

**TG18.1 – Bus Ramps IFB**

Questions are numbered in the order received. Question numbers missing in the sequence either have been answered in a previous response set or will be included in a future response set.

<b>Question No.</b>	<b>Submission Date</b>	<b>Drawing No.</b>	<b>Document/ Spec. No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
TG18.1-027	1.10.2014	S-2063		What is the minimum required clearance over Howard St at the Cable Stayed Bridge? Can the vertical clearance of 31.8' in the Elevation on drawing S-2063 be reduced through a Value Engineering Proposal? If so, what is the minimum clearance allowed.	Refer to Specification Section 00 04 20 for value engineering (VE) requirements. All VE proposals will be reviewed.
TG18.1-028	1.10.2014			Will feasible alternatives to the Cable Stayed Bridge be considered during the VE Proposal Review?	Yes, feasible alternatives to the cable-stayed bridge will be considered during the VE proposal review.
TG18.1-029	1.10.2014			The width of the Pylon 9 column varies in the transverse direction from 11' at the top of footing to 8'-4" at the base of the link beam. Can the width of the Pylon 9 column between the footing and the base of the link beam be changed through a Value Engineering Proposal? Are there clearance or horizontal issues to consider in this area?	The width of the Pylon 9 column between the footing and the base of the link beam may be changed through a value engineering Proposal. The VE proposal shall include calculations which demonstrate that the pylon is capable of withstanding the demands placed on the structure, including but not limited to construction, dead, live, seismic, and blast loads. The pylon is constrained by the vehicle ramp to the west and the bicycle ramp to the east. There shall be adequate space between the pylon and the bicycle ramp to allow passage of a person. The pylon foundation is constrained by the Transbay Transit Center train box to the north and the property line to the south.
TG18.1-031	1.10.2014		00 04 20	Please clarify the following regarding Section 00 04 20 – Value Engineering Proposals: Reference Exhibit A, Attachment 2, Paragraph 4b which states that liquidated damages shall be assessed as specified in Section 00 05 20 Article 4. According to Section 00 05 20, the maximum amount of LDs which can be assessed is \$45,000,000. While this amount is appropriate for the scope of the entire TTC project, this seems quite excessive for Trade Package TG18.1. Please place a cap on LDs for Trade Package 18.1 of no more than \$5,000,000.	Section 00 04 20 does not contain a reference to Liquidated Damages. Per the Long Form Subcontract, Section 7, the TG18.1 Bus Ramp Trade Subcontractor's liability for liquidated damages is limited to the extent of the Trade Subcontractor's comparative fault for any damages assessed by the Owner. There will be no cap placed on damages in the subcontract.

Question No.	Submission Date	Drawing No.	Document/ Spec. No.	Question	Response
TG18.1-032	1.10.2014			What are the falsework opening requirements for Harrison Street, Folsom Street, Clementina Street, Tehama Street and Howard Street? Height and width?	Minimum clearance requirements are specified in drawings S-1020, S-2060, S-2061, S-2062, and S-2063, and Specification Section 01 15 70, Traffic Routing Work.
TG18.1-034	1.10.2014			Bid items 20, 21 and 22 are for Class 1, Class 2 and Federal RCRA contaminated soil and debris. Where is this material located on site?	Information on soil investigation work for the Bus Ramps project can be found in Specification Section 01 13 50 and the following reports, which are available to bidders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Site Management Plan Addendum, Transbay Transit Center Bus Ramps, San Francisco, California</i> (Treadwell &amp; Rollo, February 2013)</li> <li>• <i>Limited Phase II Soil and Groundwater Investigation Report, Transbay Terminal West Loop, Bus Ramps and Future Transit Center Site East of Beale Street San Francisco, California</i> (ERM-West, Inc., December 2008).</li> </ul> Refer to Specification Section 00 03 35 for instructions on accessing these reports.
TG18.1-035	1.10.2014			This project bid opening is on 2/6/2014. Due to other estimating commitments we request be postponed to 2/27/2014? Because this is a complicated project, without the postponement we may not have adequate resources to complete the estimate.	The bid date was extended in Addendum #1; please review the TG18.1 Package Timeline in Section II, "Key Dates for Bidding Process" in Exhibit A for all date extensions. Bids are now due on March 6, 2014.
TG18.1-036	1.13.2014	C-4101		Plan sheet C-4101 is missing the design countour lines. Please see drawings C-1400 and C-4102 for an example of the design countour lines. Please provide the design countour lines on drawing C-4101.	Please see the attached revised drawing C-4101. This drawing will be updated and issued in a future addendum.
TG18.1-037	1.13.2014	D-1004, D-1005		Drawing D-1004 indicates existing Bents and Foundations to be removed. Bent 1, 2, 3 and 5 have corresponding details on pages D-1105 and D-1106 that further define the structures to be removed and associated earthwork. Similar details for Bent 7, 9, 11, 16, 19 and 20 cannot be found in the contract drawings. Please provide further details for these structures.	Details for bents 7, 9, 11, 16, 19 and 20 are similar to section P / D-1106. Assume the top of the existing bent is immediately below existing grade. For information on the size and depth of the existing bents and foundations, please see the reference documents listed in Specification Section 00 03 31 paragraph 1.2.D, Existing Transbay Terminal and Ramps. <p>These reference documents include the original construction reference drawings, San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge Railway Facilities, State of California Department of Public Works, March 1937 and February 1939. Note that the datum for</p>

