

# Questions & Answers 2026 Pavement Management System

## Update Request for Proposals

Given recent federal changes affecting DBE program applicability, is the proposer still required to include a detailed DBE utilization program under Section D) Equal Employment Opportunity, Item (2), including named DBE firms, scopes of work, and dollar participation amounts, or will a general statement of DBE outreach and compliance be sufficient?

- DBE outreach and compliance will be sufficient. We have been advised by Caltrans that DBE goal setting for state-originating funds is currently paused, and therefore there is no specific DBE goal established for this RFP.

Will the HCAOG allow semi-automated pavement condition surveys that utilize vehicles equipped with laser-based imaging and cameras?

- Yes, this is fine. We have moved to having a mix of foot survey method and automated in the past as well.

What is the functional class breakdown by mileage (Arterial/Collector/Residential/Other) of each jurisdiction's network?

- See summary of functional class mileage in each jurisdiction below. This information is also available in the previous reports located here (<https://www.hcaog.net/programs-projects/trails-streets-roads>) under the Pavement Management Program section.

Road Functional Classification (Source: NCE 2021-22 PMP)

Arcata

Functional Class	Number of Sections	Centerline Miles	Lane Miles	Network Area (%)
Arterials	82	14.2	28.7	24.2
Collectors	75	14.2	38.4	24.2
Residential	304	35.6	71.1	51.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>64.0</b>	<b>138.2</b>	<b>100</b>

Blue Lake

Functional Class	Number of Sections	Centerline Miles	Lane Miles	Network Area (%)
Collectors	3	0.7	1.3	10.0
Residential	71	6.4	12.9	90.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>100</b>

Eureka

Functional Class	Number of Sections	Centerline Miles	Lane Miles	Network Area (%)
Arterials	56	11.8	23.5	11.2%
Collectors	110	24.1	50.2	22.9%
Residential	418	79.0	158.0	65.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>114.9</b>	<b>231.7</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Ferndale

Functional Class	Number of Sections	Centerline Miles	Lane Miles	Network Area (%)
Rural Major Collector	7	2.3	4.6	24.1
Residential	54	7.0	14.0	75.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Fortuna

Functional Class	Number of Sections	Centerline Miles	Lane Miles	Network Area (%)
Arterials	22	7.9	19.2	22.6
Collectors	32	6.3	12.7	12.7
Residential	260	33	63.8	64.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>95.7</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Rio Dell

Functional Class	Number of Sections	Centerline Miles	Lane Miles	Network Area (%)
Rural Major Collector	5	1.0	2.1	7.3
Residential	108	13.3	27.0	92.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>29.1</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Trinidad

Functional Class	Number of Sections	Centerline Miles	Lane Miles	Network Area (%)
Major Collector	6	0.7	1.5	35.7
Minor Collector	4	0.6	1.2	19.7
Local	18	1.6	3.1	44.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>100.0</b>

County

Functional Class	Number of Sections	Centerline Miles	Lane Miles	Network Area (%)
Arterials	427	346.4	739.10	11.2%
Collectors	119	99.6	197.72	22.9%
Residential	1229	407.93	803.32	65.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1775</b>	<b>854.0</b>	<b>1740.1</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Gravel	71	49.4	89.1	-

For Task 4 (REVIEW MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION STRATEGIES) – is this review to be conducted individually meeting with each of the seven cities and the County, or just once with the whole group?

- Just once as a whole group. Although in that meeting, each agency is able to ask for a specific rehabilitation strategy that meets their needs or expectations.

In the “Attachment B Scope of Work PMS Update 2026” under DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING there is a mention of “road quality, drainage properties”. Could you please elaborate the expectations?

- Surveying pavement conditions does not include collecting information on drainage properties. The surveys do not include non-pavement issues such as traffic, safety and street hazards, geometric issues, shoulders, sidewalks, curb and gutters, drainage issues, or immediate maintenance needs. The RFP says, "Condition surveys shall be performed to identify stress in accordance with the MTC's Pavement Distress Identification Manual." Distress identification in accordance with the MTC's Pavement Distress Identification Manual does not include drainage properties. The RFP Scope of Work has been revised to reflect that drainage properties are not included in the data collection.

StreetSaver Database and Number of PMP Reports: During the 2025 PMP update for the Tribes (Hoopa, Karuk, Yurok, and Trinidad Rancheria), both Trinidad Rancheria and Karuk requested that their pavement data be removed from the shared StreetSaver database due to privacy concerns. As a result, these two Tribes/Rancherias will no longer have data available within StreetSaver for the upcoming PMP update. Based on this change, we anticipate preparing PMP reports only for Hoopa and Yurok, resulting in a total of 10 reports. Please confirm whether this interpretation aligns with your expectations for the 2025 update.

- Our expectation for the 2025 PMP update is that a report will still be prepared for each participating Tribe, including Trinidad Rancheria and Karuk.

Clarification on Drainage Properties Data Collection (Attachment B – Task 3) Attachment B, Task 3 lists required survey information, including street geometry, surface type, surface condition, surface distress, road quality, drainage properties, and Pavement Condition Index (PCI). According to MTC's Pavement Distress Identification Manual, drainage properties are not part of the pavement distress survey and would constitute a separate asset inventory effort. In the 2021/22 PMP update, NCE collected pavement distress data only and did not include drainage property evaluation. Collecting drainage information would require an additional scope, level of effort, and cost. Please clarify whether drainage properties are intended to be included in the pavement distress survey, or if they should be removed from the scope of Task 3.

- See similar question above.

Could you please confirm if there is a file size limit when submitting the final proposal in PDF format to HCAOG via email?

- Larger files can be shared as a Google Drive file, however we are capable of receiving emails up to 50 MB (body and attachments).

Could you please confirm if there is a page limit for the proposal?

- No there is no page limit

Could you please confirm whether we should also cc: [info@hcaog.net](mailto:info@hcaog.net) when submitting the proposal?

- Yes, you can CC this email, but it is not required.