

**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION  
FOR  
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**

**LISTED BELOW ARE THE QUESTIONS (Q) SUBMITTED BY  
POTENTIAL BIDDERS FOR THE**

**MIDDLEFIELD ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT  
IN THE NORTH FAIR OAKS AREA**

**COUNTY PROJECT NO. OD420  
PROJECT FILE NO. E4931 (Project)**

**THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
HAS PROVIDED RESPONSES (R) TO THE QUESTIONS BELOW**

***Responses R1-R13 provided on 11/13/2020***

Q1. I have an inquiry regarding project OD420 – Middlefield Road Improvement project.

- Can you advise on where to find the requested model for the 41 streetlights?
- In addition, is there a flat lens requirement for the cobra head fixtures?
- Are substitutes allowed?

***R1. Model for the 41 streetlights can be found on plan sheet SL-1.***

***The Specification Section 86.27.1.2 requires: "Lighting distribution shall be Type II or Type III in accordance with IESNA Lighting Distributions or as approved by the Engineer. Flat lens may be acceptable only for the standard lights/light poles shown on sheet TS-4 and not for the 41 decorative streetlights found on plan sheet SL-1.***

***An approved equal may be submitted for County review and potential written approval for the standard lights/light poles shown on sheet TS-4 and for the tear-drop style electroliers.***

Q2. Can you also please provide us with the cross sections for this project (at least 25-50 feet intervals in order to find Roadway Excavation quantity.)

***R2. The County does not plan to release the cross sections for this Project.***

Q3. Will the Agency consider releasing CAD and/or Vector PDF's for takeoff purposes?

***R3. The County does not plan to release CAD and/or Vector PDF's for takeoff purposes. Contractor is encouraged to use the plans for takeoff purposes.***

- Q4. I am hoping to obtain a plan holders list and an engineer's estimate for the Middlefield Road Improvement Project in the North Fair Oaks Area Project.
- R4. The plan holder's list has been posted to the DPW website and will be updated on Friday's, on as needed basis. The Engineer's estimate can be found in the County's Notice to Contractor (NC) Section of the Project specifications. The webpage is: <https://publicworks.smcgov.org/middlefield-road-improvement-project-north-fair-oaks-area>.*
- Q5. The Schedule B bid items list contained in the NTC (attached) has twice as many items as the Schedule B bid item list contained in the Proposal Section of the specifications (pgs 699 – 704 of the 756 pg spec).

Can you please clarify?

- R5. The County will issue an Addendum No. 1 to address this issue (pending release).*

- Q6. I was wondering if you could provide me the PDF version of the plan set for this project; something similar to the PDF document "Appendix A: 90% Design Drawings" that can be found here:  
<https://publicworks.smcgov.org/projects/middlefield-road-improvement-project>.

As it stands, the current plan set provided seems to be a scanned image of some sort and is not readable. The different hatch regions outlined in the legend is hard to distinguish from the others and some pages are faded/lighter than the rest. I would need the original PDF plans to be able to do the earthwork for this project. Thank you.

- R6. The County re-uploaded the current plan set with a higher resolution plan set on Friday 10/30/2020. Since this is not a scanned set, the plans should be legible and clear. The plans can be found by accessing the link on top of the Notice to Contractors (NC) Section on page 2.*

- Q7. I am looking to bid the special inspection scope for this project.

Will the city be issuing an RFP for this scope of work?

- R7. The County does not plan to issue an RFP for this scope of work.*

- Q8. Regarding "Schedule B" - The Engineer's Estimate in front of spec book has approximately 100 more bid items than the Bid Schedule in the back of spec which we assume is the official bid form. Can you please clarify?

- R8. Please see County response R5.*

- Q9. Are there any Minority or Local Goals that must be met, such as DBE, MBE, SBE, DVBE, etc?

- R9. The County does not have a minority or local goal for this Project.*

Q10. Please email us a copy of Plan Holder's List if one is available.

*R10. Please see County response R4.*

Q11. We could find no "Bid Bond Form" in the Bid Documents and we would like to confirm that the Bid Bond as issued by our "Admitted Surety Insurer" is sufficient for submission with this bid?

*R11. The County does not have a standard bid bond form. Please see Proposal (PR) Section for bid bond requirements. Contractor may use default template from your bonding firm.*

Q12. Is there a specific 'Bid Package' for purposes of Bid submission, or are the Bid Documents in rear of spec book sufficient for submitting our bid?

*R12. Attention is directed to the Proposal (PR) Section of the specifications. Please see the "Contractor's Check-Off List" found on the first page of the Proposal Section for the documents to be submitted at the time of bid.*

Q13. How long is the Project Warranty?

*R13. Please see the Agreement (AG) Section paragraph "Payments" of the specifications (page 2 of the Agreement section or page 740 of 755 of the specifications):*

*"The Contractor shall guarantee all materials and workmanship for a period of 1 year from date of acceptance of the project by the Director of Public Works."*

#### **Responses R14-R15 provided on 11/24/2020**

Q14. Do you anticipate the bid date pushing for this project?

*R14. County does not anticipate delaying the bid opening date at this time.*

Q15. If addenda are sent will I receive them? Also I do not see any casing spec requiring American Iron & Steel (AIS) or buy America? Is it safe to assume that import steel casing is acceptable? Also Please clarify what if any coating is required?

*R15. All Plan Holders will be notified when an Addendum is posted. In addition, all Addendums will be posted to our website. Please visit the following website periodically for the most up to date content:  
<https://publicworks.smcgov.org/middlefield-road-improvement-project-north-fair-oaks-area>*

*This Project does not have any American Iron and Steel or buy America requirements.*

*See Sections 113-2 and 113-2.1 Welded Steel Pipe Casing and Protective Coatings of the Project specifications for details.*

#### **113-2 Welded Steel Pipe Casing**

*Steel pipe casing used for jacked and open trench sanitary sewer shall be 10 -inch, 16 -inch, 18 -inch, 24 -inch, 30 -inch, or 36 -inch-diameter as noted on the plans and shall be fabricated from steel plate meeting the requirements of either ASTM A570 (36,000 psi yield) or ASTM A53 (35,000 psi yield) and shall*

*conform to all applicable provisions of Section 66-3.10, "Jacking Pipes," and Section 70-1.02B, "Welded Steel Pipe," of the Standard Specifications and these Special Provisions. Minimum wall thicknesses shall be ½ -inch, unless otherwise shown on the plans. Any heavier thickness of pipe or other facilities required to withstand jacking pressure shall be determined and furnished by the Contractor at his expense.*

### **113-2.1 Protective Coatings**

*Protective exterior coating shall conform to the requirements of Section 66-1.03, "Protective Coating, Linings and Paving," of the Standard Specifications and these Special Provisions. Protective exterior coating shall be bituminous.*

## **Responses R16-R105 provided on 12/23/2020**

Q16. Can you provide a Soils Report for the above referenced project?

*R16. County does not have a soils report.*

Q17. We were not able to attend the pre-bid meeting. Is there a pre bid agenda or a PowerPoint that was used?

