# BID QUESTION RESPONSE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT: | Replace Hydrant Fueling System | DATE: | 09/16/04 |
| | Langley AFB, VA | Clarification | Yes |
| SOLICITATION NO: | W91236-04-R-0039 | Amendment | 1 |

DESCRIPTION: Bay Associates Bid Questions

ARGUS PROJECT NO: 02010.02

QUESTION NO: 1

| | QUESTION/RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | Ms Gray,<br><br>I have a few questions concerning the plans and specifications for referenced project.<br><br>1) If I open up the indexed files for the plans, the list of drawings shows drawing MU3.05. When I open this drawing, it is actually drawing MU3.06. Drawing MU3.05 is one of the drawings in the individual drawing files provided, however, because it is not indexed, I cannot print it |
| Argus Action | **Argus will forward updated MaxViewer file.** |
| | 2) I need some clarification concerning the materials for the valves in the fueling system. Specification section 15060, paragraph 2.3 states that all manual valves whether in stainless steel or carbon steel piping systems will be noncorrosive. The specs go on to say that all of the valves in stainless steel piping shall have bodies of stainless steel or carbon steel with internal plating. What body materials should the valves in carbon steel piping be? |
| Amend. 1 | **Change paragraph 2.3, second sentence to read, "Valves shall be Type 304 or Type 316 stainless steel or carbon steel internally plated with chromium or nickel or internally electroless nickel plated.** |
| | The next sentence states that stainless steel body valves "...shall be provided only where indicated in 2-inch or smaller stainless steel piping runs." This seems to be contradictory. The only pipe in this project that is stainless steel is 2" and smaller. (see paragraph 2.2.10). If you follow this reasoning, all of the valves 2" and smaller would be carbon steel. What about the valves in carbon steel piping larger than 2"? |
| Clarification | **All piping 2-inch and smaller as indicated on drawings is to be stainless steel and therefore as stated in the specification valves 2-inch and smaller shall also be stainless steel.** |
| | Also, the check valves are specified to be carbon steel (paragraph 2.3.3) and the sight flow indicators, which are 2" and smaller are specified to be stainless steel body. |
| Clarification | **Provide as specified.** |
| | Could you please clarify the body materials for valves in carbon steel piping?<br><br>Thanks, Jim Johnson<br>Bay Associates<br>Phone (757) 422-0752<br>Fax (757) 422-9516 |

# BID QUESTION RESPONSE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT: | Replace Hydrant Fueling System | DATE: | 09/16/04 |
| | Langley AFB, VA | Clarification | Yes |
| SOLICITATION NO: | W91236-04-R-0039 | Amendment | N/A |

DESCRIPTION: Bay Associates Bid Questions

ARGUS PROJECT NO: 02010.02

QUESTION NO: 2

| | QUESTION/RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| Clarification | Ms. Gray,<br><br>I have another question concerning referenced project.<br><br>Drawing M1.01 shows the piping work involved in the existing Storage Tank modifications. The new work is shown in bold lines and the existing work is shown in gray style. My question concerns the relief valves shown upstream of the existing high level control valve.<br><br>The relief valves are shown in bold lines indicating that they are new. The ball valves and sight flow indicators around the relief valve are shown in grey indicating existing. If you look at note 3 f on drawing T1.01, it states "New accessories as indicated on drawings T1.05, T1.06, T1.07 T1.08, and T1.09" Drawing T1.06 shows the details for the relief valves and all accessories are indicated to be new.<br><br>**Please follow drawing M1.01 which shows new vs existing equipment to be reused. The detail on T1.06 shows the piping, valves and equipment for new thermal reliefs.**<br><br>Could you please clarify?<br><br>Jim Johnson<br>Bay Associates<br>Phone (757) 422-0752<br>Fax (757) 422-9516 |

# BID QUESTION RESPONSE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT: | Replace Hydrant Fueling System | DATE: | 09/16/04 |
| | Langley AFB, VA | Clarification | Yes |
| SOLICITATION NO: | W91236-04-R-0039 | Amendment | N/A |

DESCRIPTION: Bay Associates Bid Questions

ARGUS PROJECT NO: 02010.02

QUESTION NO: 3

| | QUESTION/RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| Clarification | Ms Gray,<br><br>This is the last question of the day.<br><br>The specifications for referenced project, Section 15051, describe the pantographs for referenced project. My question is how many are there.<br><br>The Bid documents have (2) bid items with the pantographs in the bid item. Bid Item NO 0010 has a quantity of 1 aircraft refueling pantograph, and Bid Item NO. 0011 has (2) aircraft refueling pantographs with high reach attachments. Are we to assume that there are no pantographs in the base bid and none included with Bid Item 0006 for the Pantograph Parking Pad?<br><br>**There are no pantographs in the Base Bid and none included in Bid Item 006. Please quote the estimated quantities for both Bid Item 0010 and 0011 as described.**<br><br>Thanks,<br><br>Jim Johnson<br>Bay Associates<br>Phone (757) 422-0752<br>Fax (757) 422-9516 |