Question No.	Submission Date	Drawing No.	Document/ Spec. No.	Question	Response
					<p>these drawings differs from that shown on the topographic survey included in the construction documents. See drawing F-112 dated February 1939 for a description of the datum relative to the City datum.</p> <p>These reference documents also include drawings for the Seismic Retrofit Project No. 14B, Transbay Terminal Ramps (Retrofit), Caltrans Division of Structures, 2001.</p>
TG18.1-038	1.13.2014		Vehicle Anti-Ram Barrier 28.16.43/APA	This question contains Sensitive Security Information (SSI) and is available only to bidders who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question. Authorized bidders may access such questions and their responses by logging into the TJPA's secure website and opening the relevant folder.	The response to this question contains SSI and is available only to bidders who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question. Authorized bidders may access such questions and their responses by logging into the TJPA's secure website and opening the relevant folder.
TG18.1-039	1.13.2014		Vehicle Anti-Ram Barrier 28.16.43/APA	This question contains SSI and is available only to bidders who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question. Authorized bidders may access such questions and their responses by logging into the TJPA's secure website and opening the relevant folder.	The response to this question contains SSI and is available only to bidders who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question. Authorized bidders may access such questions and their responses by logging into the TJPA's secure website and opening the relevant folder.
TG18.1-040	1.13.2014		Vehicle Anti-Ram Barrier 28.16.43/APA	Section requires a below pavement housing structure with lid that automatically opens and closes, and follows roadway slope. Should top side of lid have diamond ridges for tire traction when vehicles drive across, versus a smooth slick surface?	The top surface of the lid shall have diamond ridges.
TG18.1-041	1.13.2014		Vehicle Anti-Ram Barrier 28.16.43/APA	Paragraph requires barrier cable to be pliable, unaffected by de-icing salt, and shall not "kink" if impacted by a vehicle. Is a barrier net comprised of steel cable members acceptable?	A barrier net comprised of steel cable members is acceptable.
TG18.1-042	1.14.2014	C-7000 and C-7004		Reference Plan sheets C-7000 (58 of 470) and C7004 (62 of 470) On Sheet C-7000, the FMT Line at Station 11+53 identifies "Salvage and reuse existing sign panels" from an existing two post sign structure (sign bridge photo below). Sheet C7004 identifies FMT Line at Station 11+53 as "EXISTING SIGN PANELS" to be installed on a cantilevered sign structure and states "Install existing overhead sign panels cantilever truss single post type VIII." Please clarify the scope of work that is required. Is the	<p>The existing two-post sign structure must be removed as part of the demolition of part of the Fremont Street off ramp. Please see drawing D-1007.</p> <p>The cantilever truss single post type VIII is a new structure under this contract. Please see drawing S-2000, note 7.</p>

