Clarifications No. 3, August 2, 2011 – Fresno 180 Braided Ramps Design-Build Project Contract No. 06-0C1104

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
31	2	Addendum 1 Book 1 Exhibit E	Section D; P.3	Does the Designer/Builder have to carry the required "subconsultant responsible for the DBE/UDBE Performance Plan (the "Liaison Officer")" for the full length of the project or just until the 13.5% goal is met?	The subconsultant responsible for the DBE/UDBE Performance Plan (the "Liaison Officer") shall be carried for the full length of the project.
32	3	Addendum No. 2 - Book 2 and Transportation Management Plan Data Sheet	Section 1.3.3 and Connector Closure Chart 3 of 4 and 4 of 4	This section states "Replace existing AC pavements on "N3" approximate station 159+60 to station 182+64 and Route 180 approximate station 859+09 to station 871+20 with jointed plain concrete pavement (JPCP) with 20-year design." And "All new pavements shall be JPCP…" Connector Closure Charts only allows weekend closure. Use of only JPCP at the conforms will require more than a weekend to construct the conforms. Can AC pavement be used at the conforms with the branch connectors?	New Lane Closure Charts will be provided with Addendum No. 3.
33	2	Clarifications No.1 dated July 15, 2011	Response to RFC Nos. 15 & 18	Pavement Design – The response to these RFCs states "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." Our recent testing indicates on-site R-values as low as 41. What if the R-value of imported borrow or native material is less than 50? Can the pavement be designed in accordance to the latest Caltrans standards and criteria to accommodate the lower R-value?	Yes, the pavement can be designed in accordance to the latest Caltrans' standards and criteria to accommodate the lower R-value.
34	2	Book 1	9.0 or 10.0	Is Builders Risk or All Loss Insurance required? Since the bid form has a bid item break down for "Bonds and Insurance" is it Caltrans intention that 7105 for public works does not apply? Is the contractor to provide insurance per section 7 of the Standard Specifications?	Builders risk insurance is not required. PCC Section 7105 applies. Insurance requirements for this project are detailed in Section 9 of book 1.

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
35	4	Book 2	16.2.4 P. 16-3	SignCAD is listed as the design software for signs in Section 16.2.4 of Book 2. It doesn't seem that this software is available anymore. What is the alternate design software?	Microstation V8 to should be used to design signs.
36	2	Book 2	19.4 (P. 19-2 & 19-3)	Please clarify responsibilities for Litter removal and Graffiti removal. Is it the intent of Department for DB to be responsible only for Graffiti removal from constructed items and not from existing structures that are not part of the project construction? Please clarify who is responsible for litter removal.	The Design-Builder will be responsible for litter and graffiti removal within the project limits.
37	3	Book 2	2.5.2.2 (P.2-21 to 2-25)	Project will have very limited role for the "Visual Quality Manager". The Visual Quality Management Plan for this short 1.5 mile freeway segment will be based on matching existing SR180 corridor aesthetic and landscape design concepts. Development of new aesthetic theme or concepts are not required for this project. Please consider removal of this position from "Key Personnel" list and list only as Level B design staff position as Landscape Architect.	The Department has considered the issue presented by the Proposer and decided to not modify the position reflected in the RFP documents at this time. The Instructions to Proposers provide procedures for changing Proposer's organization.
38	3	Book 2	2.5.2.2 (P. 2-21 to 2-25)	Project has no utility conflicts or relocations. Please consider removing the Utilities Design Engineering/Coordination Manager" from "Key Personnel" list and list as Level B staff position (Utilities Design Engineer) and allow duties to be combined with other design staff position.	The Department has considered the issue presented by the Proposer and decided to not modify the position reflected in the RFP documents at this time. The Instructions to Proposers provide procedures for changing Proposer's organization.
39	4	Book 2	6.2.1 P. 6-1	Utility Information Sheet (UIS) are referenced in Section 6.2.1 of Book 2. These are not in the RID. Can these be provided?	Utility Information Sheet (UIS) are not available for this project. The Department has not identified any utility conflict during its preliminary work.
40	3	Book 2	Section 39	Will Caltrans consider including the Asphalt Oil Index specification?	The Department has considered the issue presented by the Proposer and decided to not modify the position reflected in the RFP documents at this time.

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
41	4	ITP	Appendix A; P. 32	ITP Page 32, Appendix A: Acronyms and Definitions, Definition of Major Participant. As part of the definition for Major Participant, the RFP includes: "All individuals, persons, proprietorships, partnerships, limited liability partnerships, corporations, professional corporations, limited liability companies, business associations, or other legal entity however organized, holding (directly or indirectly) a 15% or greater equity interest in the Proposer." The current definition could mean that Proposers would need to submit all of the materials required for "Major Participants" for all Parent Companies and/or Shareholders who have at least a 15% equity interest in the Proposer. It does not seem to be Caltrans' intent to receive this information from entities that will not participate in this Project. Since these entities are already defined and fall under the category of "Affiliates," we request that this statement in the definition of "Major Participant" be deleted. This same issue was recently addressed in two other design-build procurements with the Department. Caltrans clarified that "It is not the intent of the Department to receive the information referenced above from entities that will not participate in the procurement and the Project. Those entities by definition are „affiliates‟." As such, the definition of Major Participant was revised to reflect this intent by deleting the above-mentioned statement	It is not the intent of the Department to receive the information referenced from entities that will not participate in the procurement and the Project. The definition of Major Participant will be modified to clarify the intent in Addendum No. 3.
42	2	ITP	Appendix H; P. 80	ITP Page 80, Appendix H: Stipend Policy. Consistent with other procurements for design-build projects of similar size and scope, we request that the Payment for Work Product (Stipend) be increased to $250,000.	The Department has considered the issue presented by the Proposer and decided to not modify the position reflected in the RFP documents at this time.
43	2	ITP and Book 2	Form #2 (P.46) and 2.5.2.2 (P. 2-21 to 2-25)	Addendum #2 has deleted the statement allowing use of HMA at "conforming areas to connect to the existing facility" and now requires all new pavements to be "JPCP", except as noted at existing ramps S1 and CR1. Meeting "JPCP" construction specification requirements is not possible with the work restrictions in the current connector ramp closure charts providing with the TMP Data Sheet.	New Lane Closure Charts will be provided with Addendum No. 3.

Clarifications No. 3, August 2, 2011 – Fresno 180 Braided Ramps Design-Build Project Contract No. 06-0C1104

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
44	2	ITP and Book 2	Form # 2 (P.46) and 2.5.2.2 (P. 2-21 to 2-25)	The "Key Personnel" listed in ITP Form 2 are not consistent with the list and the position titles in Book 2 section 2.5.2.2. Please clarify.	Book 2, Section 2.5.2.2 will be corrected to conform to ITP, Form 2 and the RFQ. This will be reflected in Addendum No. 3.
45	2	RID - Conceptual Plans	Typical Cross Section Sheet X-2	The typical cross section for Ramp S2 shows an ultimate left shoulder 10' wide and an ultimate traveled way 36' wide. Please confirm that the bridge along Ramp S5, which crosses over Ramp S2, will be required to accommodate the ultimate Ramp S2 widths.	Yes, the bridge on S5 alignment over S2 and S4 alignments needs to be designed to the ultimate width to accommodate three 12' lanes and two 10' shoulders on S2 and S4 alignments.
46	3	Traffic Management Plan		Please provide ramp closure charts for the WB Cedar on-ramp.	These ramp closure charts will be provided with Addendum No. 3.