To All Bidders:

Please acknowledge receipt of this Addendum via email to Teresa Patterson at the following email address: tpatterson@mtsac.edu.

---

**CHANGES/CLARIFICATIONS**

**Item No. 1** Section 1.2.1 Intent to Respond, Mandatory Site Walk, and Clarifications.
Strike the first paragraph of this section in its entirety.

**Item No. 2** Provide pricing for the soils export to be disposed of to an on-campus location, with alternate pricing for off-site disposal.

**RESPONSE TO RFI's**

**Question No. 1** The Loading Criteria on page 9 of the Technical Criteria (Attachment A.1) states that the TES Tank shall be designed to account for:

a. 100psf uniform live load surcharge over entire structure
b. A combined minimum live load surcharge of 40psf uniform over entire structure and appropriate design truck loading.

Please confirm that the two loading scenarios are to be run separately, with the worst case being adopted, and that the structure does not need to be designed for 140psf uniform live load plus the appropriate design truck loading.

Response
Confirmed: Run loading scenarios separately and use worst case for design.

**Question No. 2** Page 14 of the Technical Criteria states the maximum flow rate to be used for TES design is 5,000 gpm. Specification Section 237116.1.2.D.3.d states the maximum chilled water flow rate shall be 4,000 gpm. Please confirm that a maximum flow rate of 5,000 gpm at the maximum allowable pressure drop shall be used for the TES tank diffuser design.

Response
The design maximum flow rate is 5,000GPM.

**Question No. 3** Page 15 of the Technical Criteria states the design roof loading for the tank shall be H-20. Please consider if HS-20 loading is more appropriate for the
design life of the tank structure and the intended use of the parking lot (Alternate tank costs could be provided to aid in the analysis).

Response

Provide bid-alternate cost for HS-20 loading design.

**Question No. 4** Specification Section 014600.1.3.B states that the geotechnical evaluation is not part of the Contract Documents. However, Specification Section 237116.1.2.D.3 does not provide geotechnical information. Please confirm if the geotechnical evaluation report shall be adopted as part of the Bid Documents or if Soil Design Criteria shall be added to Specification Section 237116.1.2.D.3.

Response

The Geotechnical Report issued by the College shall be used as the basis of design.

**Question No. 5** Specification Section 273116.1.2.D.3.w does not list an importance factor for AWWA D110-13 and adopts an importance factor of 1.0 for ASCE 7-10 design. If designed as an essential facility, the importance factor for AWWA D110-13 and ASCE 7-10 is 1.5. If designed as a non-essential facility, the importance factor for AWWA D110-13 and ASCE 7-10 is 1.25. Please confirm the design risk category.

Response

Use importance factor of 1.25.

**Question No. 6** Specification Section 237116.1.2.D.3. does not list maximum fill and draw down rates. Please confirm if the maximum flow rate for TES design shall be adopted for vent capacity and overflow design.

Response

Confirmed: Use maximum chilled water flow rate of (5,000GPM).

**Question No. 7** Specification Section 237116.2.1.E states that coarse aggregate used in concrete mixes shall be No. 67 with 100% passing the 1 ½ inch sieve. It is our experience that using a coarser aggregate #4 yields better shrinkage characteristics. Please confirm if using No. 4 stone coarse aggregate is acceptable.

Response

Proposal of using No. 4 stone coarse aggregate is acceptable.

**Question No. 8** Specification Section 237116.3.3.I does not list criteria for backfill placed on top of the roof slab. It is recommended to add language stating the compaction of backfill on top of the tank roof shall equal 85% of the maximum density as determined in accordance with ASTM D1557, using only non-vibratory, hand held compaction equipment.

Response

Proposed method to backfill is acceptable.

**Question No. 9** Attachment C.2 Page 40, paragraph 6 of the Example Design Build Agreement states, “No Work During Student Testing. Designer/Builder
shall, at no additional cost to the District and at the District’s request, coordinate its Work to not disturb District students including, without limitation, not performing any disruptive Work when students are taking State-required tests. The District shall provide a testing schedule at least thirty (30) days prior to the start of work.” Please confirm this section is not applicable to tank construction taking place in the parking lot.

Response

Since work is not taking place within a classroom building, this section is not applicable.

Question No. 10

Attachment C.2 Page 41, paragraph 11.1 of the Example Design Build Agreement states, “Driving on the Premises shall be limited to periods when students and public are not present. If driving or deliveries must be made during the school hours, two (2) or more ground guides shall lead the vehicle across the area of travel. The speed limit on-the Premises shall be five (5) miles per hour (maximum) or less if conditions require.” Please confirm this section is not applicable to tank construction taking place in the parking lot as long as the approved construction routes are utilized.

Response

Parking will be available within a designated area on campus within close proximity to the site.

Question No. 11

The project documents do not indicate the location where the tank overflow pipe shall daylight in the parking lot. As this tank is fully buried, please confirm where it is acceptable for the overflow pipe to daylight and drain to.

Response

The overflow shall be located next to the service vault for the tank, which is in a raised parking lot island.

Question No. 12

We have a question (RFI) for the TES tank project. Please see below:

1. Note 11 on sheets C3.00 & C3.00A indicates “0.2’ AC pavement overlay or full depth pavement replacement per CPM”. Is it the intent to replace the pavement to match existing pavement section (which we believe is 3-4” over native)? Or is it the intent to replace with a pavement section as described in the soils report, table 8 (page 24)? If it’s the intent to provide a pavement section identified in the soils report, please provide the Traffic Index (TI).

Response:

It is recommended that the parking lot pavement be replaced per the recommendations in the soils report using a Traffic Index (TI) of “5” (Table 8, Flexible Pavement Structural Sections (pg. 24)).