



August 25, 2022

Addendum No. 1
Pleasant Street Phase 1
Reconstruction from River Road to 11th Street
EN-231-11
Noblesville, Indiana

To all plan holders of record:

ITEM # 1 – Contract Information Book

1. The Itemized Proposal has been revised with all revisions marked in **RED** (PDF Pages 23-27)
2. An Itemized Proposal for Alternate Bid No. 1 has been added (PDF Page 28)
3. Article 13, Section 13.5 – Contractor Retainage revised to 5% (PDF Page 139)

ITEM # 2 – Special Provisions

The following Special Provisions have been revised. All revisions are shown in **RED**:

1. SP 2 Contract Time
2. SP 11 Coordination/Cooperation with Utilities
3. SP 58 Sign Assembly A (RRFB)
4. SP 67 Road Closures and Traffic Restrictions
5. SP 69 Tree Removal
6. SP 77 Luminaire Installation
7. SP 110 Waterway Maintenance of Traffic
8. SP 128 Yielding Foundation Soils

The following Special Provision was added in **RED**:

1. SP 144 Hand Rail, Steel

ITEM # 3 – Plans

1. Lumen Contact Information Added to Index (PDF Page 2)
2. Swing Gate Detail Added (PDF Page 15)
3. Demolition Note Revised for Parcel 12 (PDF Page 53)
4. Common Excavation Value Revised (PDF Page 56)
5. Guardrail End Section Added (PDF Page 58)
6. Monument Labels Added (PDF Pages 85-90)
7. Guardrail End Section Added (PDF Page 87)
8. Bill of Materials Added for MSE Walls 1, 2 & 3 (PDF Pages 169 & 172)
9. Street Signs Revised (PDF Pages 225, 236, 237 & 239)
10. Monument Table Revised (PDF Page 260)
11. Guardrail Summary Table Revised (PDF Page 260)



ITEM # 4 – Itemized Proposal

1. Item 0061 – Steel-Backed Timber Guardrail Terminal Section Type SBT-FAT Quantity Revised in **RED**.
2. Item 0085 – Monument, B Quantity Revised in **RED**.
3. Item 0086 – Monument, C Quantity Revised in **RED**.
4. Item 0087 – Monument, D Quantity Revised in **RED**.
5. Item 0096 – Mobilization and Demobilization For Seeding Quantity Revised in **RED**.
6. Item 0119 – Reinforcing Bars. Removed, as Item 0119 was a duplicate of Pay Item 0259.
7. Item 0120 – Seal Coat, Graffiti Resistant. Removed, as Item 0120 was duplicate of Pay Item 0268.
8. Item 0191 – Temporary Portable Signal. “Temporary” added to item description.
9. Item 0198 – Sign Post, Square Type 2 Unreinforced Anchor Base Quantity Revised in **RED**.
10. Item 0200 – Sign, Sheet, With Legend, 0.100 IN. Quantity Revised in **RED**.
11. Item 0201 – Sign, Sheet, With Legend, 0.125 IN. Quantity Revised in **RED**.
12. Item 0266 – Railing, Concrete C, Modified. “Modified” added to pay item description in **RED**.
13. Item 0279 – Conduit, Steel, Galvanized, 2 IN. Quantity Revised in **RED**.
14. Item 0280 – Conduit, Steel, Galvanized, 2.5 IN. Quantity Revised in **RED**.
15. Item 0286 – Hand Rail, Steel. Pay Item Unit changed from EACH to LFT in **RED**.
16. Item 0290 – 12” PVC DDR 35 Pipe, Undistributed. Pay Item Unit changed from EACH to LFT in **RED**.
17. Alternate Bid No. 1 Itemized Proposal Added.

ITEM # 5 – Associated Documents

1. Work Plans for Lumen (Century Link) added.
2. Revised Work Plans for Center Point Energy added.

ITEM # 6 – Contractor Q&A

1. Contractor Q&A Document Included

If you wish to submit a bid, please do so according to the information provided in this ADDENDUM No. 1.

CITY OF NOBLESVILLE



Michael Maurovich, P.E.

