Clarifications No. 1 July 5, 2011 – Fresno 180 Braided Ramps Design-Build Project Contract No. 06-0C1104

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
1	3	General		Drainage - Can Caltrans make available all preliminary drainage reports available for the proposed improvements?	No preliminary drainage reports are available. Design-Builder will need to generate the drainage calculations and reports for this project.
2	4	General		Are the finished grade drawings available in any format?	Finished grade drawings have been provided in both PDF and DGN formats.
3	4	ITP		We have two members of our team who are no longer available for the project. What is the procedure, required for these changes?	The procedure is defined in Section 1.10 "Change in Proposer's Organization" of the Instructions to Proposers.
4	3	ITP	Section 3,7.1 Submittal of ATC	This says ATC due date-refer to section 2. Section 2 does not have a due date. Please provide ATC due date.	The ATC Submittal Due Date is July 20, 2011. Addendum No. 1 will reflect this information.
5	4	ITP	Section 3.7.2 P. 16	What is the review time of an ATC? Since this is low bid, the Department should put a back stop date for when all ATCs will be responded to, because an ATC could significantly impact the Price.	Department intends to provide timely responses to proposed ATCs. Response times to ATCs will depend upon complexity and completeness of the proposed ATC.
6	3	Book 2	Section 1.3	Basic Configuration - Section 1.3.1 of Book 2 states the "Preliminary Design Drawings" provided in the RID convey the general intent of the project. Can you confirm that the referenced "Preliminary Design Drawings" are the "06-0C110-Fre-180-RFP-Conceptual-Plans.pdf"– PDF File in the RID folder?	Yes, confirmed.
7	3	Book 2	Section 2 P.12	The RFP states that the CAiCE file format be used for design submittals. However, CAiCE is no longer widely used. It is requested that Caltrans either makes CAiCE optional or allow design submittals be submitted in formats such as InRoads or others that are more widely used.	Final drawings and survey data are to be submitted to the Department in Microstation and CAiCE format, respectively. Work may be done on other systems as long as they can be converted to these required formats.
8	4	Book 2	12.3.5.4 P. 12-5	In section 12.3.5.4, it states "Roadside open channels shall not be used on this Project unless otherwise approved by Department." However, the preliminary plan shows a swale/open channel on each side of SR180. Is open channel allowed?	"Open channels are not permitted unless otherwise approved by the Department." Proposers may consider the proposed swales shown in the preliminary plans as acceptable to the Department.

Clarifications No. 1 July 5, 2011 – Fresno 180 Braided Ramps Design-Build Project Contract No. 06-0C1104

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
9	2	Book 2	13.3.4 P. 13-3	Need Bridge Inspection Report for the existing First Street UC.	Bridge Inspection Report has been posted to the RID.
10	3	Book 2	Section 16.3.1.7, Pg. 16-7 Section 16.3.1.2, Pg. 16-4	In Book 2, Sec. 16.3.1.7, it states "Do not attach signs to any bridge structure unless no alternative exists." Sec. 16.3.1.2 states "Replace all existing signs not meeting current sign standards..." There are existing signs within the project limits that do not meeting current standards and are mounted on existing bridges. In order to replace the signs at these locations, new brackets would have to be attached to the existing bridges to mount the new sign panels. Is this acceptable? Or is the intent to remove the existing signs from bridges and replace them with new sign panels on new structures nearby?	New sign brackets would be an acceptable solution.
11	2	Book 2	Section 20 P. 20-1	What is the future Bicycle and Pedestrian plan in this area?	There are no future bicycle and pedestrian plans within the project area.
12	4	Book 3	Section 1 P.18	Will Caltrans Standard Plans and Specifications requirements change to be 2010?	2010 Standard Plans and Specifications will not be implemented on this project.
13	4	Book 3	Section 1 P.20	The Caltrans Cadd Manual states that Microstation V8 DGN files are acceptable for submittals. This is contrary to all references in the RFP where Microstation SE is stated as the file format for submittals. It is requested that the RFP change to allow V8 files to be accepted.	V8 files are acceptable.
14	3	RID		Are there any compaction test reports for the existing embankments and pavement subgrades?	None available.

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
15	3	RID		Are the R-value test results referenced in the letter dated 3-3-2010 available?	The basement soil design R-value of 50 was used to design the structural sections. This was based upon R-values of soil samples obtained from the project site for the previous project, PM R58.4/R61.0, and is in accordance with Section 614.3 of the Highway Design Manual. There are no available specific locations of soil samples for the braided ramp project. For ramps to be constructed on fill, the R-value of the imported borrow placed within 4 feet of the finished grade shall have an R-value of not less than 50.
16	3	RID		As-built plans for the bridges show 16" dia. CIDH piles, while cost estimate for braided ramp bridges references 24" dia CIDH piles. Is there a reason for this change?	Note No. 2 on the Advanced Planning Study (APS) "N5" and "S5" stated that the 24" CIDH were **assumed** values and they are used on cost estimate only.
17	3	RID	0c11a.zip	CAiCE design files - We have reviewed the CAiCE files provided in the RID and do not find horizontal or vertical alignments nor a proposed design DTM (finish grade) surface. Please provide this information.	The horizontal alignments are indicated on the dgn files. These alignments are for reference only. Design-Builder will need to adjust them as needed. As for the DTM (finish grade) surface, Design-Builder will be required to generate them.
18	3	RID	Memorandum, Structural Section Recommendations	Geotech -Pavement Design One of the RID documents entitled "Memorandum, Structural Section Recommendations," authored by Ted Mooradian, Chief, Central Region Materials Engineering Branch – Fresno, dated March 3, 2010, includes the basement soil design R-value as 50, based on R-values of soil samples obtained from the project site. Since test data are not included in the March 3, 2010 Memorandum, will these data (sample locations and test results) be available for review by the Design-Builder to formulate the bid submittal?	The basement soil design R-value of 50 was used to design the structural sections. This was based upon R-values of soil samples obtained from the project site for the previous project, PM R58.4/R61.0, and is in accordance with Section 614.3 of the Highway Design Manual. There are no available specific locations of soil samples for the braided ramp project. For ramps to be constructed on fill, the R-value of the imported borrow placed within 4 feet of the finished grade shall have an R-value of not less than 50.
19	3	RID		Traffic - Can Caltrans make available the existing traffic counts for Route 180 (EB & WB) between Rte 41 and Rte 168 and all connector ramps for both the 180/41 and 180/168 interchanges?	Available traffic counts have been posted to the RID.

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
20	3	RID	NA	Are there any Geotechnical Investigations that accompany the boring logs for the existing structures?	Available Geotechnical Investigations have been posted to the RID.
21	3	RID	Memorandum, Structural Section Recommendations	Geotech -Pavement Design The March 3, 2010 Memorandum on Structural Section Recommendations presents rigid pavement alternatives consisting of jointed plain concrete pavement (JPCP) placed on 0.35 foot of lean concrete base (LCB) or 0.25 foot of hot mix asphalt aggregate base (HMAB). The base component (LCB or HMAB) of these recommended sections appears to be thinner than required in the Highway Design Manual (HDM), Chapter 620. Are the final design structural sections required to comply with the HDM as outlined in Section 21, Pavements, of the Project Requirements, Book 2 dated May 26, 2011?	For all projects, the thickness of LCB and HMA placed underneath the rigid pavement shall be 0.35 foot and 0.25 foot respectively. This is according to Pavement Policy Bulletin 09-01. This bulletin was approved on August 27, 2009 and supersedes what is currently found in Section 623 (i.e., Tables 623.1B to 623.1M) of the Highway Design Manual.