

Clarifications No. 4, January 5, 2012 – San Diego I-805 HOV/BRT Design-Build Project Contract No. 11-2T2004

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
87	3	Book 2	1.3.1; Pg 1-1	Please confirm that the 1' HOV Buffer and the 11' wide lanes defined as the Basic Configuration in the Preliminary Design Drawings (Conceptual Plans?) is the Department's intent to avoid the additional outside widening beyond what is shown in the RID.	Confirmed.
88	3	Book 2	Exhibit 4-B3 "1602 Department of Fish and Game Permit" Section 3 Compensatory Measures – 3.7 Page, 7 of 12	Section 3.7, Mitigation For Unauthorized Impacts states, "The Permitted shall mitigate at a minimum 5:1 ration for impacts beyond those authorized in this Agreement." Question: Will the Design Builder be held responsible for costs associated with unauthorized impacts? If so, please provide a map showing the location of the Permanent and Temporary impact areas described in Sections 3.1 thru 3.6 inclusive.	Yes. The Design-Builder is responsible for this requirement if there is an occurrence. See Exhibit 4-B5 "Design-Builder Responsibility for Permits" provided with Addendum No. 4. Exhibit 5-D has been added by Addendum No. 5 to show these permanent and temporary areas, as requested. Permanent wetland impact areas are those located at the footprint of the permanent bridge column.
89	3	Book 2	13.4.1 Page 13	The 7th paragraph of Section 13.4.1 says, "No lateral displacement or rotation shall be permitted for retaining walls constructed within 50 feet of the bridge abutments." Please clarify the intent of this requirement. Does this apply to permanent and temporary walls? Is the intent to preserve at-rest pressure in the zone of the abutment piles under service conditions? Under seismic loading conditions, are deformations consistent with the design global factor of safety allowable?	The requirements shall apply to all temporary and permanent walls, and the deformation criteria shall apply to permanent (at-rest pressures) loads only.
90	3	Book 2	16.3.1.5.2; Pg 16-7	Section 16.3.1.5.2 New Overhead Sign Structures states that "Overhead sign structures shall be illuminated if structure is a guide sign or combination of HOV and guide signs. Caltrans Memorandum, Interim Energy Conservation Measures for Guide Signs dated 3/9/1 states that its "Caltrans interim policy not to illuminate G23 and other nonaction advance warning signs when motorist safety is not affected." Please confirm if all overhead HOV and guide signs shall be illuminated.	Per MUTCD, these signs must be illuminated.
91	3	Book 2	16.3.1.5.2; Pg 16-7	Addendum 3 requires the replacement of existing overhead sign structures currently anchored in the median. Would this preclude the Design-Builder from removing and relocating structure and signs to the newly constructed median?	Should any modification be needed on existing overhead sign structures, the sign structure needs to be redesigned per the new standards.

Clarifications No. 4, January 5, 2012 – San Diego I-805 HOV/BRT Design-Build Project Contract No. 11-2T2004

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
92	3	Book 2	16.3.7.3, Page 19	<p>The following two statements regarding lighting under structures conflict with each other:</p> <p><i>The Design-Builder shall provide lighting that is consistent with the luminance levels and uniformity of the surrounding lighting system.</i></p> <p><i>Levels of illumination required under bridges shall be a minimum of 4.0 foot-candles measured horizontally on the surface of the walkway and vertically at a height of 6 feet above finished grade, with an average to minimum illumination uniformity ratio of 3:1.</i></p> <p>The required light fixtures are “soffit” lighting. Since this type of fixture provides about 1 footcandle at 17’ mounting height, it is not feasible to provide 4.0 footcandles of illumination as per the second statement. Should the second statement be disregarded? If not, what types of fixtures are permitted under structures to provide the required lighting levels?</p>	<p>The first statement is general for all lighting and the second one is specific for soffit lighting.</p> <p>More soffit lighting can be added to meet the minimum 4.0 foot-candles.</p>
93	3	Book 2	16.3.7.3, Page 19	<p>From the first paragraph:</p> <p><i>The Design-Builder shall provide soffit lighting for the following structures: ...and Soledad Canyon Bridge (Bridge No. 57-0787R/L) on the spans that crosses the Carroll Canyon Road Bridge (Bridge No. 57C0786)</i></p> <p>Standard soffit lighting cannot achieve lighting levels of 4.0 footcandles. Further, it appears that current project 11-2T0404 will provide continuous lighting on Bridge No. 57C0786. Can soffit lighting on these bridges be omitted?</p>	<p>Soffit lighting to meet the minimum standards is required.</p> <p>More soffit lighting can be added to meet the minimum 4.0 foot-candles if needed.</p>

