The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended, if not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 4 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or electronic communication which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

A. Title: Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Pilot Circular Tank and Solids Handling Project, Leavenworth, WA

B. Acknowledgement: See block 11 above regarding how to acknowledge this amendment. The acknowledgment must be received at the place designated for receipt of offers (see block 8 of the Solicitation, Offer and Award, Standard Form 1442).

C. The Time and Date for Receipt of Proposals is extended to 1300 MT on 19 JUNE 2020.

See Attachment for text of Amendment.

Continued ...
Legacy Doc #: BOR
Period of Performance: 08/31/2020 to 06/23/2021
D. **Offer Modification:** See block 11 above if you have submitted your offer and now desire to modify or withdraw it.

E. **Third Party:** If you have given your copy of the solicitation to someone else, please forward this amendment accordingly.

FOR INFORMATION ONLY: See attached questions and subsequent answers from potential offerors for the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Pilot Circular Tank and Solids Handling Project, Leavenworth, WA. This is a partial list of questions and answers. Additional Q&A to follow in subsequent amendment.

Attachments
1) General Proposal Instruction L.12 – Factor 3 Past Performance – This section indicates if offeror intends on utilizing subcontractors to perform work beyond supply of material PPQ shall be submitted on behalf of each proposed subcontractor. It appears the intent is to have 100% of the offeror’s subcontractors identified in the proposal and include past performance for them. Is this correct? If so can the Government reduce this requirement to only include major subcontractors either based on specific scope or dollar value threshold?

Response: PPQ should be submitted for any Major Subcontractor.

2) The PPQ form included in the solicitation indicates it is for a different project (Snow Lake Tunnel Outlet Valve Replacement). Can the Government re-issue a new PPQ form with correct solicitation number and project name or is it acceptable for us to modify the form?

Response: This form was corrected in Amendment 0001.

3) I am checking to see if you would accept a substitution request for the Foam Insulated Metal Panels. Currently specified Kingspan I represent METLSPAN and we can do the same panels.

Response: The Metlspan product is approved, permitted that the product supply can meet the flashing requirements of the specifications for weathertightness and that the product texture and colors are acceptable to the BOR.

4) Given the water quality, we need more filters. We do not recommend just one EBS 15k if the water quality is 40ppm TSS at times without knowing the particle size distribution (PSD). Some options are:
   a. 2 x EBS 15K filters to handle 600 gpm with 20 micron.
   b. 1 Crystal (9 pod) unit at 100 micron followed by 1 EBS 15k at 20micron.
   c. 1 Crystal (9 pod) unit at 100micron followed by 2 Crystal (9pod) units at 20micron.
   d. There is not much cost difference between the two technologies here. The Crystal technology would require external water for backwash (meaning a clean water source).

Response: Based on the 2018-2019 data provided, it appears that the 40 mg/l TSS value is an anomaly. Over 18 months of data records and (2) spring high flow events, the TSS value was never measured over 10 mg/l. There is one data point in Oct. 2019 that registers 40 mg/l. For this reason, the design criteria for the IPF-100-200 filter will be revised to a maximum TSS load of 20 mg/l in the mechanical schedule and the specification package. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**
5) I would quote this system with electric flush valve rather than hydraulic in order ensure proper operating of the filter. Since the 40 ppm is somewhat dirty water, I recommend the electric flush valve.

Response: Modify to 20 mg/l Max TSS and maintain electric flush valves. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

6) The motor requested in the specs is custom; would you rather our standard for cost savings?

Response: Spec will be revised to standard motor. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

7) The holiday spark testing mentioned in the specs is not included in our standard coating. This will add cost, would you like our standard?

Response: Holiday Spark Testing will be removed. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

8) The Division 1 section mentioned in the specs has not been provided. We will quote for our standard field services.

Response: This was question is not directed to the BOR. The manufacturer did not get the full spec package from the bidder.

9) When is the proposal due?

Response: Extended to JUNE 19, 2020 1300 MDT

10) On page 26 05 00 – 4 it states Raceways will be found in section 26 05 33 That section is not in the spec book.

