



State of Utah

GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

GREGORY S. BELL
Lt. Governor

Department of Administrative Services

KIMBERLY K. HOOD
Executive Director

Division of Facilities Construction and Management

DAVID G. BUXTON
Director

ADDENDUM NO. 3

Date: May 9, 2012
To: Contractors
From: Kurt Baxter - Project Manager
Reference: UVU Student Life Center & Parking Structure
Orem, Utah
DFCM Project No. 10289790
Subject: **Addendum No. 3**

Addendum	1 page
<u>Architects Addendum</u>	<u>4 pages</u>
Total	5 pages

Note: This Addendum shall be included as part of the Contract Documents. Items in this Addendum apply to all drawings and specification sections whether referenced or not involving the portion of the work added, deleted, modified, or otherwise addressed in the Addendum. Acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in the space provided on the Bid Form, if applicable. Failure to do so may subject the Bidder to Disqualification.

3.0 SCHEDULE CHANGES: There are no changes to the project schedule.

3.1 GENERAL: GSBS Architects, please see attached sheets.

STUDENT LIFE CENTER & PARKING STRUCTURE

Response to Bid Period Questions NO. 1

May 9, 2012

Questions Dated 5/7/2012

01-01 According to the geotechnical report (page 12 of 23) and C5/SB-504, the improved soil area footprint for the stone column/aggregate piers extends 12' beyond the edge of the footings. Along the northeast perimeter of the parking structure, this footprint would extend into College Drive and the road between the project and the Institute of Religion (see attached sketches). Please clarify if this is the intent of the drawings. If this is the intent, the excavation would conflict with the existing fiber optic and storm drain utilities that are not shown to be removed in the demo plan. Please provide information on the action you would like the contractor to take regarding this conflict. Should the aggregate pier design be altered or will a design be provided to alter the existing utilities and the repair required for the road section that will be interrupted by the placement of the aggregate piles as designed.

Response: This issue is being further investigated based on the attached response from the Geotechnical Engineer. The attached information shall be considered by each contractor in their approach.

01-02 I don't see any window washing tie off davits on the roof. Is it the owners/designers intent not to have any designed into the project?

Response: Refer to Addendum #2.

01-03 On sheet MH1-12A notes # 11 & 14 reference detail #19 on sheet AE-505 and on sheet MH1-12B notes # 1 & 2 reference sheet AE-506. We cannot find sheets AE-505 or 506. Are the references wrong?

Response: Keyed notes #11 and #14 on sheet MH1.12A should refer to detail #20 on sheet AE-512. Keyed notes #1 and #2 on sheet MH1.12B should refer to detail #10 on sheet AE-513. See upcoming addendum #3 for corrected keyed notes.

01-04 Can we use MC Cable as allowable by Code?

Response: No. MC Cable is not allowed on this project.

01-05 Can we place raceways in elevated slabs? Please specify.

Response: Raceways in elevated slabs will only be allowed in the parking structure. This will be clarified in the forthcoming addendum.

01-06 Can we use ENT and fittings in elevated slabs? Please specify.

Response: No. ENT is not allowed on this project.

01-07 Please verify the requirement to extend conduit from the data drops to the cable tray.

Response: This is a requirement. In addition to being on the drawings it is a requirement of the UVU Master Cabling Spec included in Section 270500.

01-08 Drawing EJ-111c – Sheet Keynote #3 – Please clarify. No under floor duct is shown.

Response: Duct is shown on EP-111c. Provide conduit indicated on the ET sheet to the Duct shown on EP-111c in addition to the conduit shown on EP-111c.

01-09 Drawing ET-121-c Sheet Keynote #5 – Please locate the cable tray in the Sorensen Center.

Response: Cable tray in Sorensen Center is in close proximity to the Student Life Center. Installer is responsible to field verify exact location prior to bid.

01-10 Drawing ET-111c – Sheet keynote #7 Please locate the Cable Tray in the Sorensen Center?

Response: Cable tray in Sorensen Center is in close proximity to the Student Life Center. Installer is responsible to field verify exact location prior to bid.

01-11 Drawing ET-111c – Sheet keynote #9 – Please locate the duct bank mentioned in this key note on the plans.

Response: Duct is shown on EP-111c. Provide conduit indicated on the ET sheet to the Duct shown on EP-111c in addition to the conduit shown on EP-111c

01-12 Drawing EJ-601 & EJ-602 – The symbol “CP” according to the schedule requires a 4 11/16’ sq box with a 2 gang mud ring. The Rough In Riser Diagram indicates a 2” conduit. Please verify the 4 11/16” box will accept a 2” conduit.

