



Client: Carson City Public Works  
 Project: WRP North Lift Pump Station Improvements Project  
 6562D10  
 Date Created: 11/10/2010  
 Date Revised: 11/22/2010

**Bid Period Phone Question/Comment Log**

Number	Date Received	Name	Phone Email Written	Organization	Drawing/Spec Reference	Question/Comment	Response	Date of Response	Response By	Addenda Required?	Addendum No. (If Required)
1	11/10/2010	Mack Barnhardt	e-mail	Air Filtration Systems Corp	Spec 11500	There is a bid out for odor control in Carson City. We would like to make an offer on our equipment. Can we get our equipment reviewed and accepted as an alternative for price comparison? We can match equipment performance and exceed the media requirement for the media. Please let me know soon so we can get our data together. My contact info is listed on the bottom of this email. A note from my manufacture about this project is also listed below.	The Carson City North Lift Pump Station project that is out to bid includes a packaged GAC scrubber as part of the project. The GAC scrubber specification names two manufacturers 'or equal'. The two manufacturers are also named in a base bid equipment schedule but this doesn't preclude others from being considered by the Contractor. Also note that the base bid equipment schedule also includes a column where alternate manufacturers can be written in by the Contractor. The evaluation of 'or equals' and burden of proof that the proposed manufacturer is equal is on the Contractor/manufacturer. As such, we do not evaluate any 'or equals' during the bid. Please put together pricing based on the specification and work with prospective contractors.	11/10/2010	JBR	No	
2	11/10/2010	Rick Rinabarger	e-mail	Jensen Precast	Civil Drawings, 5th Street Influent Structure	Detail Drawings depict a poured-in-place structure 5' x 6' I.D. (length x width) with 12" walls, 18" roof and floor. If Precast, would a 6' x 6' I.D. (Length x width) with 8" walls and less than 18" roof & floor slabs be acceptable if our submitted engineering shows that the submitted structure meets applicable loading criteria with consideration for floatation taken into consideration per the ground water as given in the geotech report?	Design is based on cast-in-place. Precast concrete with different size may be evaluated during construction.		JBR, e-mail	No	
3	11/10/2010	Rick Rinabarger	e-mail	Jensen Precast	Civil Drawings, North Lift Meter Vault	Detail Drawings depict a poured-in-place structure 8' x 9' I.D. (length x width) with 12" walls, 18" roof and floor. If Precast, would a 8' x 10' I.D. (Length x width) with 8" walls and less than 18" roof & floor slabs be acceptable if our submitted engineering shows that the submitted structure meets applicable loading criteria with consideration for floatation taken into consideration per the ground water as given in the geotech report? This detail also depicts a monolithically poured sump. If Precast would a non-monolithically poured sump be open for consideration?	Design is based on cast-in-place. Precast concrete with different size may be evaluated during construction.	11/11/2010	JBR	No	
4	11/10/2010	Rick Rinabarger	e-mail	Jensen Precast	Civil Drawings, North Lift Meter Vault	The Hatch Spec on Sheet C-11 Calls for an Aluminum Hatch Per Specification 07722; Specification 07722 calls for a galvanized steel, insulated double-walled hatch with padlock hasps inside and outside. The specification also calls out a Bilco JD-3 which does not meet the specifications as called out in same spec. The specification seems to be somewhat contradictory to itself. Could you please clarify what would constitute an acceptable hatch for this vault?	Vault hatch materials will be clarified by Addendum.	11/11/2010	JBR	Yes	No. 1
5	11/10/2010	Rick Rinabarger	e-mail	Jensen Precast	Civil Drawings, Bid Alt B	I have been unable to find any profile information or detail for this manhole other than the plan view on sheet C-7 which refer to details on C-13; This appears to be an 8" line intercepting a 42" line at this manhole. Could more detailed profile information be made available so we can determine if Precast material as depicted on C-13 is feasible for this location?	Drawings G-3, C-3 (demolition), C-6 and C10 clearly show Bid Alternate B, which entails a new 8-inch RW line and manhole to replace a portion of existing 8-inch RW line. The manhole inlet and outlet piping shown are 8-inch diameter.	11/11/2010	JBR	No	
6	11/10/2010	Rick Rinabarger	e-mail	Jensen Precast	Civil Drawings, Bid Alt B	The Detail shown on C-13 only allows for 48" or 60" manholes; If a Precast manhole base is mandatory, the minimum diameter would need to be 72" (I.D.) for 42" pipe; possibly 84" if a thick-walled pipe is utilized. The minimum Rim to I.E. would need to be at least 6.5'. Without more detailed profile information for this manhole and more specifics regarding pipe type, etc it will be next to impossible to determine if Precast manhole components per detail 4/C7 on C-13 will be adequate for the necessary structure.	Drawings G-3, C-3 (demolition), C-6 and C10 clearly show Bid Alternate B, which entails a new 8-inch RW line and manhole to replace a portion of existing 8-inch RW line. The manhole inlet and outlet piping shown are 8-inch diameter.	11/11/2010	JBR	No	