Response: Raceways should reference in newly inserted Spec section 26 05 33. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**
11) I do not see any detail on the inside of building finishes.

Response: The Reuse Buildings uses insulated metal panels, which are “sandwich panels” that have a metal liner panel that is integral to the sandwich panel’s fabrication. The interior facing surface of the sandwich panel is the factory-applied interior finish for the approved wall panel product, with panel requirements outlined in Section 13 34 13 of the Technical Specifications, Paragraph 2.02.A.3. All panel and trim color selections shall be coordinated with the Owner. Additional painting of the interior surface of the insulated metal panel is not required. Erection of the PEMB and its panels shall be performed so that touch-up painting of panels is not required.

12) Drawing 3712-100-60067, Detail B/60066 calls out “Remove and Crush Concrete to 3” Minus’. That is the only reference to crushing demolished raceway concrete. Detail A on that same page, makes no reference to crushing concrete. Please clarify if it is a requirement to crush demolished raceway concrete into 3” minus and if so, is there a plan to reuse on the project?

Response: Concrete removal only. Crushing is not required.

13) Specification 02 41 00, 1.10 Recycling states “The Contractor shall recycle as much of the existing metals at a local recycling facility as deemed reasonable by the COR. Metals include rebar…” Will the Contractor be required to remove all rebar from demolished raceway concrete? Or is the recycling requirement for just those rebar pieces that may become separated during the demolition operation be recycled?

Response: Concrete removal only. Crushing is not required nor is rebar removal.

14) Drawing 3712-100-60062, Detail 1 “Ground Water Hydraulic Profile” shows the connection to the existing 30” bfv is 30” and the raw water pipeline remains 30” until it reduces to 12” before the last inline tee to hatchery. It calls for the tees to the hatchery branch size to be 12”, calls for 30”x12” tee past reducer and calls for 18” bfv past reducer also. Drawing 3712- 100-60072 and Drawing 3712-100-60076 both call for the groundwater line size to reduce to 8” by way of 30”x8” eccentric reducer at the existing 30” bfv. Please clarify which drawings include the correct ground water line, fittings and valve sizing.

Response:
- The 30”X 12” Tees referenced on the hydraulic Profile (3712-100-60062) are existing fittings that serve the existing hatchery and are not part of this scope.
- Refer to sheets 3712-100-60072 and 60076 for the correct ground water line, fittings, and valve sizing to Reuse Building (RB-100).

15) Specification Section 13 34 13, 2.10 A.4 “Or Approved Equal” If Star Building Systems can comply will all specified requirements, will Star Building Systems be considered “Or Equal” to those manufacturers listed?

Response: Star Building Systems is approved as an “or equal” for the supply of the Pre-Engineered Manufactured Building. This approval does not relax any of the requirements from the Contract Documents governing the supply and install of the PEMB.
16) Drawing 3712-100-60062, Detail 1 “Ground Water Hydraulic Profile” shows the tee and valve for the raceways watermain upstream of the existing 30” bfv. Is the existing 30” bfv currently closed at all times? Drawing 3712-100-60062, Detail 1 & 2 shows line off ground water and raw water pipeline upstream of points new pipeline connects to the raceways. It appears there is a valve at these tee locations. Are there any other valves downstream to allow control of the watermain to individual raceways or only the valves at the tees? Are there certain times of the year the raw water sources the raceway watermain and certain times of the year the ground water sources the raceway watermain?

Response:
The existing groundwater line has a butterfly valve and blind flange at the connection point as represented in drawing 3712-100-600. This will provide flow isolation for connection.

The existing Raw-water line has a 48” diameter Butterfly valve upstream of the connection point to provide flow isolation (As shown on the hydraulic profile (3712-100-60062)

Also Reference Existing Site Survey, 3712-100-60060.

17) What is existing 36” drainpipe type to abatement ponds?

Response: RCP

18) What is existing 48” raw water pipe type where we connect?

Response: AWWA C905 DR25

19) SHT 60068, Gen. Civil Note #17 states that “all sleeve couplings on yard piping shall be unrestrained, unless otherwise noted.” While spec 40 23 00, 2.04 F, states “Sleeve-type coupling on pressure lines shall be harnessed unless thrust restraint is provided by other means.”

a. Please clarify if couplings (or any fittings) on pressurized lines are to be restrained or not.

