

## Buffalo Creek Parallel Interceptor, Phase 1

#1	10/14/2020 4:42 PM	Are there Specs for this project?
	10/15/2020 6:23 AM	Plan Specs will be uploaded by noon 10/15/2020
#2	10/15/2020 8:55 AM	can you please post a excel version of the bid proposal items.
	10/15/2020 12:33 PM	NTMWD will not provide excel bid form.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#3	10/15/2020 10:36 AM	Is there a KMZ file that can be uploaded for this project? Thanks.
	10/16/2020 4:15 PM	KMZ uploaded.
#4	10/20/2020 9:11 AM	The rim elevation for the manhole at 417+38.01 is 421.78 however that would appear to put the manhole below the surface. Please verify the rim elevation of this manhole.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#5	10/20/2020 9:13 AM	On sheet 36 there is a tunnel called out from 584+23.00 to 586+93.00 as being 170 LF. Please confirm the end station should be 585+93.00.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#6	10/20/2020 9:15 AM	On sheet 40 there is a tunnel from 631+42.00 to 632+96.00 which is 154 LF however it is called out as 144 LF. Please confirm the length of this tunnel and adjust bid item quantities if changed.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#7	10/20/2020 9:21 AM	On sheets 42 and 43 there are 2 tunnels that are called out as open cut w/ steel encasement in plan view and B.O.T.O.C. in profile view. There is also a 45 LF length that is called out open cut w/ steel encasement in both views. Please clarify if these are to be installed by BOTOC. If open cut casing is required please provide a pay item for 42" Carrier in Steel Casing by Open Cut.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#8	10/20/2020 9:24 AM	The pay item for BOTOC pipe items all say "in Steel Casing Pipe" however details and specifications are provided for tunnel liner plate. Please confirm that BOTOC can be steel casing or tunnel liner plate at all tunnel locations as selected by the contractor.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#9	10/20/2020 9:27 AM	Manholes at 690+31.91 and 717+30.40 are shown as type with vent but they are only designated as Type S in plan view. Please confirm these are to be Type S with Vent and Odor Control.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#10	10/20/2020 9:29 AM	The manhole over the existing 36" Line appears to also be counted in the total of item 14. Please confirm total manhole quantity.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#11	10/20/2020 3:14 PM	Please clarify what the fence removal and replacement callout is asking for. They read "remove and replace XX LF of fence and W/2 pipeit metal tube gate". Need to know if there are existing gates and are we replacing with 1 gate or 2 gates and the remaining length by matching fence type? The fence details do not show a pipe tube gate.

	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#12	10/21/2020 9:52 AM	Plan notes state not to stage equipment or store piled materials over the existing gravity interceptor. Please clarify if construction traffic will be permitted over the top of the existing gravity interceptor.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#13	10/21/2020 11:57 AM	FRP is specified with a pipe stiffness of 72. Can the PVC be specified to have a competitive pipe stiffness of 75? As the specs currently stand, FRP has an unfair price point advantage by permitting less material on their pipe.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#14	10/21/2020 12:11 PM	Can you please clarify the joint restraint requirement in casing for F679? The purpose of restrained joints in casing is to permit the ability to remove the pipe in the future, if needed, for replacement. Per the detail, the contractor is also to fill the annular space with grout. The grout requirement would prohibit the removal of the pipe in the future thus making restrained joints obsolete.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#15	10/21/2020 4:03 PM	ASTM F679 for PVC sewer pipe includes a pipe stiffness of 75. Currently PVC is specified on this project as PS115 and will not be price competitive against the lower stiffness composite pipe. Please allow PS75 for the PVC alternate.
	10/30/2020 3:09 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#16	10/21/2020 5:11 PM	We would like to submit Fiberstrong Fiberglass Reinforced Polymer Mortar Pipe as manufactured by Future Pipe Industries to be added as an approved manufacturer for the Buffalo Creek Parallel Interceptor, Phase I. Fiberstrong is manufactured per ASTM D3262 Type 1, Liner 1 and Grade 1 which meets the project specifications. The field connections are made using FRP sleeve couplings using EPDM elastomeric gaskets as the sealing mechanism and meet the joint qualification testing per ASTM D4161. There are currently only 2 manufacturers listed for the FRP pipe. Future Pipe will add a 3rd manufacturer providing North Texas Municipal Water District additional competition for this specialized product. Further, Future Pipe has successfully provided Fiberstrong Fiberglass Reinforced Pipe for North Texas Municipal in 2006 for the Muddy Creek WWTP Expansion Project. Additional product and company information can be submitted if required.
	10/30/2020 3:10 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#17	10/22/2020 8:34 AM	Embedment details call for a maximum of 12" of stone to either side of the pipe. This is typically a minimum. The use of a trench box or shield which is required at this depth would leave little to no room between the pipe and shield. Please clarify why a max of 12" has been specified.
	10/30/2020 3:10 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#18	10/22/2020 1:42 PM	Will damages to irrigation pipe and/or storm drainage damage at golf course be paid from the allowance?
	10/30/2020 3:10 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.