Question No.	Submission Date	Drawing No.	Document/ Spec. No.	Question	Response
				existing two post sign structure to be removed? Is the cantilever truss single post type VIII, identified as "EXISTING SIGN PANELS" a new structure under this contract?	The two existing sign panels shall be salvaged, stored, and installed onto the cantilever truss single post type VIII.
TG18.1-043	1.14.2014	S-1060		For Value Engineering purpose, can the columns along the Box Girder Viaduct as shown on Sheet S-1060 be modified to a rectangular shape to accommodate Barrette piles?	The columns along the viaduct (bents 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and C1) may be changed from round to rectangular as part of a value engineering proposal.  Refer to Specification Section 00 04 20 for VE proposal requirements.
TG18.1-044	1.14.2014			We request a review of the curve line for Frame 3,4 & 5 shown on Drawing Sheet S-2062 and S-2063. The survey information on these sheets appear to be in error for both curves (BBTT and TTBB). The length and tangent dimensions does not match what is shown on the drawings. Please verify these numbers.	Curve data shown on drawings S-2062 and S-2063 will be revised in an upcoming addendum. Please refer to civil drawing C-2101 for correct curve data.
TG18.1-045	1.14.2014	S-6067, S 6068		On Sheet S-6068, it appears that the intent of the Plan geometry for the bent plates on sheet S-6067 is to follow the curve shown. This would make it unlikely that a bent plate can be rolled to this shape without the flanges distorting. It appears that the channels will need to be made with flanges cut into curved shapes and welded to a rolled web. Is it the design intent to have the bent plates and walls of the ribs curved or straight? If curved, please provide a weld detail between flanges and webs.	We believe the question pertains to the plate shown on S-6073 as there are no plates shown on S-6067. The plate shall follow the curve of the bridge structure. The bent plate shown shall instead be two plates, each curved to follow the curve of the bridge, then welded together with a continuous 5/16" partial penetration weld.
TG18.1-047	1.14.2014	S-2048 to S-2052		What are the top of wall elevations for the MSE walls 8, 9 and 10? Please refer to plan sheets S-2048 to S-2052.	The tops of the MSE walls are determined by the profile of the roadway at the walls. Please see C-4100 and C-4101 (please see response TG18.1-036) for contour lines. Please see sections and details on sheets S-3212 and S-3214 for dimensions relating top of wall to the grade at the roadway.
TG18.1-048	1.14.2014	D-1006		Note 4 on plan sheet D-1006 refer to de-tensioning and removing existing the backs that interfere with the pylon foundation. Because this is inside the new building the building contractor will de-tension. Is this correct?	The TG18.1 Trade Subcontractor shall de-tension the tiebacks as specified on drawing D-1006.

Question No.	Submission Date	Drawing No.	Document/ Spec. No.	Question	Response
TG18.1-049	1.14.2014	S-1200 and S-1201		Where is trade package TG06? Plan sheet S-1200 and S-1201- note 2 refer to trade package TG06 for design loading diagrams.	Supplementary documents including documents for TG06 are available online. Please refer to Exhibit A, Section VIII, Supplementary Documents List, for the web address and password.
TG18.1-050	1.15.2014			Please confirm the trade subcontractor is not responsible for engineering accepted VE proposals post-bid.	Confirmed. Please refer to Specification Section 00 04 20 paragraph 1.5 for the requirements for the integration of VE proposals.
TG18.1-051	1.15.2014			Please confirm the TJPA's engineer will be the engineer of record for accepted VE proposals.	Confirmed.
TG18.1-052	1.15.2014		Section 00 04 20-2, Part 1.5A	In Section 00 04 20-2, Part 1.5A, please clarify who the "design team" is. Is it the TJPA's architect/engineer?	Confirmed. The design team is the TJPA's architect/engineer.
TG18.1-054	1.15.2014	Sheet S-6102, S-6115		Sheet S-6102 refers you to sheet S-6115 for Section D. Section D on sheet S-6115 does not appear to represent the correct section. Please clarify.	The section cut on S-6102, which references section D on S-6115, will be deleted in a future addendum.
TG18.1-055	1.15.2014	Note 3, S-3175		Please refer to Note 3, Drawing S-3175. This note states that "More than five prestressing ducts shall be used", yet on drawing S-3176 only five prestressing ducts are shown. How many prestressing tendons/ducts are there in the Pylon Link Beam? And how many strands in each tendon?	Note 3 on drawing S-3175 will be revised to read "at least five prestressing ducts shall be used." The revised drawing will be included in a future addendum.
TG18.1-059	1.15.2014	S-6101 and S-6102		Please refer to drawings S-6101 and S-6102 and confirm there are two link beams between the Left and Right bridge.	There is one link beam between the left and right bridge at the steel box girders. Please see S-6115 for details of the link beam.
TG18.1-060	1.15.2014			It is our understanding that once a VE proposal has been accepted by the TJPA at bid time, the TJPA's consultant, in the post Bid stage, will then further the completion of the design. Obviously this design needs to be fully approved by the TJPA's consultant since they will become the designer of record. However, even though the proposed design would meet all required design criteria, an issue might arise where the Owner's consultant might have a difference of opinion with the Subcontractor's designer. As such, granted that the design meets all required criteria, the TJPA's consultant might take the position of not accepting the design until all of his requested changes are fulfilled in the design. This would lead into a very controversial situation where the Subcontractor might incur	Costs incurred during development and submission of VE proposals are the responsibility of the Bidder. Potential risks associated with integrating a given VE proposal into the design will be considered as part of the evaluation process.

