

Clark County Public Works

Bid Inquiry Log

Last Update: October 29, 2021

Responses will be posted on the project's "Bid Inquiry Log", which will be updated twice daily, at noon and 6:00 PM. The Bid Inquiry log will display all questions and answers to the questions that have accumulated by the posting time. Questions too late to be answered as of that posting will remain unanswered. The questions and answers posted on the Bid Inquiry Log at that time will be considered part of the contract and ranked as an Addendum with respect to order of precedence under Section 1-04.2 of the Standard Specification.

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project CRP #: | 350722 |
| Title: | NE 99th Street - NE 94th Ave to Vicinity of NE 117th Ave |
| Engineer In Charge: | Brad Fisher, PE |
| Date | 9/22/21 |
| Question #1 | Is attendance for the pre-bid site meeting mandatory? |
| Answer | No, attendance to this pre-bid site meeting is not mandatory, however, access to the landfill area is behind a locked gate and this will be the only access to this area during the bidding process. |
| Date | 9/28/21 |
| Question #2 | The plans call out gravel borrow for structural earth walls as backfill behind the structural earth walls. This specification, 9-03.14(4) material is difficult to source in Clark County. If CSBC meets the PCF and friction angle called out in specification section 6-13.3(2) would CSBC be an acceptable alternative for structural backfill behind walls since this material is much more readily available. |
| Answer | Please bid the project as stated in the Contract Plans and Special Provisions. |
| Date | 9/28/21 |
| Question #3 | Due to the size and scope of the project, would the owner be open to extending the bid due date by at least a week? |
| Answer | At this time, the County does not see a need to move the bid opening date. Please check the County's website for the most updated information. |

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Date | 9/30/2021 |
| Question #4 | We are having difficulty procuring the 24 Inch C900 and 24 Inch SRD 35 Sewer Pipe. If the material is available it will likely have a very long lead time. If we can't find the material, would CRWWD allow HDPE? |
| Answer | Please bid the project as stated in the Contract Plans and Special Provisions. Updated 10/19/21 HDPE pipe will be allowed. Details will be forthcoming in an upcoming addendum. |
| Date | 9/30/21 |
| Question #5 | Bid item 151 "Mailbox Support, Type CMU" not finding any details on how this is built, can you provide a detail. |
| Answer | This item will be addressed in an upcoming addendum. |
| Date | 10/1/2021 |
| Question #6 | There doesn't appear to be a Bid Bond form included in the Bid Forms section. Does the County intend to provide one? |
| Answer | Under the INSTRUCTIONS AND INFORMATION FOR BIDDERS, in volume 1 of the Special Provisions, proposal bond forms are not provided in this contract. Please refer to the list of forms and information that must be executed in full and submitted with the Bid. |
| Date | 10/1/2021 |
| Question #7 | October 12th is coming fast and we are interested in pursuing the project as prime, however we request a bid date extension of three (3) weeks to allow for adequate DBE solicitation and project estimation. Is Clark County willing to move the bid date to November 2, 2021 at 1:50 PM? |
| Answer | An upcoming addendum will be issued on Wednesday that will revise the bid opening date to Tuesday, October 26, 2021. |
| Date | 10/4/2021 |
| Question #8 | Volume 2, Appendix A, Spec. Section 9-05.12(1)- all sanitary sewer pipe shall be green in color. Due to the supply chain/PVC resin shortages, I am unable to find a manufacturer who can quote the C900 sewer pipe in Green, will you accept Blue C900 pipe? |
| Answer | The District would prefer green but yes, they would accept Blue C900 pipe. |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Date | 10/4/2021 |
| Question #9 | The main source of Materials in the County has two products for Select Borrow that are just a little out of spec. One is 1" Screenings from MT. Top which is 55% passing the #4 and 13% passing the #200. The other is sand from Owl Creek which is great on the #200 sieve but has a higher amount passing the #4 than specified. Would these materials be considered or will you guys be standing firm on the WSDOT specifications for "Select Borrow?" |
| Answer | There doesn't appear to be enough information provided in order to evaluate this request. Please bid the project as stated in the Contract Plans and Special Provisions. |
| Date | 10/04/21 |
| Question #10 | Please reconsider your answer to Question #3 and extend the bid date by at least a week. There has been large projects bidding back to back and our estimating department is overloaded. For a project this large, the advertisement period is very short to solicit bids for the extremely high DBE goal, dig into the details for the numerous types of walls and complete take-offs along with balancing work load for other projects. |
| Answer | An upcoming addendum will be issued on Wednesday that will revise the bid opening date to Tuesday, October 26, 2021. |
| Date | 10/05/21 |
| Question #11 | WSDOT is requiring all workers including service providers, subcontractors and suppliers on state projects to be vaccinated. Will this be a requirement for this project? |
| Answer | No requirement for vaccination at this time. |
| Date | 10/05/21 |
| Question #12 | Can you provide a cross section plan set without the elevation text. The elevation text is overlaid on many of the stations so we can't determine the stationing. |
| Answer | Cross sections have been added to the builders exchange website with the elevation text removed. |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Date | 10/5/2021 |
| Question #13 | <p>We did not see notes or specification regarding the grade of steel for the soldier piles.</p> <p>Grade for wide flange beams are typically ASTM A992 Gr. 50.</p> <p>Can you please provide the grade and also confirm there is no pile coating?</p> |
| Answer | <p>Steel soldier piles shall conform to the requirements of ASTM A992 or ASTM A572, Grade 50. No pile coating is required. Sheet W-22 will be updated with an addendum identifying the grade of steel required.</p> |
| Date | 10/6/2021 |
| Question #14 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Run # 16 is not on wiring schedule 2. Run #'s 25 & 27 are missing Conduit Material Types on wiring schedule |
| Answer | <p>Run #1 and #16 have been intentionally left blank from the table on ILCT2. Run#25 and #27's material type is schedule 80 PVC. These items will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.</p> |
| Date | 10/7/2021 |
| Question #15 | <p>This question is in regards to the Precast Noise Barrier (shown on contract drawing W25). Would Clark County be receptive to changing the design of the precast noise barriers from typical pilaster of spacing of 16' (shown on W17) to the standard ODOT design of 13'-9" (ODOT Standard Drawing BR740)? The design spacing of 16' in the contract plans makes a wider panel then we are capable of producing with our current setup. With only 18 panels on the job it doesn't make sense to alter our forming.</p> |
| Answer | <p>Wall panels have successfully been constructed on projects with center-to-center spacings greater than 13'-9" as shown on the cited ODOT standard plan. The 16'-0" spacing was selected to help keep the foundations widely spaced to reduce the number of foundation elements while still keeping the panel sizes reasonable. If the panel size is reduced, it will add additional foundations for the wall run, depending on the proposed spacing. If the Contractor believes that the total overall price would be cheaper by reducing the size of the wall panels, a CRIP could certainly be submitted during construction and evaluated. Please bid the project as stated in the Contract Plans and Special Provisions.</p> |

