



BROWN AND
CALDWELL

**City of Lake Oswego
Lake Oswego Interceptor Sewer
Lake Down Contract – Contractor Questions**

February 2, 2010

TO: Planholders for Lake Oswego Interceptor Sewer – Lake Down Project
FROM: Brown and Caldwell – Pete Oveson and Mike Prett
SUBJECT: General Questions
DATE: February 2, 2010

The following questions were received from prequalified Contractors on the project. The design team's responses are provided in the table below.

| Question # | Question | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|
| 1 | Has there been discussions with disposal site for materials and wet materials? | Yes, Refer to specification section 02200 paragraph 3.07.A - Additional language added via Addendum 1. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 2 | Will the Contractor need to control turbidity from incoming creeks in addition to outfalls and other sources of incoming surface water? | <p>If the stream is removed from the work area, the Contractor would have no requirement for erosion control. If the Contractor needs to cross a stream with equipment, or the stream needs to be diverted around the work area to dewater the area and to maintain normal downstream flows, then per the conditions in the USACE Permit, the Contractor would need to implement appropriate erosion controls and related BMPs. For a crossing situation, the Contractor would be responsible for erosion control associated with the structure used to cross a stream, (e.g. bridge abutments or landings), but not for the stream itself.</p> <p>If construction activities alter the course, condition, capacity, location of the stream (not including the drawdown event itself), then the Contractor would need to protect those alterations to the existing conditions.</p> <p>Refer to Enclosure (2) of the USACE Nationwide Permit-2008-123 in the Appendices (Volume 2 of 3) of the Lake Down Contract documents.</p> |
| 3 | Requesting clarification on exactly how much insurance is required (\$15M or \$30M) | Addressed in Addendum 1. |
| 4 | Sheet 200-C-008, Key Note 9 obviously applies to the existing pipe between MH E17A-008S and STA. 2+50, yet this note is also called out at the approximate STA. of 4+40 and 4+97 near MH KB1. Is the note placement at STA. 4+40 and 4+97 correct? | <p>Key Note 9 at stations 4+40 and 4+97 is not correct.</p> <p>Addendum No. 2 will address this issue.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 5 | <p>Can you confirm the quantities listed for bid items 29, 31, 34, 35, and 41. We are coming up with the following discrepancies: 29 – Bid Schedule: 8 ea / Actual Shown on Plans: 4 ea...31 – Bid Schedule: 30 ea / Actual: 42 ea...34 – Bid Schedule: 245 lf / Actual: 197 lf...35 – Bid Schedule: 137 lf / Actual: 156 lf...41 – Bid Schedule: 25 lf / Actual: 0 lf.</p> | <p>Addendum No. 2 will address this issue.</p> |
| 6 | <p>Sheet 200-C-007, Scope Delineation Schedule, calls for the Lake Down Contractor to “Sink Fused Pipe To Lakebed” from STA. 5+58 to 6+47. The profile at the aforementioned stationing calls for SDR 26 PVC. Please clarify if you looking for standard bell and spigot joints or are you looking for fused PVC.</p> | <p>Delineation schedule was corrected as part of Addendum 1. Please refer to Section 15064 2.02 A & 3.01 A.</p> |
| 7 | <p>From Sheets 000-D-104S to 000-D-157, much of the fill around the base slab and beneath new piping is shown as Class F1, yet is called out as Lean Concrete or CDF Fill in some locations. Should we assume that this fill as shown, will be Class F1, except where specifically called as Lean Concrete or CDF Fill, despite no difference being shown amongst material?</p> | <p>Addendum No. 2 will address this issue.</p> |
| 8 | <p>Measurement and payment for Bid Item 56, “Ground Anchor for Manhole Stabilization”, states, among other things, to, “...install ground anchors for stabilization of <i>existing</i> manholes, as described in the Contract Documents.” Please clarify if the use of “existing” in this context also includes New Manholes, specifically for Bid Items 45 through 55.</p> | <p>Bid Item 56 in Measurement and Payment applies to new manholes only. Addendum No. 2 will address this issue.</p> |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 9 | Under which Bid Item should we consider all manhole and pipeline abandonments? | Please refer to the Bid Form re-issued in Addendum No. 1. |
| 10 | a) Note 8 on Sheet 000-D-204, states the Contractor is to encase entire length of HDPE later with concrete to provide ballast. b) If this is the intent, should we consider the encasement limits to be from flanged coupling to mainline connection? | a) Service laterals will be constructed of Ductile Iron per Addendum No. 1. b) Service laterals will not be required to be encased in concrete. Addendum No. 2 will address this issue. |
| 11 | In Rehab MH 2-8 and 23-26 how far down does the liner extend? | The liner will be installed as part of the LFC to just above the pipe crown. |
| 12 | If MH liner extends to the floor, does the floor line? | See answer to #11. |
| 13 | If it does not extend to the floor, what is the support mechanism? Continuous grout bench, curved SS 'Z' attached to the wall or HDPE donut per 'Full Lake'? | HDPE donut will be anchored into the existing manhole wall as part of the Lake Full Contract. Please note that all interior manhole HDPE lining and interior SS straps on MHs 2-8 and 23-26 have been completed under the LFC. |
| 14 | Do the SS lid/wall connection angles shown on 2/000-D-123 only occur in MH 23 – 26? | Yes. Note that these were installed by LFC. |
| 15 | Can the SS straps in MH 23 – 26 be cut into 10' pieces and welded post installation (due to the weight)? | N/A, these were installed by LFC. |
| 16 | Can the base be a pre-cast element? | No. Issue will be addressed in Addendum No. 2. |
| 17 | Any limitation on height (up to 8') of Pre-cast or CIP base, since the material comes in 8' widths | No structural limitations. Bases must be CIP and in one piece. |
| 18 | Can the 'top hat' portion of the liner boot be cast in the CIP portion of the base or does the 'top hat' have to extend into the MH? | Boot must extend into the manhole per Detail A/D200. |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 19 | Do the drops that get A-Lok G3 flexible boots also get a liner boot? If not the throat of the opening will be exposed? | On new MHs, per Section 03403, the pipe penetration must be fully lined with an HDPE and a G3 flexible boot must be used. There is no interior MH rehab of existing MHs as part of the Lake Down Contract. |
| 20 | What grout material and additives are to fill the annular space between the existing MH and the rehab liner? | No insertion HDPE liners are used to rehabilitate existing manholes during Lake Down Contract. |