



City of Tacoma

Questions and Answers

Tacoma Municipal Building Exterior Preservation RFB Specification No. PW25-0098F

All interested parties had the opportunity to submit questions in writing by email to Carly Fowler, Senior Buyer by May 16, 2025. The answers to the questions received are provided below and posted to the City's website at www.TacomaPurchasing.org. Navigate to [Current Contracting Opportunities / Public Works and Improvements Solicitations](#), and then click [Questions and Answers](#) for this Specification. This information IS NOT considered an addendum. Respondents should consider this information when submitting their proposals.

Question 1: The base bid scope of work includes pointing of 50% of the façade, with a unit price for variations to this quantity. Please clarify the following: 1) Can a base bid quantity be established so that each bidder is bidding the same quantity? 2) Without an established base bid quantity, how will it be determined/agreed upon at what point the 50% is reached and additional unit price payment is required, or conversely a credit is to be issued?

Answer 1: Repointing is to occur only at cast stone and at 50% of the joints at the facades. The estimated square footage can be obtained from the facades and repointing is anticipated to be approximately 16,250 square feet between both facades and must be verified by the contractor in the field. Any repointing beyond the 50% threshold is to be reviewed and approved by the Owner/Owner's Representative for utilization of the unit price line item.

Question 2: For stone buildings with varying amounts of mortar joints per square foot of wall depending on location of the repair, quantification in lineal feet is more accurate and fair. Can the unit of measure for mortar joint repair be changed to lineal feet?

Answer 2: Given all repointing is to occur only at cast stone and units are typically similar in size, a contractor could approximate the quantity in linear feet if they like, but the review team is expecting to review bids on a square footage basis, and as such the square footage price must be provided.

Question 3: In the sample contract, paragraph VII, it states that the City at its sole discretion will determine payment methods, which could include credit card. Please clarify if a credit card will be utilized as payment for this work as there is a fee the Contractor would incur that we cannot be reimbursed for per this paragraph.

Answer 3: For contracts of this size, it is typical for the City to utilize Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) by Automated Clearing House (ACH) as the method of payment.

Question 4: Please confirm that Contractor's Quality Control role can be filled by the full time onsite Superintendent and does not have to be a separate person.



City of Tacoma

Questions and Answers

Answer 4: Yes, the Contractor's Quality Control role can be fulfilled by the fulltime superintendent on site.

Question 5: In the General Contractor/Masonry Contractor Qualification Submittal the requirement is 5 similar projects within last 5 years. In Section 040127 - Repoint with Cement-Lime Mortar, paragraph 1.6, A - For submittals we are required to submit five similar projects with last 10 years, not 5. Please clarify which criteria of length of experience will be required.

Answer 5: Specification section 04 01 27 has been amended to align with the Bid Proposal document section of the spec and as such the requirement of 5 years must be met.

Question 6: Section 040140.52 -Stone Cleaning, paragraph 2.1, C-K notes multiple different cleaners which vary in cost and application methods. Some are spot cleaners, however, there are several full scale overall cleaning materials listed. Please clarify which cleaning method contractor is to base their bid on, understanding that mockups will confirm method prior to cleaning operations and after initial full water washdown.

Answer 6: Based on limited cleaning trials, the two general cleaners that were found to be the most effective are listed in Specification 04 01 40.52 "Cast Stone Cleaning" Section 2.1.C. The remaining are for specialized cleaning where, after general cleaning, soiling/staining/etc. remain. It is estimated that specialized cleaning will need to occur on approximately 15 to 20 percent of the facades due to the type of soiling/staining such as copper stains, ferrous staining, remnant water repellent, etc.

Question 7: Please confirm for this project that Contractor is to supply to Owner at the end of the project usable molds for each cast stone type per Section 047200, paragraph 3.9, E.

Answer 7: The contractor shall provide the owner with the molds used during the course of the project, and the owner shall retain any of the molds that remain usable for future work. Unusable molds shall be returned to contractor for disposal. Contractor is not required to provide new molds for each type of stone cast at the end of the project.