# BID QUESTION RESPONSE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT: | Replace Hydrant Fueling System | DATE: | 10/05/04 |
| | Langley AFB, VA | Clarification | Yes |
| SOLICITATION NO: | W91236-04-R-0039 | Amendment | |

DESCRIPTION: RFI for W91236-04-R-0039

ARGUS PROJECT NO: 02010.02

QUESTION NO: 4

| | QUESTION/RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| Clarification | 1. Drawing M3.02 section 2 indicates "IF" at the pump discharge PRV, this appears not to be required however. We are not intending to provide an "IF" at this location. Please confirm than an "IF" is not required.<br><br>**Confirmed** |
| Clarification | 2. Drawing M2.04 indicates two "MAV" at the pump discharge header whereas drawing M1.02 and M3.01 indicate that one "MAV" is required. We are intending to provide one "MAV" for the pump discharge header. Please confirm that one "MAV" is required.<br><br>**Confirmed** |
| Clarification | 3. Drawing M1.02 indicates three "MAV" in the 12" & 10" line ( 1 in 12", 2 in 10") associated with the 10" issue venture. Drawing M2.04 indicates two "MAV" ( 1 in 12", 1 in 10") in the same line. Drawing M3.01 indicates two "MAV" ( 1 in 12", 1 in 10") in the same line. Drawing M3.03, section 4 indicates two "MAV" ( 2 in 10") in the same line. We are intending to provide the "MAV" as indicated on Drawing M3.03 in section 4, please confirm.<br><br>**Confirmed** |
| Clarification | 4. Drawing M3.03 section 4 indicates a "4" Branch" connection to the surge absorber. Drawing M3.02 section 1 indicates a 12" X 6" reducing tee and 6" X 4" concentric reducer to the surge absorbers. We are intending to provide fittings as indicated on drawing M3.03 section 4 to the surge absorbers, please confirm.<br><br>**Use a 6" x 4" concentric reducer.** |
| | 5. Drawing M1.02 and M2.04 indicate "IF SA" downstream of valve I25, drawing M3.01 does not indicate "IF" associated with valve I25, section 4 on |

