X	SCR 105.02(a) requires harvesting raw rock from the Stevens Canyon Road avalanche chutes "before Memorial Day weekend" each year, but also states access will only be granted "once the Park has cleared the road in May." In recent years, what has been the typical road opening date for Stevens Canyon Road, and how should bidders plan for years when the road opens close to Memorial Day weekend?	The public road opening for Stevens Canyon Road is set for May 22 this year; typically the Park clears the road for admin traffic one to two weeks ahead of public road opening; during this time the contractor would be able to access the road for avalanche chute harvesting. The raw rock is a supplemental resource and the existing bridge rock shall be used first. The existing bridge rock will require the contractor to cut, split, and shape the rock. We will be drafting an Amendment to clarify that the Contractor is to "utilize stones conserved from existing structures. Source additional stones from the avalanche chutes as needed"	5/20/26
3		X	SCR 575.03 limits temporary bridge foundation piles to no more than 16 piles between OHWM limits, and requires design for 100-year water surface plus 5 feet of freeboard. Has the government performed a hydraulic analysis establishing the 100-year WSE at the bridge site, and if so, can that elevation and the associated scour data be made available to bidders to support temporary work bridge design?	OHW for 100-year WSE is shown on Sheet G.2. Scour data is available in the Hydraulics Report in the physical data	5/20/26
4		X	SCR 156.04 allows full road closures up to 8 times for 6 hours each for blasting and girder setting. Does the government anticipate any preferred closure windows (e.g., overnight, weekday daytime) to minimize impact, and can closures be approved consecutively (e.g., two 6-hour closures back-to-back for an overnight 12-hour window)?	No night work allowed, and no back-to-back (e.g. no 7am to 7pm). 6 hours per calendar day during daytime is allowed for full road closures.	5/20/26

5		X	The USACE permit drawings (NWS-2025-0362 sheets H-71 through H-76) lay out a specific three-season construction sequence: Season 1 abutments and majority of riprap, Season 2 girder erection and deck, Season 3 existing bridge demolition and final riprap. How much flexibility does the contractor have to propose an alternate construction sequence, or to revise the means and methods shown in the permit drawings (for example, work bridge configuration, stream diversion footprint, or temporary girder erection foundation layout), as long as the proposed approach stays within the permitted impact footprint and timing windows? Specifically, if the contractor identifies a more efficient sequence, does the government require a permit modification through the original permitting authorities (USACE, EPA, USFS, USFWS, NMFS, NPS), or can changes be approved at the CO level under SCR 104.03 submittal authority?	Construction sequence must fall within the permitted allowances and comply with all conditions as stated in SCR 107.10	5/20/26
6		X	Permit Drawing H-75 (NWS-2025-0362, sheet 18/19) shows a "Timber Pads Alternative" with a Directly Affected impact of 168 SQFT during existing bridge demolition. NWP 14 explicitly authorizes "temporary mats" as part of the permitted activity, subject to the overall 1/2-acre NWP 14 cap. For the existing bridge demolition described in SCR 203.04, the contractor anticipates requiring approximately 2,000 SF of temporary timber crane mats to support a crawler crane and rigging operations inside the isolated, dewatered zone (mats placed on existing streambed, removed in their entirety at completion, with full streambed restoration). Will the government confirm that this scope of temporary timber mat use is within the existing NWP 14 authorization given the temporary nature of the mats and the cumulative project impacts remain below the 1/2-acre cap? If a permit modification is required, will the government coordinate the modification with USACE Seattle District, or is it the contractor's responsibility?	Timber mats fall may under the Corps allowance of one half acre for mats, provided that the mats minimize compaction and do not require ground disturbance when placing them. The contractor will be required to provide a detail of the timber matts and also show the footprint of these timber mats on design drawings in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan."	5/20/26