*R17. The Project website has the pre-bid conference attendee list and meeting minutes posted. Due to technology constraints, the County is not able to post the video of the virtual pre-bid conference. The County can email a link to an audio only recording upon request. Please submit this request to [DPW\\_Middlefieldrdproject@smcgov.org](mailto:DPW_Middlefieldrdproject@smcgov.org)*

Q18. Could you please clarify bid items 83 & 84 – have not been able to find these on the plans and/or a description in the specifications.

*R18. Casings are shown on Plan Sheets RR-1, RR-3 and RR-4 and described in Specification Section 113 - "Jack and Bore Steel Casing Under Railway and Install Steel Casing Pipe." Bid Items No. 83 and 84 have been revised to match the plan sheets and the revisions were included in the Addendum No.1 package.*

Q19. Are all the solid and perforated storm drain lines paid for under bid item 99?

*R19. All solid collection and discharge piping are included under Bid Item 99. Perforated underdrains within the bioretention features are included under Bid Item 52.*

Q20. Can you please clarify the scope of work paid for under items 98 and 99? Are the bioretention curbs paid for in one of these bid items.

*R20. Bid Item 98 – "Bioretention Concrete Walls Reinforcing" includes all work associated with placing rebar for the walls surrounding the bioretention features, including for grade beams and curbing and sidewalk connections at the tops of the walls. Concrete for the sanitary sewer manholes, storm drain inlets, and storm drain junctions are currently included under Bid Item 42 – "Class 2 Concrete (Minor Structures)". The bioretention walls volume of 20 CY should be added, resulting in volume for Bid Item 42 – "Class 2 Concrete (Minor Structures)" increasing 81 to 101 CY, which will be included in Addendum No. 3. Concrete for curbing at the top of the street-side bioretention walls and adjacent sidewalks are included in Bid Item 43 – "Class 3 Concrete". Work under Bid Item 99 –*

*“Bioretention Collection and Discharge Piping and Structures”, includes all collection piping and structures draining to bioretention features and discharge structures and piping draining from bioretention features connecting to downstream storm drain piping and structures. Work under Bid Item 52 – “PVC Underdrains”, includes all perforated underdrains within the bioretention features.*

Q21. Where is the relocation of the FDC at Redwood junction paid?

*R21. Relocation of Fire Department Connection included in Bid Item 18 – “Relocation Of Health Clinic Existing Fire Hydrant, Fire Department Connection, And Sign And Regrading And Planting Of Bioretention Area”.*

Q22 For the installation of the sewer from station 11+25.01 to 15+10.23 on the west side of the road it appears that the sidewalk will need to be removed and replaced. This is not shown on the demo or improvement plans. Where is the removal/replacement of the sidewalk in this location to be paid?

*R22. The sanitary sewer work from station 11+25.01 to 15+10.23 is outside the work limits of the proposed streetscape improvements. This portion of sanitary sewer work requires repair of the existing sidewalk removed for trenching. Demolition shown on Plan Sheet D-1, however, hatch pattern to be changed to Remove (E) Sidewalk. Notes calling for repair of sidewalk and AC areas to be added to Plan Sheets PP-1 and PP-6, respectively. Please see Addendum No. 3 for this update.*

Q23. There seems to be some discrepancy between the bid item descriptions and the plans regarding the sizing of the jack/bore of the joint trench utility crossing.

*R23. This was corrected in Addendum No.1 Package.*

Q24. There also appears to be a discrepancy on the casing size on sheets JT-3 and JT-4 and RR-1 and RR-3. The JT sheets call out for 1-36” for PG&E primary, 1-30” for communication and fiber and 1-30” spare casing whereas the RR sheets call out for 1-36”, 1-30” and 1-24” none of which is a spare casing. Please clarify.

*R24. The casing sizes shown on Plan Sheets RR-1 and RR-3 are correct. Bid Item Nos. 83 and 84 have been revised to match plan sheets RR-1 and RR-3 and the revisions were included in Addendum No.1 package. JT sheets will be updated to reflect the correct casing sizes in Addendum No. 3.*

Q25. Could you please identify where on the plans bid item 189 of schedule B is?

*R25. This casing (which is to house Comcast conduits/cables in the secondary crossing) is not shown on the Plans as Comcast will pursue and install casing separately from the County, therefore a bid price is not required for this item. Bid Item No.189 will be removed in Addendum No. 3.*

Q26. I wanted to see when you expect to issue addendum 1 to address the bid items. Without the proper bid item we cant start bidding on this job. Also is the bid date expected to be pushed back on this job since addendum 1 has not been issued.

*R26. Addendum No.1 package was issued on November 25, 2020. This Addendum corrects the missing bid items in the PR portion of the Specifications. The Addendum can be found here: <https://publicworks.smcgov.org/middlefield-road-improvement-project-north-fair-oaks-area>.*

Q27. In regards to subcontracting; the specs require the contractor to perform 50% of the work, less specialty items. The entire joint trench work is a specialty items, but none are designated as such on the bid item sheets. Will you consider designating the joint trench as specialty work, so that more contractors can bid on this project, thus resulting in a more competitive bid for the tax payers.

*R27. Addendum No. 3 will designate the joint trench as specialty work.*

Q28. Per Schedule of Values, Item No. 83 (S) calls for Jack and Bore Crossing #1 (Middlefield Road) (x1) 36" and (x2) 24" Steel Casings (150LF Each), however plans show 150ft of 36", 30", 24" Casings

*R28. Bid Item Nos. 83 and 84 have been revised to match the Plan sheets and the revisions are included in the Addendum No.1 package. The Addendum can be found here: <https://publicworks.smcgov.org/middlefield-road-improvement-project-north-fair-oaks-area>.*

Q29. Per Schedule of Values, Item No. 83 (S) calls for Jack and Bore Crossing #2 (Redwood Junction) (x1) 24" Steel Casing (150LF), however plans show 90ft of 10" & 18" each per drawing

*R29. Bid Item Nos. 83 and 84 have been revised to match the Plan sheets and the revisions are included in the Addendum No.1 package. The Addendum can be found here: <https://publicworks.smcgov.org/middlefield-road-improvement-project-north-fair-oaks-area>.*

Q30. Please provide PG&E PM Drawings and Electrical Materials List if applicable

*R30. Addendum No. 3 will modify and clarify work responsibilities. See Plan sheet JT-2.*

Q31. For the buildings with service upgrades, who is responsibility for furnish and installation of termination can?

*R31. PG&E is responsible for all the work beyond County right-of-way limits, including furnishing and installing of termination can on private property. Contractor shall coordinate and work with PG&E for work within County right-of-way.*

Q32. According to plan sheet PP-12, coring table shows the existing AC section on Middlefield Road are varies from 5" to 16" of Deep-Lift AC only, it doesn't show any base rock seat under the Deep-Lift AC, is that true? Please clarify.

*R32. Plan Sheet PP-12 includes coring data as shown in the Coring Data Table. The coring data does not indicate the presence of base rock.*

Q33. Bid Item# 12 Remove Portland Cement Concrete Pavement (4000 SY). Where does this work take place on the project, please provide plan & detail?

*R33. Bid item No. 12 should be removed as it was replaced by Bid Item Nos. 15-21. Addendum No. 3 will address this change.*

Q34. What is the existing roadway pavement section on Redwood Junction Restoration? Please clarify.

