



**City of Marysville
Yuba County, California
WWTP PONDS CLOSURE PROJECT
REQUEST FOR BIDS
ADDENDUM NO. 1**

Issued August 30, 2022

NOTICE

*****Bids are due on **Wednesday, September 14, 2022 at 2:00 P.M.*******

The Request for Bids is hereby clarified, corrected, and changed as indicated below:

GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. The due date for this project has been extended. Bids are now due on Wednesday, September 14, 2022 at 2:00 PM
2. The bid quantity for tonnage of Sludge Removal and Disposal has been updated. Recent Samples were taken of the sludge to provide a more accurate weight conversion. The following updates were made to the attached revised front-end specifications:
 - a. Update bid quantity for Bid Item 9 in the Bid Schedule (page 2 of 70). The new estimated tonnage of sludge to be removed is 31,533 tons.
 - b. Update sludge density to 1.15 tons/CY in Section 11.0 (page 40 of 70).
 - c. Update bid quantity for Bid Item 9 in the Bid Schedule (page 62 of 70).
 - d. Update bid quantity for Bid Item 9 in the Bid Schedule (page 67 of 70).

QUESTIONS:

1. **Request/Question:** Please provide the engineer's estimate for the project.

Response: The engineer's estimate for the project is \$4,774,200

2. **Request/Question:** Is it possible to get the CAD files on this project?

Response: CAD files will be provided to the successful bidder. We have, however, provided the attached colored grading cut/fill exhibit for use in better understanding the grading requirements for the site. In preparing this, we found an error in the grading plan included in the plans. Please replace plans sheets C-3 with the attached revised plan sheets. There are no changes to plan sheet C-4.

3. Request/Question: Can the green waste from clearing & grubbing be left onsite?

Response: No. But we are looking into having the fire department come in and burn the brush prior to construction. More information on that will be issued in a separate addendum soon.

4. Request/Question: Does the City of Marysville have a pre-approved sludge disposal site?

Response: No. But, we did talk to the Ostrom Road Landfill (just up the road) and they have indicated that they accept sludge as a daily cover.

5. Request/Question: Does the City of Marysville have profile testing of the sludge to verify the level of contamination of the sludge in each pond? We need this information to verify if the sludge can go to a local landfill -or- if the sludge has to be disposed of at Class I Landfill (Kettleman City, Button Willow, etc...).

Response: Geotechnical Report with sludge quality data is attached.

6. Request/Question: The Drawings in the Bid Doc's do not show grading in the South Ponds. Is the only work at the South Ponds Sludge Removal & Disposal?

Response: Correct, only grading the north ponds. Leaving the South Ponds as-is after the sludge removal.

7. Request/Question: The project specifications mention removal of rocks greater than 6" in a couple locations and 3" minus material for engineered fill. Is Bid Item 10 considered engineered fill? Is it the intent of this contract for the contractor to screen all the embankment materials?

Response: The intent is to remove the larger debris so that the site can be graded. Section 02200 – 2.06A Engineered Fill is revised to the following:

Engineered fill material shall consist of soil excavated onsite, free of debris, wood, trash, peat, and other objectionable material which may be compressible, or which cannot be compacted properly. Engineered fill shall be well-graded and shall possess sufficient fines such that no nesting or voids result in the compacted mass. Engineered fill shall contain less than 3 percent organic matter or other deleterious substances by weight and shall not contain rocks or rubble fragments over 6 inches in greatest dimension.

Section 11 – 11.10 Bid Item List for Site Grading is revised to the following:

The per cubic yard price shall include all work and materials necessary to grade the site using the provided import as specified and shown in the plans. Measurement and payment will be made on a percent complete basis. The price shall be full compensation for grading, removal and disposal of rocks or other debris greater than 6 inches diameter as required to complete grading efforts, and all incidentals required by these specifications and plans. The lump sum price shall be full compensation for the preparation and installation of these materials, and for all labor, equipment, tools, and incidentals to complete this item.

- 8. Request/Question:** Will the site need to be hydroseeded at the completion of grading? If so, what is the seeding specification and where do we put the hydroseeding cost?

Response: No. Contractor to confirm with SWPPP preparation.

- 9. Request/Question:** Can you please provide copies of Attachment N Soils Screening Data Report and copies of soils reports of the sludge?

Response: Attached is the soils report for the project which includes sludge quality characteristics (Geocon, July 2020). Note that sludge from ponds 1A and 2A we moved to ponds 1 and 2 following this report. Additionally, attached is the Soil Screening Data Report for the SBFCA Feather River Sediment Removal project that includes soil characteristics of the sediment that was deposited in ponds 1A and 2A (Blackburn, May 2020).

- 10. Request/Question:** Where and how do we obtain construction water for the project?

Response: The nearest water is a Cal Water hydrant on the other side of the levee from the project site. Contractor would need to coordinate with them directly for use. Alternatively, we are considering asking the contractor to replace the pump in the City's old well at the WWTP north ponds site. More information on that will be issued in a separate addendum soon.