Response: All couplings and fittings are to be restrained as described in the specs.

20) “SLG” appears on plans and valve schedule, however, is not listed on SHT 60063 (Pipe schedule).

a. Please specify pipe materials, test pressure, etc. for sludge lines. *I see SHT 60116 (Process Flow 3) 2”/4” sludge is SCH80 PVC. Please confirm

Response: Add to 3712-100-60063: SLG Sludge (similar to (RW) RAW water Spec)

**Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

21) SHT 60072 (Overall Site) – Sheet Keynote “M” – Unable to locate on plan and materials called out do not appear to be listed on the pipe schedule nor within the specifications.

a. Please confirm that this 3” HDPE solids line is NOT part of the project scope

Response: This is not part of the project. There isn’t any 3” HDPE on project.
22) Pipe schedule and specifications call out DR-25 on 14” and larger C900, however I am unable to find a DR for 12” and smaller.
   a. Please provide DR for C-900, 12” and smaller

   Response: Use DR 25 for both C900 and C905.

23) Pipe schedule lists minimum test pressures however, the specifications provide little else.
   a. Please provide working pressures for all systems or maximum anticipated test pressures

   Response: Added to DWG 60063**Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piping System</th>
<th>Max Working Pressure (PSI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EF   Effluent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW   Ground Water</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA   Low-Pressure Air</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O    Oxygen</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF   Overflow</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS   Recirc Supply</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR   Recirc Return</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW   Raw Water</td>
<td>10, 60 (between IBP and IPF and backwash)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLG  Sludge</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24) Profiles on 60075 indicate (2) 18” X 18” tees and (2) 18” X 14” tees. This conflicts with 60119 – (2) 18” X 14” tees and (2) 18” X 10” tees
   a. Please confirm

   Response: Sheet 60119 is correct. Sheet 60075 has been updated.**Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

25) I find no evidence that a 48” X 18” nor 18” X 4” Eccentric reducers are manufactured (in any configuration; Flange, MJ, MJXFLG, C153, C110).

   a. Is it acceptable to use multiple fittings to achieve this reduction? *Sometime manufacturers can make special fittings, however there are significant costs involved and the lead times can be weeks to months.

   Response: Use of multiple fittings to make these connections is acceptable.

26) To add to the question above; I have found that the valve schedule requires FLG x FLG valves however, the piping sections 3 11 21 & 22 require that fittings be MJ.
   a. Some flanged and MJ X FLG fittings will be required to accommodate both the valves and some fitting configurations which are available only in FLG. Please confirm that this is acceptable.

   Response: The proposed is acceptable.
27) I am having trouble reconciling the valves. It appears that P&ID DWGs 1, 4 and 5 are missing the buried 14” and 10” butterfly valves (1) 10” buried butterfly valve seems to be missing from your valve schedule. There are also a number 10” of valves (butterfly and check) that are missing from your P&ID DWGs #4 and 5 – the BFVs appear between the IBP and IFP as well as between the IFP and UVU units. The best depiction of these valves is SHT 60125, Sect B.
   a. Please reexamine valves and confirm count. *Please see additional notes below (“Valve Discrepancies”) Please also note if any valves are to be provided by an equipment manufacturer. (I found no notations/spec that indicate valves are supplied by anyone other than the contractor.) Please confirm. Please also provide VALVE TAGS ON P&ID DWGs

Response: The P&ID sheets do not show all the valves, but are provided to depict the process only. See M sheets for equipment schedule for listing valves and piping diagrams.

   b. Please also provide specifications for PVC body butterfly valves (per note #1 on SHT 60110)

Response: Spec will be added. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

VALVE DISCREPANCIES

RW-VLV-101, 103, 105, 201, 203, 204, 205 – Based on the drawing should ALL be 10” (not 8” and 6”)

*RW-VLV-105 (SHT 60115-Flow diagram 2) should NOT be associated with instrumentation, correct? (It appears to be linked to “PG” downstream of IPF-100)