*R34. Contractor to confirm the existing roadway pavement section of Redwood Junction in field. Potholing/coring data is not available for Redwood Junction as*

*potholing/coring was limited to evaluating for potential Middlefield Road utility conflicts.*

Q35. Bid Item# 33 Aggregate Base (Class 2)-Open Trench SS. This bid item description is so confused. Is this bid item paid for the Sanitary Sewer (Open Trench) backfill only? If yes. How is the County paid for the new AB that goes under the new roadway section, and AB cushion under concrete curb & gutter, sidewalks, driveways, and median islands? Please clarify.

*R35. Bid Item No. 33 – “Aggregate Base (Class 2) – Open Trench SS” includes aggregate base (Class 2) for the proposed hardscape including but not limited to the typical roadway section on Middlefield Road, the new pavement section on Redwood Junction, curb and gutters, sidewalks (excluding access ramps), driveways, concrete medians, bus pads, valley gutters, and the trench backfill for the sanitary sewer work via open trench method. See Addendum No. 3 for update.*

Q36. Section 5.2 Order of Work requires this project to be constructed in 10-phases working south to north on west side than east. Can this project be constructed in multiple phases currently or must each phase be constructed in succession. Please clarify.

*R36. The general Project phasing approach, including length of each phase has been developed in an effort to balance disruption to businesses and residents while providing sufficient work area for the contractor to make efficient progress. Based on community engagement to date, the planned phasing approach appears to provide the necessary balance. The Contractor will have the opportunity post-award to propose alternative phasing for the County to review and consideration.*

Q37. Section 7.5 Permits / Licenses, Appendix G  
The contractor is responsible to procure and pay for all permit fees, licenses and RRPLI. Please clarify the costs we are required to carry in our bid estimate since the permits in Appendix G do not cover all these fees.

- a). Redwood City Encroachment Permit
- b). SFPUC permit \$1,500.00
- c). Union Pacific & Sam trans Right of entry permit
- d) San Mateo County Transit District.
- e). Southern Pacific RR Right of Entry.

*R37. Please see the following response for the costs:*

- a). Redwood City Encroachment Permit – \$800, Paid by Contractor*
- b). SFPUC permit – County will obtain Consent Letter from SFPUC*
- c). Union Pacific & SamTrans Right of entry permit – Paid by County*
- d) San Mateo County Transit District – Part of the SamTrans Right of Entry*
- e). Southern Pacific RR Right of Entry-Covered in UPRR Crossing Agreements*

*Contractor is required to coordinate and work with other utility purveyors and agencies. It is the Contractor’s responsibility to work with these utility purveyors and agencies should circumstances arise, and no additional compensation will be allowed therefor for right of way delay claims due to the Contractor’s lack of diligence.*

Q38. Please clarify if bid item #38 – Asphalt Concrete (Type B, ½” includes trench paving restoration.

*R38. Yes - for SS trenches. Joint Trench excluded.*

Q39. Railroad protective Liability insurance for both Sam Trans and Union Pacific is required. The specifications state the JPB – Joint Powers Board shall obtain Licensee’s insurance. Please clarify if we are responsible for this fee and if so provide information so we can contact or make reimbursable for actual fee.

*R39. County will be obtaining the permit from both SamTrans and UPRR and the County will pay any required permit fees related to SamTrans and UPRR. The Contractor is not responsible for any permit fees related to SamTrans and UPRR.*

*However, Contractor shall be responsible to obtain and provide insurance per SamTrans and UPRR’s requirements and shall adhere to UPRR and SamTrans work plan requirements, track monitoring requirements, and training requirements.*

Q40. Please clarify if Right of Entry and RRPLI is required as separate policies at each location or if one policy covers all locations where this occurs.

*R40. The Right of Entry agreement with the JPB will cover the Railroad crossing at the Dumbarton spur line (Railroad crossing #2). The other crossing is on the Middlefield Road Right of Way and does not require a Right of Entry permit from the JPB.*

*Contractor shall follow UPRR and SamTrans requirements for Right of Entry and RRPLI. It is the responsibility of the Contractor to inquire and follow all these requirements.*

*Please see County response R39.*

Q41. RFI Question Q6 provided a link to the web site for a better set of improvement plans. These plans are shown as 90% (NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION) and only has 109 pages. The improvement plans we are working off of is 140 pages. Please clarify what set of plans is being used by the County for bid purposes.

*R41. The Project Plans and Specifications can only be obtained by submitting the online Plan Holders Affidavit. The online Plan Holder’s Affidavit can be accessed from page 2 of the Notice to Contractor (NC) page. The NC document can be found here:*

*<https://publicworks.smcgov.org/middlefield-road-improvement-project-north-fair-oaks-area>*

*The Plans found in Q6 link are **NOT** for bidding or construction purposes. They are support documents that were used during the Environmental permit portion of the Project.*



Q42. Sanitary Sewer improvements; Bid items 83-84 Bore & Jack steel casings for sewer pipe. The improvement plans do not indicate these bores exist in this area where we cross the UPRR right away. Reference plan sheet SS-2 – SS-3. The only Bore & Jack is the 16” Steel Casing. Please clarify this issue.

*R42. Bid Item Nos. 83 and 84 refer to the casings in the Joint Trench at the Railroad crossings. The casing sizes are shown on Plan Sheets RR-1 and RR-3. Bid Item Nos. 83 and 84 have been revised to match Plan Sheets RR-1 and RR-3 and the revisions were in the Addendum No.1 package.*

*Bid Item No. 85 refers to the 16” steel casing for the Sanitary Sewer crossing under the UPRR railroad tracks on Middlefield Road. Plan Sheet SS-10 provides details on the Sanitary Sewer Jack and Bore.*

Q43. Joint Trench Plans JT3-4 Bore & Jack under UPRR indicated (1) 36” and (2) 30” Casings. No bid item for Jack & Bore 30” Casings. JT-8 indicates (2) bore & jacks under SPRR, no sized shown on plan. Bid items #185-#190 shows 6 locations of Bore & Jack but the plans only provide for 5 locations. Please clarify.

*R43. The casing sizes shown on Plan Sheets RR-1 and RR-3 are correct. Bid Item Nos. 83 and 84 have been revised to match plan sheets RR-1 and RR-3 and the revised version is part of the Addendum No. 1 package.*

*The two jack and bores shown on JT-8 under SPRR is covered by Bid Item No. 84, which has been revised to (1) 18” and (1) 10” Steel Casings per Addendum No. 1. Plan Sheets RR-1 and RR-3 show the casing details for the jack and bore under SPRR.*

*JT plan sheets will be updated to reflect the correct casing sizes in Addendum No. 3. Bid Item No. 189 is no longer applicable and will be removed in Addendum No. 3.*

Q44. Joint Trench Utility bid items #22-#184. Will the County consider change the bid schedule for these items to Lump Sum for Bid closing purposes and use these items as schedule of value for payment purposes after the job is awarded. This will assist us during bid closure due to time constraints.

*R44. The bid items will remain as they currently are shown on the Project Specifications.*

Q45. Will a Soils Report become available prior to bid?

*R45. Please see County response R16.*

Q46. Will an Environmental Report become available prior to bid?