#19	10/23/2020 9:29 AM	A third party broker is asking for permission to import FRP pipe likely from Indonesia or the Middle East. You have multiple US manufacturers of PVC pipe and FRP pipe providing ample competition and comply with the Buy American requirements of projects utilizing federal funding, meet or exceed US EPA, OSHA, Medical insurance requirements and Davis Bacon pay rates. Please help protect American workers and American jobs.
#20	10/23/2020 10:13 AM	Note 1 on the sanitary sewer in steel casing detail on sheet 64 states that all FRP in steel casing shall be SN46. All of the bid items are for SN72. Please correct this note to show that SN72 is used in tunnels per the bid items.
	10/30/2020 3:10 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#21	10/23/2020 10:20 AM	Question number 20 addresses FRP pipe grouted in place inside steel casing. The design calculations show that SN46 pipe exceeds the design (loading) requirements recommended by AWWA's M45 design guide as well as reduce the cost to NTMWD of supplying a stiffer pipe where it is not needed (one of the many benefits of reinforced plastic pipe). We request that the plans, specifications remain unchanged on this issue.
	10/30/2020 3:10 PM	See Addendum 1 documents.
#22	10/23/2020 4:46 PM	After reviewing all manholes shown in the plans, we cannot find any manholes of 48" diameter or less, also after adding up all the vertical feet of all manholes shown in plans the result is 2800+ VF more than the what is being specified in the Bid Items. Please advise
#23	10/24/2020 7:37 PM	Does the pipe material for the 24" interconnect pipe, bid item 23, need to match the selected pipe material? If so please add a pay item for 24" pipe to FRP and PVC items.
#24	10/24/2020 8:15 PM	The pave stone detail includes articulated concrete block details but the plan sheet also references 32 13 19 for grass-stone or turfstone grid pavements. These materials are not the same. Please clarify if articulated concrete blocks or grass filled pave stones are to be used for this pay item.
#25	10/24/2020 8:27 PM	Please clarify what the D50 is for the medium rock rip rap under pay item 30.
#26	10/24/2020 9:11 PM	Please provide specification 03 23 23.33 for Flowable Fill Backfill.
#27	10/24/2020 9:19 PM	Please confirm that the dimensions shown for the concrete embedment Class G-1 are correct. The dimensions of 1.6" and 2.15" below pipes do not appear typical.
#28	10/26/2020 10:08 AM	The design calculations for PVC pipe show that even for the deepest depths of cover, a PS 46 pipe can be utilized and meet the required deflection limit. Specifying PS 115 adds unnecessary costs to the project without providing any real benefit. Recommend changing bid documents to specify PS 46 for PVC pipe.
#29	10/26/2020 10:11 AM	PVC pipe joints are water-tight and tested in accordance with ASTM D3212. Requiring a hydrostatic pressure test for PVC pipe does not make sense and puts PVC pipe at a distinct economic disadvantage. Recommend either require hydrostatic testing for FRP or remove it for PVC.