Please acknowledge receipt of this Addendum by emailing mmaurovich@structurepoint.com, arodewald@noblesville.in.us and akrupski@noblesville.in.us. Also, please acknowledge this contract addendum in the contract documents within the proposal before submitting your bid.
Phone: 317-776-6330



Pleasant Street - Question Log 08/25/2022

ID	Question	Response
1	Do you happen to have a projected start date for this project?	See contract special provisions for anticipated notice to proceed date
2	Line item 0285 appears to correspond to the Tree Planting Plan sheet 21 of the Hamilton County Bridge No. 310 plans. The plan calls for (390) Canopy Trees, 3-5 gal., (10) Canopy Trees, 2" DBH, and (201) Understory Trees & Shrubs, 3 gal. Can line item 0285 be broken out into these different tree and shrubs sizes with the correct quantities for accurate pricing?	Large Canopy Trees located in Zone A, B, and C are included in Item 285 (Plant, Deciduous Tree, Single Stem, Over 2 IN to 2.5IN). Understory Trees and Shrubs are included in item 110 (Plant, Deciduous Shrub, 18 to 24 IN).
3	Items 120 & 268 are duplicated. Will the City delete one of these items?	Item 120 has been deleted. See Addendum No. 1
4	Items 119 & 259 are duplicated. Will the City delete one of these items?	Item 119 has been deleted. See Addendum No. 1
5	Similar to MSE Walls 4 & 5 in the Bridge Plans, will the City provide summary tables for MSE Wall numbers 1 2 & 3 in the road plans?	Yes - see addendum 1
6	In the bridge plans page 19 of 74, the causeway states to be between piers 2 & 3. After looking at the stream and depths, can the contractor relocate this causeway to be between piers 3 & 4 since this span is of lesser length and is shallower?	The temporary causeway was permitted to be constructed from the west bank to the eastern limits of the riprap around Pier 2 and then from the east bank to the western limits of the riprap around Pier 3, leaving the channel in Span B open between the limits of the causeway. This is identified with the "Temporary Diversion" callouts on page 19 of the Bridge Plans. An alteration to these maximum causeway limits would require coordination and approval from IDNR, USACE, and IDEM via addendums to the permits. Such requests for approval will be the responsibility of the Contractor.
7	Will the City add an item for cofferdam at pier 3?	No. The drilled shafts and precast debris wall panels at Pier 3 were designed to be constructed without a cofferdam or dewatering. Inclusion of such is acceptable, but the cost of which is to be included in other items in the contract
8	Page 28 of 74 in the bridge plans shows the BoM's for the CIP Coping. These are detailed with epoxy coated reinforcing steel. This is not a problem, however, are the MSE walls expected to have epoxy coated reinforcement? This is not standard practice nor is there a USP stating such requirements.	Construction of the MSE walls is to follow the current INDOT Specifications. Epoxy coated reinforcement in the MSE walls is not required.
9	Will the City revise the description on item 266 to read "Railing, Concrete C, Modified" to reflect the modification of the formliner?	Yes - see addendum 1

10	Will the City provide an earthwork summary for the bridge? There are items for excavation, unclassified and excavation, foundation, unclassified which are not detailed in the road or bridge plans.	No. The common excavation for the MSE walls 4 & 5 was included in the roadway plans earthwork summary table. The cost of the excavation for the riprap around the piers is included in the cost of the riprap. The cost of the excavation for the drilled shafts is included in the cost of the drilled shafts. For Item 15 (Excavation Unclassified) see SP 128. For item 21 (Excavation, Foundation, Unclassified), the quantity includes the undercut for the pedestrian tunnel footer as detailed on page 178 of the roadway plans.
11	Will the City take another look at items 72 & 286? They appear to be similar but I cannot find any details on item 286 in either plan set.	Item 72 (Hand Rail, Pedestrian) shall be per the contract documents. Item 286 (Hand Rail, Steel) shall be per INDOT 604.09 and powder coated black. See SP 144 in Addendum 1. Hand Rail, Steel can be found on PDF Page 141 of the Roadway Plans.
12	Our (Insituform) pre-qualification application to INDOT is still pending, but has been submitted and is under review. We have been pre-qualified with INDOT but our company was purchased last year and the audited financials did not meet INDOT's requirements. The verbiage above states "including, but not limited to" – We hope to have our pre-qual approval prior to this bid date, but wanted to see if you would allow us to provide our quote to GCs.	Insituform may bid on the project
13	0062 Swing Gate – Could not find location or detail in road plans. Please clarify.	See page 89 of the plans and SP 74 of the contract special provisions
14	0072 Hand Rail, Pedestrian 1.) Please reference attached my take-off. Pay Item quantity is 2,816 Lft. I can only locate approximately 2,162 Lft. A summary table similar to what was provided in plans for Timber Guardrail would be most helpful. 2.) Please be made aware that it is our experience that the 1/8" thick wall material designated for use in the rails and pickets is weaker in this design application and will be highly susceptible to warpage during hot-dip galvanization process and bending during transportation. In addition, using the hollow pickets will require internally venting with minimum 1/2" diameter holes at each welded connection thus weakening each handrail weldment and in turn making them even more susceptible to warpage and bending. If steel is desired it is my recommendation that the material thickness be increased to a minimum 3/16" wall thickness, otherwise panel lengths would need to be no more than two posts ea. 3.) SP # 56 Hand Rail, Spare Panels – You indicate that 10 panels are to be provided but do not indicate length desired of each panel required or type mounting, that is base plate (bridge mount) or long leg (foundation mount). Please clarify. 4.) There is a single step handrail panel shown on sheet 141 of road plans. Please verify that this is the only step railing to be provided and what pay item is this railing to be included in.	1.) Pay item quantity for hand rail, pedestrian is correct and includes roadway and bridge handrail. 2.) Thickness to be increased to 3/16" Minimum. Plan revision will be included with Addendum No. 2. 3.) Foundations are to be foundation mount and the panel length is to be 6'-0" per the Noblesville Standard Drawings 4.) Item 286 (Hand Rail, Steel) accounts for this hand rail panel. See Addendum 1.