*R46. The Project had an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) prepared. This can be found at:*

*<https://publicworks.smcgov.org/projects/middlefield-road-improvement-project>*

- Q47. As the existing subgrade below the sidewalk has conflicting utilities within the proposed grading plane, will the County consider alternative methods to the proposed subgrade compaction?
- R47. County will consider alternative methods proposed by the Contractor for the Project as long as there is no impact to the quality of final product and no additional compensation required.  
The Contractor would be required to submit a request of this nature in writing to the County for review and consideration of approval.*
- Q48. Project Phasing; As noted in the specifications deepest utilities first and so on... Please clarify once we begin the utilities can we move through each phase in succession and complete the entire system then test everything in one phase?
- R48. Each utility system shall be installed and function as designed and intended. The conduits, laterals, and pipes shall be tested as necessary during construction to ensure that each utility system is functional as designed.*
- Q49. Bid Item 26 of schedule A appears to be for the removal of the AC, Fabric and AB between stations 29+00 and 43+17 but section 15-22 also refers to the cold planning of the AC between station 16+60 – 19+00 and station 19+00 – 29+00 and makes no reference to the 2" cold planning from station 43+17 to the end of the project as shown on the Demo plans. Please clarify what get paid for under bid item 26 vs bid item 40 – Cold plane AC full width.
- R49. Item No. 26 includes all removal of AC associated with Project, including planing. Bid Item No. 40 includes the in-place volume of AC, AB and pavement fabric to be removed and disposed of off-site. Bid Item No. 40 will be revised in Addendum No. 3 to 11,204 SY, which includes planed areas to receive new AC.*
- Q50. Where does the 2" milling from Fifth Ave. to the end of the project get paid.
- R50. Bid Item No. 40 and the quantity for this Item will be revised in Addendum No. 3.*
- Q51. Is the intent for the 2" grinding from Fifth Ave. to continue to the end of the sewer installation at station 46+99.38 NB and 46+05.98 SB. /The demo plans currently show it ending at station 46+12.
- R51. The intent of the 2" grind is for striping transition. The 2" grind shall end at STA 46+00.*
- Q52. Could you please clarify the scope of work that gets paid under bid item 195 schedule B. Is it strictly to replace the AC section of the Pits prior to the cold planning operation? Are we to match the existing AC section?
- R52. Yes, Item No. 195 in Schedule B is to replace the AC section of the pits prior to the cold planning operation.  
Yes, on matching the existing AC section.*
- Q53. A brief note to request a postponement of your upcoming Middlefield Road bid. With the reinstatement of remote working requirements and other COVID related restrictions to the working place a number of our subs and suppliers are struggling to pull their packages together for this bid. If there is anyway your team could postpone the bid date, even by a few days it would appreciated – even to 12/18. Any additional time helps all of us.

- R53. The bid opening has been postponed from December 15, 2020 to January 7, 2021, see Addendum No. 2 for this revision. Contractor is required to submit the Addendum No. 2 Affidavit.*
- Q54. Can cross streets intersection within the working Phases 1 to 3, and 5 to 7 closed completely for the whole duration of the excavation and replacement of 9"AB and 9"AC pavement structural section on Middlefield Road work is completed?
- R54. Without an estimate of duration, it is difficult to answer the question. The general Project phasing approach, including length of each phase has been developed in an effort to balance disruption to businesses and residents while providing sufficient work area for the contractor to make efficient progress. Increasing the length of each phase would affect more businesses and the flow of traffic into and out of the side streets. Based on community engagement to date, the planned phasing approach appears to provide the necessary balance. The contractor will have the opportunity post-award to propose alternative phasing for the County to review and consider approval of.*
- Q55. The joint trench seems to extend beyond the demo limits/improvement limits into side streets etc. However, there is no call out for surface improvements (curb & gutter, sidewalk/driveways etc). Will any such improvements be required? If so, please advise how these improvements will be paid.
- R55. Pavement, curb & gutter and sidewalk restoration outside of the limits of the Middlefield Road pavement removal is to be included in the joint trench pricing in Schedule B. Please see Addendum No. 3 for update.*
- Q56. Plan sheet D6 calls out Number 19 - Reconstruct Existing Telecom Manhole to Grade and it states to "relocate the manhole" outside the new planter wall. Further details on GI-5 states that the contractor shall pothole for potential over excavation of the existing conduit's to allow the shifting out from the bio-retention planter foot print. The work required for this item of work is substantial than a reconstruct especially if we have to move fiber optic. Who will be performing the fiber optic relocation? How does fiber optic cable work for this item get paid?
- R56. If after potholing, the conduits are confirmed to be in conflict with the planter and planter configuration cannot be adjusted to allow the conduits to remain in verified location(s), payment for relocation of conduits will be via a change order. Similarly, if after potholing to confirm the existing manhole extents, if the planter wall configuration cannot be adjusted to "jog" around the manhole to allow the manhole to remain in-place, payment for relocation of the manhole will be via change order.*
- Q57. Throughout the demo drawings Note #4 for calls out for the replacement of the sidewalk..."Shall be to the nearest flag if more than half of the sidewalk width is disturbed the entire sidewalk width shall be replaced to the nearest flag" Do the contract documents account for this additional area of potential sidewalk replacement in the new design? Will the contractors get compensated based on the bid items for this requirements if it's not shown on the drawings?
- R57. This note will be revised in Addendum No. 3 to add: "Outside full-width limits of roadway and sidewalk replacement..." at the beginning of the note.*

Q58. Construction phasing in traffic handling plans show K-Rail and the notes calls out for K-rail with privacy screen please provide a detail for the privacy screen that is required.

*R58. Privacy screen shall consist of Temporary Traffic Screen per Caltrans Revised Standard Plan RSP T4.*

Q59. Many businesses will require flaggers to control the access to delivery trucks (based on notes in Demo). What time are deliveries expected? Will they be during normal working hours 5am-8pm. Is there a schedule available for the deliveries?

*R59. Contractor to coordinate with affected businesses during each phase as schedule for deliveries may vary. While it is expected the majority of deliveries will be between the hours referenced, there may be some exceptions.*

Q60. Addendum 1 - Section 116 Agency Relations calls out for coordination between PG&E, AT&T Comcast, Verizon, Wave Broadband, Open5G, Union Pacific Railroad, SamTrans, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission which may include documents, work plans and permits to be covered by various items of work. Please provide a list of the permits required with the cost associated (if any) and the work plan(s) requirement for each agency. Especially for the work required around Caltrain, Union Pacific Railroad and Samtrans.

*R60. See County response R37.*

Q61. Special provisions 7-5 also call for the requirement of various encroachment permits for multiple agencies what are the cost for these permits?

*R61. See County responses R37, R39 and R40.*

Q62. Please provide a count of how many trains the contractor can expect encounter during a normal work shift.

*R62. Contractor can anticipate 0 to 1 train.*

Q63. Special Provision Section 8 calls for the contractor to provide to maintain walkways and ADA access to local businesses. Provided that sidewalks, driveways and ADA ramps will be removed and restored per phase, providing access and maintain walkways promotes a huge challenge in an active worksite? Please consider adding an allowance item to deal with specific access situations in order for all contractors to bid apples to apples.