7	X		With the complexity of this project, quantity of subcontractors/suppliers involved, and two different bid schedules, would there be consideration to add a week or two to the turn-in date?	This will be addressed by Amendment A002.	5/29/26
8		X	Please provide weld size and locations for the anchor rod shear plates (sheet S.19) on the elastomeric bearing assemblies.	This will be addressed by Amendment A002.	5/29/26
9	X		Could I get a list of Prime bidders for this project	The Government does not provide this since bidders may obtain the registered vendors list (aka planholders list) from sam.gov after linking their entity to their registration. If you are signed into SAM.gov with your registered entity and you cannot see the Interested Vendors List, you will need to be assigned the Contract Opportunities Administrator role for your entity in SAM.gov. Go to https://www.fsd.gov/gsafsd_sp if you need additional assistance.	6/1/26
10	X		In light of the complexity of the civil and structural portions of the project, we request the bid date be extended a minimum of two weeks, if possible, to ensure we can put together a responsive bid.	See Amendment A002 for updated bid due date.	6/1/26
11		X	The drilled shaft detail on sheet RG3283-F (bridge drawing 6 of 46) shows the 48” ID permanent casing extending down to the top of bedrock elevation (as interpreted from the nearby borings). The diameter of the drilled shaft below the casing is not called out, but appears to match the ID of the permanent casing. It will be challenging to extend the casing through the very hard rock. Will it be acceptable to reduce the diameter of the shaft below the permanent casing to 42” to allow the use of conventional rock tooling with adequate clearance inside the casing? The diameter of the rebar cage would need to be reduced as well. Alternatively, could the contractor upsize the permanent casing to a larger ID so that a 48” rock tool can be used with adequate clearance?	Reducing the concrete diameter shown in the plans is not allowed. Bid accordingly for casing installation requirements conforming to Section 565.	5/29/26

12		X	Is the agency going to pay force account rates for extra work associated with dealing with rock obstructions while Drilled Shaft, 48-inch Diameter, per Bid Item B1000 (5601-0600), and for driving piles associated with the Temporary Bridge, per Bid Item B1020 (57502-0000)? Can the agency add a bid item to address underground rock obstructions, similar to other Federal Highway projects, typically referred to as Pay Item Number 20306-0100, Removal of Structures and Obstructions, to pay for the extra work associated with these underground boulders	No separate pay item will be provided for drilled shaft constuction. Difficult drilling in cobbles and boulder-size materials down to bedrock are expected the full length of the drilling; therefore, boulders will not be considered obstructions. Bid accordingly. Design for the Temporary Bridge foundations should consider the difficult driving conditions and limited embedment if driven piles are proposed. Shallow foundations are also an option.	5/29/26
13		X	Specification 104.05 states: "Unless otherwise permitted, do not operate equipment or vehicles that exceed the AASHTO legal load limits and 80,000 pounds total Gross Vehicle Weight over new or existing structures." The same specification references the Fryingpan Creek Bridge inspection report and requires compliance with the Fryingpan Creek Bridge load rating. The contract documents also include the FLH Bridge Oversized/Overweight Permit Load Request Form. Please clarify whether vehicles exceeding 80,000 pounds GVW may cross the existing Fryingpan Creek Bridge subject to review and approval through the FLH/NPS oversized/overweight permit process, or whether 80,000 pounds GVW is intended to be the maximum allowable crossing weight for the existing Fryingpan Creek Bridge.	Overload considerations are allowed conforming to Subsection 104.05.	5/29/26

14		X	The contract drawings provide a detailed plan, profile, and typical section for MSE Wall 01 at Abutment 1, including wall limits, elevations, and geometry necessary for quantity takeoff. At Abutment 2, the bridge and roadway plans depict stone-faced wall features adjacent to the abutment; however, we are unable to locate corresponding plan and profile information defining wall limits, wall heights, wall area, reinforced soil zone limits, or other information necessary to determine quantities and construction requirements. Please provide the plan/profile information and quantity basis for the wall system at Abutment 2, or confirm that no additional MSE wall or reinforced soil structure is required beyond that represented by the bid quantities.	An amendment will be issued to update plans and quantity basis for MSE wall at Abutment 2	5/29/26
15		X	Spec 575.03 states: "Limit the number of temporary piles for temporary bridges or work platforms placed between OHWM limits to no more than 16 piles." Please clarify whether the 16-pile limit applies only to temporary bridge/work platform foundations, or if the limit is intended to include all temporary piles installed between the OHWM limits, including piles supporting demolition towers, erection towers, falsework, shoring, or other temporary construction support systems.	The limit is intended for all temporary piles installed below OHWM.	5/29/26

