



PINAL COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS

To: PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS

Date: 11-3-2015

Project Name: Hunt Highway Phase 3 – Gary Road to Bella Vista Road
Gantzel Road Phase D-I – Omega Drive to Poston Butte High School
Bella Vista Reconstruction

Addendum #1

The following items shall be incorporated in the Work. All items shown on the plans or specified in the Project Manual shall remain unchanged except as specified herein.

1. **Bid Item 7: Grouted Riprap:**
 - a. The quantity has been revised from 850 CY to 21 CY.
2. **Bid Item 15: Asphalt Concrete Pavement (1/2" Mix – Thickness per Plan):**
 - a. Pavement Structural Section #1 has been added to the list of pavement structural sections that will use this bid item.
3. **Bid Item 24: Concrete Sidewalk Ramp per Details on Sheets 17-30:**
 - a. The quantity has been revised from 7,404 SF to 6,695 SF.
4. **Bid Item 55: Survey Marker, Type A per MAG Detail 120-1:**
 - a. The quantity has been revised from 8 EA to 14 EA.
5. **Bid Item 69: Safety Rail, MAG Detail 145, Type 2**
 - a. The quantity has been revised from 179 LF to 248 LF.
6. **Bid Item 145: Furnish and Install Truncated Domes for Existing Sidewalk Ramps**
 - a. Added this bid item with a quantity of 430 SF.

QUESTIONS:

- **10/15/15: Plan sheets 65,66,67,68,69,70 show a call out to construct pavement per typical sections, but there is no call out for the removal of the existing asphalt. The quantities on sheet 44 and the typical sections on sheet 15 seem to confirm there is new asphalt on these pages. Are we to remove the existing asphalt and replace per typical section? If so where is the call out to remove? Please clarify.**

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

31 North Pinal Street, Building F, PO Box 727 Florence, AZ 85132

T 520-509-3555 Hours M-F 8:00 am – 5:00 pm F 520-866-6511 www.pinalcountyaz.gov



PINAL COUNTY
wide open opportunity

- The callout for pavement removal has been added to sheets 65, 66, 67 and 68. Sheets 60, 69 and 70 already have a pavement removal callout but the quantity has been revised.
- There are no pavement removal quantities shown on sheet 44. The pavement removal is incidental to the subgrade preparation bid item.
- **10/22/15: Bid Item 7 Grouted Rip Rap. The call out is on page 52 of the plans note 11 under storm drain construction notes but # 11 is not found on the plan sheet. There is existing rip rap in the area. Are we to grout existing? Please clarify.**
 - The note can be found just below STA 352+00. The grouted rip rap goes between the back of sidewalk and the existing box culvert headwall.
- **10/23/15: Bid Item 15 In Spec Book, Item 15, TPS -17 says ½” mix to be applied to Pave Sec 3 and Pave Sec 5. Plan Detail for Pave Section 1 also shows ½” mix. Please clarify.**
 - Pavement Section #1 has been added to Bid Item 15.
- **INS-4, paragraph 6.2 states, that the selected contractor is responsible for “all...fees and permit costs”. Can these be defined by the County and associate contacts provided, as you have given us for the ‘Dust Control Permit’?**
 - Right-of-Way Permit from the Public Works Department; Dust Control Permit from the Air Quality Department; Construction General Permit from ADEQ.
- **INS-5, paragraph 9.1 states, that each bidder is “to list subcontractors, suppliers, sub-suppliers or manufacturers” that totals “more than 15% of the Bid Price”. Will the County consider a subcontractors list at bid time with any sub-tier suppliers and/or manufacturers furnished within (3) or (5) days after the opening? (We are concerned with last minute price changes at the major subcontractor level.)**
 - The County will ask for a finalized list of subcontractors at the preconstruction conference meeting.
- **GP-11, again, what is the required permitting?**
 - Right-of-Way Permit from the Public Works Department; Dust Control Permit from the Air Quality Department; Construction General Permit from ADEQ.
- **TPS-4, states that the selected contractor will be responsible coordinating the excavation and backfilling in conjunction with the utility relocation work for Johnson Utilities and City of Mesa Gas, and that these inherent costs are incidental to the construction of other specified work items: Are there any specific backfill requirements associated with these relocations other than indicated on the current set of drawings? Will Mesa allow any utility subcontractor to perform this work?**
 - Backfill requirements are per the “Joint Use Water and Gas Trench Detail” – Modified City of Mesa Detail M-58 for Pinal County as shown on sheet 5 of 5 of the Johnson



PINAL COUNTY
wide open opportunity

Utilities Hunt Highway Utility Improvement plans. The waterline will be installed by Johnson Utility crews, the gas line will be installed by City of Mesa crews, and trenching and backfilling will be done by the County's contractor.

