

Lomitas Negras, Phase 2
SSCAFCA IFB #: 2018-07

ADDENDUM #2 (December 17, 2018)

Addendum #2 answers questions submitted by perspective bidders for the Lomitas Negras, Phase 2 project.

Written questions submitted:

PERSPECTIVE BIDDER #1

Question: Item 30 and 31 is a 6' diameter manhole, but states also that the manhole is Contech Ultra Flow or approved equal. Is the manhole in this item concrete?

Response: Approved equal means submit to engineer if another material/manufacturer is proposed, and if determined to be equal by engineer, it will most likely be approved.

Question: Item 68, please confirm the Valley Gutter is paid by CY and not SY

Response: Valley Gutter is to be paid in a Cubic Yards.

Question: Can a contractor bid as a Prime Contractor AND submit a bid to other prime bidders as a subcontractor?

Response: A contractor can both bid as a Prime Contractor and submit a bid to other prime bidders as a subcontractor

Question: Reference General Note 2: Is the City of Rio Rancho going to require haul permits and fees with this project? Some projects within the City are being assessed fees **and some are not**. For the haul across Saratoga DR NE, will the CORR require multiple permits to move 280,000 CY of dirt? Will permits be required weekly? On all CORR-owned projects, haul permits are not required.

Response: A ROW permit will be required, see the website link below. There will be no permit fees associated with the project from the City. No haul permit will be required for this project. See <https://rrnm.gov/1530/ROW-Permits> for further information.

Question: Reference General Note 3: Does SCAFCA anticipate any hazardous waste within the project limits?

Response: We do not anticipate hazardous waste, however SCAFCA will not commit that any may be present.

Question: The batch plant to produce the soil cement: Can this be set up directly outside the limits of the project as to be clear of all excavation?

Response: This is for the contractor to determine how best to manage/construct project.

Question: Are any permits through USCOE or CORR anticipated to set up the batch plant?

Response: There are no permits required for the setup of the batch plant from the City of Rio Rancho or the U.S. Corps of Engineers (USCOE). However, the batch plant may not be set up within the arroyo bed and the proposed batch plant location should be identified on the SWPPP as a support activity of the project.

Question: Reference Sheet 73-S-08 and 74-S-09 Pay Note 511000, "Does Not Include Rebar". Other notations throughout the plans, example 11-C-01 includes rebar. Please provide a schedule of which 511000 Structural Concrete includes and does not include rebar.

Response: This was an error, rebar is included within the pay item for all structural concrete items as stated in Supplement Spec. Section 511.6. Rebar will not be paid for as a separate item.

Question: Are there any necessary considerations required prior to submitting a bid due to the March 26, 2019 expiration of the USCOE permit that was issued in Addendum 1?

Response: The terms of the permit are valid for a period of one year after the expiration of the permit if the activity permitted has commenced or is under contract to commence. SCAFCA does not project any change in the terms of the USCOE permit.

Question: Please confirm the 3 various plan sets on your website: Part 1 of 3 appears to include Part 2 of 3 AND Part 3 of 3. Is this correct, or are there changes to note in our bid from Part 2 of 3 and Part 3 of 3?

Response: The Plans in the Parts were reviewed on the SCAFCA website, and appear to be correct and include the following sheets with no overlap.

Part 1 of 3 includes: Sheet 1-G-01 to Sheet 15-C-05

Part 2 of 3 includes: Sheets 16-C-06 to Sheet 45-35-35

Part 3 of 3 includes: Sheets 46-C-36 to 82-C-08

Question: Sheet C-109 was published in Addendum 1. Is this sheet to replace, or is in addition to sheet C-106 (22-C-12)?

Response: This sheet is in addition to the prior sheets. C-109 provides additional detail for the connection to the wing wall.

Question: Page 45 of the specifications, Section 4.02 state the contract time is 180 cal days, and 210 cal days for final payment. The slide presentation shown at the pre-bid meeting and found on the SCAFCA website (slide #19), state contract time is 150 cal days, and 180 cal days for final payment. Can you clarify which is correct?

Response: The contract times listed in the pre-bid presentation were an error. The contract times in the specifications are correct. The contractor will have 180 days to achieve substantial completion and 210 days to final.

Question: Does SSCAFCA know if the City of Rio Rancho will allow for Saratoga Rd closure and detour while earthmoving operations commence? This operation could see up towards 600 crossings per day to meet the contract schedule and will pose a safety concern if public traffic has access.

Response: A complete closure of Saratoga Road not an option. The traffic generated by the school is too significant. The contractor will need to have a flagging operation in place.

Question: Reference Item 62. Can you confirm Aggregate Base Course paid by CY or SY?

Response: Aggregate base course will be paid in Cubic Yards.

Question: Reference Item 64. Can you confirm SP-III asphalt in 2 inch lift? NMDOT specifies 2-1/2" minimum lift for SP-III.

Response: 2-2" lifts of SPIII will be used in Saratoga Road.

Question: Reference Item 69. Is the Mobilization not to exceed 5% of items 1 to 66 or 1 to 68?

Response: This was an error on the Addendum 1 Unit Price Bid Form. Mobilization is limited to 5% of the total of bid items 1 through 68. This is true for the Based Bid, the Deductive Alternate 1 Bid and Deductive Alternates 1 and 2 Combined Base Bid.

Question: Are the stock piles on Sheet 42-C-32 to be certified at 95% Compaction?

Response: No compaction required, except as required for installation of storm drain and manholes.