7	11/11/2010	Rick Rinabarger	e-mail	Jensen Precast	Civil Drawings, Bid Alt B	Thank you John, regarding the manhole, for some reason I thought that the old 8" line was an existing 42" line which was being intercepted by the new 8" rw; Do you know what type of pipe is being utilized for the 8" RW?	8-inch RW material is DR 35 PVC per spec section 15052.	11/11/2010	JBR	No	
8	11/17/2010	Rick Rinabarger	e-mail	Jensen Precast	Civil Drawing C-10	Although the 5 <sup>th</sup> Street Influent Structure is shown as a rectangular structure, would a 96" (I.D.) Round Manhole Structure be considered as an alternative? If so this structure could be produced at a considerably lower cost than a structure as shown on the detail per sheet C-10. If a manhole is considered adequate, would A-LOK Connectors be considered in Lieu of the Sleeve/Link-Seal Combination shown in detail P-304 (Please see attachment) ?	The proposed 96-inch diameter manhole and connectors are not adequate for the 5th Street Influent Structure.	11/18/2010	JBR	No	
9	11/17/2010	Rick Rinabarger	e-mail	Jensen Precast	Civil Drawing C-10	The detail on sheet C-10 shows the invert for the 42" RW at 4515.8' and the invert for the 36" RW at 4615.4', however the drawing depicts the 36" higher in the structure with the floor sloping towards the 42" pipe; Is it possible that these elevations were transposed?	The 36" RW is higher than the 42-inch RW. The invert elevations will be clarified by addendum.	11/18/2010	JBR	Yes	No. 1
10	11/17/2010	Kyle Menath	e-mail	JBI Water & Wastewater Equipment	Spec 11332	The prebid went well today, but we still have concerns that if the design stays as is it will require Duperon as the specified screen to either take exceptions to the design or to add undue costs to the project. If Duperon adapts their design to incorporate the Carollo modifications to the specifications it will increase the cost of the screen and washer compactor. The Duperon design has been working additions at sites for up to 25 years plus.	A revised specification 11332 will be issued by addendum.	11/18/2010	JBR	Yes	No. 1
11	11/17/2010	Brian Griffith	e-mail to S. Scott	K.G. Walters Construction	ARRA Funding	I see this is an EPA funded job, but I saw a blurb (attached) about the ARRA act of 2009 as it pertained to reallocation of funds after February 17 2010. ITB-14 C. Is this a buy American job? A lot of projects with any connection to ARRA funding are buy American.	Hello Brian - You are correct any Federally Funded Project shall buy American. Additionally all of Carson City's projects are buy American. In the General Conditions of the bid document Section GC 4.2 SOURCE OF MATERIALS - Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Construction Manger, only unmanufactured materials produced in the United States, and only manufactured materials made in the United States shall be used in the performance of this contract. Please let me know if you have any further questions.	11/18/2010	S. Scott	No	
12	11/18/2010	Mark Byars	e-mail to S. Scott	A&K Earth Movers	11/30/10 Bid Opening Date	Due to the Holidays and the short work week, would it be possible to postpone the Nov. 30 <sup>th</sup> bid date to Tues. December 7?	Unfortunately if we postpone the bid opening we would not meet the deadline for Board Approval on December 16, 2010. Please let me know if you have any other questions.	11/18/2010	S. Scott	No	
13	11/18/2010	Sandy Clarke/Nolan Allen	e-mail	MISCO	Spec 11293, 2.01	On behalf of Golden Harvest, please review the attached letter requesting to be named as an acceptable supplier for the slide gates in spec section 11293. Golden Harvest has provided these types of gates on many Carollo designed projects throughout the country.	Manufacturers not named in the specifications will not be evaluated during the bid period. Please note that spec 11293 as well as the base bid equipment schedule on page BP-4 allows consideration of 'or equal' manufacturers. See also section 01330, 1.06 for additional requirements.	11/18/2010	JBR	No	
14	11/19/2010	Sandy Clarke/Nolan Allen	e-mail	MISCO	Spec 11293, 2.02	Section 2.04 calls for a quantity of two Portable Gate Operators for use with the slide gates having crank operators. However, the gate schedules lists only four gates, and the drawings show that all of the gates are located in the screen structure (see plan sheet P-4). Please confirm, per addendum, if the quantity of two portable operators is correct, or if the intent is to only require a quantity of one.	The quantity of gate operators indicated in 2.04 is correct.	11/18/2010	JBR	No	
15	11/22/2010	Mike Olvera	e-mail	Duperon	Spec 11332, Division 17	I wanted to see if you were going to have the addendum out today. I just wanted to make sure I managed the time this week since we have the holiday. I also wanted to ask if you have a copy of DIV 17. Our electrical engineer asked if I had a copy. Based on what we downloaded I did not see a section DIV 17. If you have that sections could I get a copy for review.	I've submitted the draft addendum to the City for their review. The intent was to issue the addendum today. Pleas note that all of Division 17 specs are included in the second part of 'Attachment C' and numbered pages C-659 through C-800. In short, the Tech Specs (Attachment C) are separated into two documents per the City's website.	11/22/2010	JBR	No	
16	11/22/2010	Stan Terry	Phone	Western Nevada Supply Co.	Drawing C-11; Spec 15052	Please clarify pipe materials for 4" SS, 8" RW, and 4" D.	The pipe materials will be clarified by addendum.	11/22/2010	JBR	Yes	No. 1