PLEASE CONFIRM SIZES and modify plans accordingly (if other than 10”)

Response: Valves are all be 10”. Mech Schedule will be modified. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

VALVE DISCREPANCIES (MISSING)

Shouldn’t there be a RW-VLV-104? (There is a 204)

PLEASE CONFIRM

Response: No, RW-VLV-204 will be removed. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

28) DWG 60125, SECT A – there is a check valve labeled 16” with a 14” line that follows however when scaled is a 10” check valve and 10” downstream line. From what I can see, the valve and following line should be 10”

   a. Please confirm

Response: Check Valve is 10” (RW-VLV-106/206) Drawing will be revised. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**
29) SHT 60115 shows a 6” backwash line (RW) to the IPFs – Unable to locate anywhere else.
   a. Please confirm this line

   Response: This line is depicted on 3712-100-60119. This line reports IPF-100/200 backwash to
   the overflow Pipe in the PRAS Treatment Sump (PST). This line will be modified in the drawings
   to accommodate new backwash pump and be connected to main overflow (OF) line below grade.
   **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

30) The specs make no reference for the MV equipment, the Metering Cabinet, Resistive Load Bank
    or interior or exterior raceway. Are there details for these items?
    Response:
    a. The medium voltage equipment and metering cabinet should be provided by the local utility
       (Chelan PUD). Contractor to coordinate with utility to upgrade service. Utility application and
       engineering fees are to be borne by Contractor. See 3712-100-60135 notes regarding
       coordinating with Chelan PUD on medium voltage service.
    b. Standby generator shall be provided with 300 kW resistive load bank, using a fused
       disconnected making connection. See revised standby generator specification, Section 26 32
       10.

   See newly attached Section 26 05 33 – Conduits, for questions regarding raceway. Raceway type
   used shall be as shown on the drawings. Materials shall be per section 26 05 33. **Revised
   Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

31) SHT 60125 & 60129 (probably another 1 or 2 sheet) – Air/Vac is shown. These units are NOT
    shown on “Flow diagrams” nor on P&ID sheets. No sizes called out and the only detail
    provided (SHT 60069, DTL C5) for 4” and larger. I suspect that a 14” and a 10” will NOT
    require a 4” or larger unit. The spec (43 25 42, 2.01) is generic for iron body valves and does
    not list size.

    Additionally, spec 13 99 61, 2.03 I – calls for PVC body
    a. Please provide size call outs for all Air/Vac valves.
    b. Please confirm which specification will prevail.

    Response: This should be a 1” Air Release valve, Drawing spec will be modified. **Revised
    Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

32) I am unable to find/confirm the 3” and 2” (RS) lines and valves shown on SHT 60115
    (Flow Diagram 2). These materials do not appear anywhere else.
    a. Please confirm if these lines are included in scope

    Response: These lines are included in scope. They are intended to supply the feedwater to the
    backwash pumps on all the drum filters. It is a gravity fed line from MHT-100 to MSDF-100, and
    MHT-200 to MSDF-200 and MSDF-1000. Detail will be added to Drawing 60120 (Reuse Piping
    Plan) **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**
33) How are we supposed to seal the *removable* 4” (OF) pipe within the 8” tee? Is it already made into the FRP standpipe?
   a. Please provide more information and detail.

   **Response:** Notes added to drawing. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

34) SHT 60123 calls out for almost all “EF” pipe to be (19 – C900) *A small portion of the 4” is labeled as (16), however, SHT 60116 (Flow Diagram 3) calls out for the same pipe to (16 – S80)*
   a. Please correct/confirm material

   **Response:** EF pipe is (16, SCH 80). SHT 60123 will be revised. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

35) Between SHTs 60116 & 60130 I am confused about the 4” ball valve. 60116 shows this valve as “SLD-VLV-1001” (which is on the valve schedule), while 60130 shows (what appears to be) the same valve as “ETS-VLV-1001” (which is ALSO on the valve schedule.) Both valves seem to be associated with the same “location service” (ETS).
   a. Please confirm that there are, in fact (2) 4” ball valves for the ETS

