

MPD - UPGRADE ENTRY, ROADS, PARKING AND LIGHTING (640A0-12-204FCA)

General Review Comments - 100% plans and specifications (bid set), dated April 22, 2013.

Submitted by JF - 5/15/13

*AE Response: 6/4/13*

No.	Sheet	Review Comments	Follow-up Comments	AE Response to Follow up Comments
<b>12</b> (from 100% review comments)	CS7.5	Accessibility Sign Post and Footing Detail: Signs will be installed in the sidewalk area. Detail to indicate pedestrian paving over top of concrete footing.	A/E changed the detail to indicated paving over footing. However, they also moved the signs from the paving area into the planting area. Thus the drawing information remains uncoordinated and incorrect.	<i>BKF: Detail will be revised to show both possible conditions.</i>
<b>14</b>	LI1.1 LI2.1	Controller to be WeatherTRAK ET PRO2 Smart Water Manager, with 5 years service contract: Model WTPRO2S-C-24-SPH, CIM-4YA	Model <b>WTPRO2S-C-24-SPH, CIM-5YA</b> (manufacturer rep provided incorrect info to VA)	<i>RHAA: Updated sheet LI1.1 and LI2.1 detail #1 controller model to WTPRO2S-C-24-SPH, CIM-5YA</i>
<b>17</b>	LI2.1	Install wire mesh at the bottom of valve boxes to prevent gopher intrusion	Wire mesh was added to some but not all valve box details.	<i>RHAA: Updated sheet LI2.1 detail #4 with note on wire mesh to prevent gopher intrusion</i>
<b>18</b>	LI2.1	Provide 18" coverage over irrigation supply line and wiring, and 12" coverage over lateral (new VA Irrigation standards)	A/E did not revise detail.	<i>RHAA: Updated sheet LI2.1 detail #3 with note to provide 18" coverage over irrigation supply line and wiring, and 12" cover over lateral</i>
<b>22</b>	ES0.1	Applicable Codes: Project should use NEC 2000, not 2010 California Electrical Code (CEC) Part 3, Title 24 CCR	Wilson / VA Electrical to check	<i>MAZZETTI Response 05/30/13: NEC 2000 is outdated. Mazzetti has revised sheet ES0.1 to reflect the latest version of the NEC and remove any reference to the CEC from the same sheet.</i>
<b>23</b>	ES2.2	Electrical Existing Lighting Plan: Base plan and lighting information are incorrect.	A/E did not revise plan	<i>MAZZETTI Response 05/30/13: Base plan has been updated along with the lighting information.</i>

MPD - UPGRADE ENTRY, ROADS, PARKING AND LIGHTING (640A0-12-204FCA)

General Review Comments - 100% plans and specifications (bid set), dated April 22, 2013.

Submitted by JF - 5/15/13

*AE Response: 6/4/13*

No.	Sheet	Review Comments	Follow-up Comments	AE Response to Follow up Comments
24	ES2.3	<p>Electrical Proposed Lighting Plan Photometric: The photometric data on the plan does not correspond to the location of the light fixtures. Please provide the data associated with proposed light fixtures. Calculation should have a summary table that include: Average FTC, Max FTC, Min FTC, Max to Min, and Avg to Min information.</p> <p>The VA's Light level standards for the project are: Loop Road: H= 0.75 FTC Average, Avg:Min = 6:1 Sidewalk: H= 0.1 FTC Average, Avg:Min = 4:1 Residents Lane: similar to Loop Road or less, since it is a minor and residential roadway.</p>	<p>A/E did not update photometric information or provide summary table.</p> <p>VA cannot confirm whether proposed lighting level meet the Landscape Master Plan standards.</p> <p>Electrical plan did not use the updated base (with new location for Residents Lane access)</p>	<p><i>MAZZETTI Response 06/30/13: A new photometric study has been conducted and the summary is provided. The base plan has been updated.</i></p>

MPD - UPGRADE ENTRY, ROADS, PARKING AND LIGHTING (640A0-12-204FCA)

General Review Comments - 100% plans and specifications (bid set), dated April 22, 2013.

