

ADDENDUM No. 1
November 18, 2015

Wick Road Reconstruction & Vining Road Rehabilitation
City of Romulus, Tax Increment Finance Authority ITB 15/16-07
OHM Advisors project #0155-15-0121

The following changes, additions, and/or clarifications to the Contract Documents shall be incorporated in said documents and shall be allowed for in the unit prices bid by the Contractor such that the unit prices indicated in the Bid Form shall represent the conditions as set forth in the Contract Documents and this addendum. This addendum contains 5 pages.

The bidder shall acknowledge the receipt of this addendum on page BF-1 of the Bid Form and shall staple this addendum into the Contract Book.

Below are the answers to all of the bidder questions received by OHM Advisors before 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday November 17, 2015:

Q1: Where are the sidewalk ramp details?

A1: There are no sidewalk ramps to construct in this job. However, the intersection detail grades sheet does call for curb drops for “future” ramps. The future ramps are not in this contract. However, the ramp-less curb drop gutter pans will be paid for with the item *Sidewalk Ramp, Conc, 6 inch*.

Q2: Are there any wage requirements?

A2: No, this project does not have prevailing wage requirements.

Q3: Does the Contractor have to provide shop drawings for the two principal 48-inch water valves?

A3: No. DWSD is procuring the 48-inch valves in advance of the award, and will provide them to the Contractor. The Contractor does not have to provide shop drawings. DWSD will get them directly from the supplier.

Q4: What 10-year flow rates (Q) do the proposed storm water treatment chambers (SWTC) have to carry?

A4: West of Vining Rd, between Prop MH 27 and Ex CB 1990, the SWTC must have a capacity of 8.9 cfs (e.g. KSI model 2500). East of Vining Rd, between Prop MH 25 and Prop MH 26, the SWTC must have a capacity of 6.7 cfs (e.g. KSI model 1750).

Q5: Since OHM Advisors already applied for the permits on behalf of the City of Romulus, who is responsible for paying the fees?

A5: Refer to page 9 (SIB-3) of the Specs which states, “...the CONTRACTOR must secure the permits prior to the start of construction and shall be responsible for all associated fees, deposits, bonds, proof of insurance...” This is reiterated on page 76 (GC-17) item 39 – Permits & Regulations. Note that the MDEQ Water Supply permit is already in hand and paid for. The following fees are anticipated to obtain the remaining permits:

- MDOT Permit (for construction within I-94 ROW and placing temporary signing). Application (ref. no. 35338) was submitted by OHM on 10/28/2015. Because it was submitted on behalf of a municipality, MDOT stated that there is NO fee.
- Wayne County DPS Construction Permit (primarily for storm water treatment system). Application was submitted by OHM on 11/12/2015. The WCDPS permit engineer estimated that the permit fee will be about \$5000.
- WCAA / FAA Form 7460-1 (notice of proposed construction). Application was submitted by OHM on 11/13/2015. There are NO fees associated with this FAA determination.

Q6: Who is responsible for testing and inspection?

A6: The Contractor is responsible for quality control (QC). As the construction engineer for the City of Romulus, OHM Advisors will be responsible for quality assurance (QA). As DWSD's designee, Somat Engineering will provide water main inspection.

Q7: Is it the intent to only replace one lane in the item *Roadway Restoration Sta 197+28 to 208+25 (for DWSD)*?

A7: Yes, as shown on the road/pavement typical cross section on drawing WS-XXX-24, the intent is to restore one lane of the road as disturbed by installation of the water main (east of the road reconstruction POE).

Q8: On water main sheet number WS-XXX-01, General Note 26 says, "All excavated soils shall be disposed at a Type II landfill." Is this the intent? Does all excess excavated material on the job have to go to a Type II landfill? Does it apply to all of the 48" water main work, or just a portion (e.g. east of Sta 197+28)? What about earth spoils from the road work portion of the project?

A8: Earthwork for road reconstruction is covered by the Special Provision for Roadway Grading, and excess and unsuitable material should be disposed per section 205 of the MDOT 2012 Standard Specifications for Construction.

For the 48-inch water main work, delete Note 26 and replace with the following:

During excavation for installation of the water main, the Contractor may encounter contaminated soils. If suspected contaminated soils are encountered, notify the DWSD representative immediately. The DWSD representative will use visual / olfactory observations and field screening data to determine if the soils are contaminated. Handle and manage soil considered to be contaminated as such, transport it off-site, and dispose of it at a licensed landfill. Select a landfill, subject to the approval of DWSD. Coordinate the disposal approval and permitting, as required by jurisdictional authorities and the landfill, prior to excavating contaminated soils. DWSD will have final authority to approve which procedures to follow upon encountering contaminated soil during water main installation. This work will be measured by the quantity of contaminated soil excavated, transported, and disposed, as measured in tons on a certified scale.

NOTE: Payment will be made by DWSD from an allowance allocated to this project, separate from the items listed on the Bid Form.

Q9: The plans call for all storm sewer to be Class IV RCP. Can the Contractor propose any other materials (e.g. polypropylene pipe)?

A9: No, do not propose any alternate materials in your bid. All bids must be based on the pay items shown on the Bid Form.

Q10: Regarding Wick Road Reconstruction item 47 (Roadway Grading), can you share the engineer's calculations / estimated quantities for topsoil stripping, earth excavation, and embankment?

A10: No, these quantities will not be provided. The earthwork must be bid by Station using the information shown on the plans.

Q11: On plan sheet 16, it looks like some clearing is needed, but I don't see an item for that on the Bid Form. Does one need to be added for it?

