

CHUGACH ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC.
Anchorage, Alaska

May 26, 2026

ADDENDUM #2

P1900043 – Gambell Street Undergrounding: 3rd to 16th Avenue
E2320071 – Gambell Street Transmission Pole Relocate
GCI – Joint-work
ACS – Joint-work

The following changes and additions have been made to the contract documents. Incorporate these changes and additions in your bid, sign the acknowledgement, and attach a signed copy of this addendum to your bid when submitted.

1. Q&A (attached).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The undersigned bidder hereby certifies that the revisions herein set forth have been incorporated in this bid and form a part of the contract documents.

Bidder Address

Title Date

APPROVED FOR DISTRIBUTION: *Jake Moe* acting for DT
Darwin Thornton, Sr. Manager Distribution & Construction

Chugach Electric Association, Inc
Gambell Street Undergrounding: 3rd to 16th Avenue – P1900043
Gambell Street Transmission Pole Relocate - E2320071
Bid Questions and Responses and Exceptions

1. **4/0 CONC conductor quantity:** Page 2 of 9 of the staking sheets lists 11,496 feet of 4/0 CONC. This total is understood to represent three individual conductor runs for each three-phase circuit. For example, a circuit with an installed length of 300 feet would be shown as 900 feet of total conductor.
 - That is correct.
2. **750 CONC conductor quantity:** Page 2 of 9 of the staking sheets lists 20,340 feet of 750 CONC. This total is understood to represent three individual conductor runs for each three-phase circuit. For example, a circuit with an installed length of 300 feet would be shown as 900 feet of total conductor.
 - That is correct
3. Has CEA coordinated with the State DOT on lane restrictions and any other applicable traffic control requirements that will be enforced during project and what those restrictions may be?
 - Yes, CEA and DOT have coordinated. See details of traffic control requirements in the Draft DOT Utility Permit.
4. With the project completion date set for 10/1/2026 we don't think it is possible to complete this project in the duration given. Will CEA extend the deadline to this project to summer of 2027? If DOT takes up to 60 days to review/approve TCPs this will only give the contractor potentially 2 months to complete the project
 - See 5.2 of the utility permit special provisions which states "Apply for a Lane Closure Permit (LCP) through the DEPARTMENT a minimum of thirty (30) calendar days prior to the commencement of any construction and/or maintenance work. Include a Traffic Control Plan detailing the traffic control devices and their placement in the required application." The TCP review could occur concurrently with other actions and submissions. See also section 3.3.2 Permit Amendments of the DOT&PF Alaska Utilities Manual.
5. If DOT takes longer than 30 days to approve TCPs, will CEA grant a time extension for the project completion?
 - No time extension is anticipated.
6. What happens if the contractor doesn't get work done before ROW closes in 2026?
 - Liquidated damages of \$1,000 per calendar day shall apply if the Contractor fails to meet the required completion date.
7. The Utility permit calls out engineered and stamped traffic control plans. We have not experienced this requirement on any other projects and want to verify if this is a requirement? And if it is a requirement this will further delay potential approved TCPs.
 - See 5.4 of the utility permit Special Provisions - "5.4 This project is classified as a Category 1 Significant Project in accordance with Chapter 14 of the Alaska DOT&PF Preconstruction Manual due to the project scope and corridor

characteristics. As a result, the PERMITTEE shall prepare and implement a Traffic Management Plan (TMP), developed and stamped by a Professional Civil Engineer registered in the State of Alaska, containing all required elements identified in Section 1400 of the Preconstruction Manual.” Below are electronic links to the documents cited in 5.1 of the utility permit special provisions:

DOT&PF Preconstruction Manual	https://dot.alaska.gov/stwddes/dcsprecon/preconmanual.shtml
23 CFR Part 630, Subpart J (Work Zone Safety and Mobility Rule)	https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/chapter-I/subchapter-G/part-630/subpart-J
11 th Edition MUTCD	https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/kno_11th_Edition.htm
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)	https://www.ada.gov/
Public Rights- of-Way accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG)	https://www.access-board.gov/prowag/
FHWA Work Zone Safety and Mobility Guidance	https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/wz/resources/final_rule/guidance.htm
DOT&PF Standard Specifications for Highway Construction	https://dot.alaska.gov/stwddes/dcsspecs/index.shtml#

8. It appears the Utility permit is not executed. Was the copy provided the final and approved utility permit?
 - Only a draft Utility Permit has been provided. It is expected that a final Utility Permit will be issued prior to Chugach’s Notice of Award.