| | |
|---|---|
| Clarification | drawing M3.03 indicates "IF" upstream of valve I25. We are intending to provide the "IF SA" downstream of valve I25 as indicated on drawing M1.02 and M2.04, please confirm.<br><br>**Confirmed** |
| Clarification | 6. Drawing M2.04, M3.01, M3.03 indicates a PRV across valves I25 and I26 with outlet and inlet in the 12" line. Drawing M1.02 indicates a PRV across valves I25 and I26 with inlet in the 12" line and outlet in the 2" drain line. We are intending to provide the PRV across valves I25 and I26 with outlet and inlet in the 12" line.<br><br>**Confirmed** |
| Clarification | 7. Section 1 on drawing M3.03 indicates a PRV upstream of the 40-gallon surge absorber. This PRV is not indicated on Drawing M1.02, M2.04, M3.03 or M3.04. Please confirm that it is not required.<br><br>**Confirmed** |
| Clarification | 8. Drawing M1.02 indicates a PRV in the 12" fuel loop return, downstream of the 2" drain line tap. Drawing M2.04 and M3.01 indicate that the PRV is in the 8" de-fuel line. We are intending to provide this PRV in the 8" de-fuel line, please confirm that this is acceptable.<br><br>**Confirmed** |
| Clarification | 9. Drawing M1.02 indicate a "reducer" in the hydrant loop return venturi line, adjacent to a manual air vale, however the line size upstream and down steam is the same size, i.e. 8", please clarify.<br><br>**Ignore the reducer.** |
| Clarification | 10. Drawing M1.02 indicates a sample connection in the hydrant loop return venturi line. Drawing M2.04 indicates a sample connection in the hydrant loop return venturi line, and another immediately downstream at a higher elevation. We are intending on providing one sample connection at this location not two as indicated on drawing M2.04, please confirm that this is acceptable.<br><br>**Confirmed – provide connection at higher elevation only.** |
| Clarification | 11. Drawing M1.02 indicates a pressure gauge in the hydrant loop return venturi line, downstream of the BPCV-1. Drawing M2.04 indicates a pressure gauge vent in the hydrant loop return venturi line downstream of the BPCV-1, and another immediately downstream at a higher elevation. We are intending on providing one pressure gauge at this location, downstream of the BPCV-1, not two as indicated on drawing M2.04, please confirm that this is acceptable.<br><br>**Confirmed** |
| Clarification | 12. Drawing M3.01 indicates two manual air vents in the 8" line to the operating tanks. Drawing M2.04 indicates one. We are intending on providing one manual air vent in this line, not two as indicated on drawing M3.01, please confirm that this is acceptable. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **Provide 2 ea. manual air vents as shown on drawing M1.01.** |
| Clarification | 13. Drawing detail 7/M3.03 indicates that the 8" Swing Check Valve is upstream of the 8" C.S. Transfer Pump Discharge line Tee. Drawing M2.04 indicates that the 8" Swing Check Valve is downstream of the 8" C.S. Transfer Pump Discharge line Tee. Drawing M3.01 indicates that two 8" Swing Check Valves are required, one is upstream of the 8" C.S. Transfer Pump Discharge line Tee, the other is downstream of the 8" C.S. Transfer Pump Discharge line Tee. Drawing M1.01 indicates that this swing check valve should be 6". Drawing M1.02 does not address this piping. We are intending to provide one 8" Swing Check Valve, is it to be located upstream or down steam of the tee? Please advise.<br><br>**Locate 8" check valve upstream of the tee as per 7/M3.03.** |
| Clarification | 14. Drawing M1.02 indicates that the 10" C.S. suction header for BFTP-1 & 2 has 10" Blind Flange at each end with 10" X 8" reducing Tee. Drawing M2.04 indicates 8" 90 Elbow at the ends of the 10" C.S. suction header as does section 3 on drawing M3.02. We are intending to pipe the suction header as indicated on drawing M2.02 and M3.02. Please confirm that this is acceptable.<br><br>**Confirmed** |
| Clarification | 15. Note 1 on plan C5.05 indicates to provide sediment traps, erosion checks, and/or filters etc. as specified in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Is there a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for this project? Please provide a copy of the SWPPP plan or direction as to where to install the erosion checks, sediment traps, and/or filters?<br><br>**Contractor is to provide SWPPP plan as per Spec. 01356A, para. 1.2.** |
| Clarification | 16. Detail G/M3.09 indicates that stainless steel guide bars are required; please confirm that the guide bars are to be stainless steel as the fuel loop piping is carbon steel.<br><br>**Provide carbon steel guide bars.** |
| Clarification | 17. Bid item #9 indicates all work complete for removal of existing hydrant pits in west apron. Print C2.05 indicates in the legend that the shaded hatched marks are for pavement removal and replacement under bid option. Note 2 on print C2.05 indicates existing hydrant fuel pits to be demolished. The areas at the existing hydrant pits are not shown as a shaded area. Please advise as to what is required for Bid Item #9? Is it the shaded areas as indicated on the plans or is it note 2 as indicated on the plans?<br><br>**The option work scope to be included in Bid Option Item 9 is the existing valve pits described in key note 1 on drawings C2.05 and C2.06; the valve pits described by key note 3 on drawing C2.06; and the existing hydrant fuel pits and related pavement described in key note 2 on drawings C2.05 and C2.06 which do not interfere with or inhibit the new fuel main installation. Existing hydrant pits excluded from the Bid Option Item 9 scope and must be** |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **demolished for installation of the new fuel main are the 4 pits and pavement described by key note 3 on drawings MU3.16 and MU3.17.** |

# BID QUESTION RESPONSE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT: | Replace Hydrant Fueling System | DATE: | 10/05/04 |
| | Langley AFB, VA | Clarification | N/A |
| SOLICITATION NO: | W91236-04-R-0039 | Amendment | Yes |

DESCRIPTION: ENG Equipment Co. Steve Blanchett

ARGUS PROJECT NO: 02010.02

QUESTION NO: 5

| | QUESTION/RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | Steve Blanchett from ENG Equipment Co in Richmond called with a question concerning the Ball Joints on the above referenced project. Seems the specs call for them to be all stainless steel, but the pipe is all carbon steel, so they think stainless steel ball joints might be overkill.<br><br>**Change Specification Section 15060, Paragraph 2.5.1, Flexible Ball Joints, First Sentence to read; "Flexible ball joints shall be carbon steel with interior component electroless nickel plating.** |

PARTNERING WITH AVIATION FOR PROGRESS

Argus
ENGINEERING, PLANNING, MANAGEMENT

KANSAS CITY OFFICE
601 NW Jefferson, Suite 4
Blue Springs, MO 64014-2290
816.228.7500
FAX 816.228.7535
Arguskc@argusconsulting.com

# Bid Question Responses

DATE: 10/13/04

ARGUS PROJECT NO
02010.02

PROJECT:
Replace Hydrant Fueling System
MUHJ-01-3000
USCOE – Langley AFB, Virginia
W91236-04-R-0039

