Date: March 17, 2020

To: All Holders of the CONTRACT DOCUMENTS for:

Sir Francis Drake Boulevard Corridor Rehabilitation Project
County Project No. 2018-11

From: Philip Buckley
Senior Civil Engineer
Engineering Division

Re: ADDENDUM NO. 3

You are hereby advised of the following revisions and/or clarifications to said Contract Documents:

Changes/Revisions/Amendments/Additions:

1. The Bid Schedule shall be replaced in its entirety with the enclosed, updated Bid Schedule.

2. The Bid opening date has changed to allow bidders more time given the order for Bay Area counties to “Shelter in Place” until April 7th. “Notice to Contractors” page 5, paragraph 1 of the Contract Documents is revised to read:

   a. Sealed Proposals will be received by the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Room 329, Marin County Civic Center, San Rafael, California 94903, until 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 19, 2020 until 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 2nd, 2020 until 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 23rd, 2020. Proposals will be collected by County staff at 3:00 p.m. and will be opened and read in Room No. 440B 404, of the Marin County Civic Center for:

Bidder Questions and Answers

Q15: Please clarify the following for the storm drain system; bid item #403 – 18” RCP. We cannot locate on the plans please clarify.

A15: The storm drain in question can be found on sheets IMP-11 and IMP-12.
Q16: Many of the storm drain catch basins are missing invert elevations. Please provide or base on certain depth we can bid so the playing field is equal.

A16: Catch basins that do not include an invert elevation callout need the structure to match the invert of the existing pipe. Additional invert elevation information will be added to the drawings as part of Bid Addendum No. 4. At this time, the invert of the catch basins should be assumed to be 4 feet below the top of grate (TG) elevation.

Q17: Bid item #415, storm drain easement, I EA; plans to do provide any footages where this exists. Please change item to LF or provide clarity where this encasement is to occur.

A17: Storm drain encasement is shown on sheet GR-10, refer to Note 2 under the Storm Drain profile. Bid item unit will remain as EA.

Q18: Bid Item #418 - #419, turning structure and 8" RSP outfall; please provide location/detail for this work. Cannot locate on the plans.

A18: Bid item #418 represents JB No. 1, which is shown on sheet INT-14, in the concrete lined ditch and on GR-14. Bid item #419 represents the RSP described with Keynote 40 on sheet INT-15, as well as shown on GR-15.

Q19: Bid Item #44, convert CB to MH; please provide plan page and location for this work.

A19: Bid item #44 is for the conversion of SDMH No. 1, as shown on sheet INT-03 and GR-01.

Q20: How is the work involved with asphalt concrete full depth conform measured and paid for?

A20: The asphalt concrete full depth conform represents an AC plug adjacent to new concrete improvements. This item is paid for as part of various concrete-related bid items covered in Special Provision Sections 10.27, 10.28, and 10.29.

Q21: What is the difference between Bid Item # 207 and #208 and/or Detail 21 and Detail 9? It seems everywhere we are removing guardrail we are installing new guardrail or fence, so we would backfill the holes full depth with 40" of CDF. Please clarify the difference.

A21: Bid item #207 involves guardrail removal, walkway restoration, and the installation of new post and cable fencing; bid item #208 represents the work between Wolfe Grade and Manor Road, where the guardrail will be removed and replaced with new guardrail.
The question regarding Detail 9 vs Detail 21 should be revisited and clarified so a response can be made.

Q22: MMWD water main; please clarify where Site 2 and 3 start/end. Reference WC8-WC9.

A22: The delineation between the end of Site 2 and the start of Site 3 is west of the intersection of Laurel Grove Ave and Sir Francis Drake Blvd. A revised sheet WC9 has been included with the addendum to clarify the delineation.

Q23: Please identify where SDJB Standard #260 is located. These are in the structure table on GR-00.


Q24: Addendum No. 1 stated the inverts for the storm drain structures were shown on the GR drawings. There are a number of structures missing this data. Please provide.

A24: Catch basins that do not include an invert elevation callout need the structure to match the invert of the existing pipe. Additional invert elevation information will be added to the drawings as part of Bid Addendum No. 4. At this time, the invert of the catch basins should be assumed to be 4 feet below the top of grate (TG) elevation.

Q25: Boring log B-4A located at the intersection of Sir Francis Drake and Elisco Dr indicates 14.5" AC/40 " of ¾" drain rock????? No other boring logs represent this data. Please clarify what we are to expect when trenching through this area since there are no defined limits of encountering this drain rock materials. You may want to add an allowance item for this area if we encounter.

A25: Please refer to the enclosed formal response from the geotechnical engineer regarding this boring. There are four (4) other borings in the vicinity of the boring B-4A at the Eliseo/Barry intersection. None of the other borings show the presence of drain rock. There isn't any information available regarding the extents of the drain rock and whether or not it is likely to be encountered with any of the proposed trenching work. No allowance will be included at this time.

Q26: Just realized MMWD bid sheets do not include any bid item for the fire hydrants. Please clarify where we are to include the pipe, valve, and hydrant assembly?

A26: The bid schedule has been revised to reflect the following information: Bid Alternate F item F44 has 8 hydrants. Bid Alternate G item G33 has 3 hydrants. Bid Alternate H has no hydrants.
Q27: The bid schedule released in Addendum 1 has teeny-tiny spaces for bid runners to hand-write in. Would you be able to have someone re-format it into a more manageable size?

A27: The bid schedule has been reformatted and is enclosed with this Bid Addendum No. 3.

Q28: Since the pay depth for digouts does not include the top 3" or 4" depending on which areas the digouts are in and as per detail 5 on CD-1, are we constructing the digouts before we do the grind and overlay or after we grind off the top 3" or 4"? If we do them before the grind the overlay, is the tonnage of asphalt within the top 3" or 4" that it takes to bring the digouts back to grade considered non-pay if the grind and overlay options are chosen?

A28: If the paving additives are included in the contract award and the Contractor completes the digouts before the grind and inlay, the tonnage of HMA within the top 3" or 4" to bring the digouts back to grade is considered non-pay or sacrificial. Base Bid Item No. 303 includes tonnage for a 12" digout. However, if Bid Additive C is awarded it includes Bid Item C9 "Asphalt Concrete Subtraction (Digout)" which subtracts the HMA in the top 3" or 4" over the digout. In short, the County is only paying for the top 3 or 4 inches of HMA one time.

Q29: Would the County consider increasing the size of the cells in the pricing columns of the Schedule of Bid Prices for the project? The existing cells do not leave bidders enough room to write in pricing in the space provided, especially if a change is required.

A29: The bid schedule has been reformatted and is enclosed with this Bid Addendum No. 3.

Please contact Philip Buckley at pbuckley@marincounty.org with any additional questions.

Bidders shall acknowledge receipt of this addendum as indicated on the on the Public Contract Code. Failure to do so may render bidders bid non-responsive.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 3