   **Response:** There is only (1) valve. Page 60130 will be corrected to show SLG VLV-1001. ETS-VLV-1001 will be removed from Schedule. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

36) SHT 60110 (Valve Schedule) calls out LPA-VLV-(203-211) to be 4”, however I can find nothing else in the plans to support this. Additionally, SHT 60167 (P&ID 7) shows/calls out valves LPA-VLV-(1003-1008) which do NOT appear on the valve schedule.
   a. Please confirm all LPA valve (and subsequently the pipe) sizes

   **Response:** LPA -VLV-(203-211) are 3” valves

   b. Please confirm that valves 1003-1008 are to be provided by the contractor

   **Response:** LPA-VLV-(1003-1008) are 3” valves contractor supplied, added to MECH SCH. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

37) I have some questions regarding the roof design. The two documents I am going to reference are the drawing 60093 and Specification Section 13 34 13 / 2.03 A.1
   It appears you desire an insulated roof which meets Washington State energy code. The Washington code requires if all the insulation is above the deck to be R-38. This can be achieved with a 5” panel. If you use a liner you can reduce the roof panel to an R-25 and the liner panel is a R-11.

   **Response:** The proposed alternative is not approved.
My question regards the continuous ridge vent. I don’t understand the reason for the ridge vent. The roof panels can provide the full R-38 insulation value so there is no need for insulating the ceiling panels. The attachment of the ceiling panel closes off the roof so there is no air flow from either inside of the building or in the space between the roof cladding and the ceiling panel. The roof purlins seal the space. There appears to be adequate ventilation with the end wall louvers. Condensation will occur only if there is inadequate Air flow.

A) What does the ridge vent do?  
B) Can it be eliminated?

Response: A check on the ventilation provided without the addition of ridge vents has been performed, and the ridge vents are found as unnecessary to achieve adequate ventilation. As a result, ridge vents are not required for the re-use building.

I also want to know if the bureau would consider an alternate roof system which would provide all the structural and architectural items requested. The roof would be a standing seam roof and the ceiling would have the same panels. This system is provided by Pacific Insulation Products and is called R-seal. It is approve Washington State and is used these type structurers. If such an alternate is acceptable, I am prepared to submit all the technical info today. I have attached it to this email. This system could reduce the cost of the roof 15 to 20%.

a. Would the Bureau consider alternate roof systems?

Response: The proposed alternative is not approved.

38) Can the 8” ground water and 18” raw water connections be isolated for tie in or will it need to be hot tapped?

Response: There are isolation valves for both lines.

39) Refer to sheet B/60093. This section view shows a continuous ridge vent, but there is no detail showing the separation requested for the insulated panels at the ridge. Also, since the roof is IMP, does it need to be vented?

Response: A check on the ventilation provided without the addition of ridge vents has been performed, and the ridge vents are found as unnecessary to achieve adequate ventilation. As a result, ridge vents are not required for the re-use building.

40) Refer to sheet 60095. These elevations show a translucent panel that is 3’-0” tall, but it is not defined in the specifications under section 13 34 13. Please define.

Response: Requirements for the translucent panels has been added to the Drawings (Sheet 60093). Accessories supplied for these panels shall be the complete package necessary to achieve the weathertightness requirements of the panel system per Section 13 of the Specifications. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment***
41) Refer to sheet 60141. The electrical plan shows there being electrical trays suspended from the ceiling. Is that load accounted for in the collateral?

Response: Yes, with supply and install of typical electrical trays.

42) Refer to Section 13 34 13 of the Specifications. Please define MBSS.

Response: MBSS is “Metal Building System Supplier”.

43) Refer to Section 13 43 13-3 of the Specifications. Gutters are mentioned in the work descriptions, however, they are not specified or shown on the drawings. There does not appear to be any provision to collect water from the gutter system. Please clarify.

Response: Gutters and downspouts are not required.

44) The RFQ designates the bid is to be mailed via Fed-ex, is BOR open to the possibility of receiving the bid via email?

Response: Proposals are required to be mailed copies with the required number of copies per the solicitation.