#30	10/26/2020 2:36 PM	We see the bid items for the FRP tee bases (items 10-13), riser pipe (item 7) and cone sections (item 14) and are under the assumption that the other items to complete the manhole/structure such as the ring and cover, grade rings and all other manhole materials will be supplied by the contractor. Please advise if this is correct or if a new bid item(s) will be added for the contractor to furnish such items.
#31	10/26/2020 2:41 PM	Please disregard question 30 it was to go to Sister Grove
#32	10/26/2020 3:16 PM	Can an electronic file of the Statement of Qualifications be provided?
#33	10/26/2020 3:51 PM	<p>This question/request is in reference to Section 33 39 60 which approves Warren Epoxy. As the manufacturer's representative, I request the approval of Warren 301-14 as a one coat system of 250 mils rather than a ½" of cement (Section 33 39 61) with 125 mils of epoxy (Section 33 39 60).</p> <p>Warren 301-14 has been used many times on previous NTMWD projects but always as a 1 coat system. Please consider the following:</p> <p>Warren does not recommend the coating of any concrete that has not cured for 28 days. The coating of "green" concrete has potential for delamination between the two layers of different materials.</p> <p>The adhesion between the multi-layer liners will be much lower than the adhesion of a low viscosity epoxy applied to a blasted and prepped concrete surface of a host structure. The cementitious material will be from a different manufacturer than the epoxy topcoat which will complicate matters from a liability and responsibility standpoint should there be a delamination issue. It is in the owners best interest that all layers of a coating system come from the same manufacturer.</p>
#34	10/26/2020 4:01 PM	<p>The testing of the epoxy manhole liners Section 33 39 60 does not mention spark testing or adhesion testing which are critical for Quality Control and common in most local specifications. Please consider adding the following language to the benefit of the owner.</p> <p><b>Holiday Detection Testing</b>  Holiday Detection test the liner per NACE SP0188 – Discontinuity (Holiday) Testing of New Protective Coatings on Conductive Substrates. Mark all detected holidays. Repair all holidays in accordance to coating manufacturer's recommendations. Typical testing requirements are 100 volts per mil so 12,500 volts to test 125 mils.</p> <p><b>Adhesion Testing</b>  Adhesion test 10% of the manhole liners at a minimum of three locations (cone area, mid-section, and bottom of the structure). Tests performed per ASTM D7234 – Standard Test Method for Pull-Off Adhesion Strength of Coatings on Concrete Using Portable Pull-Off Adhesion</p> <p>2/3rds of the pulls shall exceed 300 psi or concrete failure with more than 50% of the subsurface adhered to the coating. If over 1/3rd fail, additional tests may be required by the owner. If additional tests fail the Owner may require removal and replacement of the liner at the contractor's expense.</p>
#35	10/26/2020 4:35 PM	The bid form calls for a Conflict of Interest Questionnaire to be included in the bid documents. Please provide if required.

#36	10/27/2020 10:08 AM	In reference to culvert crossings that are called out to be removed along the pipeline. Are these to be removed for the full width of the easement or length of culvert; whichever may be longer? Are headwalls or safety end treatments required? If only a section being impacted has to be removed please provide a typical detail for the connection required between existing pipe and new. Also what is the embedment requirement for storm drain pipes?
#37	10/27/2020 10:18 AM	Fence details do not include a single strand rope fence with metal t-posts. Please provide detail for this fence type or provide applicable fence type to be installed where this fence type is called out to be removed and replaced.
#38	10/27/2020 10:35 AM	Will there be any cost for Permits per General Note 17 on sheet 3 of the plans?
#39	10/27/2020 10:35 AM	Please provide detail for double strand electric horse fence.
#40	10/27/2020 11:10 AM	Sheet No. 3, General Note #19 establishes Weekday Work hours, potential Saturday Work upon advance notice and Residential Area Work hour limitations. The work hour schedules set forth in Sheet 3, General Note #19 will significantly extend the construction time for the Tunnels as well as exponentially increase the costs for this scope of work. Specifically, if the Contractor is otherwise able to comply with ordinances and regulations concerning noise, etc. will the Owner allow 24/7 working hours for tunneling construction?
#41	10/27/2020 5:13 PM	Please provide the correct Rim Elevation for STA: 417+38.01
#42	10/28/2020 8:32 AM	1. Will you please clarify bid form item 24A? Bid form states Lump Sum for Post CCTV, however the specs state to be paid per LF. 2. If there are manholes that do not need cementitious backing prior to epoxy, can those manholes be sprayed with 125 mils of epoxy only and no cementitious?
#43	10/28/2020 9:19 AM	Article 9 of the bid form requires the costs of materials incorporated into the project. As there is an alternate bid the materials costs are expected to vary between the two options. Please provide a form with a table that can be completed for both material types and their respective totals.
#44	10/28/2020 9:31 AM	Can plan sheets showing the locations of the upstream MH's for the Lateral lines be uploaded? I believe they are referred to as community loading pipes in the plans. They will be needed to design a bypass pumping plan.
#45	10/28/2020 11:10 AM	Will doghouse polymer manholes paired with cast in place bases be accepted to minimize bypass pumping where existing sewers tie in?
#46	10/28/2020 11:15 AM	Sheets 42-43 have conflicting information in regards to Tunneling or Open Cut Casing Installation. Please clarify.
#47	10/28/2020 11:16 AM	Is there a weight restriction on Country Club Road?