Clarifications No. 4, January 5, 2012 – San Diego I-805 HOV/BRT Design-Build Project Contract No. 11-2T2004

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
94	2	Book 2	24.6.2 Pg. 24-4	The second paragraph on pg. 24-4 states that "The Design-Builder is fully responsible for mediation and resolution of issues between the Department and MTS/NCTD and accepts this work as part of the agreement development activity." What relief does the contract provide to the Design-Builder should the parties signing the C&M agreement refuse to agree? Since the Design-Builder is not a party to the C&M agreement, there is very little we can practically do to force an agreement between the Department and the Railroad. We suggest, at a minimum, to provide a contractual time period for reasonable negotiations to take place with the provision that if an agreement cannot be reached in that time period, then the Design-Builder would be eligible for a time and cost change order.	<p>The Design Builder is a responsible party for the C&M agreement as stated in Section 24.6.2.</p> <p>The Department will act as a "conduit" of information from the Design Builder to the Railroad. The Design Builder's timeliness and completeness of final structure plans, and construction documents required for the agreements determines when and how the agreement is written not the Department.</p> <p>The Department has successfully reached agreements with MTS/NCTD in the past. The Design Builder can choose to develop and negotiate agreements for Construction and Maintenance separately.</p> <p>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.</p>
95	3	RID	Conceptual Plans	Does the master file " <i>alt5_update_112811.dgn</i> " included in the "hidden link" supersede the file " <i>alt5.dgn</i> " as the ultimate design file?	No. The file "Alt5_update_112811" file does not supersede the previous Alt5 file. The "Alt5_update_112811" file adds information (i.e. lines for walls etc) to the project as needed and deletes any previous information by "X out". See RFC No. 81 for the description of this in the case of the walls.
96	3	RID	Conceptual Plans	Plan sheets in the RID Documents (Layout Sheet L-15 and L-16) show a proposed pavement outside widening of 10' in the NB direction from the Mira Mesa Bridge to the NB Mira Mesa on-ramp (Approx Sta 1462+00 to 1471+00). This appears to create a gap approx 20' wide with the existing pavement from the ongoing Carroll Canyon Road Extension Project (11-2T0404). Is there a change order as part of that contract to put pavement where this gap exists?	There is no change order showing this additional pavement and the as-builts for the Carroll Canyon Road Extension Project are not yet available. There is no gap in the pavement between the ongoing project and this Project. However, the Design-Builder is responsible for verifying the existing field conditions.
97	3	RID	Project Study and Reports; I-805N Final Environmental Doc	For the soundwall north of Governor Drive, the northerly limit of the soundwall shown in the environmental documents is Sta. 1340+90, can you confirm the limits?	The end limit of the soundwall is approximately 1344+00. This added berm/wall is for replacement of the existing berm (see "2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn").
98	3	RID	Ongoing Contracts; Carroll Canyon North DAR	Will the CMS Sign at the North end of the Project be relocated to the Ultimate location via a contract change order for the current contractor?	There is no proposed contract change order to relocate the CMS at the North end of the Project. See the electrical plans for 2T0404 project for the proposed CMS location.

Clarifications No. 4, January 5, 2012 – San Diego I-805 HOV/BRT Design-Build Project Contract No. 11-2T2004

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
99	3	General		Will existing Call Boxes be relocated by others or are they part of this contract?	Need coordination with San Diego SAFE. This agency operates and maintains the freeway and rural state highway call boxes. Temporary removal and possible relocation/reinstallation of the existing call boxes may be required by Design-Builder.
100	3	General		Please confirm that there are no new CCTV and CMS locations for this project	Confirmed