Question No.	Submission Date	Drawing No.	Document/ Spec. No.	Question	Response
				substantial additional cost if he is required to meet the TJPA's consultant's demands, or the situation could very well result in a substantial delay of the project, and perhaps legal actions. As long as the proposed VE design meets all of the required design criteria, how would Webcor/Obayashi assure that the possible scenario that we have just described would not occur? Otherwise, the bidders would face a tremendous risk in submitting VE proposals in an effort to reduce the cost of the project. Please clarify.	
TG18.1-061	1.15.2014			Please provide a means and method for acquiring plan sheets and related documentation with security restrictions	<p>Please refer to the following Specification Sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 00 03 51, Available Project Information— Protected Information</li> <li>• 00 03 51/APA – Protected Information, Bus Ramps (TG18.1)</li> <li>• 01 35 70, Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) for Bidders and Contractor (including instructions and NDA attachment)</li> </ul> <p>The NDA along with an explanation of how bidders access Sensitive Security Information may be downloaded from the TG18.1 page on the TJPA's website at <a href="http://www.transbaycenter.org">http://www.transbaycenter.org</a> &gt; Doing Business with the TJPA &gt; Current Contract Opportunities.</p>
TG18.1-062	1.15.2014			Please provide details for anti-ram barrier.	The anti-ram barrier is a manufactured item. Please see Specification Sections 28 16 43 and 28 16 43/APA for anti-ram barrier requirements.
TG18.1-063	1.15.2014			Please provide details for barrier gate with tire spikes.	The barrier gate and the tire spikes are manufactured items. Please see Specification Section 11 12 06 for barrier gate and tire spikes requirements.
TG18.1-064	1.15.2014			Crash cushions are designated on the plans, but details are not provided. Please provide details.	Crash cushions are a manufactured item. Please see Specification Section 34 71 06 for crash cushion system requirements.