Submitted by JF - 5/15/13

*AE Response: 6/4/13*

No.	Sheet	Review Comments	Follow-up Comments	AE Response to Follow up Comments
25	ES2.3 ES2.4	<p>Electrical Proposed Lighting Plan - Location of light fixtures: Plan shows lights in the roadway and sidewalk. How will these fixtures be located in the field by the contractor?</p> <p>Design coordination and concerns: Lights on Loop Road - two new lights are shown on the loop road. Currently there is one existing light located between these two new lights, and other lights on the other side of the roadway. The existing lights are shown to remain. Did the photo metric calculation take into account of the other lights?</p> <p>Street light at campus entrance: The front view of the entrance should be the entry road street trees and not two street lights. These two fixtures may not be needed for lighting as the intersection will have new signals and street lights at all four corners. (see attachment)</p>	<p>A/E moved light fixtures from roadway and sidewalk into planting area (except for one - see attachment)</p> <p>A/E did not revise loop road lighting. What is the light level generated by the new and existing lights in close proximity to each other? (See attachment)</p> <p>A/E removed the two lights at the campus entrance but It is not clear whether they confirm the new lighting layout meet the required light level.</p> <p>Electrical plan did not use the updated base (with new location for Residents Lane access)</p>	<p><i>MAZZETTI Response 05/30/13: The lighting levels and the base plan have been updated. The new light levels meet the VA requirements.</i></p>

MPD - UPGRADE ENTRY, ROADS, PARKING AND LIGHTING (640A0-12-204FCA)

General Review Comments - 100% plans and specifications (bid set), dated April 22, 2013.

Submitted by JF - 5/15/13

*AE Response: 6/4/13*

No.	Sheet	Review Comments	Follow-up Comments	AE Response to Follow up Comments
26	ES2.4	<p>Electrical Proposed Lighting Plan :                      Symbols are not clear.                      Building 331 is on the emergency system.                      Therefore, all the roadway lights (fed from Bldg 331) will be on emergency power. There is not need to route circuits as shown. Keep circuit on one side of the roadway for each row of light fixtures. LPCS-8 is already in use; use LPCS-13 instead.</p>	<p>A/E changed LPCS-8 to LPCS -13                       They did not change the circuit routing per VA's suggestion. Please have A/E explain the reason for their design. The lighting system as shown will function, but it is not the most efficient (and more expensive way) to build.</p>	<p><i>MAZZETTI Response 05/30/13: The reason behind the circuiting method, is to allow power connections to the street poles to be re-routed and fed from the future police annex. However, per circuiting has been modified to reduce cost.</i></p>
27	ES5.0	<p>Single Line Diagram and Mechanical/Electrical Room - Power Plans are incorrect. Please reference ES3.1 and ES5.1 of the Bldg 331 A Wing and Courtyard project (see attachment)</p>	<p><b>Wilson / VA Electrical to check</b></p>	<p><i>MAZZETTI Response 05/30/13: Plans have been updated based on the previous attachments provided by the VA</i></p>
28	ES6.0	<p>Post Base Detail:                      Detail shows light pole in paving. Provide detail for light pole in planting (note raised concrete footing is not needed.) The 2' - 6" setback from face of curb to light pole applies to both planting and paving conditions.                      Detail shows #4 bare copper ground 20FT coiled below base. VA typically uses ground rods.</p>	<p>A/E added light pole in planting detail. (Keep top of footing 2" above finish grade)                       It is not clear how contractor will locate light fixtures in the field.                       A/E kept coil in detail. 20' copper coil is expensive. This is an acceptable approach if A/E provides valid reason for design.</p>	<p><i>MAZZETTI Response 05/30/13: The electrical drawings are diagrammatical. As noted on the drawing Electrical contractor to field verify the exact location of the light poles. The detail mazzetti used is a standard VA detail. Please advice if the design team (Mazzetti) is instructed to deviate from the standard VA detail - to use a ground rod in lieu of the copper coil.</i></p>

MPD - UPGRADE ENTRY, ROADS, PARKING AND LIGHTING (640A0-12-204FCA)

General Review Comments - 100% plans and specifications (bid set), dated April 22, 2013.