Question 8: Section 079200 - Joint Sealants, paragraph 1.5, B requires stain testing for sealant per ASTM C1248. Please clarify the following: 1) If sealant manufacturer has past testing on cast stone, will this satisfy this requirement? 2) For the actual in-situ testing, please clarify what testing is required other than observation and how long the test panel is required to be in place before sealant installation can commence.

Answer 8: Per ASTM C1248, the sealant is allowed to cure for 21 days and is evaluated for 28 days after the cure time. More time for evaluation is better for plasticizer



Questions and Answers

migration and can be sequenced early in mobilization for observation well ahead of sealant work. We are open to reviewing additional manufacturer test data for cast stone but anticipate project specific testing will take place.

Question 9: The specifications state in several locations that ACM abatement is not anticipated on this project. However, the window perimeter sealant was found to contain asbestos. Although full window perimeter sealant replacement is not a requirement of this project, stone replacements/repairs are adjacent to this ACM material and require spot removal/replacement. Will this abatement work be considered a change order?

Answer 9: ACM sealant is located between the window frame and window jamb and is not anticipated to be impacted. Caulking between the window frame and stone seams was tested and found not to contain asbestos.

Specification section 01 22 00 has been amended to include the abatement of the sealant as a Unit Price item. In addition, the Bid Proposal pages have been amended accordingly.

Question 10: Section 01 11 10 Summary of Hazardous Materials, paragraph 1.4, B as well as 20 8300 Lead Related Activities, paragraph 1.1, A.2 states that all masonry mortar is to be considered to contain lead at varying degrees and be handled as such but the PBS hazard testing report in appendix D. Confirming that all mortar is to be treated at the higher levels.

Answer 10: Yes. All masonry mortar impacted by the project should be treated as lead containing. Proper work practices (dust control, HEPA vacuums, wet wiping, etc.) should be used when impacting masonry mortar. The standard practices used in minimizing silica dust exposure should meet these requirements and should be standard in the masonry removal best practices.

Question 11: At the stone removal and replacements at shelf angles it is required the existing angles are abraded for prep and coated. Because this is a buried condition, testing for lead based paint was not performed. Is Contractor to assume this paint is lead free and not include abatement?

Answer 11: Consider all painted coatings to contain lead unless specifically sampled and determined not to contain lead. Environmental Consultant will sample painted coatings discovered during construction and provide results to the Owner within 48 hrs. The existing angles have not been exposed for design team's review. Contractor should not assume paint is lead free. Please refer to General Note 25 for hazardous materials. Specification section 01 22 00 has been amended to include a Unit Price Item for LBP abatement.

Question 12: For Base Bid Lump Sum Cast Stone Unit Replacement - the scope of work on Sheet G002, Scope of Work, Item 1 states this item is to cover 3



Questions and Answers

conditions: 1) Salvaged, 2) Repaired, and 3) New. We are to assume that 75 stones are to be repaired or replaced. The cost differences between either repairing or replacing can be significant. Can separate quantities be provided for these conditions?

Answer 12: It is assumed that most of the 75 units will be new replacement units. The option for a repair is provided for flexibility if a location is observed that may not necessitate a full replacement. Please note that biscuit repairs (Detail 3 & 4/R500) and crack repair (Detail 5/R500) will not be allowed at hung units. The crack repair detail is provided to accompany the biscuit repair detail and is not a stand-alone detail. The current design team has not performed 100% close range assessment but is relying primarily on a previous consultant's assessment (See Repair Protocol on G001). The details provided are for potential use when the selected Contractor has performed the close-range review as required by the described "Repair Protocol" on sheet G001.

Question 13: For Base Bid Lump Sum Cast Stone Unit Replacement - the scope of work on Sheet G002, Scope of Work, Item 1 states this item is to cover removal and repairing of stones that will then be reinstalled. What repairs is the Contractor to assume will be required prior to reinstallation? Repairs could range from dutchman, crack repairs, patching, etc., which would vary in costs for each unit.

Answer 13: See answer to Question #12.

