

Addenda

Culpeper County, Virginia
Community Pool Project

Addenda Number: 1

Culpeper County IFB No.: PR-24-1803.1 (Leisure/Lap pool & Splash Pad), and PR-24-1803.2 (Building & Grounds Work).

DATE: 4/23/2024

Attachment A-1, Project Number 23703, provides answers to questions received prior to the April 18, 2024, Non-Mandatory Pre-Bid meeting, minutes of the Non-Mandatory Pre-Bid Meeting held on April 18, 2024, and one (1) Request For Information (RFI) received by Culpeper County, dated April 22, 2024.

Note: A signed acknowledgement of this addenda must be received by the Procurement Department of Culpeper County either prior to the proposal/bid due date and hours or attached to your proposal/bid. Signature on this addenda does not substitute for your signature on the original RFP/IFB document. The original RFP/IFB document must be signed.

Alan H. Culpeper
Alan H. Culpeper, CPPO, VCM, VCO
Director of Procurement

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

END OF ADDENDA NO. 1

ATTACHMENT A-1

NORMAN
SMITH
ARCHITECTURE

T 202.462.5886 F 202.462.4906 www.normansmitharchitecture.com

3637 State Mills Road, Sperryville, VA 22740

DATE: 19 APRIL 2024
TO: ALAN CULPEPER,
FROM: N Smith/NSA
PROJECT #: 23703
RE: CULPEPER COUNTY COMMUNITY POOL PROJECT
BIDDERS' QUESTIONS PRIOR TO AND DURING THE NON-MANDATORY PRE-BID MEETING AND MINUTES OF THE PRE-BID MEETING

FOLLOWING ARE QUESTIONS RECEIVED 16 APRIL 2024 BY THE CULPEPER COUNTY DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT/COMMUNICATION, ALAN CULPEPER, PRIOR TO THE 18 APRIL 2024 NON-MANDATORY PRE-BID MEETING FOR THE CULPEPER COUNTY COMMUNITY POOL PROJECT.

The submitter referred to the pool work as a 'prime bid'. To clarify, the pool work is a prime bid in that it is a separate IFB and bid cost. Please note that the County wants two separate prices for the pool and the building/grounds. If one contractor wants to price both scopes, the contractor should respond with two separate IFB bid forms and not a combined form.

1. Should the pool excavation spoils be included in Pool Contractors base bid or as a Per CY on bid form?
A: Pool contractors. Assumed that they will be taken off site. Please refer to the Rebid Narrative page 1, #1, e), i-ii) for scope, unit price and quantity requirements and estimated quantities of spoils calculated by the AE.
2. Please confirm PR-24-1803.1 is for the pool prime bid form? It does not say which form is for which prime.
A: The county wants two separate bids. 1803.1 is for the pool proper as described in the drawings and Rebid Narrative.
3. Please provide bid bond form. Please confirm bid bond should be submitted w/ bid.
A: Bid form is included in the Project Manual
4. Please confirm no prevailing wages or Davis - Bacon wages are required for this work.
A: At this time, Culpeper has advised that the project is not subject to prevailing or Davis - Bacon wages.
5. Narrative x. on page 9 is confusing. What electrical work (if any) is required by the pool contractor?
A: The intention is that all rough-ins are provided by the bldg contractor to a J-box or similar. The pool contractor makes connection to their equipment from there. All low voltage and control wiring is by the pool contractor - all line and high voltage wiring is by the electrical contractor with supervision provided by the pool contractor for his specific equipment, i.e., ensure the pump motors are wired properly to spin the correct directions, etc. All pool bonding wiring shall be installed by the electrical contractor with supervision provided by the pool contractor to ensure all required ferrous and conductive metals are properly attached to the continuity (bonding) loop. The pool contractor installs the rebar and any bonding jumpers within the rebar mats so as to maintain ground continuity. The GC provides the actual wiring to the rebar/jumpers and back to the NEC approved grounding source.