*R63. County will not consider adding an allowance item.*

Q64. Construction Note #15 on Sheet SSG-2 states "Base Bid will be Open Cut, with Pipe Bursting (Except at SFPUC) as an add alternative." However there is no Alternative in the Bid Documents. We suppose that this is no longer relevant.

*R64. Correct, bid to be open cut. Note #15 on Sheet SSG-2 will be modified to remove references to Pipe Bursting in Addendum No. 3.*

Q65. Bid Items #76 and #80 appear to be for the same work. Can you please clarify the differences in work for these? #76 is paid by footage and in so being only accounts for 12 connections.

*R65. Addendum No. 1 modified Bid Item No. 76 to reference Section No. 103-3.7 and be titled: "Sanitary Sewer Lateral Repair".*

Q66. Bid Item #81 – Utility Line Crossings, in our opinion, should be broken out between SS Pipelines (Wet Utilities) and the joint Trench (Dry Utilities). The work required for utility crossings for these to utilities is very different to each other. As in Wet Utilities are just one pipe/conduit and there are several in the Joint trench and the material costs will be very different.

*R66. The County acknowledges your comment; however, no changes will be made.*

Q67. Bid Item #82 – SF Water Transmission Line Crossings, reading the Specification Section for this work we are unclear what work need to be included in this item. Is this item for the full installation of both runs of 8” Sanitary Sewer Pipe in this area and is not included in item #78? Please advise.

*R67. Correct.*

Q68. Will County of San Mateo be issuing an RFP for special inspections or contracting them at all.

*R68. County’s Consultant will perform the Construction Inspection and Management for this Project. Any special inspections required of the Contractor are to be performed by the Contractor or by one of their subs.*

Q69. Please advise if there will be any waterworks relocation/installation that will occur during the course of this contract and when it is planned to take place.

*R69. The County is not aware of any waterworks relocation or installation work.*

Q70. Subsequent to joint trench being installed, will the project be under suspension while the utility companies relocate their services and dispose of their poles and overhead lines?

*R70. It is envisioned that all Project work i.e.: a) curb & gutter; b) driveways; c) landscaping/trees/GI planters; d) new roadway and bus pads; e) parking pavement; f) sidewalks to nearest joint outside of OH poles to be removed; and, g) street furniture has been constructed/installed before the utilities install their wires, test the system, and remove their overhead wires and poles.*

*Contractor is required to coordinate and work with all the utility companies as per Section No. 116 – “Agency Relations” of the Specifications.*

Q71. Please advise as to the proposed materials, thickness and width of any temporary trench patching.

*R71. Temporary patching to be sufficient to provide suitable driving surface until permanent pavement section is constructed. Permanent pavement sections in trenches: a) Detail C-7/SS-9 is applicable to STA 16+60SB/17+50NB to STA 19+00 in that pavement section to match existing pavement section (in-kind, as generally indicated in Coring Data Table on Plan Sheet PP-12); b) STA 19+00 to 29+00, a minimum of 9” of AC above 9” of AB must be included in the backfill trench profile below proposed roadway grade; and, c) STA 29+00 to 43+17, trench paving in areas of full-depth pavement replacement shall match detail C-7/SS-9 as a temporary condition until the 18” below proposed grade is removed and replaced with proposed pavement section.*

Q72. Will slurry backfill be allowed for the joint trench?

*R72. Contractor shall comply with the backfill requirements as shown on the Plans and Specifications. County will consider alternative method proposed by the Project Contractor as long as there is no impact to the quality of final product and there is no additional compensation required. Contractor shall submit this request in writing to the County for review and consideration of approval.*

Q73. Refer to Sheet SS-10: Jack & Bore pits are in conflict with the existing SS and F/O. According to the plans the existing F/O is going to be within the bore itself. Even if the F/O is higher than the SS, it is still in line with the bore and cannot be suspended in place or relocated to make room for the bore machine. Please advise how you wish us to proceed.

*R73. Contractor will have to locate F/O during pre-construction potholing to confirm location.*

Q74. Refer to the Bid Documents: Please advise as to the intent in the language on Bid Item 33 "Aggregate Base" where the words "Open Trench SS" is indicated.

*R74. This quantity reflects open trench type construction of SS.*

Q75. Refer to spec section 37.2.1 "Relocate Existing or Install New Drainage Inlet - General". The specification tells us the new inlets must be constructed per section 51-2 (Joints) of the standard specs. Even though we know to follow the standard specs, it still gives no detail to refer to, in order to give an accurate estimate. Please advise what standard detail drainage inlet type is to be constructed?

*R75. Storm Drain Inlet illustrated on Detail 2 on Plan Sheet GI-13.*

Q76. It also states in section 19-1 (page 118) that AC, Sidewalks and Curbs cannot be removed until all joint trench, storm drain and sewer is complete. So just to clarify - Does the staging only refer to the sidewalk and roadway improvements or is the joint trench and sewer to be constructed in their corresponding stages.

If the joint trench and sewer is to be constructed in the corresponding stages can we remove the roadway section prior to their installation from station 29+00 to 43+17 to facilitate the installation – this area call for us to completely rebuild the roadway so this way we are not having to sawcut through 15" of AC.

*R76. The phasing approach assumes all work (utilities, roadway and sidewalk) will be complete within each phase to the extent feasible (minus top 3" of AC, which would be placed at the end of the Project).*

*No, the contractor may not remove the roadway section prior to installation of the joint trench or sewer.*

Q77. Plan Sheet SS-2 – SS-3 Bore & Jack with 16" Steel Casing. Two questions;

1) Please provide data if the existing sewer main is installed in an existing casing. We cannot drill through an existing casing with the new casing in the same alignment.

2) There is also a Fiber Optic Cable directly adjacent to our improvements. We need information to determine if we can shore the bore & receiving pits and

we also have to lower and remove the bore equipment into the excavation. If this utility is where shown this may not be feasible. If this area can be constructed based on clarifying our questions, can the Bore be relocated away from these existing utilities i.e. centerline of road add manholes and return to the existing alignment? Please clarify.

- R77. 1) Based on existing drawings, the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District's existing 6" sewer pipe under the railroad tracks is not inside a casing. However, the Contractor shall be required to field verify actual conditions by potholing.*
- 2) Contractor to pothole to confirm location of existing utilities and report any differences to County prior to construction.*

Q78. Can you provide flow rates of the sewer so we can adequately size the bypass pumping/piping.

- R78. Contractor shall provide bypass pumping/piping system with a minimum capacity of 320 gpm based on the estimated pipeline capacity. Contractor shall also keep and maintain additional backup pumping equipment on site with a minimum capacity of 320 gpm.*

*Alternatively, Contractor may bypass the sewer flow to the trunk line on Dumbarton Avenue (MH 3848-3847) during construction. Contractor shall propose a feasible and viable bypass pumping plan that ensures sewage is delivered to an appropriate downstream line without causing backups, overflows, or disruption to service in any of the affected sewer lines. The proposed plan must include setup and maintenance details and subject to approval, in writing, by the District.*

Q79. Per Sheet JT-2 "work responsibility" breakdown, joint trench contractor is responsible for supplying and installing electrical cable, switchgear, transformers? Please confirm this is correct?

