



SAN ANTONIO WATER SYSTEM  
Evans PZ 11A Booster Station Improvements Project  
SAWS Job No. 13-6003  
Solicitation No. B-14-052-MF

ADDENDUM NO. 4  
August 6, 2014

**TO BIDDER OF RECORD:**

**The following changes, additions, and/or deletions are hereby made a part of the Contract Documents for the Evans PZ 11A Booster Station Improvements Project, for the San Antonio Water System, San Antonio, Texas, Dated July 2, 2014, as fully and completely as if the same were set forth therein.**

**PART 1 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

- Q1:** a. Specification 16195 Article 2.1. As an equivalent Square D - Schneider Electric would like to offer the Sepam 82 Relay as an equivalent to the GE 760 Relay with same ANSI Functions and communications capability as the GE 760 Relay.
- b. Specification 16195 Article 2.2. As an equivalent Square D - Schneider Electric would like to offer the ION7650 as an equivalent to the GE PQM II Meter with same metering and communications capability as the GE PQM II.
- A1:** a. SAWS is attempting to standardize on the Multilin relays. However, if it could be demonstrated that using an alternate supplier provides a cost advantage to SAWS, the Contractor may submit a request for substitution during the submittal review process. Again, the Multilins are the recommended equipment.
- b. SAWS is attempting to standardize on using the GE PQM II Meters. However, if it could be demonstrated that using an alternate supplier provides a cost advantage to SAWS, the Contract may submit a request for substitution during the submittal review process. Again, the GE PQM II is the recommended equipment.
- Q2:** a. After reviewing the Project Specifications for the referenced project, I could not figure out whose scope of work it is to perform the following testing:
1. Low Voltage Cables
  2. Medium Voltage Cables
  3. Medium Voltage Switchgear
  4. Low Voltage Circuit Breakers
  5. Grounding
- All five items are stated to be tested, but I am not sure as to who is supposed to include this testing in their bid. Is the GC, EC, or manufacturer supposed to include these items?

b. Lastly, the Power System Study is stated to be performed by the “Contractor”. I would assume that they are referring to the GC, but just want to be sure they are not referring to the EC.

**A2:** a. The Contractor has the responsibility to hire a third-party testing house. It is up to the General Contractor to include this under the “Electrical Contractor” OR to request a separate qualified testing contractor. The testing requirements are covered in new Section 16060, attached in Addendum 3.

b. The intent is for the GC to delegate that responsibility to the Electrical Contractor OR to hire the Power System Engineer direct. Refer to Section 16105.

**Q3:** System Controls & Instrumentation (SCI) respectfully requests to be added to the approved Process Control System Integrator (PCSI) list for the Evans Pressure Zone (PZ) 11A Booster Station Improvements project. Attached is our qualification statement, if you have any questions please don’t hesitate to contact me.

**A3:** The Contractor may include any qualified PCSI and/or AST following the stipulations included in the General Conditions (GC). The list included in Section 13000 (attached in Addendum 3) is a list that SAWS recommends.

**Q4:** BL Technology, Inc. would like to be added to the list of acceptable vendors for the above listed project in the following categories:

1. ASP-Application Services Provider
2. PCSI-Process Control Systems Integrator

Please advise on the steps necessary to gain approval.

**A4:** The Contractor may include any qualified PCSI and/or AST following the stipulations included in the General Conditions (GC). The list included in Section 13000 (attached in Addendum 3) is a list that SAWS recommends.

**Q5:** Regarding the subject project, please consider the following:

Supplemental Condition to Article VIII – Contract Completion Time provides for Liquidated Damages of \$5,900.00 per day “if the proposed capacity of the booster station is affected by the delay”. We request that this amount be reconsidered.

Reason #1:

Presumably (since this project is to be evaluated based on 60% of Respondent’s Background, Experience, Qualifications, Project Approach, Safety & Quality Control) the most qualified and experienced Respondent with the best project approach will be awarded the project. As such, I’m sure the Owner will have every assurance that the selected Respondent will expeditiously perform his or her obligations under the contract. Therefore, the only reason Liquidated Damages should come into play is for reasons beyond the Respondent’s control (submittal review delays for major equipment, equipment production/delivery delays, CPS Energy delays in new permanent electric power to the site, just to name a few). However, for these unlikely (but possible) delays, the Respondent would

necessarily become liable since suppliers and subcontractors typically exclude any such liability when proposing their equipment and services and CPS Energy certainly will not admit fault.

