RFI #00461

SKANSKA

Skanska USA Civil
1995 Agua Mansa Road
Riverside, California 92509

Project: 90009590 - I-405 - Brickyard to SR527
Bothell, Washington 98011

BY-CRE-02874_009727_RFI_00461_16.03.01_405 103E Seismic Retrofit and Widening

TO:	Nancy Alpuche **(Washington State Department of Transportation)** Rachel Gehrlein **(Washington State Department of Transportation)** Ron Haukom **(Washington State Department of Transportation)** Sokha Men **(Washington State Department of Transportation)**	**FROM:**	Sammy Tu **(AECOM (Seattle))**
DATE INITIATED:	06/17/2025	**STATUS:**	Closed on 06/25/25
LOCATION:		**DUE DATE:**	07/02/2025
COST CODE:		**REFERENCE:**	
COST IMPACT:		**SCHEDULE IMPACT:**	
DRAWING NUMBER:		**SPEC SECTION:**	
PRIORITY:			
LINKED DRAWINGS:			
RECEIVED FROM:			

COPIES TO:
Ryan Abraham **(AECOM (Seattle))**, Nancy Alpuche **(Washington State Department of Transpor)**, Sonia Berriz **(Washington State Department of Transpor)**, Marisa Chong **(Washington State Department of Transpor)**, Document Control - Skanska **(Skanska USA Civil West)**, Rachel Gehrlein **(Washington State Department of Transpor)**, Ron Haukom **(Washington State Department of Transpor)**, Janka Lovering **(Washington State Department of Transpor)**, Zachary Lucarelli **(Skanska USA Civil West)**, Sokha Men **(Washington State Department of Transpor)**, Michelle Petterson **(Skanska USA Civil West)**, Jacob Schmidt **(Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC)**, Bradford Shaffer **(AECOM Technical Services Inc.)**, Kyle Sharrer **(Skanska USA Civil West)**

RFI Response Date	**Estimated Hours**
RFI Priority	**RFI Type**

Question from Sammy Tu (AECOM (Seattle)) at 07:10 PM on 06/17/2025

The Design-Build (DB) Team respectfully submits this Request for Information (RFI) to clarify our position regarding the structural approach for the widening of Bridge 405/103E and the protection of the existing culvert, as referenced in the ATC exhibits and contract documents.

Due to the highly environmentally sensitive protected waterway, the absence of as-built drawings, and further investigation of existing conditions, the design-build team has determined that safely protecting the existing culvert as it passes through the shear wall, as shown in the ATC exhibits, is not feasible. Instead, our proposed bridge widening approach includes installing a pile cap with a shear wall above the existing culvert, supported by small-diameter shafts to minimize impacts. We believe the "Proposed RFP Modifications" outlined in the ATC and other contract provisions support this solution, and no additional DBICs are required.

The DB Team's position is the contract documents do not require the existing substructure of 103E to be connected to the widened substructure of 103E. The superstructure of the widened portion of 103E will be structurally connected to the existing superstructure of 103E by the reinforced concrete deck and diaphragm closure strips between the existing outside girder and the new adjacent girder. The bridge widening and superstructure connection will be designed to meet the contract design requirements. The substructure of the widened portion of 103E, including pier caps, will be separate from the existing substructure and designed accordingly per the contract design requirements.

We respectfully request confirmation from WSDOT that this interpretation aligns with the intent of the contract documents and that no further DBICs are necessary for this approach.

Attachments:

BY-CRE-02874_009727_RFI_00461_16.03.01_405 103E Seismic Retrofit and Widening.pdf

Official Response: **Sokha Men (Washington State Department of Transportation)** *responded on Wednesday, June 25th, 2025 at 12:51PM PDT*

WSDOT's interpretation is that the change proposed would require a DBIC. The ATC states that a pier wall will be provided for Piers 2 and 3 as shown in Figure 2 (attached).

Figure 2 shows the following: See attached.

The proposed approach presented in the RFI is not what the ATC was based on or approved. WSDOT will note that the infill shear walls were required in the Contract as liquefaction mitigation and would be supportive of a DBIC that removed the infill shear walls due to the updated information provided through the geotechnical boring program.

Attachments:

Screenshot 2025-06-25 124825.png

BY **DATE** **COPIES TO**