Submitted by JF - 5/15/13

*AE Response: 6/4/13*

No.	Sheet	Review Comments	Follow-up Comments	AE Response to Follow up Comments
30	ES6.0	Light Fixture Schedule: Schedule does not provide adequate specification for light fixture and pole. Coordinate the information for the specified light with the Exterior Lighting specifications.	A/E did not update /provide additional spec information. (VA had provided fixture and pole information to A/E for their design use.)	<i>MAZZETTI Response 05/30/13: The lighting fixture schedule has been modified to provide a detailed description of the light pole.</i>
31	ES6.0	Panel Schedules: These are incorrect. Please reference ES6.1 of the Bldg 331 A Wing and Courtyard project (see attachment)	<b>Wilson / VA Electrical to check</b>	<i>MAZZETTI Response 05/30/13: Panel schedule was updated based on the latest attachments received from the VA.</i>
33	AG1.2 AG1.3 AG1.4	Sign Elevations and Schedule: New signs will match existing MPD signs. Indicate top trim, background and text colors for the project.	A/E referenced "to match existing signs".  The colors are: Background - Mathews 61A-1A Yellow Trim - Mathews color to match Pantone 143M	<i>KKA updated color description for Addendum #2.</i>
B-1 (new comment / bid set review)	CS3.1		Need starting point for layout of tree grates in east-west direction.	<i>BKF: Additional horizontal control information will be added.</i>
B-2	CS6.1		The detail specifies a 70' tall flag pole. A 70' pole at the current location on the plan will dominate the entrance and be too close for viewing.  Relocate flagpole to second median to allow distance for better viewing. (See attachment)	<i>BKF: The 70' height is our best estimate of the existing pole height. The current location on the plan is per previous VA direction. The flag pole has been moved to the second median per additional VA direction.</i>

MPD - UPGRADE ENTRY, ROADS, PARKING AND LIGHTING (640A0-12-204FCA)

General Review Comments - 100% plans and specifications (bid set), dated April 22, 2013.

Submitted by JF - 5/15/13

*AE Response: 6/4/13*

No.	Sheet	Review Comments	Follow-up Comments	AE Response to Follow up Comments
<b>B-3</b>	CS6.1		<p>Civil plan shows Pedestrian Crossing and Speed Limit signs in the parkway strip at the campus entrance, and the Regulatory Sign in the median. Signage plan locates a direction sign in the median, at the same location as the Regulatory Sign.</p> <p>Directional Sign should remain in the median. Regulatory Sign should be on the side, in the parkway strip. There are many signs in the parkway strip - can we move the Speed Limit Sign to another area?</p>	<p><i>BKF: Regulatory sign has been moved to the parkway strip north of Hospital Plaza. A note has been added to the signing sheet to refer to the Signage plans for monument signs. The speed limit sign has been kept in its current location since it is ideally located to control the speed of cars entering the campus.</i></p>
<b>B-4</b>	L12.1 32 84 00 Planting Irrigation		Heat brand labels on vault covers (new VAPAHCS irrigation standards)	<p><i>Updated sheet L12.1 detail #6 with note to heat brand labels on vault covers and spec 32 84 00 Planting Irrigation</i></p>

MPD - UPGRADE ENTRY, ROADS, PARKING AND LIGHTING (640A0-12-204FCA)

General Review Comments - 100% plans and specifications (bid set), dated April 22, 2013.

Submitted by JF - 5/15/13

*AE Response: 6/4/13*

No.	Sheet	Review Comments	Follow-up Comments	AE Response to Follow up Comments
B-5	10 14 00 Signage		<p>Specification is generic, applicable to all sign types - "This section specifies interior signage for room numbers, directional signs, code required signs, telephone identification signs and temporary interior signs, etc. etc."</p> <p>To avoid confusion for contractor, please remove information irrelevant to Entry Road project, from the signage specification</p>	<p><i>KKA changed interior signage to exterior 10 13 00 for Addendum #2.</i></p>