6. Narrative xi. on page 9 is confusing. Who is setting concrete sleeves in the new filter building and surge tanks?
A: The intention is that the bldg contractor sets the sleeves, the pool contractor installs their piping and the bldg contractor seals. Coordination between the pool and general contractor is required.
7. Who is providing the Dept of Health permit for the pool?
A: The pool contractor shall be responsible for the DOH permit but WAI/NSA can assist by providing some technical documentation, as needed.
8. Who is responsible for obtaining overall construction permit?
A: The AE has submitted the bldg permit and VADEQ permits obo the County and it is in process.
9. Is the pool contractor responsible for any 3rd party testing?
A: We did not require any 3rd party testing; the only exception would be if VA DOH requires separate 3rd party testing which we do not believe to be the case.
10. Who is responsible to provide benchmarks and construction points onsite?
A: We have assumed that the bldg contractor would take the lead on this, in consultation with the pool subcontractor but each should be responsible for benchmarks within their own work, based on the drawings. The GC needs to set the main benchmark from which the pool contractor can establish the pool deck elevations, depths, and proper pool profiles.
11. Who is providing construction entrance for this work?
A: We assume that an SCE is part of the building contractor's work.
12. Who is providing site security fencing for this work?
A: We assume that a fence is part of the building contractor's work.
13. Will the site be stripped flat to pool deck subgrade? If so, who is providing?
A: See e), i). Per the Narrative, it is assumed that the pool contractor will excavate the cut and handle the spoils for the pool and the bldg contractor will do the same with the spoils for the bldg proper. This will need to be coordinated between the two entities.
14. Who is responsible for concrete pool decks?
A: See f), vi); the bldg contractor.
15. Who is responsible for installing depth markings on pool deck?
A: The pool contractor.
16. AP502 does not show sealant between the coping and deck. Is this needed and who should install?
A: We assume that the last entity to do this work will be responsible for the sealing after adequate cure time. We think the general contractor should be the responsible party to install a sealant joint at the edge of the pool deck and concrete pool coping detail. We will issue a clarification in an addendum, as needed.
17. Please confirm the GC prime bid will install electrical pool bonding and grounding.
A: The electrical contractor under the GC should perform the pool bonding with oversight and direction from the pool contractor - there is no need for an additional electrical sub on the job. See response above.
18. Who is responsible for low voltage control wiring for pool and feature equipment?
A: See answer above, but the Pool contractor is responsible for all control and low voltage wiring.
19. Who is forming and pouring the concrete splash pad?
A: See f), xii); bldg contractor with supervision by pool contractor.

20. Who is installing "TuffCoat" finish on top of splash pad? Is this one color or multi color? If multicoat, please provide layout drawing.
A: Pool contractor.
21. Who is plumbing storm and wastewater piping for the splash pad rain diverter to storm sewer?
A: All splash pad piping from splash pad to filter room is by the pool contractor. Piping beyond this point is by the bldg contractor. Pool contractor has all piping to the vortex or other rainwater diverter manufacturer. All piping associated with the supply and suction piping to and from the splash pad is by the pool contractor.
22. Please confirm all concrete pits w/in filter room on S101 are by GC?
A: Confirmed – yes.
23. Please confirm all grating, ladders and rails within filter building are by the GC.
A: Any pool specific grating, ladders, etc. are by pool contractor and including the internal pit waterproofing. This work needs to be coordinated with the bldg contractor.
24. Who is responsible for waterproofing spray pad surge tank?
A: 3/AP401, Pool subcontractor; see above.
25. How are the spray features activated?
A: Timer and electric on/off control provided by the manufacturer, activated from the pool mechanical room.

END OF QUESTIONS

A NON-MANDATORY PRE-BID MEETING WAS HELD IN THE CULPEPER COUNTY SPORTS COMPLEX FIELDHOUSE, LOCATED AT 16388 COMPETITION DRIVE, CULPEPER, VA ON 18 APRIL 2024 AT 1 PM. FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF THE MEETING AND QUESTIONS ASKED AND ANSWERED.

County representatives in attendance included:
Andrew Hardy (AH), Director, Culpeper County Parks and Recreation
Tabitha Riley, (TR) Parks and Recreation

Representatives from Norman Smith Architecture included:
Norman K. Smith, Principal (NKS)
Richard A. Zubyk, Jr., Senior Designer

Representative from Wallover Architects:
Ted Wallover (TW), Principal

AH opened the meeting with introductions of the AE team present. He then reviewed the due dates for bid questions and bid submissions.

NS provided a brief background of the project.

TW reviewed aspects of the project for which the pool contractor will be responsible, and other areas for which the general contractor will be responsible.

NS and TW emphasized the importance of communication and coordination necessary between the pool and general contractors. Gray areas of responsibility between the contractors should be talked through; NSA and WAI offered assistance in that regard.

NS briefly reviewed the changes in the project between the first and current bid drawings and documents.

TW explained that the Mirtha-based pool design of the first bid was revised as a skimmer pool. He briefly reviewed the skimmer pool features.

NS briefly reviewed the drawing set.

AH reviewed the storm water issues involved with the pool project and the closely related parking lot project.

NS shared the status of the project permits. Building, electrical and pool permits have been issued. The mechanical and plumbing permit is in process. The VA DEQ permit review is in process with issuance expected within 15 to 30 days. Application for the DOH permit has not been submitted yet.

Question from an attendee was asked about securing all pool water discharge permits from the local AHJ. TW answered that it may not be an issue since there would be not chlorine in any pool discharge, so the water could go directly into the storm water retention facility. Issue had also been addressed by Marvin Hinchey, project Civil engineer, with DEQ.

NS reviewed the changes to the project timeline. The County requires a contract with the pool and general contractors in place no later than 31 July 2024. Expected construction completion can be as late as approximately May 2026 but an earlier completion is preferred. The current timeline is more relaxed than the original. The IFB contains all relevant project dates and bid bond forms. He encouraged all to read the 01 portion of the specifications which lays out how the AE team envisions the project to proceed and the project scope.