15	is there a separate demo contract for the Pleasant St Phase 1? Has it already been let for bid?	The city has already contracted for early demolition of buildings for the project and all buildings are expected to be demolished by the end of September, 2022. All known improvements including foundations on the building parcels will be removed to the back of the sidewalk, or the back of the curb if no sidewalk is present. Trees will not be cleared by the city's building demo contractor and will be required to be cleared as part of this contract.
16	Will there be any goals for this project? MBE/WBE/VBE?	No
17	<p>Plan sheet 14 of 74 of the bridge plans show an earthwork summary table. A note on the table states that "Benching and MSE wall undercut will not be paid directly, but shall be included in the cost of other items". The table indicates 60 cys of undercut for MSE walls, but looking at the geotechnical report and the plans, we are coming up with over 700 cys of undercut for the MSE walls as portions of the existing RR bed are to be removed within the MSE wall envelope below bottom of level pad. There is further undercut required for the roadway as undercuts are anticipated for yielding subgrade soils from STA 100+00 to 116+00.</p> <p>While it is standard practice to not pay for benching as it is a defined quantity, it is not common practice to not pay for actual quantity of undercuts performed as it is an undefined quantity that can not be anticipated at bid time. Please revise plan notes to state that undercuts for MSE wall and roadway will be paid for as common excavation.</p>	<p>Page 14 of the bridge plans is for reference only as noted on that sheet. The earthwork summary table included in the final roadway plans (PDF Page 56) shall be used for earthwork balance. Removal of railroad embankment material per the geotechnical report for retaining walls is included in the quantity for Item 14 (Excavation, Common).</p> <p>Undercut for MSE walls per the geotechnical report shall be paid for as Excavation, Unclassified. See SP 128 in Addendum 1.</p> <p>18" undercut for soils at risk of yielding per the geotechnical report is included in the quantity for item 15 (Excavation, Unclassified).</p>
18	Bid Items 273,274 and 275 are for the drilled shafts for the piers. Typically INDOT item 728-11672, Drilled Shaft Exploratory Core is also included to cover the cost of the exploratory core that is required at each drilled shaft location prior to drilling the shaft to know precisely the location of competent rock. Please consider adding this bid item to the contract.	The exploratory cores will be completed by Terracon under a separate contract with the OWNER per SP 94 (Exploratory Cores). A bid item is not required for this work.
19	Can the IDNR Permit be amended to construct a full-width causeway?	<p>IDNR Provided the following response:</p> <p><i>"As far as the full channel wide temporary crossing, we most likely would not approve that. That type of crossing would block boat, canoe/kayaking traffic as well as having a potential to negatively affect the fish, wildlife and botanical resources in the area. However, a definite answer cannot be made until we review plans and discuss with other divisions within the Department. "</i></p>
20	Item 279 (Conduit, Steel, 2In) has a great deal more qty than what is shown in the plans. I am coming up with approx. 1,600 in the bridge railing, and another approx. 1,600 for the lighting. Plan qty is 10,219 lft. This leaves approx. 7,000 feet of conduit that is not shown on the plans.	Quantity has been revised. See Addendum 1