9. Can CEA provide a couple-day period for the contractor to ask to follow up questions and a chance to further clarify the answers for this project? This would help finalize any clarifications/exceptions as well as give the contractor an option to change/adjust clarifications based on how CEA answers the questions.
 - Bidders can submit additional follow-up questions until 2pm on May 27th. Upon review by CEA, if questions are deemed necessary to inform bidders, answers will be provided to all bidders.
10. The asphalt, concrete, and restoration units called out on the bid schedule are classified as LS units. Will CEA be willing to make these unitized? based on the extent of restoration required on the utility permit it is going to be difficult to accurately quantify these restoration costs.
 - No. Units of restoration such as ASPHALT, CURB, and SIDEWALK are lump sum units.
11. With the uncertainty of Traffic Control Costs would CEA get rid of the LS traffic control and instead unitize it (per day)?
 - No. The unit of TRAFFIC CONTROL is a lump sum unit.
12. Can the bore locations be added to the electrical drawings (or any of the drawings)?
 - Segments that run north/south along Gambell Street are designed for directional drilling (bore). Segments that cross Gambell Street east/west are designed for directional drilling (bore).
13. Between PB7427 and Vault 7336 it is listed there is 165' of bore and 45' of SUR2-5 Primary trench. Can it be annotated on the drawings where the CEA would like the pipe installed by trench, and where to bore between these two apparatuses?
 - The segment for this line that is in the Gambell Street road prism is designed for bore (~165'). The segment for this line that is not in the Gambell Street road prism is designed for trenching (~10' of hand dig and ~45' of normal trench).
14. HMA Type VH, PG 64-40 is a rubberized mix designed for cold temperatures and is 50% more expensive than the City E-Mix. Given that we have completed many projects on Gambell over the past 10 years and have previously been granted a variance to use E-Mix, can we continue to use E-Mix instead of PG 64-40?
 - See response in question #16.
15. Since HMA Type VH, PG 64-40 is difficult to compact and typically requires larger highway-sized rollers, how are we expected to achieve proper compaction in narrow trench areas that are smaller than a 48–52" drum? Additionally, considering examples like Tudor Road where PG 64-40 was required around manholes and those areas are deteriorating, is this mix still appropriate?
 - See response in question #16.

16. Given that this road contains varying asphalt thicknesses (8”–12” in some areas and 4” in others), and side roads consist of 2”–4” of City E-Mix, can State Type II B or City E-Mix be used instead of PG 64-40, as has been successfully done on prior projects such as Gambell–3rd, Gambell Crossing, Worthington OH-UG, and other ML&P and City Electric work?
- Response to questions 14-16: In meetings, CEA & DOT&PF agreed to the following pavement replacement for DOT&PF facilities to be included in section 8.1 of the utility permit special provisions:
 - The PERMITTEE shall replace all paving and base and subbase removed with the following:
 - Hot Mix Asphalt, Type II: Class A to match existing pavement thickness or 8 inches, whichever is lesser, in 2- to 3-inch lifts, with STE-1 tack coat between each pavement lift
 - 2-inch Crushed Aggregate Base Course, D-1
 - Select Material, Type A (36-inch min.)
 - Bedding Material as defined by the Utility
17. In areas where curb has previously been capped after asphalt overlays to achieve a 6” reveal, should this same method be followed again?
- See Section 10.0 Right-of-Way Protection, Maintenance, and Restoration of the utility permit special provisions.
18. In locations where curb was added and the gutter pan was overlaid with asphalt, creating contamination that makes the concrete difficult to dispose of, how should this material be handled or disposed of?
- See paragraph ‘O.’ of the utility permit as well as section 3.0 Environmental of the utility permit special provisions.
19. When paving multiple lifts on the same day, is tack coat required between lifts, given that the asphalt will bond naturally and that tack coat can create excessive mess and tracking issues on the roadway?
- See response to questions 14 -16 above as well as 8.3 of the utility permit Special Provisions.
20. For areas designated for replacement, are we being required to perform a 24”–36” excavation and install select materials in all such locations?
- Replacement should be according to section 8.1 of the utility permit special provisions, extending to the depth necessary. Note that CEA’s facilities are proposed to be at a depth of 4 feet or greater, which exceeds the depth range in the question.