Response: A 2” conduit is required by UVU. Installer is responsible to adjust box as required to accept 2” conduit.

01-13 Drawing EJ-602 – There is a symbol for “WC”. There is no indication of this symbol on the schedule. Please clarify what the rough in requirements are for this device.

Response: WC’ is a 3 gang deep junction box mount at electrical switch height

01-14 EP-603 calls out the conduit from the new 15KV switch to the transformers to be 2-4”. Dwg EP-601 calls out 2-5” conduits. Please clarify.

Response: Two 5" conduits will be required.

01-15 Dwg ep-603 Conduit Schedule is blank from 1MCCC to 1HC

Response: This will be a "30" per Conduit and Conductor Schedule.

01-16 Dwg EP-121a calls out an elev disc for elev A shown being fed from 1MCCC. Dwg EP-603 does show a disc fed from 1MCCC , however Dwg EP-604 shows an unlabeled disc fed from Panel 2QHDPB. Please advise.

Response: There will be no elevator fed from 2QHDPB

01-17 Dwg EP-605 calls out P1 & P2 to have size 2 starters adjacent to equipment, however Dwg EP-603 shows to starters in the MCC. These should be labeled as to size. Which is correct?

Response: This and a number of other mechanical equipment issues will be addressed in the forthcoming addendum.

01-18 Dwg EP-111a shows P17 & P18 in Room 100G-1 being fed from 4MCCA although they are in the same room as 1MCCC. Dwg EP-603 does not show either pumps fed from either MCC. Please review and advise

Response: This and a number of other mechanical equipment issues will be addressed in the forthcoming addendum.

01-19 Dwg EP-121c shows FC-5 fed from 1MCCC but it does not show up on the MCC one line on Dwg EP-603. Please review and advise.

Response: This and a number of other mechanical equipment issues will be addressed in the forthcoming addendum.

01-20 Dwg EP-141b, Room 406 – the two floor boxes are not labeled with a number. Please review and advise

Response: These will be type "FB3" floorboxes.

01-21 RF-1 is duplicated on drawings EP-121a and EP-151a. Please review and advise.

Response: This and a number of other mechanical equipment issues will be addressed in the forthcoming addendum.

01-22 Dwg EP-151b shows RF-7,8,9 & 10 fed from 4MCCA. Dwg EP-603 shows RF-7,8 & 9 fed from 1MCCC and RF-10 is not shown at all. Please advise.

Response: This and a number of other mechanical equipment issues will be addressed in the forthcoming addendum.

END OF RESPONSE

UVU Student Life Center

Contractor Question 01-01

General Geotechnical Comments

The minimum lateral extent of the ground improvement beyond the east edges of footing at this location could be reduced by a few feet (see discussion under separate heading below). However, it appears that the utilities in question would still conflict with the ground improvement areas for at least five or six of the footings. Also, vibrations and ground movements during ground improvement work could impact utilities adjacent to the improvement areas.

Overlaying the foundation sheets and the demolition sheets, it appears that the utilities in question run right along the edge of the 15'x48' rectangular footing, and it may not be feasible to preserve these utilities while constructing the footing >15' below existing ground, even if there were no ground improvement required beyond the edge of the footing.

The adjustment to the lateral extent of ground improvement described below is unlikely to resolve the issue. We recommend that the disposition of the utilities in question be re-evaluated to address the conflict.

Adjustment to Lateral Ground Improvement Extent

The ground improvement extent beyond the east edges of footings on line G6 (see sheet SB-101) could be reduced as follows:

- A review of the boring logs along the east side of the building area indicates the zone of soils to be improved extends down to about elevation 4586 feet, which is two feet higher than the bottom elevation of 4584 feet specified generally for the east building area (see 3.4.A.1 in ground improvement specification).
 - Assuming elevation 4600 on the site grading plans is equal to elevation 100 on the foundation plans, the depth Z from bottom of footing (approx. elev. 101 on average) to the bottom of the improvement zone would be approx 15 feet along line G6.
- For footing edges adjacent to shoring retaining more than 5 feet of earth above the footing elevation, the recommended lateral extent of treatment beyond edges of footings may be reduced to a bare minimum of 0.60Z, from the 0.70Z recommended on page 12 of the geotechnical report.
 - For Z = 15 ft, the bare minimum extent of treatment beyond the east edge of each footing on line G6 would be 0.60Z = 9 ft.
- This adjustment would be a localized exception to detail C5 on Sheet SB-504.