21	Item 280 (Conduit, Steel, 2.5In) – Can you please let me know where this conduit is to be installed?	Refer to pdf pages 64 and 66 of the Bridge Plans Refer to Addendum 1 for quantity revision
22	Item 208 (Light Pole Ornamental) – The CIB states that these light poles are “TBD”. When can we expect to receive what pole and luminaire is to be installed?	SP 77 has been revised in addendum 1. See SP 85 for light pole and luminaire specifications.
23	Item 197 & 198 (Sign Posts) – CIB calls out for Sign Post “X” to be Powder coated Black. Are all the sign post to be black on this project?	All sign posts are to be powder coated black per the Special Provisions. The "X" denotes the type of sign post (1 or 2).
24	Can the “Noblesville Alternative Transportation Plan – 2015” be made available? Need details on the Trail Signage.	Please refer to the City's web page for the Noblesville Alternative Transportation Plan - 2015. https://noblesvilleparks.org/DocumentCenter/View/108/Noblesville-Alternative-Transportation-Plan-Part-5-PDF Parts 1-6 are available at https://noblesvilleparks.org/DocumentCenter inside the “Parks & Trails” Folder
25	Can not find the portable traffic signals listed on the plan sheets. Can this be detailed as it is a LS price.	Sheet 36 of the roadway plans for Detour Route Phase 3 shows the Portable Signal Req'd at the intersection of 16th Street and Greenfield Avenue. See SP 75 (Temporary Signal Timing Plan) for additional details.
26	Page 42 of 74 shows the pier details. The cage for the columns shows the vertical bars (831, 832, 833 & 834) to run from the shaft to the pier cap. Will the City and its Designer consider shortening these vertical bars and adding splice bars so that the entire cage does not have to be suspended during the pouring of the shafts?	Yes - this will be provided in a future plan revision
27	Page 51 of 74 shows the beam details. The ninth note on this page states the stirrups shall be epoxy coated. Should this be revised to be galvanized?	No. The stirrups are to be epoxy coated. In accordance with SP 96 (Galvanized Rebar) please provide non-ferrous spacers to separate the beam stirrups from the deck reinforcement to ensure the two rebar types are not in direct contact with one another.
28	The third page of the CIB states the qualification of bidders. One of the pre-qual requirements is for "Drilled Foundations". This is also reiterated on the bid submittal affidavits of subs and suppliers. There are only a handful of prequalified contractors who meet this requirement which may impact bid results. Does the pre-qualified contractor have to perform 100% of the drilled shaft work or is this requirement for the actual drilling of the shafts only? Please clarify.	A prequalified contractor is required for both the drilling and casting of the drilled shafts. A separate contractor may assemble and place the reinforcement within the shafts, but a prequalified contractor must drill and pour the shafts.
29	SP's 55, 87, 97, 98, 100 & 118 all mention various concrete elements on the project that shall be colored. For simplicity, will the City add an item "Surface Seal, Modified" to encompass all the color on the project instead of making the color incidental to each of the concrete items? It is also unclear in the plans and SP's if the PF Rails on the bridge are to be colored. Please Clarify.	On the bridge, approach slabs, and terminal joints, the raised median and overlooks at the piers are to be colored. The limits of the overlooks that are to be colored are shown on Sheet 38 of 74 in the bridge plans. The concrete in the PF bridge railings are not to be colored, other than the Hamilton County and City of Noblesville logos as described in the associated special provisions. A separate modified surface seal pay item will not be added.

30	<p>There are 2 bid items with the exact same name and quantities.</p> <p>Item #119, REINFORCING BARS, 138,856.0 LBS Item #259, REINFORCING BARS, 138,856.0 LBS</p> <p>Will you please clarify if one of these (#119) is a duplicate? If not, please specify where each is used.</p>	Item 119 has been deleted. See Addendum No. 1
31	<p>The Irrigation Plan shows only one controller; the River Road RAB is approximately 4,050' from the 8th St. and 10th St. RABs. This distance exceeds the operational capacity of specified controller, which can only operate a valve up to 1,000' from the controller location. Furthermore, there appears to be a bridge separating the River Road RAB from the others. We assume this system will have 2 separate controllers?</p>	Pending Response
32	<p>Typically, controllers on RAB projects are mounted in P1 cabinets or something similar; this plan does not show a P1 or other cabinet. Should we plan to install these on a pedestal?</p>	Pending Response
33	<p>There is no irrigation in the turf area of the River Road RAB or surrounding median areas; the other RABs are completely planted, but figured the River Road RAB would/should have coverage over the entirety of the RAB and that this was overlooked in design.</p>	Pending Response
34	<p>This plan includes a total linear foot count of 5,600'+ of drip tube; our suggestion would be to substitute hi-pop sprays with MP Rotator nozzles for the drip tube. The advantages are more complete coverage, smaller watering window, and far less maintenance cost; disadvantages are lower distribution uniformity and possibility of overspray.</p>	Pending Response
35	<p>The plan is designed around 15 GPM at a constant 60 psi; based on historical data, we recommend the inclusion of a booster pump at each of the points of connection to deliver this flow to pressure requirement.</p>	Pending Response
36	<p>This design does not include any backflow enclosures (StrongBox); are those to be included?</p>	Pending Response
37	<p>This design does not include any master valves; are those to be included?</p>	Pending Response
38	<p>We assume an electrical source will be provided for the controller and (possibly) the booster pump; if there are no P1 cabinets on site, where will the electrical points of connection be located?</p>	Pending Response
39	<p>This system design utilizes traditional spray heads instead of rotary nozzles (MP nozzles); most municipal/commercial installations opt for MP Rotators because they are significantly more efficient, have significantly lower application rates/GPM meaning fewer valves for the same coverage, better wind resistance, improved coverage, etc.</p>	Pending Response
40	<p>The sleeve layout is incomplete. In order to utilize a single controller for the eastern RAB group, we will need sleeves connecting all parts of the area; the plan does not show all necessary sleeves.</p>	Pending Response
41	<p>Can you please tell me the difference between the RRFB "A" and RRFB "B". The CIB only call outs the RRFB "A" and nothing for the RRFB "B". From looking at the plans they look to be the same, however it is hard to tell due to the type A note having a detail on the plan sheets??</p>	See Revised Special Provision 58 in Addendum 1
42	<p>It also appears some of the type "B" are double sided and some are single sided. It would make it a great deal easier if you would make one type single sided and the other type double sided.</p>	The different type of assemblies are for the different pole bases required. A separate pay item will not be made for the double-sided sign assemblies. See Special Provision 58 in Addendum 1.