- R79. PG&E will be supplying and installing electrical cable, switchgear and transformer. Plan Sheet JT-2 will be updated to show the correct work responsibilities in Addendum No. 3.*

Q80. Section 15, Existing Facilities & 103.3-8 require contract to maintain flows at all times; Please have Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District provide Wet weather sewer flow data so we can determine by pass sewer pumping requirements.

- R80. Please see County response R78.*

Q81. Are there available flow calculations for the existing Sanitary Sewer system?

- R81. Please see County response R78.*

Q82. The plans call for the County's contractor to supply and install the transformers. There is no bid item for transformers. What bid item do we apply this to?

- R82. Please see County response R79.*

Q83. The plans call for PG&E to pull the electrical cable. Does the county's contractor have to supply the cable? If so, what bid item should we apply this to?

- R83. Please see County response R79.*

Q84. Bid item #42 Class 2 Concrete (Minor Structures) 81 CY. Please clarify where this exists. Does this quantity include all minor concrete for sewer manhole bases and precast risers, storm drain inlets and junction boxes?

*R84. Yes, concrete volume for the following Schedule A items: a) Sanitary sewer manholes; b) Storm drain inlets; and, c) Storm drain junction boxes.*

Q85. Please clarify Asphalt trench paving thickness where the road is not reconstructed. Are we to follow detail C-7 of Plan Sheet SS-9.

*R85. Detail C-7 on Plan sheet SS-9 is applicable to STA 16+60SB/17+50NB to STA 19+00).*

*Please see County response R71.*

Q86. Approximate +/-14" to 16" of existing Roadway AC Pavement must be remove and backfill for the New Flat Concrete work. How is the County paid for backfilling the void area after removing the 14"-16" Asphalt to the New Flat Concrete Subgrade?

*R86. Quantities for Bid Item Nos.: 26 – "Remove Asphalt, Concrete Paving, Pavement Fabric, Aggregate Base"; and, 30 – "Roadway Excavation" have been updated to reduce depth of removal between existing and proposed curb to only remove material necessary to place new AB and concrete sidewalk. The updated quantities will be part of Addendum No. 3.*

Q87. Please clarify the scope of work for bid item 30 – Roadway-x vs Bid Item 26 – Remove AC, Pavement Fabric & AB.

Section 19-1 states removal of existing pavement, as shown on plans, shall be considered as part of roadway excavation but it appears this is covered under bid item 26 and not bid item 30.

Our take-off quantities are different than the bid item quantities so it is difficult to tell what work gets paid for where therefore it would be helpful to get clarification on these items.

*R87. Please see County response R49.*

Q88. Will the steel casing exterior need to be coated per section 113-2.1 protective coating? If so, please provide section 66-1.03 which is not provided in the specs. Also, please advise, if coating is required, the boring operation will be slowed drastically to allow for time to coat the welds of each steel casing prior to boring the 20' section.

*R88. Please see Section 66-1.03 in 2006 Caltrans Standard Specifications. Please also see County response R15.*

Q89. Will the grade of steel casing be ASTM A53 per section 113-2 welded steel pipe or ASTM A139 Grade B per section 133-7.1 steel casing?

*R89. ASTM A139 Grade B per section 133-7.1.*



- Q90. What type of casing spacer/skid will be required to insulate the 8" PVC sewer from the 16" steel casing?
- R90. Non-rotting spacer with 316 SS hardware per Casing Detail on Plan Sheet SS-11.*
- Q91. Are spacers required for the conduit bores for PG&E, AT&T, and the city traffic signals or will the conduits lay on the floor of the casing?
- R91. Spacers required to separate the conduits within the length of the casing and align with the end seals.*
- Q92. There is no callouts for crash cushions arrays with the K-rail. Will crash cushions be required?
- R92. Yes. Crash cushions should be included as part of Bid Item 4 – Maintaining Traffic and included in the Traffic Handling Plan. This will be clarified in Addendum No. 3.*
- Q93. What are the costs and requirements for the Caltrain - On Track Safety Training that is required to work around the railroad tracks?
- R93. Contractors shall at all times comply with the provisions of the Federal SamTrans Administration regulations pertaining to SamTrans Workplace Safety, and Railroad's On-Track Safety Program (Program). The County does not anticipate any fees associated with this Program.*
- Q94. Per Specification Section 68-3 PVC Underdrains, the Contractor is directed to use Class 2 Permeable per Spec 68-3.2.2. However, Details of this area of work seem to indicate that the contractor is directed to use AASHTO #3. Please clarify which stone gradations we are supposed to use.
- R94. Class 2 Permeable was called out in the event underdrains are needed in the non-planter areas of the Project. For the bioretention planters, no filter fabric or Class 2 Permeable is required and the reference to AASHTO #3 per Detail 1 on Plan Sheet GI-12 is correct.*
- Q95. Per Specification Section 68-3 PVC Underdrains, the Contractor is directed to use Filter Fabric per Spec 68-2 and is to be applied per the plans. However, we cannot find reference to filter fabric in the GI Detail sheets. Please advise.
- R95. Filter fabric was called out in the event underdrains are needed in the non-planter areas of the Project. For the bioretention planters, no filter fabric is required per Detail 1 on Plan Sheet GI-12.*
- Q96. Refer to Sheet SS-10: The Sewer will need to be by-passed while this work is being done (Approx. min. 9 working days) and according to the notes on the plans there is no by-pass pumping at the tracks. With these restrictions along with the restrictions in spec section 103-3.8 it is unclear as to how we are to deal with the by-pass at this location. Please advise.
- R96. Please see County response R78.*

Q97. Please refer to spec section 51.2 (Class 2 Concrete Minor Structures). The spec tells us to refer to the standard specs section "90-10". This spec section does not exist in Caltrans 2018 Standard specifications. Please advise on how to proceed in order to accumulate an accurate estimate for the bid item #42.Bid

*R97. Unless designated otherwise, the Caltrans 2006 Standard Specifications shall be considered the Standard Specifications for this Project.*

Q98. I had a question on Schedule B of the bid documents. Bid items 104-124 all have same description on H6 trench. It looks like it was copied down the excel cells. I believe bid item 105 should be H7 30" x 41, 106 should be H8 18 x 49, H9, H10 ect as trench sections are shown on sheet 128 of 140. Can you please correct or confirm its accurate?

*R98. Yes, you are correct. Schedule B will be corrected in the Addendum No. 3.*

Q99. It appears that some of the bid items for the bores have been duplicated. Bid item's 83 & 84 appear to be the same as 185 thru 190.

*R99. Bid Item Nos. 83, 84 and 85 cover the installation of the casings. Bid Item Nos. 185 thru 188 and 190 cover the contents (piping and conduits) passing through the casings. For Bid Item No. 189, please see County response R25.*

Q100. Do you have a by-pass pumping plan in place?

*R100. Please see County response R78.*

Q101. If we are to use tanks to temporarily hold sewerage that cannot be by-passed we will need flow charts to determine how large or quantity of tanks. And, if this is the solution to partial pumping, will we be allowed to dump the tanks into a sanitary sewer manhole when needed?

