City Project No. UW18029 **Date:** February 7, 2022

CITY OF STOCKTON - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Project: Sierra Nevada Street Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation

Location: Along Sierra Nevada Street between Worth Street and Hazelton Avenue and along Hazelton Avenue between Sierra Nevada Street and Wilson Way in Stockton, CA

Questions & Answers No. 1 – January 27, 2022

Q1: Is the city aware of any Infiltration in the segments? Are pre-liners required on all liners?

A1: Infiltration has not been observed during CCTV at any location. Preliner is not required in the section from station 1+00 to 12+01 (along Sierra Nevada Street) but is from station 12+01 to 16+42 (along Hazelton Avenue) as indicated on the profiles on sheets 5 and 6, respectively, and elsewhere in the Bid Documents.

Q2: There is reference to exfiltration test for CIPP Liner 36" and below. Is this required? This will entail having the contractor fill the liner up with appx 100,000 gallons of water and hold it. This will add many hours to each workday.

A2: The exfiltration text is required to test the integrity of the rehabilitated pipeline.

Questions & Answers No. 2 – February 7, 2022

Q3: Letter of Clarification No. 1 instructed us to replace the Bidding Schedule in the Bid Forms with an updated Bidding Schedule, but while an updated list of bid items was provided, an updated Bidding Schedule was not provided since the document that was included did not have any place to input unit or total pricing for the items or for the total bid. Please provide the updated replacement Bid Schedule that would replace pages 4 & 5 in the original Bid Forms per the changes made in Letter of Clarification No. 1.

A3: Please refer to LOC No. 2 as shown on the Bid Flash site.

Q4: In the Bid Schedule totals, why are the Alternative items 5A and 7A being added to the Base Bid totals to arrive at a total bid when items 5A and 7A would replace items 5 and 7 and could not be additive with them.

A4: The Base Project Bid Items Subtotal remains the basis for contract award. Complete the forms as instructed.

Q5: CIPP design parameters specified in section 79-1.08.B require the CIPP thickness calculations to use a soil modulus of 500 psi, which is an extremely low value for almost all design situations, and especially for this project given that the majority of the pipe is fairly deep and is located under streets &/or pavement where soil can reasonably be expected to be well consolidated and of higher strength. Using 500 psi as the soil modulus in the CIPP thickness calculations will unnecessarily increase the CIPP design thickness, increasing the difficulty of installation and overall project cost. Typical values for soil modulus are often 1,000 psi at shallow to moderate depths under streets, and with values as high as 1,500 psi or higher in deeper &/or well consolidated soils. Since this pipe has significant soil cover under streets, we request that the soil modulus to be used in the CIPP thickness calculations be increased to 1,500 psi for this project.

A5: Design per Special Provisions requirements.

Q6: Is there a way to obtain and download the available videos remotely through an ftp site or other means? If so, can a link to that site be made available via email upon request?

A6: Contact the City project manager to request the videos as instructed in the Special Provisions.

Q7: Why is preliner required in the segments in Hazelton and not the segments on Sierra Nevada if, per the Q&A #1 dated 01/27/22, infiltration has not been observed in any of the pipelines previously?

A7: The segment on Hazelton contains multiple irregularities such as exposed rebar, unsealed joints, cracked and/or missing sections of pipe. Although infiltration has not been observed, the preliner provides mitigation against potential infiltration the owner has opted to implement.

Q8: Note 3 on drawing sheet 6 says the location of the new SSMH currently shown at STA 15+25 may shift. What will influence the determination on the final location for this manhole? Will the Contractor or the Owner make the final determination on its location?

A8: Potential bidders should bid as shown on the plans. The Owner may consider input from the Contractor but will direct any changes as necessary.

Q9: What existing condition has been observed in the pipe that is resulting in the potential point repair located between STA 15+55 and 15+65 on Hazelton? Is this point repair only required if this potential condition in the host pipe has further deteriorated, and if so, by what amount? Will the Contractor or the Owner make the final determination on whether a point repair is needed? If this point repair is needed, is there a possibility that the new manhole currently shown at 15+25 could be shifted to be in the same location as the point repair?

A9: Review the CCTV footage to observe the condition of the pipe at the time. Upon providing video of the pipe in its current state, Owner will determine whether the pipe requires point replacement as described. The new maintenance hole if not constructed where shown will be located outside the intersection of East Hazelton Avenue and South Wilson Way.

Q10: Information provided about work near the BNSF tracks indicates a railroad permit is not required, but will railroad protective insurance be required to be provided by the Contractor? Also, will BNSF flaggers need to be on site? If so, under what conditions will BNSF flaggers need to be present, and will the Contractor or Owner be responsible for paying for them?

A10: The Contractor shall coordinate for flaggers to be present during CIPP operations under the railroad. For rehabilitation or replacement of Maintenance Hole SSMH-34P074 at station 4+45, Contractor may assume that flaggers are only required if removed and replaced. Refer to Letter of Clarification No. 3 and the bid item descriptions for information on the number of days of BNSF flagging the City will pay for. See also LOC No. 4.

Q11: Is the pipe crossing under the BNSF tracks in a structural casing? Will the CIPP installed in the pipe under the BNSF tracks need to be designed to support E-80 railroad loading? Q10:

A11: The pipe under BNSF tracks is believed to be cast-in-place and is not known to be within an additional structural casing. Contractor design standard is for the conditions specified; design for E-80 loading is not required.