

IFB-23-T026

ADDENDUM #4

THIS ADDENDUM IS ISSUED TO: Answers to Questions Received on 5-22-23

1. Question:

Sheet C1.1 – Note 15 indicates 128 SF of concrete rip-rap. Bid Item 20 is for 30 SY (270 SF) of medium stone riprap. Please clarify whether the rip-rap is concrete or stone, and verify the bid quantity.

Answer:

Bid tab has been updated. See attached.

2. Question:

Sheet C1.1 – Note 18 indicates 17 LF of 24" storm pipe. There is no bid item for this pipe. Should we include this 24" pipe in Bid Item 17 – 30" HDPE Pipe?

Answer:

Bid tab has been updated. See attached.

3. Question:

Sheet C1.2 – Note 10 shows a monument sign on the north side of the drive approach to the parking lot, but there are no details for this monument sign. Is the monument sign by others?

Answer

Monument sign is being constructed by others.

4. Question:

Landscape plans L1.1, L1.2, & L1.3 show sod in the parking islands and also outside the perimeter of the parking lots, but the outer limits of the sod around the parking lots is not clear. Please indicate the extent of sod around the parking lots.

Answer:

Sod should extend 5' outside the perimeter of the parking lots.

5. Ouestion:

Paragraph C.1..e of the geotechnical report recommends an asphalt bond-breaking layer between the treated subgrade and the concrete paving. There is no detail for this and no information on the specific material and thickness. Please confirm whether this asphalt layer is to be used, and if so, what material and how thick?

Answer:

Asphalt bond-breaking layer is not required between the treated subgrade and concrete paving.

6. Question:

We ask that you consider allowing the use of one application of the CEM-LIME product from Martin Marietta as a cost and time-saving alternative to separate lime stabilization and cement stabilization processes. Product flyer and technical data are attached.

Answer:

Bid as per geotechnical report recommendations.

7. Ouestion:

Addendum 2 – The response to question 2 basically tells us to build the head wall as-is and the driveway will be constructed later by others. If the headwall is built as-is, there doesn't appear to be anywhere for the water to go as it's surrounded by paving & curb. The overall site plan on sheet 2 of Plan Set 2 appears to show our 30" HDPE line tying into an existing storm line running under the main road coming from Trinity Blvd. Does this line exist, and are we supposed to tie into it?

Answer:

Storm Sewer line doesn't exist of yet, but we anticipate construction to start soon. If connecting storm drain system is not in place at the time of installation, then a grading plan will be provided that will allow current plan to drain.

8. Question:

Detail 4 on sheet 9 of Plan Set 2 indicates to backfill around conduit with "sand or flowable fill as specified" and to backfill above the conduit with "suitable backfill or flowable fill as specified". Please clarify what specific materials are to be used for this trench backfill.

Answer:

Contractor may use a clean sharp sand adhering to ASTM C33 around the conduit and a general backfill material adhering to the geotechnical report between it and the pavement section. The contractor has the option to use a flowable fill instead.

9. Ouestion:

Detail 5 on sheet 9 of Plan Set 2 is a ductbank detail. Please clarify which underground conduit runs are to be encased in ductbank concrete.

Answer:

No underground conduits are anticipated to be encased.

10. Question:

Section 01450 – Quality Control, paragraph 1.7 specifies a full-time Contractor's Quality Control Representative. Will this be required?

Answer:

Contractor's Quality Contractor Control Representative doesn't have to be a full-time individual. Revised Specification attached.

11. Question:

Section 01450 – Quality Control, paragraph 1.8 indicates that the contractor is responsible for provide their own testing facilities or engaging a third-party independent testing lab. Is this correct, or is Trinity Metro engaging an independent testing lab?

Answer:

Contractor is responsible for QC, and Trinity Metro is responsible for QA. So yes the contractor will need their own testing facilities or engage a third party independent testing lab.

12. Question:

Section 01560 – Environmental Protection, paragraph 1.11 and Tables 1 and 2 specify construction noise limits for the project. Are these limits to be enforced for this project?

Answer:

Contractor should adhere to the decibel requirements.

13. Question:

Section 01562 – Soil Erosion and Sediment Control, paragraph 1.4.D specifies the qualifications and duties of the contractor's Environmental Compliance Manager. Will an ECM with these qualifications be required for this project?