## Company: Structural Associates (David Richter)

| Item | Reference | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Schemmer | Are pilings required at the Pantograph Canopy? Detail A on print A1.2 indicates "See typical piling plan G – this sheet." No detail G is found on print A1.2. Detail H on print A1.2 does not show any pilings. | **The reference note to the Piling Plan G should be ignored. Piling are not required at the Pantograph Canopy.** |
| 2 | Schemmer | Print S1.1 shows 53 piles at 30 tons, and 5 piles at 5 tons. Specifications indicate 53 piles at 30 tons, and 36 piles at 5 tons. Please advise as to the correct number of piles? | **The required number of piling is correctly shown on sheet S1.1 – 53 @ 30 tons and 5 @ 5 tons.** |
| 3 | Norfolk | Specification 02458A Prestressed Concrete Piling 1.2.2 Basis for Payment implies piles will be a unit price as bid. The bid schedule has no line item for unit pricing for piling. Please advise as to whether the pilings are a unit price or lump sum item? | **Spec section 02458, Paragraph 1.2.1 correctly indicates 2118.5 linear feet of piling. Payment for piling will be based on Paragraph 1.2.2 where the unit price for piling is based on the principle sum submitted with the bid divided by 2118.5 linear feet. Also, a principal sum should be submitted with the bid for the Pile Load Tests and the unit price per test shall be this principal sum divided by the required (1) load test. A principal sum should also be submitted with the bid for the Dynamic Analysis tests and the unit price per dynamic analysis shall be this principal sum divided by the required (2) analyses.** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Schemmer | Specification 02458A Prestressed Concrete Piling 3.2.4 Cutting of piles implies to remove three (3) feet of concrete from the top of each pile to expose the pile strands and splay the three (3) feet of pile strands into the pile cap. No detail is shown on the project drawings. Should an extra three (3) feet of pile be allowed for each piling? Please provide a detail showing this pile connection? | **Dowels or other tie reinforcing between the piling and the mat are not indicated or required on this project. Paragraph 3.2.4 of Spec section 02458 indicates a requirement to splay tendons only when any required dowels cannot be properly developed into the concrete above. This would be a condition where the piling was not driven as deep as originally anticipated and the upper section of pile would be cut off to provide the correct 3" embedment. This would potentially remove any required dowels above and the splayed strands would be utilized to replace the dowels. Since no dowels are required on this project, this work is not required. No extra allowance for piling should be applied based on this paragraph.** |
| 5 | Argus | Print S3.3 and Ms.01 shows metal stairs and walkway over the suction piping at the new pump station. Is this metal stairs and walkway required? | **Yes** |
| 6 | Argus | Print M1.04 indicates at the typical fuel loading island to modify existing maintenance ladders with handrails. Are the ladders getting handrails only? Do the platforms on top of the ladders also get handrails? How long are the platforms on top if they require railings? | **Ladders only, both sides.** |
| **Company: Kinley Construction (Dennis Hemingway)** | | | |
| **Item** | **Reference** | **Comment** | **Response** |
| 1 | Argus | Drawing M2.04 shows a PIT-3 at pump FP01 and M3.01 shows this device as PS-2. We have two questions, is this PIT or a PS device? Our second question is, should this device be typical for all five FP pumps? We assume that there is only one device. | **PIT-1,2,3 and PS-1,2,3 are one in the same. They are Pressure Transmitters.** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Argus | Specification section 15060 Para. 2.2.7.4 Isolating Gasket Kit states "Exterior above grade flanges separated by electrically isolating gasket kits shall be provided with weatherproof Lighting Surge Arrestor devices." But drawing M3.05 detail N note 2 states that "Include surge arrestors only at insulating flanges marked with designation SA." Which of these two are correct? We assume that the plan is correct as the SA symbol is used at limited locations on drawing M3.01. | **Your assumption is correct.** |
| 3 | Argus | Drawing M1.01 indicates that we will need to install new half couplings for the low level, high level, and high-high level alarms for all tanks. In section 15176, 1.2 the 2nd paragraph states that only a new half coupling will be required for the low level alarm.. Which is correct? We assume that only the low level coupling will be required. | **Comply with drawing M1.01.** |
| 4 | Argus | Drawings C2.05, MU3.14 and MU3.15 show PCC paving demolition areas that are shaded darker than the others. The legend indicates that these darker areas are part of a bid option. There is no bid option for this work, are we to exclude this work? | **Question previously addressed in last amendment:**<br>**The option work scope to be included in Bid Option Item 9 is the existing valve pits described in key note 1 on drawings C2.05 and C2.06; the valve pits described by key note 3 on drawing C2.06; and the existing hydrant fuel pits and related pavement described in key note 2 on drawings C2.05 and**<br>**C2.06 which do not interfere with or inhibit the new fuel main installation.**<br>**Existing hydrant pits excluded from the Bid Option Item 9 scope and must be demolished for installation of the new fuel main are the 4 pits and pavement described by key note 3 on drawings MU3.16 and MU3.17.** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Argus | Drawing M1.01 indicates that all DBB valves at all the tank nozzles are to have limit switches that communicate to the PLC. But Section 15060 paragraph 2.3.2.1 indicates that only the operating tank suction valves are to have the switches. Do all the valves at all of the tanks require position switches? We assume that only the two operating tank suction/issue valves require these switches (see Drawing E8.2). | **All tank outlet(suction) valves shall have position switches, only the inlet(issue) valves for tanks 3-6 shall have position switches.** |
| **Company: Team Reliable (D. Breeden)** | | | |
| 1 | Schemer | Reference Prestressed Concrete Piling (Spec. Section 02458) paragraph 1.2.1 requires thirty-six, 5-ton piles yet the new pumphouse shows only five. We do not know where the other 5-ton piles are to be placed. Please clarify. | **The required number of piling is correctly shown on sheet S1.1 – 53 @ 30 tons and 5 @ 5 tons** |
| 2 | Schemmer | Reference Concrete Piling (section 02548) and paragraph 1.2.1: the specifications require a lot of dynamic testing on both test piles and production piles. The Dynamic Analysis section (para. 1.2.2 on page 5) requires analysis of "0" test piles. Which is correct? | **One pile load test and two dynamic analyses of test piles are required** |