45) Regarding the Leavenworth drum filter MOD-100, MOD-200 & ETS-1000, could you please provide a specific “cut out” where the drums are to be placed?

a. We need precisions on water elevations (incoming & in sumps), connecting points details and length & width of each sump?

Response: Sump details are referenced on the foundation plan, DWG #60090. Invert elevation for all critical levels can referenced throughout the drawing document.

b. Do you request the frame drums to have a pan (or sub frame) underneath to maintain proper hydraulic profile?

Response: Specification require that a weir be utilized to maintain water level outside the drum filter. A Pan would be acceptable for this.

46) Is there a cable tray specification?

Response: See Section 26 05 33 Electrical Raceway for material and installation of cable tray.

47) Is a new pole & cutouts required if so whose scope will that fall within?

Response: Chelan PUD will be responsible for final MV equipment design and installation. Contractor to coordinate with PUD on upgrading service.

48) Sheet 3712-100-60136 shows the HV UG feeder in Sch. 80 PVC. Sheet 3712-100-60142 shows RGS for conduit which is correct?

Response: Revised drawing to show RGS conduit for primary service. Final design to be
49) Is there no exterior lighting on the reuse building?

Response: No external lighting is required.

50) Is there no branch power is in the generator building for the generator block heater & generator battery charger?

Response: See revised panel and cable schedule for generator shore power. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

51) Is there no lighting in the generator building.?

Response: Generator Cover does not have lighting.

52) The written specs show an LHO width of 8 ft, but the drawing show 7 sections , and drawing below (page 3712-100-60098) show 7 ft.

Response: Written Spec will be updated to match the Drawing at 7’ X 2’. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

53) Could you provide a detailed drawing of the LHO?

Response: LHO details are left open to accommodate designs from multiple manufacturers.

54) If the dimensions are 7’ x 2’ x 15”, the new hydraulic rate will be 92.5ft. Is that acceptable?

Response: yes, this is acceptable, and updated in spec.

55) Will the rotometer be inside an enclosure?

Response: Rotometers do not require enclosures.

56) Explosion proof rating- Please confirm that Class 1 Division 2 explosion proof electrical is acceptable for the explosion proof electrical options required.

Response: Yes

57) WA State Approval Seal- Please confirm if a WA State Approval Seal is required.? If so, it will take a minimum of 8-10 months for the submittal/state approval process prior to fabrication. Please note that additional options may be required beyond what is specified to meet WA State Approval for the specific site location and chemicals being stored.

Response: Assume this refers to Chemical Storage unit? A specific approval from WA State is not required as long as the Manufacturer’s Qualifications are met. Submittal Drawings shall be stamped by registered professional structural engineer.
58) FM plant inspections - Our buildings are FM approved and will carry a FM approval label; however, your building will not be inspected by FM during production. Only WA State Approval Seal will provide a 3rd party inspector (not FM) to visit our plant to inspect at multiple stages of the production.

Response: The FM approval label is acceptable. A 3rd party inspection by COR or COR designated representative shall be allowed if requested by COR.

59) Due to the lack of specification on Electrical Raceway Systems, would it be permissible to use EMT Steel boxes for lighting systems close to the ceiling?

Response: See specification 26 05 33 Electrical Raceway.

60) Section L.15 gives instructions for faxing changes for a previously delivered hardcopy. Do we need to fax 4 pages of each document since we are submitting 2 originals and 2 copies.

Response: You may fax one copy to acknowledge amendments, modification to offers and withdrawal of offers per the provision.

61) The Solicitation Box 8 says to address the offer to the Boise BOR office but page 3 states that delivery will be made to the Yakima Office. Please confirm where the proposal need to go.

Response: The offer is to be addressed to the Boise address as stated in box 8. Delivery Location on page 3 refers to the WORK, not the offer.

62) Section 40 91 23 provides specific requirements for the electromagnetic flow meters, however no specifications were provided for the rest of the instrumentation. Can you please provide further clarification on the requirements for the pressure, level, temperature, and water quality devices?