Question: There is a large, very large pile of rumble soil cement north of the "North Tributary". Does SSCAFCA know if this debris is within the work zone and the contractor will have to dispose of this material, or is this debris pile outside of the project limits?

Response: Existing piles of debris within the staging area or site access that need to be removed to facilitate the operations of the contractor will be the responsibility of the contractor to remove and dispose of (cost incidental to the contract). Piles of debris falling outside of the contractors staging area or not interfering with contractor operations may be left in place.

Question: Is any storm water flow from entering the North Tributary designed to enter the new drainage facility or do these flows bypass the improvements to directly flow to the existing Saratoga CBC?

Response: No flows from the North Tributary Arroyo flow directly into the Saratoga Pond. All flows drain to the Saratoga Rd. Box Culverts.

Question: Are the grubblings allowed to be placed on the final grade of the new facility of sheet 11-C-01 or on top of the stock pile of sheets 42-C-32?

Response: Grubbings will be stockpiled and reapplied to the dirt stockpiles on sheet 42-C-32 after final grade is achieved.

Question: Upon review of the site, there is now available fire hydrant for construction water without utilizing the school's on Obregon Road. Will the City of Rio Rancho allow for either a temporary or new fire hydrant if incidental to the project?

Response: There is an existing fire hydrant located approximately 200' north of the intersection of Saratoga and Obregon that can be utilized and another at the intersection of Saratoga and Vera Cruz. However, if the contractor wants to install another fire hydrant closer to the project, a proposal may be made to the City for review.

PERSPECTIVE BIDDER #2

Question: Bid item 43 is calling out 3" PVC SCH40 pipe on the bid tab. The plan details (34-C-24) are showing sch40 pvc and steel pipe. Do you want to use pvc or steel pipe?

Response: The weep holes are Schedule 40 PVC and Bid Item 43 is correct. Please note the lower right side of Sheet 34-C-24 indicates Schedule 40 steel pipes, this is correct. Since the quantity of these steel pipes is small, these pipes are not a bid item, and are incidental, as called out on the sheet.

PERSPECTIVE BIDDER #3

Question: Good afternoon. I would like to know if the Engineer will allow Reinforced Concrete Pipe in lieu of Corrugated Metal Pipe. I am a supplier and have contractors requesting quotes for RCP. As I stated at the Pre-Bid conference the benefit of strength as well as the life of the concrete pipe well out weighs metal pipe. The Corrugated Metal Pipe from my research appears to be the approximately 70% the cost of the Reinforced Concrete Pipe. Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Response: Reinforced concrete pipe is not allowed.

PERSPECTIVE BIDDER #4

Question: Page 170 – Testing Costs? No Line Item for Measurement and Payment on Bid Document? Look at 1507.9 payment on invoices from tester with no mark-up.

Response: Near the end of the Addendum 1 Unit Price Bid Form, Line Bid Item 71 provides an allowance for Testing Costs. Supplemental Technical Specification 1507 Testing and Quality Assurance calls this out as paid for as an "allowance on a Lump Sum Basis". A markup to an invoice by a test consultant would not be allowed.

Question: Page 172- Project Record Documents 1508.7 There is a bid line item for this, but it says that No Payment to be made for this effort? Please clarify.

Response: Yes payment for project Record Documents is allowed (Bid Item Number 5). Delete the Supplemental Specification Section 1508.7 Measurement and Payment Section text that says "shall be incidental to the Work and no separate payment shall be made for this effort".

Question: Page 224- 4.2.6 Soil Cement- Compaction equipment to be a minimum width of 5 feet. The width of the step is only 5' so can we go with a smooth drum roller that is 4-foot-wide and a plate compactor to go up against the forms?

If we use a trench roller with sheepsfoot teeth for the back two feet for to meet bonding specs or else we groove it in some way?

Response: It is the contractor's responsibility to meet the design and specifications. Means and methods will be left to the contractor to achieve these items.

Question: On sheet 11 where the 12' wide access road is shown coming down into the pond it says to see sheet 60-C-50 for detail. That sheet shows 5' of soil cement and 7' of 6" base course but also shows the base course side sloping away at a 3:1 slope which does not seem correct. Is the 12' wide access road actually a full 12' wide of base course and we cut the soil cement off at an angle at the ends at top and bottom of the access road?

Response: Sheet 11-C-01 – The note you are referring to “12 ACCESS ROAD SEE SHEET 60-C-50 FOR DETAIL” is incorrect for the access road from pond bottom to top of embankment. Refer to Construction Note 4 (Sheet 11-C-01) shown at the pond bottom, and shown at two locations on top of the embankment. These are the limits of 12' wide base course which becomes a little wide on top of the embankment between the two “4” construction notes. Also refer to Sheet 16-C-06 that indicates the soil cement transitions on the pond embankment side do not continue on top of the embankment along the soil transitions slopes. Therefore this part of the top of pond embankment is 12' wide base course.

Question: Elevation 5191' is not shown on the Energy Dissipator Drawing 33-C-23. Section A on 33-C-24 shows invert of weir at 5191'. Please confirm invert of weir.

Response: Yes, 5191.00 is the elevation of the top of the bottom slab on “Section A” (Sheet 33-C-24). See Sheet 33-C-23 - the top left plan view shows the elevation is 5191.00 for that same slab.

Please remember to acknowledge this addendum on your bidding form.

END OF ADDENDUM

Q:\SEC---PROJECTS\115121-02\ENGINEERING\Bid_Assist\Addendum 2\ADDENDUM #2 - Lomitas Negras Phase 2 Format
from SSCAFCA.docx