



ADDENDUM #2

SYNTHETIC TURF REPLACEMENT-GERP FIELDS 7-8

BID #17/18-011 / PWP #WA-2018-048

BIDS DUE NO LATER THAN: 1:45 PM ON DECEMBER 20, 2017

PUBLIC BID OPENING: 2:00 PM ON DECEMBER 20, 2017

This addendum is to notify all potential proposers of clarifications made to the Bid documents as stated below.

Questions provided by potential bidders as of 12/11/17, and answers provided by the City of Sparks:

Bidder Question #1

Is the insured 3rd Party warranty requirement a strict requirement?

City Response #1

DELETE: from Section 32 18 13 – Synthetic Turf; Part 3; 3.2 A.1.h

~~h. The warranty must be prepaid and insured by an A rated, third party insurer.~~

INSERT: to Section 32 18 13 – Synthetic Turf; Part 3; 3.2 A.1.

h. The system warranty specific to the turf material and installation on this project shall be provided and serviced by the turf manufacturer. Warranty work shall be the responsibility of the manufacturer and completed by the manufacturer or their licensed designee in a timely manner throughout the duration of the warranty term. Typical expectations include 48 response for emergencies and critical safety concerns with 5 working days being acceptable for correction of identified non-emergency repairs and/or corrective measures.

CLARIFICATION: from Section 32 18 13 – Synthetic Turf; Part 3; 3.2 A.1.c

In addition to the language already contained in this section of the bid document with respect to possible warranty exclusions, the final warranty shall not include any exclusion for the use of “flat-soled” or “smooth soled” shoes in activities that will take place on the fields.

Bidder Question #2

Please review CCG Superb+DuroX50 as an equivalent turf product.

City Response #2

Based on the information provided, and insufficient supporting evidence presented, the CCG Superb+DuroX50 is not considered an equivalent:

- No data, (for example: Lisport Testing or Independent Materials Lab Testing data) was presented to support items such as resin type, fiber turf bind, or grab tear strength for example.
- The Blend of monofilament fibers and slit film fibers is required to be at a maximum 60% to 40% ratio with either fiber being dominate. The proposed product does not meet these requirements at 67% monofilament and 33% slit film. Nor is any evidence presented that this solution or system (fiber blend ratio) may in fact perform equal to or better than the ones specified.
- The warranty is unacceptable with numerous exclusions such as:
 - *“The warranty is based on regulation size fields and within the regulation playing area.”* A warranty on every square foot of new turf is required
 - *“use of incorrect or defective (sports) attributes and/or incorrect or defective training shoes (for example smooth soles)”* is not covered. A warranty for public uses for all types of sports in all types of non-metal cleated and flat soled shoes is required.
 - *“Chemical reactions caused by the infill product”* is not covered The turf system including the turf, the backing and the in-fill must be full covered as a warranted system without such compatibility exclusions.

The request for equivalence is rejected.

Bidder Question #3

Please review Edel Hybrid F 50 as an equivalent turf product.

City Response #3

Based on the information provided, and insufficient supporting evidence presented, the Edel Hybrid F 50 is not considered an equivalent:

- No data, (for example: Lisport Testing or Independent Materials Lab Testing data) was presented to support items such as resin type, fiber turf bind, or grab tear strength for example.
- The Blend of monofilament fibers and slit film fibers is required to be at a maximum 60% to 40% ratio with either fiber being dominate. The proposed product does not meet these requirements at 70% monofilament and 30% slit film. Nor is any evidence presented that this solution or system (fiber blend ratio) may in fact perform equal to or better than the ones specified.
- The warranty is unacceptable with numerous exclusions such as:
 - *“The warranty is based on regulation size fields and within the regulation playing area.”* A warranty on every square foot of new turf is required
 - *“use of incorrect or defective (sports) attributes and/or incorrect or defective training shoes (for example smooth soles)”* is not covered. A warranty for public uses for all types of sports in all types of non-metal cleated and flat soled shoes is required.
 - *“Chemical reactions caused by the infill product”* The turf system including the turf, the backing and the in0-faill mist be full covered as a warranted system without such compatibility exclusions.
 - *“Turf flattening, twisting or fibrillating or surface hardening or unevenness due to compaction or movement are considered normal wear.”* Broad exclusionary statements detailing concerns not covered under the warranty is problematic.