*R101. Contractor shall provide bypass pumping/piping system with a minimum capacity of 320 gpm based on the estimated pipeline capacity. Contractor shall also keep and maintain additional backup pumping equipment on site with a minimum capacity of 320 gpm. Sewage from holding tanks, if necessary, maybe discharged to the manhole downstream of the work area but with controlled flow rates so not to cause backup or overflow anywhere in the sewer system.*

*Please also see County response R78.*

Q102. Can we use precast sanitary sewer bases? This will allow us to let the sewer flow almost immediately. A cast in place manhole will require several hours of cure time prior to stacking the barrels or allowing the sewer to flow again.

*R102. No, pre-cast manhole bases are not allowed.*

Q103. Will PG&E be providing the casing for their bores, or should California Auger Boring figure on providing all the casing?

*R103. PG&E will not be providing casing for bores that will contain their facilities.*

Q104. The County of San Mateo detail C-7 calls out for the replacement of asphalt in existing streets to be 2" minimum or replace in kind. The Potholing and Coring Date shown on PP-12 (sheet 27 of 140) seems to be in contradiction with one another. The potholing thickness of existing AC typically shows anywhere from

4" to 14"-17" on PP-5, whereas the coring data indicates existing AC thicknesses of 11"-16" with most corings about 15". What is the correct information, and what should be the replacement depth of existing AC in sewer trenches.

*R104. Pavement thickness information provided in the pothole and coring data represent what conditions were encountered at each specific location. For sewer trenches see County responses R71 and R85.*

Q105. I see that there is a lot that is owned by the County adjacent to the Redwood Junction part of the project. Would the County make this available to the Contractor for a temporary staging area?

*R105. At this time, the County does not have any County owned property available to be used as a temporary staging area.*

***The RFI's listed below were received and submitted after December 23, 2020. The County has provided responses to R106 through R126, submitted after the deadline, but not be providing responses to additional RFI's.***

Q106. Bid Item 12 Section 15-8 Remove Portland Cement Concrete Pavement 4,000 SY. This item is typically used for concrete under asphalt in the roadway. You do have bid item 25 which is sidewalk c&g removal. Your potholes on sheet PP-12 does not show that much concrete under the roadway to account for 4000 sy, as most of the concrete are caps on utilities. My question, what is this 4000 sy for?

*R106. Please see County Response R33. Bid Item 12 has been removed in Addendum No. 3.*

Q107. Where does the Green Bike lane is compensated for (item 56 or 57). If it is 57 then the bid item is by LF and should be SF. If it is not 57 then where does the white thermo lane line gets paid as it says (color)?

*R107. Bid Item 56 -Thermoplastic Pavement Marking (per SF) includes green rectangles, bicycle shapes and arrows etc. Bid Item 57-Thermoplastic Striping (per LF) includes which includes yellow and white striping.*

Q108. The sewer system runs another 980 lf past the improvement down to Douglas. All that sidewalk has to come out to install the sewer; there are no phasing plan either. How does all the improvement, sidewalk demo, concrete installation etc, gets paid for. This is a major construction to install this, the entire street will be impacted.

*R108. This work will be paid as part of the Sanitary Sewer replacement. Please see Section 106-2.1.7 of the Project Specifications.*

Q109. The non-GI planters, there are 6 of them on the job, Sheet GI-12 detail 2 shows deep curbs. The planters are not bioretention planters like detail 1 on GI-12 and there should be no need for deep curbs. We can price out bid to have them all deep curb, but there should be no need for the County to pay for deep curb when there is no need for it.

*R109. The non-GI planter do not require a deep cut. For the street-side curb and gutter, Detail 4/MD-1 could be utilized. For the sidewalk side, Detail 4/MD-3 (upright curb) could be used to "finish" the sidewalk along the planter.*

Q110. Is the County still planning to bid this project on the 7th, as the previous questions are not answered along with these

*R110. County released RFI responses on 12/23/20 in response to previous questions. The County has postponed the bid opening from January 7, 2021 to January 14, 2021, as outlined in Addendum No. 4.*

Q111. I have a question on the soil, is there a Geotech report or analytical? Has the soil been tested for contaminants.

*R111. Please See County Response R16. The soil has not been tested for contaminants.*

*A Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) meter was used to detect VOC odor at the locations shown on Coring Data Table on PP-12. VOC readings were identified at the following locations:*

*2635 Middlefield Rd (Southbound, Inboard Lane) approximately: -0.04 PPM*

*Middlefield Rd and Hurlingame Ave (Southbound, Inboard Lane) approximately: 0.2 PPM*

Q112. SP.E4931, 86-10 Conduit (p.237) indicates: "Conduit shall be installed by directional drilling or jacking and boring methods unless otherwise noted." However, this method may not be effective since the conduit installation in the street crossings, and one longer run along the middle of the street are relatively short. It would be more effective to do an open trench. Please confirm that the installation of the traffic signal conduits by method of "Trenching in Pavement Method" is acceptable if delays to vehicles will not exceed 5 minutes per 86-2.4 (p.227).

*R112. Open trench is acceptable if coordinated with phasing and traffic control plans. Contractor awarded the project shall submit in writing the requested method of work for the County to review and approve in writing. The Contractor awarded the project shall submit in writing a traffic handling plan, and proposed method of work.*

Q113. Bid Item #61 indicates an Estimated Qty of 15 EA. However, there is no description of how this bid item shall be divided into 15 units. It appears to be better suited as one lump sum bid item. Please clarify.

*R113. 15 refers to number of traffic signals (of various types/sizes) as listed as "A" thru "O" on Sheet TS-1.*

Q114. SP.E4931, 86-2A indicates: "The traffic signal pole at the NE corner of the intersection shall be removed and combined with the new streetlight post at this location..." However, I was unable to determine the specific type of pole in the plans or specs. Please specify the Pole type to be installed at this location.

*R114. Same as Location "L" on Sheet TS-1 (Standard Type 17A-2-100, SIG M.A. 20', LUM M.A. 15', Mast Arm: MAS, Pole: SV-1-T, Ped Signal Mounting: SP-1-T, LED Luminaire: 88W).*

Q115. 86-2.4 Conduit (p. 226) indicates: The conduit in a foundation, and between a foundation and the nearest pull box, shall be Type 1 (GRS). However, Section 86-8 Foundations (p.236) indicates: "Sch. 40 or 80 PVC conduits shall be used in all cabinet and pole foundations." This information is conflicting. Please clarify the type of conduit to be used inside the pole and controller foundations to the nearest adjacent pull box.

*R115. Schedule 40 or 80 PVC may be used.*

Q116. Our take-off quantities are different than the bid item quantities so it is difficult to tell what work gets paid for where therefore it would be helpful to get clarification on these items. Please clarify the scope of work for bid item 30 – Roadway-x vs Bid Item 26 – Remove AC, Pavement Fabric & AB. – County responded by stating to refer to question 49 but question 49 did not address bid item 30.

*R116. Bid Item 26 – Remove Asphalt Concrete Paving, Pavement Fabric, Aggregate Bases covers the removal operation only and does not cover the costs for hauling and disposal.*

*Bid Item 30 – Roadway Excavation covers hauling and disposal of materials identified under bid items no. 26 and 40.*

Q116a Section 19-1 states removal of existing pavement, as shown on plans, shall be considered as part of roadway excavation but it appears this is covered under bid item 26 and not bid item 30.