- **TPS-7, Item 2 does not specifically mention the SWPPP Narrative; *since the design engineer has furnished the plan will he also provide the narrative, or is this cost to be borne by the contractor?***
 - The design engineer will only provide the plans. Any other required documentation (such as the narrative) shall be provided by the selected contractor.
- **TPS-8, Item 4 states, that the removal of “all trees...” is part of this pay item, however, Item 46 (TPS-22) establishes a different pay item; *please clarify.***
 - Any trees that are not identified on the plans (Removal Note #6) will be paid for as part of bid item #4. Any trees that are specifically identified for removal will be paid for as part of bid item #46.
- **TPS-9, Item 6 states, that the borrow fill required to achieve design grade will be paid by the ton: *Unless this material comes from a commercial source, which has the means to provide such measurement, the contractor will have no onsite method to meet the requirement; will the County consider changing this to a volume – cubic yard-measurement per MAG specifications?***
 - The method of measurement shall remain as Ton and the contractor shall be responsible for measuring the material.
- **TPS-10, Item 11 states, that the contractor is to prepare the subgrade to a minimum compaction of 95%, but, the 12” over-excavation shown as subgrade on the plan pavement typical sections and compensated for under the “Roadway Excavation” item would already cover these costs. *Please clarify the intent.***
 - The 95% compaction standard is a requirement that includes areas outside of the pavement area where the over-excavation will occur.
- **TPS-18, Item 19 states, that the crack sealing interlayer shall the requirements of MAG Section 337, however, the Geotechnical Report (Ninyo & Moore Project No. 601868006, page 5) that has been furnished for this area states that if the cracks encountered are greater than ¼” wide, a ½” section of ‘gap-graded AC’ should be placed on the milled surface. *Since this is an all or none process due to design elevations, how is this recommendation to be compensated for?***
 - Item 19 has been revised to be an allowance for up to 5,000 SY (approx. 20% of milling area). The use of ‘gap-graded AC’ and paving fabric/geotextile as recommended in the Geotechnical Report shall be incidental to bid item #19.
- **Bid Item 7 establishes the grouted rip rap quantity at 850 CY, our takeoff is much less (it appears that the unit of measure is wrong, there is close to 850 square feet). Also, the plans do not indicate size of rock or the bed thickness as noted; *please clarify.***



PINAL COUNTY
wide open opportunity

- The quantity has been revised to 21 CY. The size and bed thickness of the rock is shown on sheet 34.
- **Bid Items 8-10 do not seem to have a common conversion, cubic yards to tons, predicated on the areas generated from the plans; *What unit weight is the engineer using?***
 - The design engineer assumed 1.25 Tons per CY.
- **Bid Item 13 appears to have an inaccurate unit weight, again, cubic yards to tons; *please re-evaluate. Also, will lime treated ABC be allowed?***
 - Based on a recently completed project, the design engineer assumed 130 LB per CF.
 - The County has used lime treated ABC in the past. The selected contractor shall submit a request in writing for the County's evaluation/approval.
- **Bid Items 14-15 appear to have an inaccurate unit weight, again, cubic yards to tons; *please re-evaluate.***
 - Based on a recently completed project, the design engineer assumed 160 LB per CF.
- **Bid Item 24 has a pay quantity of 7, 404 square feet, per the details shown on sheets 17-30; our quantity, per these same details, is much less: *Please re-evaluate. Also, I do not see a pay item for the ramp retrofit work shown as plan note 23 on the drawings, those areas where we are adding truncated domes to existing concrete sidewalk ramps?***
 - The quantity has been revised to 6,695 SF.
 - Bid Item #145 has been added to include "Truncated Domes"
- **Bid Item 30 is for Concrete Driveways per MAG Detail 250-1, the notes on plan sheets 58-60 call these out to be 250-2; *please clarify.***
 - Bid item #30 is for MAG Detail 250-2 and bid item #29 is for MAG Detail 250-1
- **Bid Item 63 has a pay quantity of (30) each. *Is the handrail, per MAG 206, incidental to the scupper construction or will it be paid for under Bid Item 69? Will it be required?***
 - Yes, the handrail will be required and is incidental to the construction of the scupper. In addition, the handrail shall be painted similar to bid item #69.
 - Bid item #69 quantity has been revised from 179 LF to 210 LF.
- **Bid Item 64 states that the spillway is to be constructed "per detail on sheet 12" – this is wrong – we believe it to be sheet 77?**
 - The detail is on sheet 31 (See construction note #28).
- **Is the excavation for the rip rap construction to be considered incidental to those specific items? Has it been accounted for in the roadway prism quantity?**



PINAL COUNTY
wide open opportunity

- Excavation for the rip rap construction shall be incidental to those bid items as it has not been accounted for in the roadway prism quantity.
- **We have not yet completed a grading analysis, the only numbers we can consider until then are the engineer's calculations. With that said, *it appears that the majority of the excess will be generated by grading operations along the Hunt Highway alignment and the majority of the fill will be required along the Gantzel Road alignment south of Bella Vista. Since the NTP for Hunt will not occur until after Gantzel section has been completed, will this effect balancing the grade? Has the engineer, and/or County considered this regarding sequence, quantities and budget?***
 - No. It will be the contractor's responsibility to price the grading operations according to the sequencing plan. The engineer's calculations provide an overall grading analysis.

Scott Bender P.E.,
County Engineer