Response: Revised “Meters, General” specification and retitled “Meters and Instrumentation, General”. See revised specification. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

63) Please reference Factor 1: Experience, which states the contractor shall furnish a list of (no more than 5) projects completed within the last 6 years of similar scope and complexity. Similar projects are defined as work involving hatchery and/or installation of partial recirculating aquaculture systems for hatcheries. While our company does bring hatchery experience that fits this experience requirement, we feel that the requirement of partial recirculating aquaculture systems is narrowing the limit for us to showcase to the BOR the multitude of our mechanical and filtration type project experience. We respectfully request that the BOR expands Factor 1 to include “similar mechanical filter and process technologies and equipment” to the similar project’s description.

Response: Factor 1 states “similar in scope and complexity to the work required under the solicitation”. It is at the contractor’s discretion to determine relevant work that is within scope of the solicitation to submit for company experience.
On page L-15, it states that the first page of the pricing proposal should be the “Contract Pricing Proposal”. Conversely, on page L-9, it states that a “fully executed solicitation, offer, and award form should be the cover sheet, or first page.” Please clarify.

Response: Contract Pricing Proposal is required to be submitted in the format provided in Table 15-2 located at FAR 15.408(m) when offerors not claiming exemption from submission of Cost or Price Data. Certified Cost and Pricing is not included in this solicitation.

Reference attached PDF (Question 92). Sheet 3712-100-60098 shows the Top Plan view elevation information that seems to conflict with Sheet 3712-100-60099. The T.O.C. elevations in the Section View show concrete elevation uniformly placed to Elev1129.75, but the Plan View shows both 1128.75 and 1129.75 pointing to what appears to be the same slab. Please clarify the intent for TOC.

Response: The elevation of 1128.75 is invalid. A revision to the drawing has been made to clarify slab elevations. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

Reference attached PDF (Question 94). Sheet 3712-100-60104 shows the plan view of the South Sump without a footing/slab. Sheet 3712-100-60105 shows the Section Views with a footing below. Please clarify that the South Sump requires a footing as shown in the section view.

Response: The slab of the South Sump is the mirror image of the North Sump. The call out on the “Foundation Plan” of Sheet 3712-100-60090 has been corrected. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

Reference Price Schedule Page B-1. Contract Line Item Number 4 – Concrete has a proposal quantity of 284CY. Based on quantity take-offs it appears this number is low by more than 10% when considering all concrete classified under 03 00 00. Does the Owner or Engineer wish to revise this proposal quantity?

Response: Line item Number 4 will be adjusted to 300 CY. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

Reference plan sheet 60072, sheet Key Note L indicates “Ground water and raw water supply drain sump”. Please provide the sheet number of the detail for the ground water and raw water supply drain sump. If no detail is provided in the documents, please provide the sump details.

Response: See revised drawings 60075, 6076, and 60081. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

The valve schedule indicates flanged valves where an MJ valve is more applicable in buried situations. Are MJ valves acceptable?

Response: MJ fittings are acceptable for underground applications.
71) The valve schedule indicates 1 each 10” valve for buried service (RW-VLV-1003). The plan sheets indicate two. Please confirm which is correct.

Response: The following valves are underground isolation valves on branch tees associated with RW and GW distribution south of the building.
- RW-VLV - 1001, 1002, 1003
- GW-VLV-1001, 1002

The following valves are underground terminal valves associated with RW and GW distribution south of the building.
- RW-VLV-2001
- GW-VLV-2001
- MJ X MJ connections are acceptable

72) Reference plan sheet 60127 and 60128. The side box drain indicates a 14” overflow. The OF piping shown on sheet 60119 indicates the OF line is 12” where is the transition from 12” to 14”?

Response: Transition at the outlet of the 90 deg elbow once the line turns horizontal.

73) Plan sheet 60125 section A shows a 16” check valve on a 14” and 10” line? This valve is not on the valve schedule? Please clarify valve number and correct size.

Response: Sheet was corrected. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

74) If the Contractor is submitting a PPQ for a specific project that has previously been submitted in a prior offer proposal for the Bureau of Reclamation, is that PPQ still required to be submitted with this proposal.