43	The bridge plans, MSE walls #4 & #5 have quantity tables for panels, cap, #8s, Str backfill #8s, and B-Borrow. The road plans, MSE walls #1, #2, and #3 do not have quantity tables. Will you please provide the quantity tables for walls 1, 2, and 3?	Yes. See Addendum 1
44	will you please provide a detail for the Slip Joint Covers for the MSE walls 2 and 3?	Slip joint details will be the responsibility of the wall manufacturer.
45	In regard to Item #62: Swing Gate - Special Provision 74 references that the item is to consist of two gate leafs with a double gate latch. However, SP 74 also indicates that the "Swing Gate shall be constructed as shown on the plans". Upon review, we did not see any detail provided as to the requirements of the Swing Gate on the project. The only reference to this item shown on the plans is on Page 89 of 364 which shows the location of the Swing Gate only. Could a detail of the required Swing Gate on the project please be provided?	Yes. See PDF Page 15 of Roadway Plans in Addendum 1.
46	In regard to Item #286: Hand Rail, Steel - We did not see any mention in the CIB or either set of Plans indicating what is required for this item. Could clarification please be provided as to what is expected for Pay Item #286: Hand Rail, Steel?	See Page 141 of the Roadway Plans. Refer to SP 144 in Addendum 1.
47	In regard to Item #61: Steel-Backed Timber Guardrail Terminal Section Type SBT-FAT - The pay item quantity for Item #61 is 3 Each. However, the guardrail summary table on Page 260 of 364 shows a quantity of 4 Each. Based on the layout of the SBTGR on the project, we believe this quantity should actually be 5 Each. The SBTGR runs on Line "PR-P3" appear to be correct. However, the quantity listed for the "River Rd Roundabout" appears to be combined as these are shown on the plans as two (2) separate runs of approximately 370 LFT and 355 LFT. Each of these runs of SBTGR would require its own SBT-FAT end terminal. Therefore, we believe there should be 3 Each SBT-FAT end terminals required on Line "PR-P3" and 2 Each SBT-FAT end terminals required on the "River Rd Roundabout" for a total of 5 Each on the project. Please advise.	Quantity has been revised. See Addendum 1
48	In regard to Item #85 - Monument, B - The pay item indicates a quantity of 53 Each. However, the Monument Table on Page 260 of 364 only shows a quantity of 11 Each. Please advise.	Quantity has been revised. See Addendum 1
49	Are we sticking with INDOT specs with the DG (Fluorescent Yellow) signs?	Pending Response
50	Typically, Noblesville uses Extruded street sign blades, however this is not specified on the bid documents. My question is do you want Extruded street name blades or non-extruded blades? If you do what Extruded blades it would require another pay item.	All the signs on this project shall be sheet signs as indicated in the contract documents.
51	confused on the existing building demolition. Demolition Plans state "Completed by Others" on ALL parcels except parcel #12 (assuming just inadvertently left off). BUT, the Building Demolition Reports make it appear that most parcels are being removed as part of this contract. Please clarify.	Parcel 12 demolition is completed by others. See response to question 15 about building demolition. Plan Note has been updated to reflect this.