Argus

BID QUESTION RESPONSE

PROJECT:	Replace Hydrant Fueling System	DATE:	10/19/04
	Langley AFB, VA	Clarification	Yes
SOLICITATION NO:	W91236-04-R-0039	Amendment	No
DESCRIPTION:	Kinley Construction Company		
ARGUS PROJECT NO:	02010.02		
QUESTION NO:	14		

	QUESTION/RESPONSE
	Kinley Construction Company questions are: 1. Specification section 00010 Solicitation Contract Form Item 0003 states "All work in the Tank Farm Area (excluding storage tanks #1 and #2) as shown on sheets C4.50 through C4.52, M4.01 through M4.10 ...exclusive of bid items 0001,... Drawings M4.01 through M4.10 includes the 8" and 16" piping from tanks 1 & 2 to the new pump house. If it is your intention place all tank area piping in this bid item it will leave no way to issue fuel through the new pump house if item 0003 is not awarded. Is it the intent of the bid item # 0003 to include all piping within the containment dike as part of its scope? Please clarify. We do not want to assume anything and possibly put costs in the wrong item. **Response: Piping associated with Tanks 1 and 2 is to be included in the Base Bid. Temporary is also shown in the base bid which provides the means to transfer fuel.** 2. Specification section 10530 paragraph 1.4.8 the second sentence states " The capacity of each pile shall be 10 kips with a bottom of pile elevation located 18 ft. below bottom of pile cap." But drawing A1.2 section H does not indicate that any piles are placed below the footing. Are piles required under the Canopy Footings? We assume that piles are not required. **Response:** **No pile are required at the Canopy footings - see A1-2, section H.** Jason Bacon / Poling & Bacon question

	1. The plans and specifications do not indicate what type of material is to be used to fill the interstitial space between the old and new tank bottom. Please advise. **Response: The scope does not include any work on storage tank bottoms.**

Argus

BID QUESTION RESPONSE

PROJECT:	Replace Hydrant Fueling System	DATE:	10/20/04
	Langley AFB, VA	Clarification	Yes
SOLICITATION NO:	W91236-04-R-0039	Amendment	No
DESCRIPTION:	Scott Rushing		
ARGUS PROJECT NO:	02010.02		
QUESTION NO:	15		

	QUESTION/RESPONSE
	Scott Rushing; Bradford Brother Inc. 1. Is there a possibility that the contaminated groundwater can be containerized, sampled and discharged at a remote onsite location if the sampling results are below disposal limits? Response: Based upon conversations with VDEQ this would most likely be acceptable. However, regardless of contaminant level, all water discharges shall be coordinated with Tammy Coffee of VDEQ (757-518-2134) and Matt Goss of Langley AFB (757-764-1130) (See Specification Section 01355). Jason Bacon: Poling & Bacon 1. In Answers/Questions A - Question #3 addresses flowable backfill around fuel piping. Using flowable fill has several disadvantages over sand bedding, which is typically used for these applications. 1) Price - the price of concrete, and thus flowable fill is much higher (50 - 75%) than the cost of sand per cubic yard - adding significant cost to the project due to the length of piping involved. 2) Backfilling opperations - using flowable fill as backfill material makes backfilling more dificuilt and requires additional labor at pipe joints, which are to be left exposed prior to testing. 3) Future access to the pipe - by using flowable fill you severly limit any future acccess to the pipe should you ever need it for modifications or maintenance (local suppliers can not make a mix that low in PSI). For these three reasons we are requesting a variance to spec section 02316A Para 2.1.7 and are requsting that sand bedding be permitted for this project. Response: Engineer recommends installation of flowable fill material as specified within the fuel pipe bedding envelope. Final disposition of issue will have to be resolved by Omaha and Norfolk COE.