OWNER:	Gerald R. Ford International Airport Authority 5500 44th Street, SE Grand Rapids, MI 49512
ENGINEER:	Fishbeck 1515 Arboretum Drive, SE Grand Rapids, MI 49546
DRAWING REVISION NO.:	A1
ISSUED HEREWITH:	
SPECIFICATION SECTIONS:	None
SHEETS:	None
BIDS DUE:	February 10, 2025

This Addendum is issued to all Bid Set Holders, is a part of the Contract Documents, and modifies the previously issued Bidding Documents. Acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in the space provided on the Bid form; failure to do so may result in rejection of the Bid.

ITEM NO. 1: Bid Date Extension

A. The bid date has been extended to Monday, February 10, 2025

ITEM NO. 2:

PB RFI 001:

1. What is the anticipated start date?
   - The anticipated start date for the project is March 3, 2025.
2. Are there any liquidated damages?
   - Liquidated damages are not included.

ITEM NO. 3:

PB RFI 002: Regarding Sheet A401, is existing Medium Voltage Switch PS4 live front or dead front?

- Referencing Sheets D401 and E401, existing switch PS-4 is a S&C PMH-12, which features a live front design.

ITEM NO. 4:

PB RFI 003: Will it be the responsibility of the contractor to close down the areas in the parking garage for the overhead conduit work?

- Note #1 in the Sequence of Operations specifies that the conduits should be run above the sidewalk on the north side of the garage, along the car rental return lane. Installing the conduit above the sidewalk should minimize or eliminate the need for road closures.

ITEM NO. 5:

PB RFI 004: Note 2 tells us to furnish a vac truck to be available at all times. Can we have some clarification for the reason

- Vac truck is required to maintain cleanliness of adjacent roadways that are subject to site access. The airport sits on heavy clay soils that are susceptible to off-site tracking of soils. The contractor is responsible to maintain adjacent roadways and cleanliness at all times during the work so that soils are not being tracked off site.

ITEM NO. 6:

PB RFI 005: There is a note on the civil drawings that call for a 4” drain from the vault under the new PMH switches too be tied into the existing underdrain. Is the electrical contractor responsible for this?

- The u.g. contractor that is installing conduits/vaults/etc. will be responsible for installing and connecting the proposed 4” underdrains into existing underdrains/downstream structures to provide drainage from around the vaults.

ITEM NO. 7:

PB RFI 006: Detail 2 on E501 shows us installing the hangers in the parking garage on the beams. The beams are further apart than code allows for support. We will have to drill into the deck to install hangers for the conduit. Will x ray of the floor be required?

- The maximum drill depth into the PT slab is 3/4", as the tendons and rebar have only 1" of concrete cover at the bottom of the slab, as confirmed by Fishbeck Parking Engineer. X-ray scanning of the floor will be required for any drilling deeper than 3/4"

ITEM NO. 8:

PB RFI 007: After a site visit on Thursday we have a question in regards to the overhead conduit supports in the parking garage. Per the detail, we are to mount the conduit supports into the beams. These beams are too far apart to meet code. Will we be permitted to install the hangers into the parking garage deck? Any special instruction/detail for this?

- The maximum drill depth into the PT slab is 3/4", as the tendons and rebar have only 1" of concrete cover at the bottom of the slab, as confirmed by Fishbeck Parking Engineer. X-ray scanning of the floor will be required for any drilling deeper than 3/4".

ITEM NO. 9:

PB RFI 008:

1. Plan sheet CP004 appears to have an incorrect scale. Can you please review and verify the scale on each drawing?
   - The scale on CP004 is 1”=10’. Remaining drawing scales appear to be accurate upon review.
2. On plan sheet E100, near new pad mount switch PS-11 and MHE-18, there is reference to detail 2 on sheet E-501. That detail is for overhead conduit, can you please clarify?
   - The detail should reference duct bank detail 1 on E-501. This will be corrected.
3. Key note #1 on plan sheet E100 indicates we are to direct bore (1) 4” conduit from existing manhole E4 to “existing manhole”. The Utility Duct Profile on plan sheet C202, indicates there is a “new electric vault” and indicates there are (2) 4” conduits, with only a portion of the conduit run installed by direct bore and the balance installed concrete encased.
   a. Please clarify how many conduits are to be installed.
      - One new 4” should be installed and the existing 4” spare should be extended.
   b. Please clarify how much of the conduit run is to be directionally drilled and how much should be concrete encased duct bank.
      - One additional conduit should be installed from MHE-FIS-2. The existing spare 4" conduit shall be redirected from its existing location.
   c. Please clarify where “existing manhole E4” is on the plans.
      - Note #1 will be revised to say. DIRECT BORE (1) 4" CONDUIT UNDER TERMINAL DRIVE. KEEPING NEW CONDUIT AS TIGHT AS POSSIBLE TO EXISTING DUCT BANK TO ALLOW FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FUTURE FIS PHASE II. EXTEND DIRECTIONAL BORE CONDUIT TO MHE-FIS-2 AND NEW SWITCH PS-12. REFER TO CIVIL PLAN AND PROFILE SHEETS FOR ADDITIONAL ROUTE DETAILS.

d. Please clarify where the other “existing manhole” is and its designation.
   - Clarified in Note C

4. Can you please provide an enlarged plan detail for the new work and/or rework at switch PS-2A, PS-10, PS-11, and PS-12?
   - Bid per drawings and specification.

5. Can you confirm if existing to remain medium voltage cables will have sufficient length and correct elbows/terminations for replacement of switches or will the contractor be required to splice and extend cables?
   - In the event that cable length is insufficient the contractor should write an RFI Engineer of Record and Owner to review.

6. Plan sheet C201 makes reference to spare conduits from PMH-9 for future concourse C, refer to detail on sheet E401. Sheet E401 does not appear to provide any details. How many conduits, how far do they need to be stubbed out, concrete encased or direct bury?
   - The future concourse C conduits should be terminated in MHE-18 as shown on E-401.

7. Sheet E100, sequence of operations note #24 references submission of a coordination study, please provide a spec section and a scope of how expansive the coordination study will need to be.
   - This note will be removed. A full site coordination study will be required, as an additional project.

8. Electrical plans and civil plans do not depict the same conduit/trench route (sheet C202 and E100) please clarify.
   - Civil plans shall take precedence over electrical plans for routing and site details.

9. Key note 12 on sheet E100 is ambiguous, can you please provide additional details on where the “in-ground box” is, where and how far out the 4” spare conduit is stubbed out, and clarify if we are intercepting and extending that conduit to PS-12 or if we are installing (2) 4” conduits from PS-12, one to the “in-ground box” and one across the road to MHE-FIS-2.
   - The in-ground box referenced in note 12 is at the end of note 12, approximately 15’ due east of the parking garage.

10. Plan sheet C202 references permanent marker/monuments for location of duct under terminal drive. Can you please provide a detail for the marker/monument?
    - The marker/monument shall be a 2” diameter bronze electrical utility marker by Bernsten (or approved equal) embedded in 12” diameter x 18” L concrete cylinder. Top of concrete/bronze marker shall be set flush with surrounding grade. See link for example product https://www.berntsen.com/Utilities/Metal-Utility-Markers/Custom-Bronze-Utility-Markers/ctl/ViewProduct/mid/1241/itemID/1439

ITEM NO. 10:

PB RFI 009: Please clarify whether medium voltage cable that runs from the Terminal Building Switchgear to the FIS Building Switchgear is part of the scope of work.
- Yes, medium voltage cable from the Terminal Building to the FIS Building is in the scope of work.

END OF ADDENDUM