Question No.	Submission Date	Drawing No.	Document/ Spec. No.	Question	Response
TG18.1-065	1.15.2014			What specific noise testing devices will be required to meet the requirements of Exhibit N?	The Trade Subcontractor should submit its Noise and Vibration Mitigation Management Plan with proposed noise/vibration monitoring devices and detailed monitoring procedures, as required in Exhibit N. The plan will be reviewed by the CM/GC and TJPA.
TG18.1-066	1.15.2014		Exhibit N	Exhibit N alludes to a vibration monitoring requirement. Can Webcor/Obayashi define these requirements in more detail?	Refer to response TG18.1-0065.
TG18.1-067	1.15.2014			Who pays for soils testing, stockpiling, covering, etc. for contaminated soils?	The TG18.1 Trade Subcontractor shall pay all costs required in the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exhibit L, Hazardous Materials Management Plan</li> <li>• Specification Section 00 03 35, Existing Conditions: Hazardous Materials</li> <li>• Specification Section 00 08 13/APD, Industrial Waste Ordinance #19-92</li> <li>• Specification Section 00 08 13/APE, Industrial Waste Discharge Limits</li> <li>• Specification Section 01 13 50, Hazardous Materials Procedures</li> <li>• Specification Section 01 13 50/APA, Site Mitigation Plan</li> <li>• Specification Section 01 35 65, Mitigation Measures and Monitoring</li> <li>• Specification Section 01 74 00, Construction &amp; Demolition Debris Recovery Plan</li> </ul>
TG18.1-068	1.15.2014			Precisely what tests are to be performed by the Trade Subcontractor? What tests or specific items of work will the Trade Subcontractor have to hire an independent testing lab for?	Please refer to the Specification Section 01 14 00, Quality Control for the test requirements. Additionally, each individual technical specification section specifies testing requirements for each scope of work.
TG18.1-069	1.15.2014			The Specifications indicate that the Trade Subcontractor must provide a resume of our proposed jobsite superintendent with the bid. In addition to this requirement, the trade subcontractor is also asked to assign a LEED certified professional at the time of bid. Can this be delayed until contract award?	No. All specified documents for the bid submission must be submitted on or before the bid due date. Any Bid that does not include all required documents may be deemed non-responsive and rejected.

Question No.	Submission Date	Drawing No.	Document/ Spec. No.	Question	Response
TG18.1-070	1.16.2014			What level of site security will be required by the Trade Subcontractor? Will security guards, security cameras, etc. be required?	Please refer to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Bidding Manual, Section IV.A.13, Protection of Work and Security</li> <li>• Section 00 07 00, General Conditions, paragraph 3.14, Use of Site</li> <li>• Section 01 14 19, Restriction to Use of Site Areas</li> <li>• Section 01 15 00, Construction Facilities and Temporary Controls</li> <li>• Section 01 15 40, Protection of Property, for the site security requirements</li> </ul>
TG18.1-071	1.16.2014		IV- Trade Subcontractor Requirements	[Bidder] is requesting information regarding the staging area available to the subcontractor. Need the size of the area that is available to the subcontractor need a specific location and duration that will be available. The concern [concern] is the area between Howard St. and Natoma St. The existing trailers and construction offices are in use by other trades, need to be vacant to perform all work in this area.	Please refer to Exhibit A Attachment 3, Logistics, for the TG18.1 Bus Ramps construction area. As specified in Exhibit A, the area south of Howard Street is provided to the TG18.1 Trade Subcontractor during the Bus Ramps construction period. The area between Howard Street and Natoma Street must be shared with other trade subcontractors and will not be limited exclusively to the TG18.1 Trade Subcontractor.
TG18.1-072	1.16.2014			[Bidder] is requesting a specific information regarding the design load allowable for its falsework of Frame 4 Box Girder. Trade Package TG06 Structural Drawing information not sufficient to provide the design load allowable. Please provide a drawing that address the allowable loading over the Transbay Transit Center very specific to this location.	Please refer to S-1001, S-1002 and S-1003.
TG18.1-073	1.16.2014		Long Form Subcontract	As you know, [Bidder] may elect to pursue the TG08.2 Exterior Awning Package and the TG18.1 Bus Ramp Package. Consistent with the revisions already incorporated in the Subcontract for TG07.1 Structural Steel Superstructure Package, [Bidder] requests that three revisions be made to the proposed Long Form Subcontract for these bid packages. First, add a Mutual Waiver of Consequential Damages as follows:  25.19 Mutual Waiver of Consequential Damages. Contractor and Subcontractor	1) The following underlined language will be added to the end of the first paragraph of Section 7:  <u>Neither party shall be liable to the other for consequential damages incurred directly by either party arising out of or related to a breach of this Agreement, except that Subcontractor shall remain liable for indemnification and the duty to defend against any actual and/or consequential damages that arise out of the Work or a breach of this Agreement that are assessed or claimed against Contractor by third parties, which include,</u>