16		X	Plans call for 48” ID permanent casing ½” wall thickness. Because most oscillator casing used is measured in metric the closest size available to 48” ID is 1.2M OD or 3.94’ inside of this casing measures 44.09 in. Due to the elevation of assumed drill pad elevation being approximately 21’ above top of shaft elevation additional casing will be required to provide hole protection. Either sacrificial casing in 48” ID will need to be provided or the ability to use 1.2M permanent casing allows the use of temporary casing in the upper 21’ to remain for hole protection until the excavation can be made to access top of shaft at which time the temp casing can be retrieved. Due to the presence of boulders and cobbles and the fact that the tip of the shaft will encounter 18k psi diorite rock, ½” wall casing without the use of a drive shoe will likely damage or fold the permanent casing in at the bottom. Please advise whether 1.2M casing is acceptable for use?	Provide a 48" diameter concrete shaft as shown in the plans. Minimum casing geometry is shown in the plans, bid accordingly.	6/2/26
17		X	Please identify how and what will be considered an obstruction while performing the drilled shaft scope of work. How will compensation for a drilled shaft obstruction be compensated ?	See the geotechnical report for subsurface information and bid accordingly. Boulders are expected throughout the drilling and will not be considered obstructions. No additional compensation will be provided.	6/2/26
18		X	A 48’’ Dia 1/2’’ Wall Casing is called out in the plans. This seems a little light for the depth and anticipated soils called out in the Geotechnical report. Is this the correct casing size or should we assume we have to use something larger that would hold up to the torque it will take in order to get these drilled in?	The casing wall thickness is a minimum. Contractor can use a thicker casing at their option.	6/3/26
19		X	5/8” fillet weld seems excessive and could potentially cause plate distortion. Is this the correct weld size? Is the UT, RT designation in the weld symbol a drafting error and should inspection be noted as MT as is required AASHTO/AWS D1.5 standard? Please specify extent of MT testing 30% or 100%	Provide weld testing conforming to AASHTO/AWS D1.5. Amendment 3 will update plan sheets.	6/4/26
20		X	Permit drawings show temporary work bridge constructed only in Season 2 for use in girder setting. Is it possible to utilize it for more than one season?	Temporary work bridge is allowed in years 2027, 2028, and 2029 according to 107.10(f)(1).	6/3/26

21		X	104.05 states loads exceeding 80,000# GVW cannot cross new or existing bridge. Shaft drilling and potentially demolition will require getting cranes to the west side that exceed 80,000 GVW. Will there be a way to allow larger loads to cross either new or existing structure? If not, is temporary work bridge permitted in multiple season and multiple locations?	Overload vehicles may be considered for approval conforming to 104.05.	6/3/26
22		X	203.04 states "All work to remove the existing Fryingpan Creek Bridge is to be completed from above the ordinary high water mark. Only hand powered tools and work crews are allowed below the ordinary high water mark to assist in removal of the existing substructure and temporary works." Does this mean that no equipment is allowed beneath OHW at any point? If so, what is the planned procedure for constructing/removing the temporary stream diversions, excavations, log placement, and shoring towers for existing girder removal?	Amendment 3 will update this section of the Specifications to clarify that: Only hand powered tools and work crews are allowed below the ordinary high water mark to assist in removal of the existing substructure and temporary works. Where removal of the existing Fryingpan Creek Bridge requires work below ordinary high water, perform work during the in-water work period according to Subsection 107.10 and within the area isolated by temporary diversion according to Subsection 157.10.	6/3/26
23		X	Do the temporary stream diversions have to be placed in the exact same locations as shown in the Permitting Plan Set or is the quantity of impacts shown in the Permitting Plan Set tables more representative of the guidelines for our impacts below OHW?	Contractor may vary design of temporary stream diversions as approved, as long as they stay within the construction limits identified on the plan sheets not exceed 4.92 acres of wetland impacts, and do not exceed quantities of permitted impacts identified in Section H.	6/3/26
24		X	I looked through the documents but was unsure if this project requires any drilling, blasting, or explosive demolition. Do you forsee a need for any of these services in this project?	Drilling is anticipated. Blasting or explosive demolition is not expected to be required, but was not ruled out as a means and methods. Therefore, some specifications relate to blasting / explosives, should they be used.	6/3/26
25		X	On plan sheet 29 of 46, Deck Pour Sequence Note 6 indicates that the sidewalk most be poured in the same placement as the bridge deck. Plan sheet 28 of 46 appears to show a construction joint between the sidewalk and the bridge deck. Is it allowable to pour the bridge sidewalk in a separate pour?	Alternative sequences may be submitted to the CO for approval according to Note 5 on S.29.	6/8/26
26		X	We are allowed to obtain rock for the stone curb and fascia per the plans and specifications at the avalanche chutes on Stevens Canyon Road. Is it allowable to harvest the rock both above and below the roadway?	Rock may only be harvested above roadway and conforming to Section 620.	6/8/26