A11: Since there is only about 0.07 acre of clearing required for the entire project, it will be included in payment for the item *Roadway Grading*.

Add the following to section "c. Construction" in the Special Provision for Roadway Grading:

6. All clearing, as described in section 201.

Q12: Regarding both east and west end of the 48" water main, it is my understanding that we are leaving temporary end caps (dished bulkhead on west end and blind flange on east end), but that we are not making a physical connection to existing pipe at either end. Please confirm this is correct.

A12: Yes, this is correct.

Q13: On water main sheet WS-XXX-24, the road/pavement typical cross-section indicates 6" MDOT CL II under the pavement. Is this really intended to be an aggregate base?

A13: Yes, the 6-inch base under the concrete pavement should be aggregate, per section 302 of the MDOT 2012 Standard Specifications for Construction. Please bid accordingly for the item *Roadway Restoration Sta 197+28 to 208+25 (for DWSD)*.

On drawing WS-XXX-24, on the Road/Pavement Typical Cross Section, delete the label "6-inch MDOT Cl II backfill compacted to 95% of ASTM D1557 (both pavement cross sections)" and replace with the following: "Aggregate Base, 6 inch".

Q14: On water main sheet WS-XXX-24, the road/pavement typical cross-section notes appear to indicate no crushed concrete in the aggregate base. Does this apply to just roadway restoration east of Sta 197+28 or does it apply to all of the Wick Road reconstruction?

A14: No, it does not apply to any aggregate base on the project. Aggregates must conform to section 902 of the MDOT 2012 Standard Specifications for Construction.

Delete the following note on drawing WS-XXX-24, under the Road/Pavement Typical Cross Section: "All aggregate base NCC is to be compacted to 100% of its maximum unit weight. NCC = no crushed concrete."

Q15: We submit the following technical clarifications for the Special Provision for DWSD, Water Main, Prestressed Concrete Embedded Steel Cylinder Pipe, 48 inch. Do you concur?

A15: Yes, but only as indicated below.

The following changes are accepted into the Special Provision for DWSD, Water Main, Prestressed Concrete Embedded Steel Cylinder Pipe, 48 inch:

- Page 561, Section b.1.A.(4): Change “cubic yard” to “cubic **foot**”.
- Page 562, Section b.1.G: Change “Grade 33” to “Grade **36**”.
- Page 562, Section b.1.I: Change “Grade 33 steel” to “Grade **36** steel”.
- Page 563, Section b.3.I: Change “steel hub, pipe flanges” to “steel **ring**, pipe flanges”.
- Page 564, Section b.7.B: Change “3,000 psi” to “**2,700** psi”.
- Page 564, Section b.7.C: Change “at least 425 percent” to “at least **400** percent”.
- Page 564, Section b.7.D: Change “the range of 1.02 and 1.19” to “the range of **0.95** and **1.45**”.
- Page 564, Section b.7.F: Change “compound of 60” to “compound of **50 ~ 65**”.

Q16: Can the following statement be deleted from the Special Provision for DWSD, Water Main, Prestressed Concrete Embedded Steel Cylinder Pipe, 48 inch on Page 562, Section b.3.C: “Strut fittings until installed unless otherwise reinforced.”?

A16: No, this statement will remain in the special provision.

Q17: On 48” Water Main drawing WS-XXX-15 (Sta 168+82 to 173+00), can bulkhead detail Note #2 be changed from “for 350 psi internal pressure” to “to meet specified field test”?

A17: No, this change is not acceptable to DWSD.

Q18: On 48” Water Main drawing WS-XXX-15 (Sta 168+82 to 173+00), on the bulkhead detail, can the following label be deleted: “1-inch threaded steel rod (4 total) with washer”? Also, can the 3-foot dimension be deleted for the threaded steel rod embedment measurement on the same detail?

A18: Yes, these changes are acceptable. However, design and submit these items to DWSD for approval prior to construction or installation of the cap / bulkhead.

On drawing WS-XXX-15, on the bulkhead detail, delete the label “1-inch threaded steel rod (4 total) with washer”. On the same detail, delete the 3-foot dimension for the threaded steel rod embedment.

Q19: Regarding pay item 169 – Roadway Restoration (Sta 197+28 to 208+25), can you confirm the type of transverse joints desired for the 9” non-reinforced concrete pavement? Should they be MDOT Cp contraction joints?

A19: Yes, provide transverse joints according to the following MDOT Standard Plans:

R-39-I: Transverse Pavement Joints (Plain Concrete Pavement).

R-43-I: Location of Transverse Joints in Plain Concrete Pavement.

Q20: Regarding pay item 74 – Storm Water Treatment System, the quantity is listed as one lump sum. Normally, these units are paid by Each. There is more than one treatment system shown on this project. Is Lump Sum the correct pay unit?

A20: Yes. The Special Provision for Storm Water Treatment System was developed with input from MDOT, Wayne County, and an approved manufacturer. The (one) lump sum payment will be for both chambers and all associated work and fittings as described in the special provision.

Q21: Supplemental specification section 18: insurance, subsection 2.2.5 indicates Builder's Risk insurance is required. Based upon the type of work being performed on this project (no building work), is this correct for this project?

A21: Yes, Builder's Risk insurance is required by DWSD with an installation floater to cover the underground piping.

Q22: Does the concrete encasement around the 48-inch water main associated with the access manholes and the 8-inch blow-off manholes get paid as concrete encasement or is it incidental to the access manhole or 8-inch blow-off manhole?

A21: The concrete encasement will be paid by lineal Foot of *Concrete Encasement* constructed per the water main drawings and specifications.

End of Addendum No. 1