Clarifications No. 1, September 26, 2011 – LA I-10/I-605 Interchange Connector Design-Build Project Contract No. 07-245404

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
1	3	Book 2	1.3.3 "General Description"	Third bullet states "Remove and reconstruct portion of the existing soundwall and pile foundation in conflict with the proposed bridge columns/footing locations and where connector joins the freeway along the eastbound I-10 traffic". The proposer understood this statement that the sound walls would be fully constructed by the current contractor on contract 07-117074. At the one-on-one meeting, Department informed us that the sound walls will not be built, and will be the responsibility of this contract. Please clarify by station limits the extent this contract will be responsible for removal and construction of soundwalls, barriers and foundations.	The pile foundation for Soundwall No. 605-322 as shown on Contract # 07-117074 has been constructed from station 26+00 to 29+00. The Design-Builder is responsible for removal of the soundwall pile foundation at locations where there are conflicts with the proposed bridge column foundations. The soundwall will need to be constructed by the Design-Builder to the limits shown on the provided Contract Plans for the ongoing construction project (Contract # 07-11707).
2	2	Book 2	1.3.4 "Cooperation"	We are requesting Caltrans to furnish the latest construction CPM schedule of the two contracts mentioned on page 1-3 (07-117074 and 07-274404).	The Department will provide the CPMs as soon as received.
3	4	Book 2	6.1 "Utilities-General"	It states "The Design-Builder may be required to perform utility relocation design work or/and physical relocation under a separate Work Order". Does this apply to all dry and wet utilities that project may encounter?	The Design-Builder is responsible for identifying all utilities, determining which utilities are in conflict, acquiring any necessary permits, coordination with the utility owners and approval of their relocation plans. The Department will take the lead in the relocation coordination for the two electric towers with DWP. The Department will be responsible for the cost of the relocation for all utilities that are in conflict with this project except for the sewer line at Dalewood Street. The sewer line at Dalewood Street is the responsibility of the Design-Builder.
4	3	Book 2	Section 11.3.3 "Design Exceptions"	Please clarify if the DB team is responsible for existing design exceptions that may result in AFS or MFS if (a) they are existing conditions completely unrelated to the DB design, and (b) the DB design did not contribute to such design exceptions.	The Design-Builder is responsible for all required design exceptions for the Project including for non-standard features not identified by the Department. If the Project is not touching an existing non-standard feature, a design exception would not be required.
5	3	Book 2	13.2.1.1	Seismic isolation code is referenced – can we infer that seismic isolation is a permitted alternative?	Yes, seismic isolation is allowed per the RFP.

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
6	4	Book 2	13.2.1.1	AASHTO segmental guide spec has largely been superseded by the LRFD – is there anything in particular that is intended to conform to the guide spec, instead of the LRFD?	Based on Section 13.2.1.1, AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 4th Edition with California Amendments supersedes AASHTO Guide Specifications for Segmental Concrete Bridge.
7	3	Book 2	13.3.1.1	Under "additional design requirements" item (b) – please clarify the term "exterior girder face shall have consistent geometry" – i.e., does this provision applicable only to the side slope on the consistent external web? Is varying overhang or varying soffit width on the box girder acceptable? With varying girder depth, not all exterior dimensions can be consistent.	See Book2, Section 15.3.3 for Visual Quality Elements Requirements.
8	3	Book 2	13.3.1	Please clarify the last sentence in the first paragraph – "unless Cast-In-Steel Shell is used with shear connectors and designed for." The sentence appears incomplete?	This sentence fragment has been eliminated in Addendum No. 2.
9	3	Book 2	13.3.1	Please clarify if the entire template provided in Exhibit "13-A" considered a contractual requirement? If the answer is "yes", what is the procedure for design team to request modifications of the design criteria for segmental construction?	The requirement in Exhibit 13-A is a minimum and is part of the contract. If the modification is less than the minimum requirements, submit an ATC.
10	2	Book 2	13.3.1.2 "Vertical clearance"	It states "The proposed structure <u>shall</u> meet the following <u>minimum</u> clearances. Yet the clearances mentioned in (a) conflict with the second paragraph in that section where it states "The minimum clearance for the Project shall meet the following"…As an example the first paragraph states vertical clearances are 21'-6" over I-605, yet the second paragraph sates that "Permanent minimum vertical clearances is 16'-6" over freeway mainline.	See Addendum No. 2
11	3	Book 2	13.3.1.2	There appears to be a contradiction within article 13.3.1.2 on minimum vertical clearances. The "proposed clearances" shall be met as well as the "minimum required clearances". For example, does it mean that because the "proposed" clearance over I-605 Northbound 27'-2", it is the minimum required? Or does it mean the contractor needs to maintain the minimum falsework clearances?	See Addendum No. 2.