27		X	Once the road is plowed do we have full access to the road (i.e. is it closed to all other traffic) until Memorial Day?	This has been addressed with previous bidder questions, and Amendment 1 clarified rock sourcing requirements. Stones should be salvaged from the existing bridge before using the avalanche chutes (including the fascia and stone curbs). This requirement is in Section 620.	6/8/26
28		X	Is BI 1220: Simulated Stone Masonry Surface Treatment for the formliner purchase/install for the simulated stone surface treatments of Schedule A bridge shaft cap front/side face, abutment front/side face, and wingwall side faces, as shown in the plans? If so, is 180 SQYD the appropriate quantity?	Simulated Stone Masonry Surface Treatment pay item is only measured at the MSE walls up to the wingwall joints. See Note 3 on Sheet S.03, the quantities for the wingwall and abutment wall surfaces are paid for under bridge concrete. See Amendment A003 for updated MSE wall quantities and the H Sheets for an illustration of the measurement limits (Amendment A003 includes these sheets).	6/8/26
29		X	For the MSE wall soil reinforcement, will you accept Tensar high-density polyethylene geogrid for the soil reinforcement?	No geosynthetics will be accepted for MSE wall reinforcement. Provide hot-dipped galvanized steel mesh reinforcement integrated with the steel facing as shown in the H sheets and specifications sections 255 and 257.	6/9/26
30		X	Does the temporary work bridge need to be removed each season or can it be left in place for an entire year or more, as long as it is removed in the in-water work window?	The temporary work bridge may remain in place for up to three consecutive construction seasons according to Subsection 575.0.	6/9/26
31		X	With the in-water work window only being 7/15-8/15 and the stream diversion work for each of the seasons, is it anticipated that diversions remain in place until the following year's in-water work window for removal or is the stream diversion allowed to be removed outside of the allotted one month in-water work window?	IWWW is 6/15 to 8/15. Diversions need to be removed at the end of each construction season.	6/9/26
32		X	As engineers studying the your report referenced below since 2001 and all updates, curious if there is a technical reason for this requirement? Source: Publication No. FHWA-NHI-00-043 / NHI Course No. 132042, 2001 MECHANICALLY STABILIZED EARTH WALLS AND REINFORCED SOIL SLOPES DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION GUIDELINES	Please bid according to the solicitation documents.	6/11/26

33		X	As a follow up to Question #11 and #16, to accommodate a 48” OD permanent casing, contractor may chooses to use oversized temporary casing down to the rock elevation, is grouting of the annulus between the 48” OD permanent casing and the actual shaft diameter (based on temp casing size) required? If so, please provide grout requirements.	The rock socket diameter below the permanent casing elevations at Elev. B on sheet S.06 may be minimum diameter of 1.2 m or 3.9375 feet. The casing used can be larger than 48" and remain in place, thus filling the extra diameter with drilled shaft concrete. The primary purpose of the permanent casing is provide containment of the drilled shaft concrete in the expected large voids in the coarse subsurface materials (boulders, cobbles, etc.). If two casings are used, the annulus between them should be filled with either drilled shaft concrete or flowable backfill (lean concrete) meeting the requirements of FP-24 section 614.	6/11/26
34		X	Section 156 gives details on full road closures, but is silent on single lane closures. There are single lane closures in the drawings, including both signalized and flagged. Is the intent to allow single lane closures the duration of the project, outside of the full closure timeframes? If not, what are the restrictions for single lane closures?	Single-lane closures with alternate one-way control are allowed outside of full closure timeframes if restrictions under Subsection 156.07 are satisfied.	6/15/26
35		X	Is all rebar on the project included in the bid items A0900/ A0920 and B0900/B0920, respectively or is there rebar incidental to other bid items? Also, we are estimating more rebar weight than is shown in those bid items, so please confirm if the rebar quantities shown in the bid schedule are final pay quantities or if payment is made on actual poundage placed.	No specific reinforcement detail is provided. The simulated stone surface treatment is a Contractor-designed component per 257.06. See Subsection 109.05(b) for Indirect Payment, note any item is not directly paid for, the work is subsidiary to the Contract.	6/15/26
36		X	Please confirm if two separate test walls are to be constructed, per bid item A1240, one MSE Test Wall and one CIP test wall, each showing the simulated stone facing.	A1240 is for one (1) simulated stone masonry test wall conforming to Section 613. No separate MSE Test Wall is required.	6/12/26
37		X	Is there a rebar or mesh detail for the simulated stone masonry surface treatment facing for the MSE Wall? Is this bar/mesh incidental to the simulated stone masonry surface treatment bid item?	No specific reinforcement detail is provided. The simulated stone surface treatment is a Contractor-designed component per 257.06. See Subsection 109.05(b) for Indirect Payment, note any item is not directly paid for, the work is subsidiary to the Contract.	6/12/26