Answer:

Yes

14. Ouestion:

Section 01570 – Maintenance and Control of Traffic, what traffic control is anticipated for this project?

Answer:

Little to None.

15. Question:

Section 01785 – Project Record Documents, Figure 01785-1 Record (As-Built) Certification Stamp indicates that the as-built drawings must be sealed by a professional engineer employed by the contractor. Is this correct?

Answer

As-builts can be stamped by the contractor, a PE is not a requirement.

16. Question:

Section 01786 – Operation and Maintenance Instructions, paragraph 1.1.D specifies a training program. Will the contractor be required to provide any training for this project?

Answer:

Only training that will be required is showing the maintenance personnel how the lighting, CCTV, and irrigation systems work. O&M manuals will need to be provided in addition to any training.

17. Question:

Section 02221 – Utility Excavation and Backfill, paragraphs 1.3.A.4, 5, & 6 reference standards from the cities of Haltom City, North Richland Hills, and Grapevine. Are these standards applicable to this project?

Answer:

References above are not applicable to this project.

18. Question:

Section 02560 – Site Improvements specifies benches, trash receptacles, and bike racks, but we cannot locate these items in the plans. Please clarify the scope of this work.

Answer:

These amenities are not required for the parking lots.

19. Question:

Section 02600 – Maintenance and Control of Traffic, paragraph 1.3 refers to City of Fort Worth and TXDOT specifications for traffic control, detours, portable traffic barriers and work zone pavement markings. Please clarify the extent of traffic control required for this project.

Answer:

Little to None.

20. Question:

Section 02780 – Underground Electrical and Communications Distribution Systems, paragraph 1.7 specifies that the contractor provide ten sockets to fit security bolts and a certain number of fiberglass extension ladders to the Owner. Is this correct?

Answer:

Any required specialty tools required for maintenance access shall be provided with the O&M manuals. 2 of each will suffice. No extension ladders are required.

21. Question:

Section 02831 – Bollards specifies several different types of bollards, but we cannot locate any on the plans. Please clarify the quantity and type of bollard(s) required.

Answer

Bollards are not part of this project

22. Ouestion:

Section 03100 – Concrete Formwork, paragraph 1.3.A.2 references a specification from the American Railway Engineering and Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA) Railroad Structures Manual. Are these specifications relevant to this project?

Answer:

Specification for AREMA are not applicable.

23. Question:

Section 03200 - Concrete Reinforcement, paragraph 1.3.A.2 references specifications from the

American Railway Engineering and Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA) Railroad Structures Manual. Are these specifications relevant to this project?

Answer:

Specification for AREMA are not applicable.

24. Question:

Section 03300 – Cast-in Place Concrete, paragraph 1.3.A.3 references specifications from the American Railway Engineering and Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA) Railroad Structures Manual. Are these specifications relevant to this project?

Answer:

Specification for AREMA are not applicable.

25. Question:

Section 03300 – Cast-in Place Concrete, paragraph 1.3.A.4 references specifications from the BNSF-UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD GUIDELINES FOR RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS. Are these specifications relevant to this project?

Answer:

Specification for BNSF-Union Pacific Railroad Guidelines for Railroad Grade Separation Projects are not applicable.

26. Question:

Section 03305 – Portland Cement Concrete, paragraph 1.3.A.2 references a specification from the American Railway Engineering and Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA) Railroad Structures Manual. Are these specifications relevant to this project?

Answer:

Specification for AREMA are not applicable.

27. Question:

Section 03350 – Concrete Finishing, paragraph 1.3.A.2 references specifications from the American Railway Engineering and Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA) Railroad Structures Manual. Are these specifications relevant to this project?

Answer:

Specification for AREMA are not applicable.

ALL TERMS OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL REMAIN THE SAME UNLESS CHANGED THROUGH A WRITTEN AMENDMENT TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL. NO ORAL CHANGES ARE BINDING. CHANGE REQUESTS MUST BE IN THE FORM OF A WRITTEN REQUEST TO BE ANSWERED IN A WRITTEN ADDENDUM.

RESPONDANTS MUST ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM IN FORM 1 IN THEIR PROPOSAL. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY INVALIDATE THE PROPOSAL.