| 3 | Schemmer | Again reference Section 02548, paragraph 1.2.2 Basis for Payment: The paragraph references unit prices for different capacity piles and tests yet the bid form has no unit prices for these items. Please clarify.4 | **Spec section 02458, Paragraph 1.2.1 correctly indicates 2118.5 linear feet of piling. Payment for piling will be based on Paragraph 1.2.2 where the unit price for piling is based on the principle sum submitted with the bid divided by 2118.5 linear feet. Also, a principal sum should be submitted with the bid for the Pile Load Tests and the unit price per test shall be this principal sum divided by the required (1) load test. A principal sum should also be submitted with the bid for the Dynamic Analysis tests and the unit price per dynamic analysis shall be this principal sum divided by the required (2) analyses.** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Schemmer | Reference section 02548 paragraph 3.2.4: The specifications require removal of the top three feet of concrete to expose the reinforcing steel which is to be bent and installed into pile caps. The structural drawing S5.1 does not show any dowels extending from the piling into the structural mat slab. Please clarify whether an additional three feet of piling should be included to allow for splaying of three feet of piling rebar into the mat slab or drilling and doweling into top of piles will be required and if so provide details. | **Dowels or other tie reinforcing between the piling and the mat are not indicated or required on this project. Paragraph 3.2.4 of Spec section 02458 indicates a requirement to splay tendons only when any required dowels cannot be properly developed into the concrete above. This would be a condition where the piling was not driven as deep as originally anticipated and the upper section of pile would be cut off to provide the correct 3" embedment. This would potentially remove any required dowels above and the splayed strands would be utilized to replace the dowels. Since no dowels are required on this project, this work is not required. No extra allowance for piling should be applied based on this paragraph.** |
| **COMPANY: Poling Bacon (Jason Bacon)** | | | |
| 1 | Argus | Drw S2.04 Note 4 refers to a Type 7 pipe support shown on S4.51. This drawing is not in the index. Please furnish the drawing. | **Type 7 should be Section A on Sheet S2.02 which shows the section of the dike berm casing sleeve and support.** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Argus | Drw C4.12 and C4.13 refers to some of the PCC as "bid option – apron pavement." However, the bid sheet does not contain a line item for this alternate. Please clarify. | **Question previously addressed in last amendment:**<br>**The option work scope to be included in Bid Option Item 9 is the existing valve pits described in key note 1 on drawings C2.05 and C2.06; the valve pits described by key note 3 on drawing C2.06; and the existing hydrant fuel pits and related pavement described in key note 2 on drawings C2.05 and**<br>**C2.06 which do not interfere with or inhibit the new fuel main installation.**<br>**Existing hydrant pits excluded from the Bid Option Item 9 scope and must be demolished for installation of the new fuel main are the 4 pits and pavement described by key note 3 on drawings MU3.16 and MU3.17.** |
| 3 | Norfolk | Is the project taxable? If so, what is the rate? | Yes. The project is located in VA. |
| 4 | Argus | The schedule of contaminated soil and water for the alternate work to construct the canopy is confusing to us. The quantities are very large. We will excavate less than 150 tons of soil total for work under this alternate. Would you please explain the contaminated soil and water pricing under this bid item. | **Amount of actual contaminated soil and water is unknown, therefore the bid schedule is set up to handle all situations, from minor amounts to large.** |
| **COMPANY: Mid Eastern Builders (Elizabeth Michaels)** | | | |
| 1 | Norfolk | In Factor 4: Technical Past Performance – Only financial and bonding information is requested, should section also require additional past performance references? (i.e. additional jobs not required in Factor 1 that may or may not be similar in nature). | See Section 00110 and Section 00120. |
| 2 | Norfolk | In Factor 1: Construction Contractor Experience – In paragraph titled "Submission Requirements", it is requested that information be submitted for "firms on the proposed team that performed this project". Should that be only the subcontractors/suppliers that will also be used on this Hydrant Fuel project, or all major subcontractors/suppliers on that project? | Need to list all major subcontractors/suppliers for each project. However, specifications state "firms on the proposed team that performed on this project:. |
| **COMPANY: Poling & Bacon (Jimmy Bacon)** | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Argus | Drawing MU3.05 is missing at your web site. This drawing should be "Plan & Profiles, Sheet 5" and should contain profiles from STA 20+00 to STA 25+00. Please issue drawing MU3.05, "Sheet 5 of the Plan & Profiles, STA 20+00 to STA 25+00. | **Should be accessible through revised MaxViewer.** |
| **COMPANY: Inge Equipment Co., Inc. (Steve Blanchette)** | | | |
| 1 | Argus | Section 15060 page 23, paragraph 2.5.1 "Flexible Ball joints" calls for stainless steel construction. Since there is only carbon steel pipe being used in the 8", 10" and 16" fuel lines at the fuel tanks, it would be a huge cost savings to the government if the "Flexible ball Joints" were to be constructed of carbon steel as verses stainless steel. Please let us know which material of construction the Corps of Engineers would like us to bid on. | **Previously answered in last amendment: Change Specification Section 15060, Paragraph 2.5.1, Flexible Ball Joints, First Sentence to read; "Flexible ball joints shall be carbon steel with interior component electroless nickel plating.** |
| **COMPANY: Mideastern Builders (Jon Mosser)** | | | |
| 1 | Argus | Where will the Miami Buff color be required for the cast-in-place concrete? | **Have not been able to locate requirement for Miami Buff.** |
| **COMPANY: Mideastern Builders (Mike Dean)** | | | |
| 1 | Schemmer | Pile length footage does not match with Bid Form. | **The required number of piling is correctly shown on sheet S1.1 – 53 @ 30 tons and 5 @ 5 tons.** |
| 2 | Schemmer | Testing on Piles needs to be clarified. | **See revised Bid Schedule** |
| 3 | Argus | Will all excavated soils need to be tested for contaminants? | **Testing requirements are addressed in the specifications** |
| **COMPANY: Underground Construction (Jon Klion)** | | | |