#48	10/28/2020 11:17 AM	Sheet 50 has a call out for gravel road repair. Please update the plan view to show the location for take off purposes.
#49	10/28/2020 11:33 AM	Sheet 34 and 35 show the 48" pipe to be installed via open cut casing. Will the bid schedule be corrected to show 48 Inch Dia pipe in Open cut casing and will the BOTOC item be reduced?
#50	10/28/2020 12:56 PM	Where is the Sanitary Sewer connection requiring bypass pumping per the plan view note on sheet 28 of the plans?
#51	10/28/2020 4:12 PM	The polymer concrete manhole specification calls out chemical resistance testing per a California public works standard. Can the ASTM C267 standard for acid resistance be included in the specification as an alternative?
#52	10/28/2020 5:05 PM	Specification 33 39 60 indicates that flow through plugs shall be utilized to complete the installation of the epoxy coating. Specification 33 39 61 indicates that a cementitious manhole coating must be applied before the epoxy coating but the use of flow through plugs is not included in that section. Was it the intent of the design to have the existing line bypassed at all existing manholes in order to install the cementitious coating? Would NTMWD consider the use of a single coat epoxy only system in lieu of a 2 coat system? The cost of bypass does not seem likely given the estimated cost of construction for the project. Please clarify.
#53	10/29/2020 9:01 AM	Specifications for the 48" Diameter Steel Casing pipe indicate minimum wall thickness of 0.6875", and requires an OD Coating of AWWA C203 Coal Tar. The nominal wall thickness for uncoated pipe Per AREMA 2017, Table 1-5-5. is 0.688". Inconsideration of the specified ASTM A139 GR B standard which exceeds typical 36,000psi steel strength, will the Onwer waive the requirement for Coal Tar Epoxy coating if Nominal wall thickness of 0.750" is used?
#54	10/29/2020 9:07 AM	33-05-22-3 Part 2 B4 - Steel Casing specifications require longitudinal weld seams. The manufacture process of straight seam pipe to spiral weld pipe is more costly and provides no additional benefit to boring operations since boring operations utilize overcut on the lead section of casing pipe. Will the engineer permit the use of low profile spiral weld steel pipe for casings?
#55	10/29/2020 9:15 AM	33-05-22-3 Part 2 B requires ASTM A139 GR B steel Pipe for casing, a standard that requires hydro testing. Consider that end seals of casing, and press-fit connections will not withstand the same pressure as required by the Hydrostatic test pressure of the steel, nor are field welds of casing required to be X-Ray inspected. Please confirm the Hydro Testing of steel casing is not required and steel needs to conform only to yield and tensile strength of ASTM A139 Grade B.
#56	10/29/2020 9:16 AM	Does the contract require iron and steel to meet Buy America (100% domestic) or Buy American (51% Domestic) provisions?
#57	10/29/2020 10:24 AM	Please clarify where Bypass Pumping is required per Plan View Note on sheet 35 of the plans?

