



DR4692 Post Site Visit Questions and Response

A Mandatory Site visit was held on 9/15/2026 at 13:30, various questions were raised at that time. This is the official response to those questions:

Question	Response
Does Davis Bacon apply to the project?	Yes. <u>Prevailing Wage</u> applies
Are/Will Pain Colors be available for bidding purposes	Paint color has not been selected although pain supply preference is "PBG – Scotchgard"
Tish Non Square Footage	1 st floor = 17,773, 2 nd floor = 11923
Tish Non - Will contractor be responsible for removal and replacement of wall items such as paintings/art	Yes, the contractor is responsible for removing and replacement of all wall hanging materials
Tish Non – are offices included in the project or is the project limited to the common areas	The project is limited to the common areas, no offices have been included.
WTF - More information on official engineering report for CMU walls.	See below:

Engineers Report – WTF:

Structural Comments: Water treatment facility is a one-story building with Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) walls and wood roof trusses with plywood as the roof diaphragm. During the visual inspection of the building, we noted vertical cracking in the CMU walls and cracking in the roof trusses. CMU cracking appeared minimal and non-detrimental to the overall strength of the structure, assuming CMU is reinforced. Cracking in roof trusses was also minimal except in one spot. Picture 1 of attachment 1 shows a cracked top chord member. The cracking is significant enough to limit the overall strength of the truss and requires repair. For the repair, we recommend sistering with a member of the same size and connecting the sistered member based on a detail by a licensed engineer.

Structures with heavy walls and light framed roofs, such as the water treatment facility, are required to have out-of-plane anchorage and diaphragm support to prevent separation of the roof and wall during a seismic event. During our visual inspection, I was not able to positively identify out-of-plane anchorage, continuous support members or a sub-diaphragm. I recommend a licensed Engineer review the existing structural plans and determine if the existing configuration is adequate or to design a retrofit. Pictures 2 and 3 of Attachment 1 show the wall to roof connection for the end wall and where the trusses bear on the wall.

Conclusion

Based on my visual inspection of the damaged areas listed above, the buildings are not detrimentally damaged to reduce their capacity to resist further seismic demand. The roof truss repair in item 8 is the only structurally significant repair item identified; however, roof loading is based on intermittent loading of the roof (usually for roofing or repair of roof mounted equipment). No work is to be performed on the roof until repair is made. Check for crack lengthening or worsening conditions after any wind or seismic events.