| 1 | Argus | Plans seem to show HPV/LPV in 1 pit for both pipeliners. The details do not address dual vents and drains in 1 pit. | **Provide pit with both and provide similar to detail referenced in relation to pit penetration requirements.** |
| 2 | Argus | The notes for IVP's state that there will be a HPV and LPD in each pit. However, the piping details show different situations (2 LPD, 2 MPV's, etc.) | **Bid as detailed and coordinate with plan and profile.** |
| 3 | Argus | The phasing in the Bulk Fuel Facility shows eight (8) distinct sequences. For bid purposes, can we assume no downtime in between sequences? If not, what amount of time should be anticipated? | **Follow the phasing requirements, downtime is not required but may be needed for contractor's means and methods.** |
| **COMPANY: Team Reliable (Mark Keeling)** | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Argus | Is it the Government's intentions for the contractors to bid the project as if there is currently no contaminated water and soils on the project and if and when these conditions are encountered then the unit price structure as laid out in the bid item form will be utilized? | **Yes** |
| **COMPANY: Poling & Bacon (Jason Bacon)** | | | |
| 1 | Argus | Tank Cleaning:<br><br>a. Please detail requirements of tank cleaning further than 15899 / 15177. We are assuming that we will have to completely clean the two tanks which are being modified prior to the modifications being performed. Will we than be required to clean these tanks COMPLETELY again after we have flushed the lines into them? Are we to assume complete cleaning of the other tanks after we flush into them?<br><br>b. 15177 1.4.1 states that the government will remove fuel from the tanks down to 18" and that the contractor will be responsible for pumping out the rest into a government supplied tank truck. However, the next sentence says that the Contractor must treat the fuel as contaminated and remove it from the base at his expense. How are we supposed to remove it from the base in a government truck? Do you want us to figure a civilian haul off and disposal service for this fuel? How many times (tanks) should we consider performing this work on? (See a. above) | **a. Your assumption on the Operating Tanks is correct, and any tank used for flushing must also be cleaned.**<br>**b. Assume you will have to remove the 18-inches with commercial trucks. The 18-inches to initially empty the tanks will only have to be performed once.** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Schemmer | Piles:<br><br>a. Specifications call for 53 piles @ 30 ton @ 38.25' long @ 12" square prestressed concrete and 36 @ 5 ton @ 18.25 feet long @ 12" square prestressed concrete piles. Total = 2684.25 linear ft. Sheet S1 shows the 53 @ 30 ton piles and 5 of the 5 ton piles. Is the count shown on S1 correct and the quantity in the spec incorrect or are there piles elsewhere in the project.<br><br>b. The project proposal form does not have a unit price item for the piles. Is it to be bid as lump sum item, although the specs call for a bid price per linear feet.<br><br>c. The specs call for removal of 3 feet of concrete from the top of each pile to expose the pile strands and to splay the 3 feet of pile strands into the pile cap. However, this detail is now shown on the project drawings. Should we allow for an extra 3 feet of pile on each to perform this work? | **a. The required number of piling is correctly shown on sheet S1.1 – 53 @ 30 tons and 5 @ 5 tons.**<br><br>**b. Spec section 02458, Paragraph 1.2.1 correctly indicates 2118.5 linear feet of piling. Payment for piling will be based on Paragraph 1.2.2 where the unit price for piling is based on the principle sum submitted with the bid divided by 2118.5 linear feet. Also, a principal sum should be submitted with the bid for the Pile Load Tests and the unit price per test shall be this principal sum divided by the required (1) load test. A principal sum should also be submitted with the bid for the Dynamic Analysis tests and the unit price per dynamic analysis shall be this principal sum divided by the required (2) analyses.**<br><br>**c. Dowels or other tie reinforcing between the piling and the mat are not indicated or required on this project. Paragraph 3.2.4 of Spec section 02458 indicates a requirement to splay tendons only when any required dowels cannot be properly developed into the concrete above. This would be a condition where the piling was not driven as deep as originally anticipated and the upper section of pile would be cut off to provide the correct 3" embedment. This would potentially remove any required dowels above and the splayed strands would be utilized to replace the dowels. Since no dowels are required on this project, this work is not required. No extra allowance for** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Argus | Are we responsible for performing any pigging operations on the new pipeline? There is no spec for this work. | **See Section 15060, Paragraph 3.10.** |
| 4 | Schemmer | Please confirm the presence of ACM material in the pump house? | **If ACM stands for "Asbestos Containing Materials" the answer is no, and any reference in the documents to ACM material in the pump house should be deleted.** |
| **COMPANY: ALLIED CORROSION INDUSTRIES, Inc. (Robert A. Foreman)** | | | |
| 1 | CPAN | Within the specifications for this solicitation; Section 13112A, Page 18, Part 3.1 and 3.1.1 refers to the standard criteria for Corrosion Control, as established by the National Association of Corrosion Engineers (NACE). Specifically, the NACE recommended practices are NACE RP0169, NACE RP0193 and NACE RP0285. These standards require a minimum of **–850 millivolts** "instant off" potential between the structure and a reference cell, be achieved over 95% of the area of the structure.<br><br>However, this is not what is being specified. In fact, we have never seen anything quite like these Specs. Together, they constitute a potentially impossible requirement and would preclude us from bidding! The above referenced **Part 3.1.1. (a)** specifies a minimum of **–1,000 millivolts** "instant off". This is NOT in line the NACE standards. | |
| **COMPANY: Tom Earnhardt/RICH/AlliedBuilding/OldCastleDist** | | | |
| 1 | Schemmer | On the drawings I am only able to find areas showing metal roofing and in the specs I can find only built-up roofing material guidelines. There is one page (A5.1) that shows the B.U.R. mentioned, but I am unable to locate the details anywhere else in the roofing and wall section drawings. Any help that you can give me to decifer this would be of great help. | **Yes, the built-up roofing is used above the control room, which is what is shown sheet A5.1, Details 3, 4 & 6 (cuts on control room wall).** |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Argus