Question No.	Submission Date	Drawing No.	Document/ Spec. No.	Question	Response
				<p>mutually waive claims against each other for incidental or consequential damages arising out of or relating to the Subcontract. This mutual waiver includes, but is not limited to, all damages for principal office expenses including the compensation of personnel, for losses of revenue (including profit), financing, business and reputation, and for loss of management or employee productivity or of the services of such persons. Liquidated damages imposed by the TJPA against Contractor are direct damages and nothing contained in this Section shall preclude an award of liquidated damages, when applicable, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Contract Documents.</p> <p>Second, the Long Form Subcontract has a binding arbitration clause in section 17.2, while section 13.1 of the Prime Contract states that disputes under the Prime Contract will be adjudicated in a California court. All disputes should be resolved in a court of law, including those that arise under the Long Form Subcontract. Arbitrations are just as costly and time consuming as litigation, without the ability to appeal an erroneous ruling of law.</p> <p>Third, section 24 of the Long Form Subcontract gives the prevailing party in any dispute its attorneys' fees. These clauses promote litigation, which benefits only the lawyers who drafted these clauses in the first place. If the parties are forced to bear their own attorneys' fees, the parties will work for a resolution before disputes escalate. All parties should be forced to bear their own litigation costs and attorneys' fees.</p> <p>Please let us know at your earliest convenience whether these proposed revisions will be incorporated into the Long Form Subcontract. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p><u>but are not limited to, the Owner, as well as for any such damages that are caused by an insurable event and covered by insurance.</u></p> <p>2) The following underlined language will replace Section 17.2.1 of the Subcontract Agreement:</p> <p><u>All claims, disputes and other matters in question between the Subcontractor and the Contractor arising out of or related to the Agreement or the breach thereof, except as specifically governed by the foregoing provisions, and except for claims which have been waived by the making and acceptance of final payments, or the failure to provide timely written notice, shall be decided by litigation; provided the parties agree to take all good faith efforts to resolve such disputes through informal dispute resolution procedures prior to instituting formal litigation, including but not limited to, discussions between the parties' principals with authority to resolve such disputes, and non-binding mediation.</u></p> <p>3) Section 24 of the Subcontract Agreement shall be deleted in its entirety.</p>
TG18.1-074	1.16.2014		Specification 00 04 20 2, Article 1.5	Project Specification 00 04 20 – 2, Article 1.5 Section A states that the TJPA's design team will incorporate the new VE proposal and be	The Section 00 04 20 requirements relative to integration of VE proposals will remain as indicated.

Question No.	Submission Date	Drawing No.	Document/ Spec. No.	Question	Response
				retained as Engineer of Record for the new design. We request that TJPA reconsider this specification since the VE proposal will have most of the Conceptual design completed and VE's Engineer can expedite the final design in quicker manner.	
TG18.1-075	1.16.2014	S-2048		Drawing Sheet S-2048 shows the total length of the retaining wall to be 16'5". Should the length Of the wall be 197'?	The total length of the wall is 197 feet. Drawing S-2048 will be revised in a future addendum.
TG18.1-077	1.16.2014			Regarding the overhead power lines for lighting and transportation (buses): Will the lines be relocated during falsework installation and removal? What is the work window? Who is responsible for the cost of this work?	If the falsework designed by the Trade Subcontractor requires OCS (overhead contact system) relocations, the Trade Subcontractor is responsible for the relocation, restoration and all necessary permissions including all associated costs. If relocation is not required, the existing OCS must be protected to maintain the safety of the public transportation system.
TG18.1-080	1.16.2014			What are the allowable closure hours for the Fremont Street off ramp?	Please refer to the following specifications for any existing street/roads closures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 01 15 70, Traffic Routing Work</li> <li>• Section 01 15 70/APA, Maintaining Traffic – Bus Ramps</li> <li>• Section 01 15 70/APB, Traffic Control System for Ramp Closure – Bus Ramps</li> </ul>
TG18.1-081	1.16.2014	S-3191		There is only 1 pier foundation with 2 single Barrettes on the entire project. All other foundations utilize CIDH piles of various types. To optimize construction schedule and overall cost, we kindly request an alternate foundation type underneath the Pylon. CIDH piles from 5ft to 12ft in diameter have been successfully installed in similar ground conditions and to similar depth in the City of San Francisco.	The loads on the foundation from the pylon combined with the proximity of the foundation to the train box require the use of barrettes.