Question 14: Sheet R500 of the drawings shows Dutchman and 2 types of stone crack repairs in details 1, 3, and 5. No quantities are given for these repairs nor areas marked on the drawings. Also, no unit prices exist for quantity variations. Please clarify what quantities Contractor is to include in their base bid pricing for these items. Do these items only apply to stone pieces that are removed, repaired and reset?

Answer 14: See answer to Question #12.

Question 15: For unit price 13: Cast Stone Unit Replacement - the scope of work states this unit is to cover 3 conditions: 1) Salvaged, 2) Repaired, and 3) New. The cost differences between these types can be significant. Can separate unit prices be provided for these conditions?

Answer 15: See answer to Question #12.

Question 16: Detail 2A on R500 has a note that states " if 'J' hook is not salvageable, follow details 6/R501 or 7/R501 to install (N) anchorage at head joints." Because this is a buried condition that the Contractor cannot quantify prior to bid, can a quantity and unit price be established for this repair when needed?



City of Tacoma

Questions and Answers

Answer 16: The design team has also not seen this concealed condition. Specification section 01 22 00 has been amended to include a unit price item to cover “J” hook replacement.

Question 17: Detail 1A on R500 illustrates for the dutchman repair that anchors are to be installed into the upper stone at depth and width as stated in the sheet notes. Is the assumption that the contractor is to remove the above stone as well to access for drilling purposes?

Answer 17: The dutchman detail does not show anchoring into the adjacent unit. It shows that the dutchman piece is anchored into the parent stone along with the use of stone epoxy for bonding.

Question 18: Per the general notes on sheet G002 note 28, the existing helical pin locations where not tracked. What is the expectation of the Contractor to salvage stones that require repairs and the unforeseen additional costs of removing stones that have been pinned?

Answer 18: Pinned units were completed by a previous consultant to keep the unit on the building. As such, it is assumed that these units are part of the replacement quantity. As these areas were not tracked, the unit price line item for replacement units can be utilized if the assumed quantity is exceeded.

Question 19: Are there photographs of the spalls marked as incipient?

Answer 19: Refer to photograph 1 on sheet R600, which was intended to show the cast stone conditions at an angle, but also shows incipient spalls where the pieces appear to be detached but remain in place.

Question 20: Are there any historical specifications regarding previous waterproofing products used on this building?

Answer 20: The previously applied waterproofing is not known, but is believed to have been applied prior to 2007. The water proofing specified for this project has been presented to the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Tacoma and is not anticipated to significantly change the color or overall appearance of the cast stone.

Question 21: Are there available water spigots at the roof level that have enough water pressure for pressure washer usage?

Answer 21: The building has ground level water spigots which have sufficient pressure at street level. There is a custodial sink faucet at the 4th floor which can be used via the egress stair door to the 3rd floor roof. There is an additional water spigot on the 16th floor roof as well.

Question 22: What power is available at the roof level to power swing stages?



Questions and Answers

Answer 22: There is a 208v power outlet on the 12th floor in the electrical closet that was previously used for swing stage work on the south façade, and there are two 208v outlet on the 16th floor of the tower that were also previously used for swing stage work.

Question 23: What is the access and protection requirements at the neighboring building roofs for the alternate bid work?

Answer 23: The neighboring buildings to the south are privately owned and the contractor shall use necessary measures to prevent items from falling on or impacting the roof or facades of these neighboring buildings. Contractor shall not for any reason walk or enter onto the roof of the neighboring buildings.

Question 24: Please clarify what the warranty term length is for the mortar joint repairs and stone repairs (ie: Dutchman, crack repairs).

Answer 24: Refer to Specification 04 72 00 "Cast Stone Masonry" Section 1.9B. Refer to Question 12 regarding repair approaches.

Question 25: Confirming that unit prices on the bid form are not to include sales tax.

Answer 25: Do not include sales tax on any unit prices or bid alternates.

Question 26: Confirming in Alternate No. 1, that the sky facing sealant joints are only required on the joints that are shown on accompanying pages.

Answer 26: Correct, those are the anticipated typical locations of upward facing joints.

Question 27: Has an office location been identified for the contractor's on-site office during the project?