*R116a Removal of existing pavement is included in Bid Item 26.*

Q117. It also states in section 19-1(page 118) that AC, Sidewalks and Curbs cannot be removed until all joint trench, storm drain and sewer is complete. So just to clarify - Does the staging only refer to the sidewalk and roadway improvements or is the joint trench and sewer to be constructed in their corresponding stages.

*R117. Please see County Response R54 and R76.*

Q118. If the joint trench and sewer is to be constructed in the corresponding stages can we remove the roadway section prior to their installation from station 29+00 to 43+17 to facilitate the installation – this area call for us to completely rebuild the roadway so this way we are not having to sawcut through 15” of AC.

*R118. Please see County Response R54 and R76.*

Q119. Are bid items 191 and 192 of schedule B to be paid as 2 EA or 1 LS. Currently it is stated as a quantity of 2 with a unit of LS.

*R119. Bid items related to Jack and Bore have been modified for clarity. Please see Bid Items No. 83, 84 (Schedule A), 191-199 (Schedule B) in Addendum No. 5.*

Q120. The response to question 49 is still very unclear as to what work is to be included in bid item 26 vs 40. Bid item 26 description reads - Remove Asphalt Concrete Paving, Pavement Fabric, Aggregate Base: This would indicate that this is for the AC, Fabric and AB removal between stations 29+00 to 43+17 where we are to remove the AC, Fabric and AB.

Based on the new quantity per addendum #3 this appears to cover all the planed areas(areas where we only remove 2” to 4” of AC) and the removal of the AC, Fabric and AB from stations 29+00 to 43+17. This quantity matches up with our take-off quantity

*R120. Bid Item 26 includes the following “non-planing” work: a) Full width (and depth to lower roadway) removal from Sta 29+00 to 43+17 and intersecting streets; b) Redwood Junction; and, c) Sta 19+00 to Sta. 29+00 (to lower roadway, but not planing top 3” below proposed grade, which is included in Bid Item 40). Bid Item 26 – Remove Asphalt Concrete Paving, Pavement Fabric, Aggregate Bases covers the removal operation only and does not cover the costs for hauling and disposal. Bid Item 30 – Roadway Excavation covers hauling and disposal of materials identified under bid items no. 26 and 40.*

Q121. Still very unclear as to what work is included in bid item 40. It seems to be somewhat of a duplicate to bid item 26. The description reads Plane Asphalt Concrete Pavement (Full Width), which would lead us to believe this is everywhere other than stations 29+00 to 49+17, but it appears the planning is covered in bid item 26. I cannot get the owner quantity of 11,204 sy to match up with any of our take-off quantities so it is very difficult to figure out what is cover here. Section 39-4 refers to cold planning but A49 indicated the cold planning is part of bid item 26. Could you please try and clarify this

*R121. Bid Item 40 includes planing work (only): a) 2” plane between 43+17 to north edge of 6th Avenue crosswalk (existing crosswalk to remain); b) 3” plane between Sta. 16+60SB and Sta. 17+50NB to Sta. 19+00 (excluding RR tracks) below existing grade; and, c) 3” plane below proposed grade between Sta. 19+00 and Sta. 29+00.*

Q122. The response for question 22 addresses where the removal of the sidewalk is to be paid for the sewer installation between station 11+25.01 to 15+10.23 but it doesn't really say where the construction of the new sidewalk/curb and gutter should be paid. Is it paid for in bid item 78 or is it to be included in bid item 43? If it is part of bid item 43 were the quantities for that bid item going to be adjusted?

*R122. The AB under the sidewalk/curb and gutter is paid under Bid Item No. 33 – Aggregate Base (Class 2). The new 5.5’ wide sidewalk over this section of SS is paid under Bid Item 43 – Class 3 concrete. Finally, for Bid Item 25 – Remove Concrete Curbs, Gutters, Sidewalks, etc., the area of sidewalk to remove as listed in Specification 15-21 “Remove Existing Sidewalks” to be increased from 23,100 SF to 25,220 SF. This quantity was provided as informational use only. Please see Addendum No. 5 for updated quantities.*

Q123. The quantity for bid item 42 was increased from 81 cyds to 101 cyds to account for the bio-retention curbs and tie-beams.

@ the bio-retention planters there is:

370 lf of vertical curb below the curb and gutter for 25 cyds of PCC  
445 lf of vertical curb adjacent to the sidewalk for 42 cyds of PCC  
91 lf of tie-beams for 5.5 cyds of PCC

This alone total 72.5 cyds of PCC. If we added the manhole and inlets to this item the yardage would be more like 200 cyds.

But per the response to question 20, bid item 42 is to include the bio-retention walls, SSMH's, SD Inlets and SD Junction boxes.

This is very confusing as bid item 74 is for the removal and replacement of the Sanitary sewer manholes, bid item 35 is for the Storm Drain inlets outside the bio-retention areas and bid item 99 is for all the storm drain structures within the bio-retention areas.

Should bid item 42 just be for the bio-retention curbs and the SSMH and SD items be paid in their respective items.

Could you please provide clarification.

*R123. For the 14 bioretention planters, the quantity for Bid Item 42 – Class 2 Concrete should be increased an additional 40 CY (to 141 CY).*

*Also, Bid Item 98 – Bioretention Concrete Wall Reinforcing should be increased to 3,000 SF.*

*Please see Addendum No. 5 for updated quantities.*

Q124. We are very confused with answer to question Q49. Here are the issues:  
The quantity from plans for the 3" milling and 2"milling seem to correspond to item #40. This clarifies that item #40 is paying for the 3" removal and 2" removal.  
Roadway excavation which is the complete removal of 18" of roadway seems to gets paid under bid item #30. Our quantities match what you have on addendum 3 of 10,066 cy.

Here is the issue, what is bid item #26? If it for removal of asphalt, AB and fabric, then bid item #30 should be reduced to about 1000 cy. Basically you have two bid items that pay for the same work, or you have one bid item too many. Item 26 and item 30 pays for the same work.

*R124. Bid Item 26 – Remove Asphalt Concrete Paving, Pavement Fabric, Aggregate Bases covers the removal operation only and does not cover the costs for hauling and disposal.*

*Bid Item 30 – Roadway Excavation covers hauling and disposal of materials identified under bid items no. 26 and 40.*

Q125. Per specs, excavation for joint trench gets paid under the joint trench items and the sewer gets paid under the sewer items. So basically excavation for sewer and joint trench don't get paid under bid item 30.

*R125. Yes, that is correct.*

Q126. There are no bid items for the following work that are shown on the plans  
Utility trench D12, H18, L16, L19, P25 and V4.

*R126. The bid table has been updated to include these items. Please see Addendum No. 5.*

All RFI requests were due by December 11, 2020 and the County provided responses on December 23, 2020 and January 8, 2021. The County will not be providing responses to additional RFI's.

Updated as of **January 8, 2021 at 9:00 AM.**

F:\Users\design\C3D\E4931000\_Middlefield Rd\Bid Process\RFI\RFI\_County Responses.docx