

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

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

2023 SLIP-OUT REPAIR NEAR 2180 HIGGINS CANYON ROAD PROJECT (Project)

**COUNTY PROJECT NO. 08H21
FEDERAL-AID PROJECT NO. FEMA DR-4683-DR-CA
CAL OES NO. 081-00000
PROJECT FILE NO. E5083**

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

Q1. The required traffic control for this project really isn't clear to me. Sheet 3 of Plans indicates the Traffic Control and note 1 indicates that Higgins Canyon Rd is to be fully open (2 way traffic) during non working hours (with 1 way flagging during work hours). Furthermore, Sheet 9 (Excavation Plan) indicates a near 20' deep mass excavation and removal of the existing roadway subgrade soils down to bedrock. It's unclear to me how the County foresees the Contractor maintaining the public's use of the road either during work hours (1 way flagging) or during non-work hours (2 way traffic) once the mass excavation takes place. The excavation/backfill is only really conceivable if Higgins Canyon road is temporarily closed (at project site) for at least 4 to 6 weeks.

R1. Section 12, Maintaining Traffic, of the specifications will be revised to clarify traffic control at the project site. Revised specification sheets will be issued with Addendum #1.

Q2. The project duration is indicated as 70 Calendar Days. Even with 12-hour work days and working on weekends (which comes at premium cost to the county), this is far too short of a contract duration to accomplish the amount of proposed work. Can the County reconsider and provide additional contract time (140 days)?

R2. The County will keep the original contract time of 70 calendar days. As stated in the specifications, the contractor may submit a request for additional working days for County's approval.

Q3. Can you please verify which Caltrans approved end terminal system you would like installed at both ends of MGS?

R3. Please provide a Type B end cap on both ends, as shown on drawing C-102.

- Q4. What is the radius of the rail being used in this installation?
R4. The MGS is intended to generally follow the as-constructed shape of the segmental block retaining wall and will have varying radii as a result. Contractor shall provide a guardrail installation plan, based on the geometry of the as-built wall, to the County Engineer for approval prior to installation.
- Q5. Which Caltrans Layout [for MGS] do we install?
R5. A Type 11B Layout is required. Contractor shall provide a guardrail installation plan, based on the geometry of the as-built wall, to the County Engineer for approval prior to installation.
- Q6. MGS is measured in 12.5' increments. Can you verify guardrail quantities to be installed?
R6. Bid item #35's bid quantity will be revised to 162.5 feet to reflect the use of full rail segments (13 ea @ 12.5' segments). Revised specification sheets will be issued with Addendum #1.
- Q7. For Bid Items 8 and 9, it's customary for the Contract documents to provide a tree removal table detailing the individual diameter of each tree to be removed. There's a massive cost difference for a removing a 11" tree versus a 36" tree, and Contractor has no apparent way of knowing how to base this cost without further details.
R7. The Contractor is encouraged to review the project site in order to assess the trees and root balls that will require removal." per specification section 17-1 on Page 72 of the project specifications. For better cost estimation, bid item #8 will be broken down into two size ranges. The revised specification sheets will be issued with Addendum #1.
- Q8. Sheet 16 indicates the Inboard Wall (uphill wall) profile and shows a considerable slope running from pile 1 to pile 7. The design isn't really appreciating that the concrete lagging requires that the bottom of a given lagged section (between any two adjacent piles) to be flat/horizontal grade ... there really can't be a slope as indicated since we can't install partial lagging lengths (lagging must run from pile to pile). Please revise drawing as needed to indicate to what depths below grade lagging between each pile should be.
R8. The option of cast-in-place reinforced concrete lagging is provided in the specifications to alleviate this issue. The cast-in-place option can be used to fill the triangular shaped spaces between soldier piles with precast concrete lagging above the cast lagging, or can be used full-height.

Q9. Section 19-4 states “Excavations for the project are anticipated to be up to approximately 30 feet deep to construct the repair alternatives. Due to the existing road upslope surcharge, the slope must be shored with a retaining wall before any excavation”. Under what bid item is Contractor to put the extensive cost of a temp shored wall?

R9. The inboard hybrid concrete/steel soldier pile retaining wall as shown on the plans is the “temporary shoring.” That wall must be in place before the slide material(s) in the roadway prism can be excavated and the MSE wall constructed. Once the outboard wall and MSE section is complete, the inboard wall is duplicative but infeasible to remove.

Q10. Similar to prior question/design concern about the pile wall and lagging on slope. Sheet 18 shows the Outboard MSE Wall, again a considerable slope is shown, down to the lowest point near pile 14. From our past experience with MSE walls ... these walls always need to be built on near flat/horizontal footings that are stepped. It seems like design has opted to forego this necessary level of detail on sheet 18 and instead provided a generic footing step on sheet 17, detail 4. Sheet 18 merely calls out a 18” min grade beam, where in fact the grade beam will vary from min 18” to max of 40”. Is it possible for design to revise the drawing to show the stepped footing as will be necessary so Contractor can estimate the amount of concrete footing work AND our rebar sub can accurately determine amount of rebar?

