

# Ackerman Creek Bridge Replacement on North State Street

Mendocino County DOT – Fed Project # BHLS-5910(081)

**REVISION DATE: 04/25/2024**

## Bidder Inquiry and Response Summary

1	4/11/24	Question:	Are there cross sections available for the channel excavation and roadway excavation work? The roadway would be especially helpful for the plotting the stage 2 roadway work and temporary wall limits.
		Answer:	<i>Roadway cross-sections have been distributed to the plan holders and will be posted to the website.</i>
2	4/11/24	Question:	Are there as-builts available for the existing bridge?
		Answer:	<i>Available bridge as-builts have been distributed to the plan holders and will be posted to the website.</i>  <i>Bidders' attention is also directed to the As-Built Drawings in the Bridge Inspection Report that describe and show foundations from the prior generation of bridge previously at this location. Portions of these older foundations are readily visible in the channel below the existing bridge. Two photos are attached. Portions of these older piles are also shown on the Foundation Plan with notes for removal. Removal and disposal of these man-made buried objects will be required to construct the channel improvements and is considered paid for under Channel Excavation.</i>
3	4/11/24	Question:	There are 2 conduits mounted on the east side of the bridge, one appears to be water and the other is unknown. Are these abandoned or live conduits?
		Answer:	<i>These conduits are abandoned.</i>
4	4/11/24	Question:	What type of piling are under the existing abutment foundations? If they are in conflict with the new abutment piling this may be an issue if the existing piles cannot be removed full length depending on the type.
		Answer:	<i>As-Built drawings show possible concrete pile types for the existing bridge. Portions of these piles are visible in the field below the existing pier walls and appear to be steel casings.</i>  <i>The new pile layout was spaced to stagger new piles between existing piles. Conflict is possible. Based on As-Built drawings, it is anticipated the cut-off elevations of the existing piles will be above the elevation of the bottom of new footing. Based on the As-Built drawings, it is anticipated the backrow of existing battered piles will be outside the footprint of the</i>

			<i>new footing at the elevation of the bottom of new footing. The intent of last sentence of Note 1 on the Foundation Plan is only to direct the Contractor to remove portions of existing piles when in conflict with the new bridge. Buried portions of existing piles not in conflict may remain. Bidders are encouraged to examine the as-built drawings and consider their means and methods for shoring, earthwork, and pile installation.</i>
5	4/12/24	Question:	How long is the Plant Establishment work for?
		Answer:	<i>There will be no Plant Establishment period for this contract after all other work has been completed. The County will meet the revegetation requirements of the permits through a separate contract with a separate entity. The Contractor for this project will be responsible to installing and maintaining plantings shown in the plans until all other work is complete. At Contract Acceptance, the County will provide maintenance and protection relief for plant establishment. An addendum will be issued to clarify these timelines in the specifications.</i>
6	4/12/24	Question:	Is there a typo on the application rate for seed mix 1 on Erosion Control (Type 1), plan sheet ECL-1? The rate listed is 110 lb/ac instead of the 111 lb/ac in the seed mix chart.
		Answer:	<i>The correct application rate is 111Lbs/Acre shown in the table for “Seed Mix 1”. The typo in “Erosion Control (Type 1)” table will be corrected with an addendum sheet.</i>
7	4/12/24	Question:	The type of Fiber for Erosion Control (Type 1) under Hydroseed is not listed. Please advice.
		Answer:	<i>The type of Fiber for Erosion Control (Type 1) is Wood. This will be revised with an addendum sheet.</i>
8	4/12/24	Question:	Are the F&I of the 30” and 40” casings part of the water district bid or the base bid? There are no bid items for this work in the base bid but they are installed in the bridge concrete work?
		Answer:	<i>Furnish and Install of the 30” and 40” casings are part of the utility work and should be included in the water district bid. An addendum will be issued to clarify these items of work are included in the Bid Additive 1 and not the base bid.</i>
9	4/12/24	Question:	Will the 16” connections to the water line be made with 90 degree bends instead of tees as shown?

