

Report on Road Repairs at Cambridge/Flying C Rd Gate

I obtained bids from Veerkamp and Sierra Asphalt. Vicini was not interested in bidding.

Veerkamp proposal dated 1/24/20 for \$23,307 was accepted and proposal and contract was signed on February 18, 2020. Work began 2/26/20 to demo approx **2643 SF (approx 30 x 88)** to depth of 7", re-grading and placing 3/4" road base at an average compacted depth of 4". The gate contractor, Andrey Zhadnov of Capitol Iron then installed seven new loops placed approximately 8 inches in trenched lines in the road base. Veerkamp then paved the area at average compacted depth of 3" rolled smooth. This project also included re-striping the road, re-shaping 217 LF of ditch & clean out of culvert to allow water to flow away from entrance. They also added left over asphalt to widen the shoulder at no charge to the District. The job was completed on February 28. The gate loops were tested and all are functioning as they should.

Sierra Asphalt proposal dated 2/4/20 for \$24,445 to demo approx **1260 SF (approx 3 x 42)** to depth of 7" and install 3/4 road base at average compacted depth of 4" and once gate contractor installed new loops, apply asphalt at average compacted depth of 3". This also included re-striping of road, re-shaping the ditch & clean out of ditch. It also included shoulder widening of 190 LF to re-grade & compact existing base as needed to widen 1-4' and install asphalt at average compacted depth of 3" -*****-**note that this shoulder widening work was not included in the motion at the 1/20 meeting so we did not think we should include this in contract anyway. The shoulder widening portion of the proposal was \$1425 per the owner, Tim Carver.**

Veerkamp proposal dated 2/7/20 for \$17,908 exact same work and measurements **1260 SF (approx 3 x 42)** as shown on Sierra Asphalt proposal above.

Had the Road Committee chosen to reduce the amount of work from 2643 to 1260 SF of R&R, we would have awarded the work to Veerkamp for proposal dated 2/7/20 for \$17,908 since it was for the same scope/description of work as Sierra Asphalt and the cost was \$6537 less. But the Road Committee made a decision not to reduce the SF. The Road Committee Directors Johnson & Clark, former Director & Road Chair Ken Moonitz and GM Karen Moonitz met on 2/13/20 at the gate. We examined the road, edges, ditch and where the loops were exposed and remaining loops would have problems in the near future. It made sense to do the larger portion of road of 2643 SF. GM reminded us that the Board motion was to "authorize critical repairs for the Cambridge/Flying C gates" based on the Board's discussion to R & R the road so that all the new loops could be installed under new asphalt to prevent further deterioration of road & loops, and that this was serious enough to do the work as soon as possible. We all were in agreement that the larger section of work needed to be done in order to do this right and that we needed to R & R 2643 SF not 1260 SF of road.

I did not obtain a second updated bid from Sierra Asphalt (with the additional SF of R&R & removing 190 LF of shoulder widening from the bid) to compare with Veerkamp's original 1/24/20 proposal because it was not necessary. I discussed with Director Clark and we knew that asking Sierra Asphalt to add on another 1383 SF of demo & install of 7" asphalt would result in a bid well over the Veerkamp bid of \$23,307--even with removing the shoulder widening portion of \$1425 (which we got for free from Veerkamp anyway)

Since Veerkamp had equipment already out, we also accepted and contracted an additional proposal dated 2/16/20 for \$7074 for the ditch repair on Strolling Hills since this collapsing ditch was starting to erode the road (page 2 of Director Sholl's culvert report) They re-shaped, installed fabric and rockline for 262 LF.

Director Johnson was authorized to obtain bid proposals and get the work done. The Veerkamp proposal was the obvious lowest and included the most SF of R&R and that was the accepted proposal. This project amount is less than the California Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Act and we can award work under this Act without going out to bid. Under this Act we are not even required to take the lowest bid. However we did get more than one bid and awarded the project to the contractor giving us the lowest price.