

**Clarifications No. 2, December 1, 2011 – San Diego I-805 HOV/BRT Design-Build Project Contract No. 11-2T2004**

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
20	4	ITP	Appendix B 3.11 Form of Guaranty Form 16 Page 32	<b>Inconsistency Request</b> – Section 3.11 starts by stating, “If a Guaranty is required, provide (i) an irrevocable letter signed by the Guarantor committing to provide a Guaranty in Form 16.....” whereas the end of the paragraph states, “The executed Form 16 shall be included in Volume 1”. Please confirm that if a Guaranty is required, we are <b>only</b> to provide the irrevocable letter, not the Form 16 when submitting the Proposal.	This is confirmed. If a Guaranty is required, only the irrevocable letter/authorization is to be submitted with the Proposal. The reference to submittal of Form 16 will be removed in a future addendum.
21	4	ITP	Appendix I Page 74 and Appendix B Page 33	<b>Inconsistency Request</b> – Section A in the table indicates we are to include “Draft Special Purpose Entity Corporate Formation Documents” and “Executed copy of Partnering/Consortium Agreements”, referencing Appendix B 3.15. However, Appendix B 3.15 does not specifically identify these documents as labeled in Appendix I. Please clarify what these documents are to include.	The references to the named documents in Appendix I are for illustrative purposes. A Proposer may submit to the Department appropriate corporate documents, including but not limited to articles of incorporation, articles of organization, board of director resolutions, partnering agreements, and the like to demonstrate that the requirements of Section 3.15 of Appendix B have been met.
22	3	Book 1  Book 2	6.3.1, Page 24;  4, Page 4-6	These sections indicate that the Design-Builder shall perform all environmental mitigation measures for the Project. Is the Design-Builder responsible for off-site mitigation?	Design Builder will not be responsible for any off-site mitigation.
23	2	Book 2	1.3.1 Basic Configuration 11.3.1 Design Requirements	Section 1.3.1 specifies the Basic Configuration as depicted in the Preliminary Design Drawings. Section 11.3.1 indicates that design must “Meet all future improvements identified as the “preferred alternative” in the environmental document...” Page 13 of the Environmental Document describes the “preferred alternative” as having DARs with “... two 12 ft lanes with 8 ft outside shoulders and 4 ft inside shoulders.” This configuration would require a DAR width greater than 50 ft, but the Preliminary Design Drawings are showing the DAR being 41.8 ft wide. Please clarify what width of DAR the Department intends the bid to be based upon, and also be advised that following the widths prescribed in the Environmental Document will lead to a conflict with the existing Carroll Canyon Bridge.	The proposed Carroll Canyon DAR includes two 12-foot lanes with 4-foot outside shoulders and 4-foot inside shoulders. See b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn posted to the hidden link.

## Clarifications No. 2, December 1, 2011 – San Diego I-805 HOV/BRT Design-Build Project Contract No. 11-2T2004

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
24	1	Book 2	6, Utilities, "Utility Relocation Cost Estimate" Item No. 36; "Category 3."	Why are relocation costs shown on the Utility Relocation Cost Estimate table for the 30" VC Sewer in Carroll Canyon (does Caltrans expect this pipeline or any of its appurtenant facilities to need to be relocated during this contract)?	The estimate spreadsheet indicates that it is to be Relocated/Protected in place. The 30" VCP is within the construction area, therefore, a preliminary estimate to protect or relocate was provided. Final design plans are needed to determine the exact impact.
25	3	Book 2	11.3.1	Section 11.3.1 (page 11-3) indicates that "The Design Builder shall identify and correct all clear recovery zone deficiencies on the freeway facility for all areas adjacent to new construction." Please clarify if "adjacent" is intended to mean anything within the project limits, or those areas directly affected by construction activities.	"Adjacent to new construction" is intended to mean those areas directly affected by construction activities. However, all clear recovery zone deficiencies north of La Jolla Village Drive shall be identified and corrected.
26	3	RID	12	<b>Inconsistency request.</b> Please provide the drainage report for Contract No. 11-2T0404 so the Design-Builder can confirm drainage along the median up to Station 452+00.	The I805 Carroll Canyon Onsite Drainage Report (Contract No. 11-2T0404) has been posted to the Data Room under "Additional_RID_12-01-11."
27	2	Book 2	12.3.2.1 P. 12-4  12.3.2.2 P. 12-4	<b>Missing hydraulic document and application</b>  Please provide the following document and application that are listed in the references above:  I-805 Managed Lanes North offsite Drainage Report (2007)  IDF 2000 application	I-805 Managed Lanes North offsite Drainage Report and IDF 2000 equations have been posted to the Data Room under "Additional_RID_12-01-11."
28	3	Book 2	12.3.2.2	<b>Inconsistency request.</b> To perform hydrologic analyses, RFP Section 12.3.2.2 Hydrologic Methods (see attached), directs the Design-Builder to use storm flow information contained in the "I-805 Managed Lanes North Offsite Drainage Report (August 2007)". Please provide this report.	I-805 Managed Lanes North offsite Drainage Report has been posted to the Data Room under "Additional_RID_12-01-11."

**Clarifications No. 2, December 1, 2011 – San Diego I-805 HOV/BRT Design-Build Project Contract No. 11-2T2004**

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
29	4	Book 2	13.5.4.1, Page 13-12 <b>Structures</b>	<b>Bridge widening at Carroll Canyon:</b> Left Side Widening - RFP says 52.5ft minimum and varies; dimensions shown in the CAD file are 55ft min and 67ft max. Right Side Widening - RFP says 44ft min and varies; dimension shown in the CAD file is 51.7ft. <b>Please clarify dimensions to be used for design.</b>	The Master file b2T200aa1 update 112811.dgn has been posted to the hidden link so Proposer can determine which widths to provide for the Ultimate condition. All lane and shoulder widths on both the Left and Right Bridge of the Carroll Canyon Bridge and Overhead in the Ultimate condition must be standard.
30	3	Book 2	Exhibit 18-B	Will the contractor be allowed to close Sorrento Valley Road at the I-805?	A lane closure chart will be provided to allow the closure of Sorrento Valley Road/Mira Mesa Blvd. for falsework erection and removal in a future addendum. Although not immediately available, it is anticipated that the lane closure chart will allow closures from 9:00 pm to 5:00 am for a maximum of 120 working days.
31	3	RID	General	<b>Wall on west side, north of Sorrento Valley bridge, station 1454+00 to 1459+50:</b>  Caltrans plans show a wall from the bridge abutment heading north. For our project, there are no improvements in this area and the Caltrans plans show this wall in the middle of the existing (currently under construction) slope. What is the purpose of this wall?	Wall limits for Stage 1 are shown in "b02T200aa1_update_112811.dgn" which has been posted to the hidden link.  Design-Builder should construct wall from north end of bridge structure to approximately Sta 1456+00 "A" line.
32	2	RID	Missing Information / Files	Please provide the following missing information:  As built drawings for Nobel Dr OC and 0785S Mira Mesa Blvd UC.	The As-Built plans for the Nobel Drive OC were included in the original RID located under the As-Built Plan file of "11-089714.pdf" (Sheet Nos. 134 to 147).  The As-Built plans for Mira Mesa Blvd UC were posted under "Additional_RID_11-09-11".