

LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN WATER DISTRICT
Consulting Engineering Services for Design of the
Main Replacement Project Western Sections

ADDENDUM NO. 1

1. Will the District be completing geotechnical bores and study or should the consultant include this in the scope of work? If required by the consultant, can the number of Geotech bores assumption be set by the District?
The District will not be completing a geotechnical investigation, and the consultant should not include the geotechnical investigation in their proposal. If necessary, this may be added to the scope of work with the selected and awarded consultant.
2. Could the District please confirm whether the consultant's fee proposal should include potholing / SUE Level A services, or if those services will be handled separately by the District or another party? If required by the consultant, can the number of potholes assumption be set by the District?
The consultant should not include SUE Level A services. This work may be added to the scope of work with the selected and awarded consultant once areas to be excavated have been identified. The consultant should include potholing of 20 locations for the purpose of verifying pipe size, material, and depth.
3. Is there as-built drawings for the section to be lined or has the line been potholed?
There are no record drawings for these sections of the main. There are record drawings for the sections adjacent to these sections that will be provided to the selected and awarded consultant.
4. Is there drawings available of the section currently under construction?
Drawings for the Main Replacement Project 2025 are provided with this addendum. The El Rancho Section (Sheets C1.0 – C1.9) is currently under construction (onsite work starts 28 July 2025). The Storage Tank Section (Sheets C2.0 – C2.8) was not awarded for construction and will be added to the scope of work for this request for proposals per #14 below.
5. Has a tunneling expert been consulted on the feasibility of pulling PVC thru tar lined steel?
A tunneling expert has not been consulted for the project. The Main Replacement Project 2025 includes a test pull of pipe through that section prior to final installation. The District will share the outcome of that project with the selected and awarded consultant.

6. How much construction budget is available for this project?
The project has a preliminary construction cost opinion of \$6.0M based on the bid accepted for the Main Replacement Project 2025.
7. As of July 1, 2025 it is our understanding that consultants must provide ADA compliant documents for public entities in Colorado. Can you confirm if our proposal needs to be ADA compliant for this project?
The proposal does not need to be ADA compliant.
8. Can we expect the district to perform the potholing necessary to locate utilities to Quality Level B at potential pit locations?
The District will not perform potholing. See the response to #2 above.
9. Conformation that the Avery lateral line is excluded from project scope.
The Avery lateral line will not be replaced as part of the project. The new main in this section must reconnect with that lateral and the reconnection detail should be included in the design scope of work.
10. Was butt fusion HDPE considered for pipe material? If not, Would the District consider evaluating butt fusion HDPE pipe for the project?
HDPE pipe was considered and is not suitable for this project. HDPE pipe will not be allowed by the District.
11. Will the consultant be responsible for stakeholder engagement? If so what exactly is consultant responsible for?
The consultant will be responsible for a supporting role in stakeholder engagement. The District will reach out to property owners and hold a public meeting, and the consultant will be expected to present details of the project at that meeting. The consultant is fully responsible for agency notifications required for the environmental review.
12. Does the District think a larger temporary construction easement is needed for the project and should we include this in our scope? Or does the District believe that the contractor will be required to coordinate a Construction Access Agreement with each property owner, using a Surface Restoration line item built into the Bid Tab?
The need for temporary construction easements should be identified as part of the design, and this additional work may be added to the scope of work by the District. The District would negotiate such easements with the property owner(s).
13. What level of NEPA analysis has been completed (i.e., Environmental Review, Categorical Exclusion, Environmental Assessment, etc.)?

The NEPA analysis has not been completed and should be included in the design scope of work as part of the environmental review.

14. The District is adding the following section to the consulting engineering services to be included with the design drawings. The Storage Tank Section (approximately 1,627') can be found in the Main Replacement Project 2025 drawings (Sheets C2.0 – C2.8). The consultant will be provided the survey file and AutoCAD file, and shall incorporate this section into their design drawings. The District anticipates incorporation of this section into the project will be less involved than other sections, however, the District acknowledges there will be some work involved to convert to the consultant's standards. The consultant should provide a separate line item for this work.