# BID QUESTION RESPONSE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT: | Replace Hydrant Fueling System | DATE: | 10/14/04 |
| | Langley AFB, VA | Clarification | Yes |
| SOLICITATION NO: | W91236-04-R-0039 | Amendment | No |

DESCRIPTION: **Tom Earnhardt/RICH/AlliedBuilding/Old CastleDist**

ARGUS PROJECT NO: 02010.02

QUESTION NO: 7

| | QUESTION/RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | Within the specifications for this solicitation; Section 13112A, Page 18, Part 3.1 and 3.1.1 refers to the standard criteria for Corrosion Control, as established by the National Association of Corrosion Engineers (NACE). Specifically, the NACE recommended practices are NACE RP0169, NACE RP0193 and NACE RP0285. These standards require a minimum of **–850 millivolts** "instant off" potential between the structure and a reference cell, be achieved over 95% of the area of the structure.<br><br>However, this is not what is being specified. In fact, we have never seen anything quite like these Specs. Together, they constitute a potentially impossible requirement and would preclude us from bidding! The above referenced **Part 3.1.1. (a)** specifies a minimum of **–1,000 millivolts** "instant off". This is NOT in line the NACE standards.<br><br>The NACE Standard of -850 millivolt "instant off" potential is considered as the minimum required to achieve external corrosion control. If the pipeline goes below -850 mV it would be considered as not achieving protection.<br><br>**We do not want to install a new cathodic protection system that is only capable of achieving the minimum required. We would like for this system to provide a protective potential for many years.**<br><br>**As the piping system ages there will be pipeline coating deterioration and anode deterioration. If the cathodic protection system is built to provide only the minimum potential then additional systems will be needed in a few years.**<br><br>**NACE Standard RPO l69-96 paragraph 6.2.2.1.2 states " A negative polarized potential (see definition in section 2) of at least 850 mV relative to a saturated copper/copper sulfate reference electrode."** |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **The 1000 millivolt requirement of the specifications is in line with NACE Standards.**<br><br>**The Air Force has had many Aircraft Fueling Systems with a potential of -1000 mV or more negative.** |