The request for equivalence is rejected.

Bidder Question #4

Please review the Progame 9014XC by Trocellen as an equivalent shock attenuation pad.

City Response #4

Based on the information provided, and insufficient supporting evidence presented, the Progame 9014XC by Trocellen is not considered an equivalent:

- The Progame is installed with seam tape sealing the joints of the installed rolls, this is a fragile joint as compared to the interlocking fastened panels and the poured in place seamless approach of the other two specified product options.
- The tensile strength is not provided and could not be evaluated. (Tensile strength is a key component to the product withstanding the rigors of the construction process and the two planned resurfacing of the turf during the 25 year life of the warranty.)
- The warranty specifically excludes both high wear areas and multi-sport use facilities which is unacceptable.
- The compressive strength and permanent deformation can reduce the product to 85% of its original shape/strength by the manufacturer's own warranty exclusion. This highlights concern for damage during periods of heavy loading which will happen during the 25 year warranty period. Heavy loading is unavoidable during the resurfacing in year 10 and 20, if not occasionally during normal use and maintenance activities. The warranty does not specifically cover/include suitability for the required construction activities at regular turf replacement intervals during the "25 year stated warranty".
- No third party independent lab materials testing of the product was provided to verify the manufacture's claims as submitted.

Any one of these would be considered evidence to not approve the equivalency request.

The request for equivalence is rejected.

Bidder Question #5

Please review Gamechanger 46Q as an equivalent turf product.

City Response #5

Based on the information provided, and insufficient supporting evidence presented, the extremely insufficient warranty the Gamechanger 46Q is not considered an equivalent:

- No data, (for example: Lisport Testing or Independent Materials Lab Testing data) was presented to support items such as resin type, fiber turf bind, or grab tear strength for example.
- The warranty failed to meet most of the essential requirements outlined in SECTION 32 18 13 – SYNTHETIC TURF; Part 3; 3.2 Maintenance, Testing and Warranty. The warranty appears to be a product warranty and NOT a comprehensive product, product installation and product performance warranty over the minimum 8 year term as required. For example, the following statements and exclusion as submitted are in direct conflict with the specifications.
 - *"..products are guaranteed against all defects in workmanship for a period of 8 years from the date of shipment."* The project warranty clock will begin at the date of project completion and acceptance, not shipment date.

- *“Contractors and owners must take special consideration to onsite exclusions that fall outside the warranty, including the installation of the turf...”* The project requires the turf, its installation and its performance over the term to all be fully warranted.
- *“...the manufacturer assumes no responsibility that the goods will be fit for any particular purpose intended..”* The manufacturer/seller of the product should be able to market and assume general responsibility that their product is “fit” for the purpose of a multi-sport, general use athletic field as contemplated in this bid.
- *“In no event will Manufacturer be liable for any consequential damages, lost profits, lost revenue, the labor cost of removal, the labor cost of replacement of its products or freight.”* This is in in direct conflict with Warranty requirements 1. g.
- *“..the Ultimate Consumer/Owner, contractor or retailer select a competent, experienced and responsible installer and carefully inspect the installers work...”* This language is in direct conflict with the requirements of this bid. The project mandates that the manufacturer to certify the installer and take all means necessary to assure a quality installation, since they will be ultimately responsible for the extended, 8 year warranty.

The request for equivalence is rejected.

Bidder Question #6

Can we use a 2.00” fiber height system to be utilized in place of our standard 2.25” system?

City Response #6

No matter which fiber length system (2.00 or 2.25 in this instance) a manufacturer elects to submit in the formal project bid, the minimum or range requirements MUST be met. In this case, the specifications in Section 32 18 13 – Synthetic Turf Part 2; 2.2, 8 and 9 require:

8. Synthetic turf must have a minimum face fiber weight of 44 ounce per square yard. Fiber face weight may only include weight of full length fibers 2” to 2.25”. Any thatch zone or root zone fiber elements in the system are not to be included toward the minimum face weight requirement.