- 11. Request/Question:** Can I get a copy of the Prebid Sign in sheet?

Response: The pre-bid sign in sheet is attached.

- 12. Request/Question:** Page 10 of the spec states that GFE postings must be made available for viewing for at least 30 days before the bid opening. This project was posted on August 10th and it bids on August 31st. There is not enough

time to post a solicitation for 30 days. We would like to request a 15 day extension.

Response: The project was posted on Aug. 1. We have extended the due date for this bid to 9/14/2021

13. Request/Question: Is there any asbestos in the buildings or piping that will be removed?

Response: No building will be removed as part of this project. The structures to be removed are concrete valve structures. We do not believe there to be any asbestos in the structures or piping to be removed.

14. Request/Question: Will any backfill be needed other than what is onsite?

Response: Imported soil will not be needed.

15. Request/Question: Regarding Section 02100, 1.06, Paragraph B: Does this clause apply?

Response: Please revise Section 02100-1.06 B as follows:

B. Stripped material shall be hauled offsite to an appropriate disposal facility.

16. Request/Question: Will hydro seeding or other restoration be required after grading the north site and after sludge removal at the south site?

Response: The City does not require hydroseeding. Contractor to confirm if needed with SWPPP.

17. Request/Question: Will the city make water available at it's well locations? If so where are the wells located? What is the fee schedule if any?

Response: The City has a 14" well casing on-site at the north ponds near the south side of the metal building and the City is currently having a well contractor pump test and inspect to see confirm if it is feasible water source. If the pump test comes back good; the City will issue an addendum with the requirements for installing a pump and using this water source. If this is not a viable water source, the contractor will have to purchase water from California Water Service or some other source. The City does not have a water source at the south ponds and the contractor will have to haul from the north ponds or purchase water from Linda Water District or some other source.

18. Request/Question: Regarding the removal of Elderberry bushes: The bushes are identified in terms of which will be protected, and which are to be removed on the grading plan for the North Ponds. None are identified on the South Ponds drawing. However, the Biological Report identifies 73 plants total - 24 removed and 42 protected with 7 transplanted. Is this considered valid and or accurate? Will we transplant 7 Elderberries? The bid item has it at 20 Elderberries protected but the report shows 42. Which is accurate? Will the cities purchase of mitigation credits negate the need to transplant Elderberries? If we are transplanting Elderberries is there a designated location where the plants will be re-planted?

Response: Please see attached updated plan set revision 1 for this addendum. The revised plans set now accurately shows the Valley Elderberry Beetle shrubs called for protection or removal. The Contractor shall be responsible to protect the Valley Elderberry Beetle shrubs identified on the plans as not being removed. The 7 shrubs identified for transplanting in the environmental document have already been transplanted off site. The credits have also already been purchased by the City.

19. Request/Question: Reference Specification 02100, Demolition, Clearing, Grubbing, and Stripping, Section 1.03.E, which essentially calls for bare (disturbed) ground to have a finishing treatment of hydroseed or Class 2 aggregate base. Both the north and south ponds will be bare ground upon completion of the work. Please confirm whether the completed ponds are to be treated as specified herein, and if so, please provide a specification for the desired hydroseed.

Response: Please delete Section 02100-1.03 E. The City does not anticipate needing to hydroseed. The Contractor shall confirm with a SWPPP.

20. Request/Question: Reference Specification 02100, Demolition, Clearing, Grubbing, and Stripping, Section 1.06.A, which calls for stripping to a depth of not less than 6 inches, and Section 1.06.B, which calls for the subsequent spreading of the stripped materials “across the borrow site to drain towards the tailwater ditch.” Normally the vegetation would be disked into the surface, and then stripped, stockpiled and re-spread at completion as permitted. This method won’t work as the surface sludge is mostly less than 6” deep, and would be mixed with underlying soil if disked for vegetation removal/stripping. Given that the specified depths for sludge removal are mostly 6 inches deep or less, please specify how the contractor is to keep strippings separate from sludge, and clarify whether stripped materials can be re-spread across the pond bottoms at completion of sludge removal and grading.

Response: Stripped material may not be left on site. It must be hauled off site and disposed of properly. The City will allow the contractor to burn the material if permitted properly.

21. Request/Question: Reference Earthwork and Grading Note no. 1 on Plan Sheet G-2, which states that all material on site shall be compacted to 90% relative compaction. Please clarify whether this compaction requirement is relative to a standard (ASTM D698) or modified (ASTM D1557) proctor.

Response: Compaction is not required. See updated plan revision for Grading Note 1.

22. Request/Question: Regarding the Mitigation Measures: We assume the paragraph about the installation of a cofferdam is from a previous project and does not apply here?

Response: An outfall structure with a coffer dam is not expected to be needed for this project.

23. Request/Question: I would like a plan holders list for the MARYSVILLE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (WWTP) PONDS CLOSURE project.

Response: See attached sign in sheet from the pre-bid job walk. The Valley Builders Exchange may have a plan holders list.

City of Marysville,

Jim Schaad, City Manager