Response: Yes, you must submit the PPQ with this offer, using the PPQ forms within the solicitation, as they have information specific to this project.

75) Can you please provide details for the groundwater and raw water drain sump shown on 3712-100-60072 & 60076?

Response: See revised drawings 60075, 60076, and 60081. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

76) Sheet 3712-100-60093 depicts the re-use building footing as being a continuous T.O. footing elevation of 1126.50’. Sheet 3712-100-60096 gives T.O. footing elevation of 1130.25’ and 1126.50 in Sections A, B, and C. Can you please clarify proper T.O. footing elevation?

Response: While elevation 1126.50 is correct for the top of the footings at applicable rigid frame columns, the Section Cut is recognized as being away from those footings and existing within the continuous footing. The drawing has been revised to show the continuous (perimeter) footing at this location. No change to the perimeter footing or the column footings result from this drawing revision. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**
77) Please provide type (material composition, O.D., etc.) of pipe detail of the 48” and 30” existing pipes that the GW and RW connect to so that the Contractor can provide accurate pricing for tie-in materials.

Response: Both pipes are AWWA C905 DR 25 with bell and spigot joints.

78) Note 1 on Drawing 3712-100-60110 states “Butterfly valves that are 12” or smaller and are exposed shall be PVC valves.” Specification Section 43 25 02 Butterfly Valves only makes references to gray iron or ductile iron for valve bodies but no PVC butterfly valves. Can you please provide necessary information for 12” or smaller and exposed butterfly valves?

Response: Specifications added to 43 25 02. **Revised Specification Sections and or drawings are forthcoming in a future amendment**

79) Section M paragraph M.1.b references paragraph (e) which details out relative importance on proposal factors. Can you please include information for paragraph (e)?

Response: There is no paragraph (e) n M.1. The relative importance of the factors is specified in the final paragraph of M.1 (d).

80) The spec and electrical one line calls for a 550kW generator. We can do either a 500kW or 600kW. I was planning on running a sizing report to see which we would need to go with, but I haven’t come across a load summary. Do you know if a load summary is available? If not, I will quote the 600kW.

Response: 550kW generators are commercially available. Minimum 550kW is require, larger may be supplied provided other requirements.

81) Fuel Tank:
- Section 1.04 calls for a 48-hour tank at 50% load
- Section 2.04, I, 3 calls for a 24 hour at 25% load

Can you get clarification on which they are looking for? Also, it would be helpful to understand if they are looking for the stand-alone tank (day tank) to be larger in size and whether they are planning on using the base tank essentially as a day tank.

Response: Revised to be consistent, 48-hr at 50% load.

82) Enclosure:
- Section 2.03 calls for 85 dBA at 1 meter. Converting that to 7 meters (23’), that would be a 58-dBA enclosure which would also be a custom enclosure. Our level 2 factory enclosure is 73 dBA at 23’. Usually in specs we see everything listed at 7 meters, so not sure if this may just be a mistake in the specs or if that is truly what they are looking for. 85 dBA at 7 meters wouldn’t be an issue to supply with a factory enclosure.

Response: Revised to 75 dBA at 7 meters, and is available using sound attenuated enclosures.
83) General Proposal Instructions L.12 - (Page L-9) of the solicitation has a chart that lists Volume Title Copies Required. This chart indicates Past Performance Questionnaires are to be included in volume 1 however, in reading the Factor 3 requirement it appears PPQ’s should be included in Volume 2 and not volume 1. Please confirm which volume PPQ forms should be included in.

Response: Past Performance Questionnaires are required to be submitted by the company filling the form out as part of Volume 1.

84) General Proposal Requirements L.13 Factor 3 Past Performance (pager L-13) requires PPQ’s for subcontractors. How many PPQ’s are required for each subcontractor? The solicitation indicates a minimum of 3 are required for the prime contractor. Is this the same for the subcontractors?

Response: Yes, a minimum of 3 for major subcontractors.

85) Does the hard copy proposal for the Leavenworth Fish Hatchery Circular Tanks proposal require a “wet” signature or will digital signatures be accepted?

Response: Digital Signatures are acceptable, as well as wet signatures.