9. Synthetic turf must be a minimum of 2.0” pile height and a maximum of 2.25” pile height.

Products meeting all City specifications, including Sections 8-9 (above) would be acceptable.

Bidder Question #7

Can we bid a 44oz face weight product as compared to our standard 46oz system?

City Response #7

No matter which face weight (44 or 46 in this instance) a manufacturer elects to submit in the formal project bid, the minimum or range requirements MUST be met. In this case, the specifications in Section 32 18 13 – Synthetic Turf Part 2; 2.2, 8 and 9 require:

8. Synthetic turf must have a minimum face fiber weight of 44 ounce per square yard. Fiber face weight may only include weight of full length fibers 2” to 2.25”. Any thatch zone or root zone fiber elements in the system are not to be included toward the minimum face weight requirement.

9. Synthetic turf must be a minimum of 2.0” pile height and a maximum of 2.25” pile height.

Products meeting all City specifications, including Sections 8-9 (above) would be acceptable.

Bidder Question #8

Is the 3/4” fiber reveal above the top of the in-fill a requirement?

City Response #8

DELETE: from Section 32 18 13 – Synthetic Turf; Part 2; 2.4; H

~~H. The top of infill level must be installed at 3/4” below the top of the highest turf fiber or higher. Refer to manufacture recommendations for infill depths. Actual infill depth may not infringe on existing patents and/or other proprietary systems.~~

INSERT: to Section 32 18 13 – Synthetic Turf; Part 2; 2.4; H

H. The fiber reveal above the top of the in-fill may vary slightly from a nominal 1/2” to 3/4” length. The final fiber reveal may vary slightly depending on face weight, pile height, sand rubber in-fill componentry, and final ratio of fibers used to achieve the maximum 40% to 60% blend of monofilament fibers to slit film fibers or visa versa. In all cases, the system proposed for installation, through the submittal process, including details about the fiber reveal length must conform to all manufacturer requirements and installation protocols. Additionally, the system and reveal length must meet the requirements for necessary traction/cleat interface, shock attenuation, reduction of in-fill splash or fly out, and maintain a positive visual appearance. Actual infill depth may not infringe on existing patents and/or other proprietary systems.

Bidder Question #9

Is the 6 lbs of in-fill per square foot a requirement?

City Response #9

DELETE: from Section 32 18 13 – Synthetic Turf; Part 2; 2.4 A.

~~A. The infill for the synthetic turf must consist of SBR and sand. The minimum infill weight must be 6.0 lbs/sf.~~

INSERT: to Section 32 18 13 – Synthetic Turf; Part 2; 2.4 A.

A. The infill for the synthetic turf must consist of rubber (SBR) and sand. The infill weight measured in lbs./sf. may vary slightly depending on final face weight, pile height and sand rubber in-fill componentry of the system proposed by the bidder. In all cases, the final proposed installation, through the submittal process, must conform to all manufacturer requirements, installation protocols, and meet the requirements for necessary traction/cleat interface, shock attenuation, and visual appeal.

Please note and adjust your bid according to the revisions, additions, deletions, clarifications or modifications as presented on this Addendum #2, which are made a part of this bid. NOTE: To avoid disqualification, this Addendum 2 (and any other addenda) must be signed by an authorized representative of the bidding firm in the space provided and must be submitted with your firm's sealed proposal. Failure to return this addendum, duly signed, may be cause for rejection of the bid. ALL ADDENDA SHOULD BE SIGNED AND PLACED IN SEQUENTIAL ORDER AND ATTACHED TO THE FRONT OF THE BID PACKAGE, COMPLETE WITH ALL REQUIRED DOCUMENTS.

CONTRACTOR BUSINESS NAME

Dan Marran, C.P.M., CPPO
Contracts and Risk Manager

X _____
Authorized Signature

December 15, 2017

Printed Name of Person Signing