



STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

Department of Administration  
DIVISION OF PURCHASES  
One Capitol Hill  
Providence, RI 02908-5855

Tel: (401) 574-8100  
Fax: (401) 574-8387  
Website: [www.purchasing.ri.gov](http://www.purchasing.ri.gov)

September 6, 2013

**ADDENDUM NUMBER THREE**  
**RFQ # 7484384**

**TITLE: Construction Services for the Reconstruction of the JL Curran Upper Reservoir Dam Located off Seven Mile Rd., Cranston, RI**

**Closing Date and Time: 9/12/2013 at 10:00 AM**

**Per the issuance of this ADDENDUM #3 (5 pages and disc with PDF files) the following change(s) are noted:**

**Specification Change /Addition / Clarification**

**This addendum answers questions sent in by email.**

**Please also note the drawings attached to this addendum on disc. Can be viewed by clicking on the letter "d" under the "info" column on this website.**

**NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WILL BE ACCEPTED.**

**Addendum No. 3**

Plan Changes

The following changes have been made to the plans:

1. Drawings C-5, C-6, and C-7 have been revised to include the existing grading on the upstream side of the dam (see response to Question 6 below).
2. Drawings C-8 and C-10 have been revised to include additional details on the concrete footings at the spillway (see response to Question 12 below).
3. Drawings SK-1 and SK-2 have been added with this addendum, and show the maximum depth of muck excavation for bidders to utilize in determining quantities for the lump sum bid (see response to Question 7 below).

Bidder's Questions

The following questions were received from bidders, and the responses are included in italics. Please note that some responses include revisions to plans, as indicated in the responses.

1. Due to the extensive amount of earthwork, we request a copy of the CADD files to assist in takeoff.

*Response: The AutoCADD files cannot be provided to the contractor as bid documents without creating potential conflicts in interpretation of the plans. Please prepare the bid based on the plan set.*

2. Please clarify the limits of removal of the existing spillway.

*Response: The existing spillway training walls and any other structure shall be removed in its entirety from Station 1+75 and eastward, and excavations for demolition shall be backfilled as required with compacted Gravel Borrow. The existing structures to the west of Station 1+75 shall be removed to a depth of at least four feet below final grade. The bottom of the discharge channel, if left in place, shall be sufficiently broken up to allow vertical drainage.*

3. The core wall ties into the training walls. Is a new section of core wall or steel sheeting required at the spillway?

*Response: Yes, the new steel sheeting extends beneath the spillway and auxiliary spillway. The existing concrete core wall is to be removed to 27 inches below the bottom of the box culverts. See limits of sheeting on plans C-5 and C-8. The spillway approach slab is also haunched down and tied into the sheeting, see Detail 12 on Sheet C-11.*

4. The PRELIMINARY WATER DIVERSION AND CONSTRUCTION ACCESS PLAN on Drawing C-4 allows the eastern half of the dam to be reconstructed, but obstructs work on the western half of the dam. Is there a plan to allow water diversion and access to reconstruct the west half of the dam?

*Response: The preliminary water diversion plan is provided to allow initial construction access and to repair the low level outlet. Once repaired, the low level outlet may be used to pass flows in conjunction with reservoir storage. The contractor's Control of Water Plan submittal shall include any additional cofferdams, bypass culverts, pumps, or siphons necessary to pass water and to protect the work based upon the contractors planned construction sequence and schedule.*

5. By reviewing the original plans and photos of the dam, it appears the dam was constructed with a boulder fill from EL. 310 down to the hard pan bottom. Proposed plans call for a sheet pile cutoff wall to be installed from the top of the dam through the boulder fill. How will removal of the boulder fill be paid for so the sheeting can be installed?

*Response: The lower portion of the existing concrete core wall was constructed using boulder and concrete fill base. Test borings performed on the upstream and downstream sides of the corewall did not indicate the presence of boulders in the embankment fill. The steel sheet piling is intended to be installed on the upstream side of the core wall and is not anticipated to encounter boulder obstructions within the existing embankment fill. The sheeting shall be driven to refusal, and shall be provided in sufficient length to allow driving to a minimum tip elevation of 300 feet if refusal is not encountered at that depth. Refusal of the sheeting above this elevation will not require excavation to remove the obstructions. See also the response to Question 9.*

6. There is insufficient information to accurately determine the earthwork quantities. On Drawings C-5, C-6, and C-7, the existing contour elevations are not shown thru the entire project area. For one example, there are no existing contours in the area to the north of the spillway crest. Although there is an existing grading plan, it is at a different scale than the

proposed grading plan and is not tied into the new work. Cross sections are provided, but in some instances do not extend far enough out to depict all the work (Sta. 1+00, 2+00, 2+50, 4+50, etc.). Please provide existing contour elevations for the entire proposed construction area.

*Response: The existing grading on the upstream side of the dam has been added to revised Drawings C-5, C-6 and C-7 included with this addendum. Additionally, the limits of the cross sections on Drawings C-19 and C-20 have been extended to the limits of the work.*

7. Since the quantity of muck excavation is indeterminate, can this be reimbursed as a unit price item?

*Response: The depth of required muck excavation in the seepage areas is shown on drawings SK-1 and SK-2, Muck Excavation Limits. Stripping of topsoil and organic soils outside these wetland/seepage areas shall be assumed to be to a maximum depth of one foot. The contractor's lump sum price shall be based upon these muck excavation limits.*

8. The riprap on the north slope goes on top of the existing riprap with varying thickness. This makes the quantity indeterminate. See Section 2/C-8. Can this be reimbursed at a unit price item?

*Response: This item will remain lump sum. The upstream slope was constructed fairly uniformly, and the existing elevation contours have been added to the grading plans (see response to Question 6). The quantity shall be based upon these grades.*

9. Please provide a detail on the interface of the proposed sheeting and the existing outfall pipe.

*Response: The original drawings indicate that the existing outlet pipes were backfilled with a zone of stone masonry. The sheeting shall step up and over this zone of masonry and the pipes.*

10. We request a unit price to furnish and install rip rap below the reservoir drawdown elevation of 323 on the upstream side of the dam due to the unknown underwater surface conditions.

*Response: See Response to Question 8.*

11. We request a unit price for muck excavation and corresponding backfill material due to the unknown limits of muck excavation.

*Response: See Response to Question 7.*

12. Lower Spillway Walls – It appears the profile drawing on C8 shows the lower spillway walls and footings as a stepped down configuration. Details of this wall on C10 & C11 only give the footing and wall basic dimensions. Please clarify the design of the wall and provide the necessary elevations of top of wall, bottom of wall and top of footing, bottom of footing that is required along the slope.

*Response: The footing is to step down with the proposed grade in order to maintain a minimum four-foot depth of embedment below the spillway slab. The bottom of the footings shall be haunched at 1H:1V at each step. Additional dimensions and elevations of the footings have been added to the revised plans C-8 and C-11 included with this addendum.*

13. Drawing C-19, the cross section at Station 1+00 shows EXISTING GRADE (TYPICAL) and PROPOSED GRADE (TYPICAL). Both notes point to the same line. Please clarify.

*Response: The existing grade and the notes shown at Station 1+00 are incorrect, and have been corrected on the revised plans included with this addendum. The dashed line is the existing grade and the solid line is the proposed grade.*

14. Drawing C-19, do the cross sections of the riprap reflect the material removed above elev. 324.0 as shown in Detail 30/C-17?

*Response: No, the sections do not reflect the material to be removed above elevation 324.0 for the riprap layer at the top of the slope. The sections depict the existing finished surface and the existing surface, and do not include all construction below grade.*