#58	10/29/2020 10:27 AM	Please Clarify what type of Fence is required to be removed and replaced at Sta: 564+75.00 on sheet 35 of the plans?
#59	10/29/2020 11:55 AM	Please Clarify what type of Fence is required to be removed and replaced on sheet 36 of the plans?
#60	10/29/2020 12:13 PM	The polymer concrete manhole specification calls out a requirement that all manufacturers will be ISO 9001 certified. To our knowledge, there is only one precast concrete manhole manufacturer, polymer or Portland, in the U.S. that is ISO certified. The precast concrete manhole and pipe industry typically supplies a certificate of conformance and sealed test results in order to satisfy any specification requirements. We would ask that any requirement for ISO certification be removed in order to allow more than one polymer concrete manhole supplier to bid the project.
#61	10/29/2020 2:01 PM	Specification 01 40 00 3.05 A.13.b states to test gravity pipe per procedure C, D, or E. Just below that procedure B is for hydrostatic leak test of gravity sewer lines. Please confirm that all gravity sewer, regardless of pipe type, does not require hydrostatic leak test.
#62	10/29/2020 2:03 PM	Please Clarify what type of Fence is required to be removed and replaced on sheet 37 of the plans?
#63	10/29/2020 3:10 PM	Can photos and/or videos of the manholes to be rehabbed be made available?
#64	10/29/2020 3:40 PM	Please Clarify what type of Fence is required to be removed and replaced on sheet 39 of the plans?
#65	10/29/2020 4:23 PM	Are contractors allowed to perform their own soil investigation?
#66	10/29/2020 4:53 PM	Please clarify where Bypass Pumping is required per Plan View Note on sheet 41 of the plans?
#67	10/29/2020 5:14 PM	Please clarify or provide a detail of the 24" interconnect at Sta: 656+19.31.
#68	10/30/2020 8:25 AM	Please clarify if PS115 PVC is the intended material for the alternate PVC items or if PVC meeting ASTM F679 standards is acceptable. Additionally, will hydrostatic testing will be required for the PVC alternate?
#69	10/30/2020 9:22 AM	Would you please post the pre-bid meeting attendees list?
#70	10/30/2020 3:26 PM	Will pipe installed pipe deflection be measured by dividing the amount of installed deflection in inches by the pipe's actual ID as measured in the field? For example 48" pipe that has deflected 2" (now 46" tall and 50" wide) is $2"/48" = 4.17\%$ deflected.
#71	10/30/2020 3:37 PM	Addendum 1 Revised Sheets file is incorrect. It is instead the PDF version of the Bid Tab Form. Please post the Addendum 1 plan sheets for this project. Thank you.

#72	11/02/2020 6:23 AM	Can the awarded contractor drain the existing pond inside Buffalo Creek Golf Club to preform excavation, sheet pile driving, and pipe installation?
#73	11/02/2020 6:31 AM	Who will mark the private irrigation, electric, water, sewer, gas and all other private utilities inside the Buffalo Creek Golf Course?
#74	11/02/2020 6:32 AM	Can the Buffalo Creek Golf Course allowance be used for a Ground Penetrating Radar/Survey to identify private utilities inside the golf course?
#75	11/02/2020 9:39 AM	Please clarify which creek crossings, if any, will require "G-1" type of embedment as shown on sheet #63.
#76	11/02/2020 10:28 AM	From Sta. 647+00 to 680+00 Has an investigation been done to locate any irrigation? If any irrigation is encountered in this area, will the district provide a change order cover cost associated with the repair/replacement of irrigation in this area.
#77	11/02/2020 10:32 AM	Sta. 647+00 to sta. 680+00 the existing grass in this area looks to be in very good condition and the homes in this area are well kept. Will sod be required for restoration in this area? Could a bid item or allowance be provided for the sod in this area?
#78	11/02/2020 10:49 AM	The Access easement called out on sheet 10, 11, 12, 13, Are they required? Are they for construction only or will they be used for access post construction? If required to be left for use after construction is complete, could a profile be provided?