A question from an attendee was asked about spoils disposal. NS and AH explained that spoils will be disposed of on-site. An earlier plan was to truck the spoils to a local site, but the plan was rejected by DEQ. The current plan now is to deposit the spoils in a swale on the far side of the future parking lot from the project site. Use of dump trucks was approved by AH who said that his own department will level the deposits.

A question from an attendee was asked about the pool. From a review of the structural drawings, it appears that the entirety of the pool would be formed up and backfilled with gravel. Is that correct? TW answered with 'Not necessarily'. If the soil would hold, the contractor could shoot against the grade. It depends on the site condition. The pool specs stated that the client will not pay more for forming up the pool.

A question from an attendee was asked regarding inspections. Rebar inspections, soil, soil bearing, soil expansion - will inspections be by the county, or third party? NS responded that the basic building inspections will be by the county. TW added that there was no specific requirement identified for third party testing for the pool. Once the rebar is set, the county will obviously want to inspect that. Attendee focused his follow-up question on soils, expansive soils and soil condition once excavation of the pool area was complete. NS stated that the geotechnical report did not show evidence of expansive soils. He added that the geotechnical report is in the project manual. Should excavation reveal visually questionable conditions, then arrangements could be made to have GEI, formally Underhill, perform necessary field testing.

TW continued by stating that he prefers dry gun gunnite but will accept shotcrete.

NS and AH pointed out that the intent is to proceed with both the pool and the building. The project will not proceed with just one or the other. TW added that this does not preclude a contractor from bidding the entire project - both the pool and the building. But the contractor would have to submit separate costs under both IFB numbers per the IFB bid forms.

NS reviewed the first 25 questions above which were received prior to the pre-bid meeting.

Commenting on question #9 above about third-party testing, TW stated that they would want the pool concrete tested.

Commenting on question #19 above about who is responsible for forming and pouring the concrete splash pad, TW and NS pointed out that since this was primarily concrete flatwork, it made sense to have the building contractor responsible for this work rather than the pool contractor who was working with gunnite or shotcrete.

NS commented that assumptions were made regarding the division of responsibilities between the building and pool contractors, and rather than make exceptions here, follow the assumptions and if question or condition arose later, discussion could be held at that time for further defining responsibilities.

Commenting on question #22 above about filter room pits, NS pointed out that there are minor changes to the pit depths, and that those changes are reflected on the A and AP drawings but not on the Structural drawings. The AP drawings would prevail in this regard. It is just a dimensional change and the wall thickness and rebar remain the same.

Pre-bid meeting was moved outside to the site.

AH indicated the intention to block off entry onto Competition Drive of patron traffic with bollards; patron traffic would be through the main entrance to the east. This will allow the contractors to have unimpeded access to the site and the adjacent spoils disposal. Construction traffic would enter the sports complex and the project site by Competition Drive with the SCE located near the bollards.

AH pointed out the area across Competition Drive from the project site which will be the staging area for the contractors. A portion of existing fence could be removed for direct access. This area will be a future parking lot.

The existing swale on the far side of the future parking lot was viewed by attendees as the location for depositing spoils.

Pre-bid meeting adjourned at this point.

END OF PRE-BID MEETING SUMMARY

FOLLOWING IS RFI #1 RECEIVED BY CULPEPER COUNTY FROM BIDDER TAFT CONSTRUCTION, DATED 22 APRIL 2024, FOR THE REBID OF THE CULPEPER COUNTY COMMUNITY POOL PROJECT, AND A RESPONSE TO RFI #1 FROM THE PROJECT MEP ENGINEER. THEY ARE PROVIDED FOR YOUR REVIEW AND DISSEMINATION.

RFI #1:

M000.4 under section 230900 states the following:
HVAC CONTROLS (CARRIER): VERIFY PROPER OPERATION OF CONTROLS ON EXISTING VAV BOXES AND TEMPERATURE SENSORS PRIOR TO ANY DEMOLITION WORK. ADVISE ENGINEER OF ANY CONTROL DEFICIENCIES. REMOVE EXISTING CONTROLS AND STORE FOR REINSTALLATION. REINSTALL CONTROLS WHEN EXISTING VAV BOXES ARE RELOCATED. RECALIBRATE TEMPERATURE SENSORS AND VAV BOX CONTROLS TO PROVIDE PROPER OPERATION AT NEW AIRFLOW SETPOINTS. PROVIDE ALL NECESSARY PROGRAMMING, AND COMMISSIONING. MODIFY SYSTEM GRAPHICS AND POINTS MONITORING ACCORDING TO OWNER'S STANDARDS TO INCORPORATE MONITORING AND CONTROL OF THE RELOCATED TERMINAL UNITS.

This does not appear to apply to this project. Please advise what controls are to be used for the project.

RESPONSE:

Reference General Note 3 on Sheet M000.2. Not all specifications noted on Sheets M000.3, 000.4, 000.5, and 000.6 are applicable to this project. In this case existing controls are not present on this project. Controls do exist local to devices such as ductless split systems.

Response By: Phil Gentry, Valley Engineering, Date 4/23/24

END OF RFI #1