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
12	3	Book 2	13.3.1.3 "Foundations"	Please clarify if the minimum one (1) total settlement applies to only the long-term settlement? Or does this include the instantaneous settlement as well?	The minimum one inch total settlement applies only to long-term settlement.
13	3	Book 2	13.3.1.4	Seismic during construction – Please confirm if an alternative analysis during various construction phases could be performed with an RSA analysis, possibly in lieu of the 10%g requirement. Please note that the Design Criteria Template includes an ARS curve to be used during erection (or rather, design rules to develop the curve).	See Addendum No. 2.
14	4	Book 2	11.3.3 "Design Exceptions"	For both mandatory and advisory design exceptions, the RFP states "Some elements of the design developed in the preliminary design may not meet these design requirements. For these variances, mandatory (or advisory) design exceptions have already been approved….if the D-B team documents other design exceptions (either Mandatory or Advisory) using the state provided design, that CT will be responsible for preparing and approving those design exceptions?	The Design-Builder is responsible for the preparation and approval of Design Exceptions (Fact Sheet) for any Non-Standard features encountered during the final design.
15	2	Book 2	11.3.3 "Design Exceptions"	The existing I-10 shoulder at around station 502+ has 2.4m (7.88') median shoulder. The RFP also called out the 10/605 connector will be supported on 8'-8" column. Giving half width of the column (4'-4") and a 14" thick barrier (60-E barrier), the shoulder width is 2.38' (0.72m), which is less than 1.3m stated in the MFS.	The Design-Builder is responsible for the preparation and approval for the Design Exception (Fact Sheet) for Non-Standard shoulder width at bridge column location at the I-10 and I-605 median. The Mandatory Design Exception (Fact Sheet) approved for the Non-Standard shoulder width in the PSR was based on a preliminary design of the column width and a new Mandatory Design Exception (Fact Sheet) will be required from the Design-Builder for approval during the final design.
16	3	Book 2	13.3.6 "Structures Type Restricted from Use"	Please clarify the third item on the list "open-girder superstructure system. Is the intent not to allow the use of single-element precast girders; i.e. "I" or "bulb-T" girders?	Any superstructure that has a closed bottom soffit (e.g. precast girders with attached bottom slabs) is considered a closed superstructure system.

RFC No.	Class	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
17	3	Book 2	13.3.6 "Structures Type Restricted from Use"	Outrigger or C-bents over freeway mainline were mentioned under this section. Unless indicated otherwise, we would therefore assume that outrigger or C-bent would be permissible over ramps or connectors.	C-bents are restricted per RFP. The language has been clarified in Addendum No. 2.
18	4	Book 2	Exhibit 13-A	Design Criteria 3.16.5 – Should the definition for "young structure" apply to the structure when it is opened to traffic, including SDL, etc rather than closure pour completion?	Follow the criteria in Exhibit 13-A.
19	3	Book 2	Exhibit 13-A	Does the provisions on live load described in Design Criteria 3.10 applicable only to the segmental portion of the bridge? Or do they apply also to the CIP box girder when they coexist in the same frame (such as in the case of progressive cantilever spans on I-605).	The requirement applies to the frame that has segmental construction. Language has been clarified in Addendum No. 2.
20	4	Book 2	Exhibit 13-A	Similar question on Design Criteria 3.19 "Special Construction Load". Does this apply only to the segmental span?	The requirement applies to the frame that has segmental construction. Language has been clarified in Addendum No. 2.
21	3	Book 2	Exhibit 13-A	Design Criteria 2.5.2.2 –Are there specific requirements for the high performance concrete with low permeability? Is this required only for specific structure types, or throughout? Similar question for the curing methods. The SP for segmental construction provided in the RID does not contain special requirements for high performance concrete.	See Addendum No. 2.
22	4	Book 3	Exhibit 13-A	Design Criteria 5.8.1 – is this provision in force? Is the alternate method in the LRFD acceptable (i.e., the Vci / Vcw method from the LRFD, not the simplified method in the Guide specifications).	Design criteria 5.8.1 has been clarified in the Addendum No. 2. AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 4th Edition with CA Amendments shall be followed for shear and torsion design.
23	3	Book 2	16.4.3.1	The RFP states the design builder shall pay all costs charged by the electrical utility company. Will any of these charges be reimbursed as a provisional sum?	No, these costs should be included in the Design-Builder's Price Proposal.