		Answer:	<i>The current contract documents for the 16” DIP tie-in show a Tee. The Tee will require 3 valves. Millview would be open to reviewing/discussing the Contractor’s proposals during construction to reduce schedule and cost without compromising function or quality. If the current staging for the project is executed per contract plans, use of an elbow and single valve may be acceptable pending Millview’s review and approval of the Contractor’s proposal.</i>
10	4/12/24	Question:	How many valves are being installed at the tie-ins of the 16” line? The plans say “valves” but Detail B only shows one valve.
		Answer:	<i>See response to Question 9 above.</i>
11	4/17/24	Question:	While reviewing the specifications from Millview Water I noticed some items which may be non-applicable to this contract. It looks like it was put together as if bidding a separate project, which is understandable. Their section 1.02 for qualifications of the contractor states the need to submit a list of 5 prior projects of similar scope with the bid. Will this be required by the County?
		Answer:	<i>The prior project list will be a submittal due within 5 days of bid opening. Millview County may use this information in determining whether to include Bid Additive 1 in the Contract. The County will not use this information as the basis of disqualification for the Base Bid. An addendum will be released to clarify the language in Millview’s Section 1.02.</i>
12	4/17/24	Question:	While reviewing the specifications from Millview Water I noticed some items which may be non-applicable to this contract. It looks like it was put together as if bidding a separate project, which is understandable. Their section 1.07 has beginning of work, time of completion, and liquidated damages language. Since all this is driven by the bridge construction staging and schedule, is it applicable to this project?
		Answer:	<i>Items #1-#3 under Section 1.07 of Millview’s specification will be removed to eliminate a conflict in contract administration. An addendum will be issued.</i>  <i>In general, in the occurrence of a discrepancy in Division 1-3, the County’s specifications govern over Millview’s specifications except as authorized by the Engineer. In the occurrence of a discrepancy in Division 5, Millview’s specifications govern over the County’s specifications except as authorized by the Engineer.</i>

13	4/17/24	Question:	Are the 30” and 40” casings paid for under the base contract, for which there are no bid items, or under the water district contract?
		Answer:	<i>See response to Question #8</i>
14	4/25/24	Question:	In reviewing the plans and looking at the existing site conditions, there appears to be a discrepancy in the work for the temporary walkway along the stage 1 portion of the existing bridge. Plan sheet 65 shows the temporary walkway mounted on the bridge level with the bridge deck and the 16” waterline being below the walkway. The site visit shows this information about the waterline elevation to be in error. Currently the top of waterline appears to be 2” to 3” above the deck and also there are couplers which are even higher above the deck and an air relief valve assembly which would be in the center of the walkway, thus making it un-constructable as shown. Is the County going to develop a design which shows the existing conditions and what the walkway and k-rail configuration needs to be to accommodate actual conditions?
		Answer:	<p><i>The Temporary Pedestrian Walkway shown on plan sheet 65 is a schematic illustration to indicate approximate size and location of walkways relative to the construction staging. The County will not be providing further design details on materials, member sizes, and connections.</i></p> <p><i>Design of the walkways is described in Section 48-9.01 and therefore considered included in the payment for both walkway bid items. Specific selection of materials, member sizes, and connection details to achieve the design criteria (AASHTO &amp; MUTCD) in Section 48-9.01 is considered a form of Contractor means and methods which will be reviewed and authorized through the shop drawing approval process.</i></p> <p><i>The pedestrian walkway does not necessarily have to be at the same elevation as the existing bridge deck. Connection of the walkway to the existing bridge could be at the edge of deck, temporary barrier, soffit, or pier walls depending on Contractor means and methods. The only geometry requirement shown on plan sheet 65 is that the temporary walkway must provide 48” minimum of clear width for public use. The waterline must remain in-service through construction staging.</i></p>
15	4/25/24	Question:	<p>The specs are calling for butterfly valves to be rated @ 250psi w/ class 250 flanges. The DI fitting spec says they need to be per C110 but nothing about class of flanges.. Standard would be class 125..</p> <p>Can you confirm that class 250 flanges are wanted for the Butterfly Valves &amp; DI Fittings for the 16” water material? Just want to make sure, we see mostly class 125, &amp; the 250 are a lot more expensive.</p>

		Answer:	<i>Class 125/150 is acceptable for both the Butterfly Valves and DI fittings per the Millview County Water District.</i>
--	--	---------	--