Date 10/11/21
Question #16 The plans showing the guardrail are very unclear. Several plan sheets have number 8 shown but no linework to be able to tell where the guardrail starts or stops. Then other plan sheets that call out the guardrail runs say to refer to the GR(x) Plan sheets. Those plan sheets are just standard plans. Please provide details of the starts and stops of the guardrail and where the terminals and anchors are so we can confirm the quantities.

Answer In volume 2, GR1 (sheet 85) identifies station / offset for each new installation of guardrail for this project. GRD1-GRD7 (sheets 86 to 92) are the Standard Plans for guardrail.

Date 10/13/2021
Question #17 Regarding infiltration facilities B and C does the entire infiltration facility receive drain rock to the specified elevations or just the pipe trenches? On sheet 200 and 202, the typical trench section does not show a specified width.

Answer The plans identify the dimensions of the infiltration facilities and give a cross section showing drain rock from the bottom to an identified elevation. Yes, the entire infiltration facility is to receive the drain rock. Clarification will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.

Date 10/13/2021
Question #18 Can you provide specifications and detail on the solid grout cap on the masonry wall?

Answer The proportions of the solid grout cap are defined on Sheet W26 at 8” tall and 1’-0” wide, centered on top of the wall. Section 6-12.2 of the project Special Provisions states “Grout for concrete masonry units shall conform to ASTM C476 for fine grout.”

Date 10/21/2021
Question #19 Addendum #2 - Can you please clarify if the minimum diameter of 22.76 inches for the HDPE pipe is the inside or the outside diameter? Also, does this minimum diameter apply to the 15" diam. pipe bid item No. 190 if the HDPE pipe option is selected.

Answer An upcoming addendum will clarify the minimum inside diameter for both the 24 inch and 15 inch HDPE pipes.

Date 10/26/2021
Question #20 There is a significant amount of vegetation in the existing ponds where fill is to be placed between approximate sta 27+00 - sta 30+00 and sta 30+50 - sta 32+50. Are there any special requirements to protect the liner? Could this be added as a bid item and quantified?

Answer An upcoming addendum will add a bid item to address this work.

Date 10/26/2021
Question #21 Can you please clarify if you are requiring all pipe lengths to be joined with electrofusion couplings, or just at manhole locations? The spec. says that pipe shall be joined into continuous sections with thermal butt fusion...except where otherwise specified - and then the following paragraph talks about joining HDPE ends with electrofusion or bolted sleeve type coupling. Is butt fusion an acceptable means of joining the pipe sections, or do you want couplings?

Answer Thermal butt fusion shall be the primary method of joining HDPE pipe sections. Bolted sleeve type couplings are acceptable where required by contractors means, methods, and/or work sequencing.

Date 10/29/2021
Question #22 Plans show Double Wide ITS Cabinets with battery backup System but cabinet detail does not show BBS nor does specs refer to a BBS. Do we provide BBS in the 334D ITS cabinet? Plans ILC1, ILC6 and ILCD6

Answer No, the BBS is planned for a future installation and is not part of this project.

Date
Question #23
Answer

Date
Question #24
Answer

Date
Question #25
Answer

Date
Question #26
Answer