21. Considering the existing roadway is approximately 50 years old and may vary by more than 3/16", how strictly will this tolerance be enforced, especially given that we are working with a 3/4" aggregate in the asphalt mix and handwork in small areas may not consistently meet that precision? Additionally, the details reference milling but do not specify milling or paving depths or quantities—can these quantities be clarified so accurate pricing for the 64-40 mix can be prepared?
 - See 8.3 of the utility permit Special Provisions.
22. Given the obvious commercial impacts with this project. After the bid award will CEA organize a community council meeting with all parties/customers involved to help with communication and relations prior to the start of construction?
 - The awarded contractor can organize a community event with involved parties. Chugach can attend and assist in such a meeting.
23. Will all contacts be provided to the Contractor by CEA for customers impacted by this project?
 - Chugach can provide a contact list of CEA members impacted on this project after the project is awarded.
24. Can the Old ML&P pole yard be utilized as a staging/laydown area for the project?
 - CEA will be unable to lease that property for a staging/laydown yard. The contractor will need to reach out to property owners to secure any staging/laydown area for the project.
25. Will the contractor be required to cut and remove asphalt for the entire lane?
 - See Section 8.0 Pavement Replacement and Traffic Markings of the utility permit special provisions, specifically 8.1, 8.2, 8.8, 8.9, & 8.10.
26. Will enough Conduit/HDPE be provided by CEA to do the bores from end-to-end vs having to stop at bore pits midway to drop a pipe or pick up pipes?
 - Assuming this method of picking up bore pipe is minimal, there will be enough conduit to construct via this method.
27. Are contaminated soils anticipated to be encountered at any point within the project? If so what's the protocol for disposal?
 - See Section 3.0 Environmental of the utility permit special provisions.
28. What is the protocol for Dewatering vaults in contaminated areas?
 - Follow the SWPPP provided. Also, See Section 3.0 Environmental of the utility permit special provisions.
29. Clarify – The price for the “bore” line item is based on the provided footages and sizes for each bore. If the footages or number or pipes change, a recalculation of the bore price will be required.

- No. The BORE unit is not negotiable.
30. Due to the unpredictable nature of DOT traffic control requirements on recent projects, the contractor is unable to reliably determine the level of traffic control that will ultimately be required and enforced for this project based solely on past experience and consultation with traffic control specialists. Our clarification would be to work with CEA and DOT to get approved TCPs, zero out our traffic control unit and invoice CEA based on actual costs without markup.
- TRAFFIC CONTROL is a lump sum unit. See Section 5.0 Traffic Control of the utility permit special provisions for more details.

Accepted CEA exceptions:

1. We are needing to bid and complete this work linearly meaning DOT will need to allow us to take a lane closure and keep that throughout the duration not having to set up/stage equipment and material each day.
 - Accepted. In meetings, CEA & DOT&PF agreed to allow for multiple lane closures along Gambell Street. With the correct traffic control devices, lane closures can be in place for 24 hours per day – 7 days per week construction. See Section 5.0 Traffic Control of the utility permit special provisions for more details.