Reason #2:

At some point, liquidated damages stop encouraging performance and start encouraging bid inflation to cover possible (though maybe not so likely) worst case scenarios. So, again though unlikely, a possible worst case scenario would be that the Pumping Equipment delivery for this project is delayed by 6 months due to any of a myriad of possible reasons. A conservative Respondent, and especially a SBE/DBE respondent, would consider such a possibility when preparing its response and include contingency amounts (in this case \$1,062,000.00) to cover such a possible (though unlikely) worst case scenario.

We would propose that \$5,900.00 per day Liquidated Damages be excessive considering the project's estimated amount and request that it be reduced to an amount as is typical with other Invitations and Solicitations issued by the San Antonio Water System.

**A5:** SAWS considered the recommendation. However, because Evans PZ 11 A booster station will be a critical component for the future water supply in the area, SAWS decided that the liquidated damages for the project was adequately estimated.

**Q6:** Regarding the subject project, is it possible to extend the proposal deadline of August 12th to later in the week (say August 14th or 15th)?

I and a key person involved with preparation of these competitive sealed proposals will be out of town from August 7th through August 11th.

If it is not postponed, we will not be able to submit.

**A6:** SAWS considered the recommendation. However, after evaluating the schedule thoroughly, SAWS decided that the current schedule should remain unchanged.

**Q7:** a. On drawing #I-110 you show (9) field instruments. I know the (5) on the left hand side are "existing" per drawing #PID-101. What about the (4) on the right hand side of the drawing. Are they "existing" or new? I don't see a P&ID on them.

b. On drawing #I-102 you show (1) Lantronix Modbus Gateway, Ethernet Switch, SCADA UPS & Broad Band Radio. I am assuming these are new items, since they are drawn in bold print. If this is correct. I don't see a specification on them. Please provide specifications with model #, manufacturer, VA or KVA on the UPS etc.

c. On drawing #I-110 & 111 you show some Digital Indicating Controllers. I'm assuming these are new? If this is correct. I don't see a specification on them, please provide a specification with model #, manufacturer.

d. Who will be doing the programming modifications of the PLC & SCADA system? The reason I ask is in specs section #13000-2, 1.3 you say the ASP will be doing it. But in spec section #13330-1, 1.1, C. you say the PCSI will be doing the PLC & SCADA programming modifications?

**A7:** a. Drawing I-110 is reissued in Addendum 3 and it includes the proper labels.

b. PLC equipment and all communications equipment is new. Section 13515 “Communications Interface Equipment” and Section 13328 “Single Phase UPS” are included with Addendum No. 3.

c. All panel mounted instruments and switches not remaining with the project shall be new. Refer to new Section 13327 in Addendum 3.

d. The intent is to have the recommended ASP perform all software updates, modifications, and all new code. This has been clarified in Section 13000, which is attached in Addendum 3.

**Q8:** I would like a copy of the sign in sheet from the mandatory pre-proposal meeting that took place at 11 am on July 30th when it becomes available.

**A8:** Please see SAWS’s website to download the sign-in sheets for the Mandatory Pre-Proposal and Mandatory Site Visit.

**Q9:** We are writing to request pre-approval for Crane Deming pumps to be added to Specification Section 11210, 1.03, A.

Our company, Pump Solutions Inc. has supplied pumps (water and wastewater) to SAWS for many years including the Dos Rios WWTP, Crescent Park BPS, Southcross PS, etc. SAWS has Crane Deming pumps and we recently replaced one at the Southcross pump station that was in service since 1960s. Crane Deming pump are manufactured in Piqua, OH.

Anyhow, I have attached our pump data and request Crane Deming to be added to the specifications by addendum if that is acceptable?

**A9:** The pump data provided does not adequately meet the specified pump selection criteria. The NPSHr for the pump is close to or exceeding the NPSHa for the minimum flow requirements as indicated on the supplied system curve data. Also the minimum efficiency is not being met by the selected pump.