Answer 27: There are two potential contractor office locations, which were discussed during the pre-bid on-site walk through of the building. The first location is on the 16th floor of the building and has been previously used as a contractor office. The second location is in the Tacoma Municipal Building North. The final location will be determined at time of contracting in consultation with the awarded contractor of the project.

Question 28: Will the contractor be allowed to use on-site restrooms or must temporary facilities be provided by the contractor?

Answer 28: The City will designate restrooms in the building on various floors for contractor to use. This use will be allowed if the restrooms are not damaged by the contractor's use.



Questions and Answers

Question 29: Have any of the asphalt patches been removed from the building and if so, what does the stone condition behind the patch look like?

Answer 29: No, none of the asphalt patch material used on the building exterior has ever been removed. The surface condition of the stone under the asphalt patch is unknown. The asphalt patches were installed with Tapcon screws in 2021.

Question 30: Will the repointing work require hand tooling only?

Answer 30: The work will require a combination of hand and machine tooling to complete the work. Contractor shall follow the prescribed methods in the architectural plans and technical specifications.

Question 31: Is there a known quantity of helical pins that have been installed on the building?

Answer 31: The quantity of helical pin anchors installed in the façade stone of the building is unknown.

Question 32: Where are the staging locations for this work? Can any material be stored on the roof of the parking garage?

Answer 32: The street parking locations indicated on the site plan can be used for material storage, however, additional permitting and usage costs will apply and it shall be the contractors responsibility to apply for, obtain, and pay for any additional permit required and any fees associated with this usage. The contractor may utilize the roof of the parking garage for material storage, provide that maximum weight of materials stored does not exceed 30 pounds per square foot.

Question 33: Is there a depth measurement to the patches being removed, or is there a typical patch depth?

Answer 33: No, there is no typical patch depth associated with the project. Note that only deteriorated patches are to be removed. Intact and performing patches remain.

Question 34: The Unit price section lists steel angle replacement. Can you provide clarification on what is to be included in the requested linear foot number?

Answer 34: The steel angle replacement linear foot pricing is meant to be an installed price per linear foot which should include the provision of the steel angle material, and its installation including all labor costs to install it, listed as a cost per linear foot of angle installed without sales tax.



City of Tacoma

Questions and Answers

Question 35: will there be any chain anchoring/mounting of cast stone units?

Answer 35: No, different size J-hooks will be used for hung units. See detail 6 and 7 on sheet R501. Non-hung units are to be secured on the building with the use of strap anchors. See details 2, 2A, and 2B on sheet R500.

CITY OF TACOMA
Pre-Bid Meeting – Sign-in Sheet

Project: **Tacoma Municipal Building Exterior Preservation Project (PW25-0098F)**
 Date, Time: Thursday, May 15, 2025 at 9:00 a.m., at 747 Market Street Room 243
 Attendees: **(PLEASE PRINT)**

Name	Company:	Email:	Phone #
David Pagel, Project Manager	City of Tacoma, Public Works	dpagel@tacoma.gov	253-753-4889
AJ MOODY	D+R MASONRY	aj@drmasonry.com	5033531650
ROGER PETERSON	PIONEER MASONRY	roger@PioneerMasonry.com	206-549-5534
Louis Fox	Technical Waterproofing	Lfox@technicalh2o.com	206-619-0432
Jeffrey Elliott	western specialty	Jeff@westerngroup.com	253.250.7426
DATE HINDS	PETROCHEM INC	DATE.HINDS@PETROCHEMINC.COM	206-402-8184
MICKEY WILLIAMS	WESTERN SPECIALTY	mickeyw@westerngroup.com	206 314-737-8309
Craig Vialle	Realfine Painting	craig@realfinepainting.com	253-651-4908
DAVE KIMBLE	Pullman S&S	DKimble@Pullman-Services.com	425-479-7197
Chad Rife	Rife Masonry	chad@rifemasonry.com	206-646-6948
Stan Phair	JMS Masonry Restoration	stan@jmsmasonryrestoration.com	253-355-0637
Deborah Trevorrow	COT	dtrevorrow@tacoma.gov	253.316-3057
Becky Wong	WJE	bwong@wje.com	
Andrew Stanke	WJE	Astanke@wje.com	