CIP 500 C: Santa Fe River at La Joya Street River Bank Stabilization Repair (Phase 3b)
AND Flood Damage Repair Ricardo Bridge to Don Jose Storm Drain Outfall

BID # '20/05/B

ADDENDUM NO. 3

September 25, 2019

Answers to Contractor questions received by email:

Q1: Our understanding is that several of the crossvanes below the Ricardo Road footbridge in areas 1-4 are not to be reconstructed entirely and that parts of the crossvanes that appear intact will be utilized without reconstruction. Would you please confirm if our understanding is correct?

A1: That understanding is correct. The intent of the plans was to minimize disturbance of the existing overbank vegetation by leaving intact crossvane arms in place, and working between them.

Q2: If our understanding is correct, would you please clarify warranty responsibilities of the engineer/designer and the contractor related if the connecting areas where rebuilt, grouted sections of the crossvane meets the older, existing and retained portions in the case that the crossvane is damaged or destroyed by a flood?

A2: Contractors will only be responsible for work that they do. Any stonework or structures that are not part of the work would not be part of any warranty responsibilities.

Q3: What is the final configuration/specification on the grouting of the outside the bend wall opposite of the Don Jose Storm Drain?

A3: See Construction Detail "C" on sheet 10 of 17 of the 500C Construction Plans, which shows a typical section of the proposed wall re-construction. Station/Elevations and an average bankfull slope (top of boulder elevation) are shown on "Profile – Area 12" on Sheet 9 of 17. Location of wall is to match the existing location and offsets from the existing centerline can be scaled off the plan view on Sheet 9 of 17.

Q4: To clarify is filter fabric with gravel *or* gravel required behind the wall at Don Jose?

A4: Since the wall is grouted, no filter fabric or graded gravel backfill will be required. Backfill behind the wall will be comprised of native soil excavated elsewhere on site.

Q5: We are unclear on the plan's definition of the elevation difference between the invert of the crossvanes and the elevation of ends of the crossvane arms of the cross vanes where it meets existing grade of floodplain slopes. Would you please clarify?

A5: The upstream invert elevation of each crossvane is shown on the profile view for each respective structure. In most cases, the downstream ends of the crossvane arms remain intact, on at least one side of the channel. Where the arms are missing, the elevation of the downstream end of the arm should match the existing arm on the opposite side of the channel, which should be at the top of the bankfull channel.

Q6: In the event buried gabion baskets are found during the excavation of boulders to be salvaged and/or during site prep for proposed grouted boulder structures, are they

to be removed? If removal impacts existing, un-grouted arm of a crossvane that is called out to be retained, will there be an addendum for the reconstruction of the arm?

A6: Where gabion footers are encountered under existing vane arm boulders that are to remain, the gabions will also remain. Where a gabion extends beyond the edge of the existing upper course of boulders, if the end is damaged it may be necessary to remove one additional surface boulder so that the damaged gabion can be removed and replaced with a new boulder footer.

Q7: Is staging access available for Areas 1-5 from the south and west of the Ricardo foot bridge? We are unclear if this is private or City land and see it as a good potential staging area. If it is not available would the City potentially make it available?

A7: Addendum 2 identified several potential access points and staging areas. If the contractor would like to use other locations for access or staging, it is up to them to make arrangements with the City and/or private landowners as appropriate.

Q8: In the established revegetation area from 2012 construction, how does the Engineer propose mitigation to the existing and established plantings during wall excavation to salvage boulders? And will the final configuration/revegetation of these disturbed areas be coordinated with the Engineer after award?

A8: It was noted during the site visit following the pre-bid meeting that it is assumed all existing vegetation between the two boulder walls will be removed during demolition, but that vegetation behind the second boulder wall will remain in place and be protected during excavation and salvage. It is anticipated that any removed vegetation can be harvested and stored for re-use as pole plantings, in accordance with the Pole Planting Notes on Sheet 11 and revegetation plan on Sheet 16 of the plan set.

Q9: Will the line item for traffic control in alternatives 1-3 be added to the bid documents?

A9: Traffic control for Additive Alternatives 1-3 is considered incidental and should be included in the Base Bid line item #14 – Traffic Control.

Q10: Will Contractor be responsible for protecting the existing river trail (concrete pavement)?

A10: Contractor shall be responsible for protection of the existing concrete trail during construction and shall include costs for protection as incidental to Base Bid line item #14 – Traffic Control.

Q11: What type of traffic control plan is required and do you require a certification?
A11: Contractors will be required to submit a traffic control plan for City approval but certification is not required.

All other pertinent information to remain the same.

_____

RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGE BY PROPONENT

This addendum will be part of the bid documents and shall be included with bid submittal. Non-receipt of addenda by bidder in no way relieves bidder of obligation of the compliance with any terms and conditions stated in the addenda.