

Addendum #2


**Travis Field Water Reclamation Facility Force Main (SW-534-19)
EVENT #8192**


December 15, 2020

This addendum has been issued from the Office of the Purchasing Director. Proposer shall be responsible for acknowledging receipt of this addendum in the Proposal Form. Failure to do so will result in the proposal being rejected by the Purchasing Director. This addendum is also posted on the City's official website: www.savannahga.gov.

Note: This addendum addresses all the questions received through the end of the Q&A period. Answers are provided here for questions (1 through 4) received by Friday, December 11, 2020. The Answers to questions (5 through 22) received after Friday will be provided in a separate addendum that will be posted at a later date.

1. **Question:** I found one conflict in specifications. In 00 1100, Invitation to Bid, it states bids are to be submitted in three (3) envelopes; however, Section 00 1110, Article 8 states it should be submitted in two (2) envelopes.
Answer: Bids shall be submitted in three (3) separate sealed envelopes. The first envelope shall contain the Disadvantaged Business Enterprises Provisions and shall be clearly marked with the Project Name, Event Number and Section 00 1310 Disadvantaged Business Enterprises Provisions. The second envelope shall contain the Bidder's Qualifications and shall be clearly marked with the Project Name, Event Number and Section 00 1135 Bidder's Qualifications. The third sealed envelope shall contain all other bid requirements and shall be clearly marked with the Project Name and Event Number and Utility Contractor's License Number (when required). The envelopes containing the Disadvantaged Business Enterprises provisions and Bidder's Qualifications shall be attached to the outside of the bid envelope
2. **Question:** Can the Vendors get a Key to walk the site at a later date.
Answer: No.
3. **Question:** Does the COS reserve the right to approve a contractor that does not meet the qualifications regarding 3 projects in 10 years over 12,000 LF and larger than 24" (See section 1135, page 1135-2)? You might be excluding some local contractors who are otherwise well qualified.
Answer: The minimum bid requirements shall remain in effect.
4. **Question:** Railroad Protective Insurance. Please advise on the following if the information is available.
 - Any pedestrian train traffic? If so, how much?
 - Number of daily passenger and/or freight trains:
 - Max. allowable speed (within construction zone):**Answer:** The contractor shall contact the appropriate railroad company directly in order to get the answer to the above 3 questions.
5. **Question:** Will you consider moving the bid date back to mid-late January?

- 
6. Question: Given the nature of this project, we are having a difficult time with the DBE requirements. Will you consider lessening these percentages? We are finding that there are not enough pre-qualified DBEs that can assist with this type of work (large diameter pipe installation, HDD pipe installation, etc.).
 7. Question: Will you consider a detailed line item contract in lieu of lump sum? There appears to be some areas / items that will need to be field adjusted. There will be a better bid value to the owner to get line items for these potential field adjustments instead of the contractor making assumptions.
 8. Question: What is the depth of the bridge foundation on SR 17 where the plans are calling for the HDD? Is the HDD designed to miss these deep foundations?
 9. Question: HDD at SR17 (STA 130+50 to STA 135+25); plan view shows 42" casing with 36" carrier. The profile shows 36" carrier only. Please clarify the material needed. Also, please clarify length as the note indicates 323 LF but the station range is closer to 475 LF. This is another reason why a line item bid may be more beneficial in this type of project.
 10. Question: Existing 48" Steel casing (STA 140+50 to STA 145+75); once the ends of this casing have been excavated, how much cleanout should we expect? IE - is it full of dirt.
 11. Question: Has a SUE (Subsurface Utility Exploration) been performed? If so can this information be provided? Given the nature of the bores, crossings, etc. we would like the ability to review these documents prior to bid time especially given the nature of this being a LS project.
 12. Question: Given this is treated water we are carrying, are there any coating requirements above CS-55 for manholes?
 13. Question: Will the entire run of pipe need to be restrained? Or do we only follow the chart shown in the details? We have been on these larger pipe line projects in the past where we were required to install RJ pipe in and out of valve locations. This would generally not be an issue if RJ pipe were a line item.
 14. Question: The manhole shown for 30" BFV will not be large enough. Please provide a detail that allows for the interior size needed.
 15. Question: Does the County / City / GPA have any designated laydown areas that can be used for this project?
 16. Question: There are power poles that will need to be supported during the excavation process. From the onsite walk through it sounded like GPA had to hold some of these poles themselves. Can you provide a contact that can provide us cost for this?
 17. Question: The note at the outfall structure states to remove / replace any rip rap during the installation. However this slope appears to have fabri-form slope stabilization. Will rip rap be acceptable to replace in these areas or are we to assume SY removal and replacement of the fabri-form?

- 
18. Question: Can you provided the costs for the Railroad Fees the contractor should include so we are all using the same numbers? If not can you specifically direct us to where we can get those fees?
 19. Question: Could a Precast Concrete Section be used for the Outlet Structure with a poured in place spillway poured on the slope portion?
 20. Question: Will the water for the hydrostatic testing be free and if not could you provide the fee rate for us?
 21. Question: Does this project have to meet AIS or Made in America requirements?
 22. The Bore pits on sheet C2.14 are inaccessible. Will the contractor be able to cross the Norfolk Southern Rail tracks to asccess this area?
 23. Will the utility poles on sheet C2.20 (approximately stations 163 to 165) that are in conflict with the force main be removed or held by the utility owner or will the contactor have to provide shoring?
 24. Is the contractor responsible for the cost to add access gates to the work areas in the port or will the Port Authority pay for this cost?
 25. Will the contractor be allowed to use lay down areas within the port?
 26. Which Port Gate will be used for material deliveries?
 27. What is the cost for port police to guard the work access gates?
 28. Question: We intend to submit a bid for this project and are planning a site visit this Wednesday, December 16th. We do not have proper credentials to access the Ports property. Is it beneficial for us to have access to the Ports property? If so, how do we go about obtaining these credentials?
Answer:
 29. Question: the plans call out C900 DR25 for pipe but the only PVC pipe Spec is for Water which calls for C900 DR18. Can you clarify.
Answer:
 30. Please provide route/ROW access to Sta. 114+00 to 115+00 (just south of the Norfolk Southern Railroad. This location seems to be inaccessible to all heavy equipment, due to lack of roads, right of way, or easements.
 31. The plans show 34" HDPE transitioning to 30" PVC. There is no 34" HDPE MJ adapter currently being manufactured by anybody.

Your options are below. Let me know how you want us to quote.

- a. Sub 36" HDPE for the 34"
- b. 34" x 36" Reducer – 36" MJ connection – 36" x 30" PVC reducer
- c. 34" HDPE x 30" Reducer – 30" HDPE MJ



Attachments to Addendum #2

- Site Walk Sign-in Sheet