

CITY OF HOUSTON_

Sylvester Turner

Mayor

Mario C. Diaz Director of Aviation



George Bush Intercontinental ~ William P. Hobby ~ Ellington Airport

November 22, 2019

SUBJECT:

Letter of Clarification No. 4

REFERENCE:

RFCSP No. H37-RTWYNA-2019-002; Project No. 907, Reconstruction of Taxiway NA at

George Bush Intercontinental Airport (IAH)

To: All Prospective Respondents:

This Letter of Clarification is issued for the following reasons:

- I. To EXTEND the DUE DATE from Thursday, December 5, 2019 @ 2:00 P.M., CST to Thursday, December 12, 2019 @ 2:00 P.M., CST.
- II. To CHANGE and REPLACE the list of FORMS TO BE SUBMITTED WITH PROPOSALS (Section 7.1), with the attached Section 7.1. See Attached LOC #4 Attachments for Clarifications Nos. II through VIII (revised 11-22-2019)
- **III.** Replace Specifications Section 00410, "BID FORM PART A", with the attached Section 00410, "BID FORM PART A". Contract Time has been changed.
- **IV. Replace Specifications Section 00520, "AGREEMENT"**, page 00520-1, with the attached Section 00520, "AGREEMENT", page 00520-1. Contract Time has been changed.
- V. Replace Specification 265590 "INSTALLATION OF AIRPORT LIGHTING SYSTEMS", Pages 4 and 20 with attached Section 265590 "INSTALLATION OF AIRPORT LIGHTING SYSTEMS" Pages 4 and 20 for use of coated bolts.
- VI. Replace plan drawing E08-05 "AIRFIELD LIGHTING LIGHT FIXTURE SCHEDULE TAXIWAY 'NA' CENTERLINE (WEST) with new drawing E08-05 "AIRFIELD LIGHTING LIGHT FIXTURE SCHEDULE TAXIWAY 'NA' CENTERLINE (WEST)" showing modification of L-852C fixtures with L-852D fixtures following revised FAA design requirements.
- VII. Replace plan drawing E10-03 "ELECTRICAL DETAILS AIRFIELD LIGHTING" with new drawing E10-03 "ELECTRICAL DETAILS AIRFIELD LIGHTING" showing modification to detail 3 modifying bolting hardware to Grade 5 coated bolts.
- VIII. Replace plan drawing E10-04 "ELECTRICAL DETAILS AIRFIELD LIGHTING" with new drawing E10-04 "ELECTRICAL DETAILS AIRFIELD LIGHTING" showing modification to details 1 and 3 and new detail 6 clarifying label requirements and splice details.

IX. Answer the following questions from prospective respondents:

1. **Question:** Are the HAS extensions and adaptor rings required on inset light fixtures on existing cans? Page 26 55 90-10 in the specification does not clearly state if the existing cans require the extensions and adaptor rings.

Response: The existing cans already have multihole adapter rings. Multihole adapter rings are not required to be replaced on existing cans. The existing cans may need spacers to be sure they comply with the FAA criteria after the new fixture is installed.

- 2. **Question:** The RFCSP on page 20 lists Bidders DBE Participation Plan as one of the forms to be submitted with our proposal. Please confirm if this includes the following:
 - a. Schedule of DBE Participation
 - b. DBE Letter of Intent
 - c. Contract Compliance DBE Utilization Report

Response: Please refer to the Response provided in Section II above.

NOTE: Form 00470 has been replaced with Form 00470D which includes the following documents:

- a. Schedule Of DBE Participation
- b. Letter Of Intent
- c. Certified DBE Subcontract Terms
- d. Contract Compliance DBE Utilization Report
- 3. Question: Document 00410 Bid Form (Parts A & B) lists bid supplements that should be attached to the bid form. A couple of these documents are not included in the Forms to Be Submitted with Proposals list within the RFCSP (page 19-20) and I need clarification if they are required with the proposal submission.
 - a. 00454 Affidavit of Non-Interest
 - b. 00456 Bidder's Certificate of Compliance with Buy American
 - c. 00458 Bidder's Certificate Regarding Foreign Trade Restriction
 - d. 00459 Contractor's Statement Regarding Previous Contracts Subject to EEO
 - e. 00842 Letter of Intent (this document is also referenced under 7.2 Documents to be submitted within 10 business days after receipt of notice of intent to award)

Response: Please refer to the Response provided in Question No. 2.

4. **Question:** The RFCSP Item 5.11 states the Proposal Surety amount should be equal to 10% of the total bid amount and the bid bond form (00430) has 2% listed on it. Please confirm which amount is correct.

Response: The Proposal Surety amount stated in RFCSP, Item 5.11 has been <u>REVISED</u> to state that <u>THE PROPOSAL SURETY AMOUNT SHOULD BE EQUAL TO 2% OF THE TOTAL BID AMOUNT.</u>

5. **Question:** Spec 304-4.3 indicates a mechanical spreader to be utilized to place the cement treated base material. Past projects have utilized a GPS motograder to place the material. Is this an acceptable option or at a minimum is it an acceptable value engineering item if it is cheaper option while still maintaining the requirements of the specification?

Response: Use of a mechanical spreader is a requirement of the FAA standard and will not be modified for bidding. Value engineering proposals will be considered subsequent to agreement execution.

6. **Question:** Sheet G06.00.2 indicates a total of 600 Cal Days for contract time and Documents indicate 553 Calendar Days. Please confirm.

Response: Please refer to the Response provided above in Section IV: Replace Specifications Section 00520, "AGREEMENT".

7. **Question:** Designated Laydown yard provided for this contract appears to not have the required setback requirements needed because of it being used for an existing contract. Is the 16888 Lee Rd. site available for use?

Response: Requirements remain as stated.

8. Question: Please verify the 70/30 flyash/cement is an acceptable option for subgrade.

Response: Subgrade treatment shall meet the requirements of Section 31 32 13.26, "LIME/FLY-ASH TREATED SUBGRADE".

9. **Question:** Are alternate phasing layouts to speed up construction acceptable for Value engineering alternate?

Response: Requirements remain as stated.

10. **Question:** Are alternate aggregate requirements for the P501 mix acceptable as a value engineering alternate?

Response: Requirements remain as stated.

11. **Question:** Please review Transition pavement bid item qty of 1055 SY. Plans show 2308 SY. Please confirm.

Response: Phases 4 and 7 were completed under PN675; therefore, no pavement transitions will be required between Phases 4/7 and Phases 7/9A. Pavement transitions are required between Phases 5A/8 (266 SY), Phases 6A/8 (243 SY), and Phases 8/13A (199 SY), totaling 708 SY. Additional quantity has been added to the pay item in the event that phasing operations must be modified in order to support aircraft operations and additional transition pavements must be installed. The bid quantity will not be modified.

When issued, Letter(s) of Clarification (LOC) shall automatically become part of the solicitation documents and shall supersede any previous specification(s) and/or provision(s) in conflict with the Letter(s) of Clarification. It is the responsibility of the respondent(s) to ensure that it has obtained all such letter(s). By submitting a Proposal on this project, Respondent(s) shall be deemed to have received all LOC(s) and to have incorporated them into their submittal.

If further clarification is needed regarding this solicitation, please contact Andre' Morrow, Sr. Procurement Specialist, via email at Andre.Morrow@houstontx.gov.

Justina J. Mann, CPPO Procurement Officer

Assistant Director Infrastructure Controls

Houston Airport System

attachments: 00470D Bidder's DBE Participation Plan Forms cc: File, RFCSP Solicitation No. H37-RTWYNA-2019-002