R10. The pile cap detail will be revised and provided in the upcoming addendum.

Q11. Does this project not have an associated geotechnical investigation/report? It will be very difficult to assess the drilling productivity without referencing a Geotech report. Simply splitting items into soil drilling (Bid Items 17, 19) and rock drilling (Bid Items 18, 20, 28) is not adequate level of detail for Contractors to determine drilling production. Please provide any known geotechnical info.

R11. Geotechnical Report dated 04-17-2023 will be provided.

Q12. Bid Item 13 needs to absolutely be a unit price bid item (currently it is tagged as (F) final sum). Contractor has no way of knowing what amount of rock excavation that he will encounter. Furthermore, there is a lack of detail on the required stepped pile cap/ MSE wall footings and per detail 1 on sheet 17, it appears that the Contractor will have to excavate into the bedrock to simply install the lower levels of Geogrid reinforcement. Please change Bid Item 13 to unit price AND please do not add any language about how the provisions of Sections 9-1.06B, “Increases/Decreases of More Than 25 Percent” shall NOT apply (there’s a reason CalTrans uses this provision as it is equitable to both parties when bid quantities differ vastly).

R12. Bid item #13 – Rock Excavation will not be final pay. This will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.

A table of information regarding the segmental wall facing blocks that provides beginning and ending stationing, and elevation of each block course as well as

additional notes regarding how to complete each block course will be added onto the appropriate plan sheets and will be provided in the upcoming addendum.

There is the possibility that the contractor may have to excavate into bedrock at the lowest level of the segmental block wall face to install the lower levels of Geogrid reinforcement with the necessary depth of Geogrid to develop the necessary strength at the bottom of the MSE wall.

Q13. Please confirm if the W beam piles are to prime coated? Please confirm that final coating on these piles/beams is not necessary.

R13. Prime and Final coating of the W section(s) is required.

Q14. We are trying to find out what type of backfill mix (solid concrete or lean mix/sand slurry) should be placed from top of steel soldier pile elevation (F) to top of concrete elevation (B), where the Concrete Lagging wall is placed for the Soldier Piles at the Inboard Wall (Inboard Wall Detail C-400 sheet 15) for the Slip-Out Repair 2180 Higgins Canyon Road Project. We typically place low strength lean mix above embedment to easier the chipping behind the beam flange for lagging installation.

R14. The design of the inboard, hybrid, soldier pile retaining wall does not anticipate concrete soldier pile material being placed above the top of the concrete elevation. The exposed steel w-section is anticipated to accept lagging (either cast in place, or stackable, or combination of both) but not be encased in concrete. If the contractor desires to place concrete above the concrete soldier pile section to protect the steel W-section, there is no prohibition, that we are currently aware of, in doing that. Presumably, that material can be placed at the same time as the lagging. No additional payment will be made for that possible additional material. Contractors are welcome to submit proposed improvements with cost savings for evaluation after award of the contract. If there is a better means & method to construct the wall, that will be entertained and evaluated by the engineer.

Q15. Please confirm the County is not providing a Bidder's Bond Template and will accept a bid bond issued by an admitted surety on template provided by the surety and not the County.

R15. Correct, the County does not have specific template for Bidder's Bond.

Q16. What is the anticipated notice to proceed or start date of this project?

R16. The anticipated Notice to Proceed will be issued soon after the award of the Project (9/12/2023). The Contractor is advised that the Contractor shall be prepared to start work in late September 2023 and finish the project before the end of 2023.

Q17. Please confirm the project/contract duration for this project. Is it 70 calendar days?

R17. The contract duration is 70 calendar days. As stated in the specifications, the contractor may submit a request for additional working days for County's approval.

Q18. There's extensive language under Section 13-1 about Contractor's winterization requirements and Contractor's responsibility for maintaining SWPPP controls. What is County's anticipated timeline for this project? With consideration for the upcoming winter and how late in the summer season it is ... is County willing to consider postponing the project start until next Spring? Again the contract duration of 70 calendar days is not at all feasible.

R18. The anticipated Notice to Proceed will be issued soon after the award of the Project (9/12/2023). The Contractor is advised that the Contractor shall be prepared to start work in late September 2023 and finish the project before the end of 2023. Construction of this project will not be postponed until next Spring.

All RFI requests are due by Thursday, August 17, 2023.

Updated as of **8/18/2023 4:22 PM**

F:\Users\design\C3D\E5083000_2023 Slip-Out Repair Near 2180 Higgins Canyon Road\Bidding\RFI\RFI_County Responses.docx