**Q10:** Siemens is the existing equipment at the Evans Road facility and Siemens is requesting the opportunity to provide pricing as an approved manufacturer for this current phase. Please add Siemens as an approved manufacturer to the following specification sections

- 1) 16345-MV Metal Clad Swgr and Med Voltage Motor Controllers
- 2) 16461 – Distribution Dry-Type Transformers
- 3) 16470 – Panelboards 16475 – Low Voltage Enclosed CB’s and Disconnects.

**A10:** The existing switchgear is to remain in-place. The project calls for a new switchgear lineup with new medium voltage controllers, low voltage panelboards, and MV to LV transformers. The listed equipment is the Owner's recommended equipment. However, if it could be demonstrated that using an alternate supplier provides a cost advantage to SAWS, the Contract may submit a request for substitution during the submittal review process.

**Q11:** a. Could SAWS provide some acceptable manufacturers for the Sound Barrier or at least provide contact information on the barrier wall picture in the drawings and presumably who the design was based on?

b. Would SAWS please consider removing the requirement for including qualifications for the ASP and PCSI in the proposal as listed in SIR C.1.g? There is really no need to provide this information if SAWS has deemed them acceptable manufacturers. It is quite difficult for the general contractor to assemble the proposal in advance because we usually do not know which subcontractor is going to provide the best value until the day of the bid.

c. Would SAWS consider moving Exhibit "B" (the Good Faith Effort Plan) to Envelope 1 with the Bid Proposal? It would make it easier for the contractor if it were not part of the bound proposal that is in a separate box.

d. What is included in Bid Item 2? All labor, materials, and equipment associated with installation of the 20" valves. If so, please clarify so that contractor can determine if that is enough cost for work.

e. Why is there a prevailing wage rate provided if this is not being funded by TWDB?

**A11:**a. The proposed sound wall may be supplied by any manufacturer meeting the requirements of the bid document. The bid document has been prepared to be as generic as possible. The photographs of typical sections were included as for example only. The photographs were provided by AIL Sound Wall System (URL: [ailsoundwalls.com](http://ailsoundwalls.com))

b. The Contractor must include the name of the proposed PCSI with their bid to allow SAWS to evaluate their proposal. They can submit qualifications during the submittal process. Even if the PCSI is approved, SAWS wants to make sure that the people doing the work are qualified and they have a good track record with SAWS. Refer to Exhibit B, "Good Faith Effort Plan for Construction SUBCONTRACTORS"

c. Yes, SAWS will accept an Exhibit B (Good Faith Effort Plan) that is included in Envelope 1. However, please be aware that SAWS normally uses the RFCSP method for larger and more complicated projects. Therefore, if a proposer is waiting until the last day to finalize the subcontracting team and submits their Good Faith Effort Plan in Envelope 1, then the Technical Evaluation Committee may

have an incomplete organizational chart and an incomplete set of project team résumés, **which may impact how they score Experience and Qualifications**. It is therefore *recommended* that the Good Faith Effort Plan would be included with the bound proposal, (as should completed project team résumés and a complete organizational chart for other areas of the bound proposal).

d. The respondent is directed to Section 01025 Measurement and Payment of the specifications. On page 01025-5, the items to be included in the payment for Item No. 2 of the price proposal are explained in detail.

e. While this may not be a TWDB project, SAWS must still comply with the state requirements as it relates to certified payroll.

ALL BIDDERS SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF ADDENDUM NO. 4 ON THE BID FORM AND BY HIS/HER SIGNATURE AFFIXED HERETO AND TO FILE SAME AS AN ATTCHMENT TO HIS/HER BID. BID FORMS SUBMITTED WITHOUT THIS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT WILL BE CONSIDERED NON-RESPONSIVE.



*Mark B Hill*

8/6/2014

**Mark B. Hill, P.E.**  
Ford Engineering, Inc.  
TBPE No. F-1162



*Oscar Miramontes*

*AUG 6, 2014*

**Oscar Miramontes, P.E.**  
San Antonio Water System



8/6/2014

**Kum Wing Chan, P.E.**  
K.M. NG & ASSOCIATES,  
A DIVISION OF MERRICK  
& COMPANY  
TBPE No. F-3911

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT BY BIDDER**

THE UNDERSIGNED ACKNOWLEDGES RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM NO. 4 AND THE BID SUBMITTED HERewith IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE INFORMATION AND STIPULATION SET FORTH.

---

Date

Signature of bidder