# BID QUESTION RESPONSE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT: | Replace Hydrant Fueling System | DATE: | 10/14/04 |
| | Langley AFB, VA | Clarification | Yes |
| SOLICITATION NO: | W91236-04-R-0039 | Amendment | No |

DESCRIPTION: **Doug Johnson, General Plant Services, Inc.**

ARGUS PROJECT NO: 02010.02

QUESTION NO: 8

| | QUESTION/RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | The ball joint on the 16" pump suction at Tank #2 is listed as 10" on M4.03 and 8" on M2.03. Additionally, the drawings do not indicate a pipe size reduction from 16" to either size. Clarification please.<br><br>**Match size as shown for Tank #1, 16-inch.** |

# BID QUESTION RESPONSE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT: | Replace Hydrant Fueling System | DATE: | 10/14/04 |
| | Langley AFB, VA | Clarification | Yes |
| SOLICITATION NO: | W91236-04-R-0039 | Amendment | No |

DESCRIPTION: **Octavian Radu**

ARGUS PROJECT NO: 02010.02

QUESTION NO: 9

| | QUESTION/RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | In details drawing ED.4 we have a detail for type "F" manhole. From all the drawings I can find only four handholes and no manholes. Please indicate by note if there is any manhole Type "F" in this project.<br><br>**See EU.01, New EM-72B&C.** |

# BID QUESTION RESPONSE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT: | Replace Hydrant Fueling System | DATE: | 10/14/04 |
| | Langley AFB, VA | Clarification | Yes |
| SOLICITATION NO: | W91236-04-R-0039 | Amendment | No |

DESCRIPTION: **Stephen Blanchette, INGE Equipment Co., Inc.**

ARGUS PROJECT NO: 02010.02

QUESTION NO: 10

| | QUESTION/RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | In order to provide pricing for the Type "A" pipe supports that are shown on the subject drawing we will need additional information.<br>• The detail for the Type "A" support shows the bottom (1/2" x 6") plate as being supported directly on top of a column with 1" of grout.<br>Section 10 shows the Type "A" support sitting on top of an additional spacer that is placed on top of the column.<br>Which arrangement is correct?<br>**The detail is correct.**<br>• Please provide the centerline heights for the 8", 10", 12" and 16" supports, from the bottom of the ½" x 6" steel base plate that is specified.<br>**See schedule on sheet S1.03.** |
| | |

# BID QUESTION RESPONSE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT: | Replace Hydrant Fueling System | DATE: | 10/14/04 |
| | Langley AFB, VA | Clarification | Yes |
| SOLICITATION NO: | W91236-04-R-0039 | Amendment | No |

DESCRIPTION: **Wesley Bynum, MEB, Inc.**

ARGUS PROJECT NO: 02010.02

QUESTION NO: 11

| | QUESTION/RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | The specifications call for the steel Steel Supplier to be AISC Certified with no exceptions noted. There are a number of local suppliers who have equivalent programs, but will not bid without some notification that they would be approved. Would a Supplier with an equivalent program be accepted?<br><br>**Must meet certification as specified.** |
| | |

# BID QUESTION RESPONSE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT: | Replace Hydrant Fueling System | DATE: | 10/14/04 |
| | Langley AFB, VA | Clarification | Yes |
| SOLICITATION NO: | W91236-04-R-0039 | Amendment | No |

DESCRIPTION: **Team Reliable (D. Breeden)**

ARGUS PROJECT NO: 02010.02

QUESTION NO: 12

| | QUESTION/RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | The proposed pumphouse building's endwalls have a fifty foot clear span. Refer to Drawing S1.2 and A1.1. Now refer to detail 3/ A5.1 which shows 8" metal studs placed horizontally at 24" c/c to support the wall panels. The horizontal studs spanning fifty feet will not laterally support the walls against wind loads unless intermediate wind columns are added at mid-span or a very heavy beam is placed at the bottom of panel elevation or diagonal braces up tp roof structure are added. Please look into this and respond.<br>**The Pre-Engineered Building Manufacturer is responsible for wall panel support. The metal studs are to support interior features.** |
| | |