

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

PPI#	Question Date	RFP Section/Page/Paragraph	Question	Government Response	Change RFP (Y/N)	Amend #
1	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Bid Drawings/S111	Please confirm what is the start Station of the soil improvement. Judging from the step of the treatment at Sta. 1+08 and that the step is 120ft from North edge of the treatment, -0+57 seems not correct	The 0-57 value is measured from the 0+00 station at the corner of the existing wharf along the face of Wharf Tango.	N	
2	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Bid Drawings/Sxxx series	The soil improvement is shown as 50ft or 40ft wide starting against the existing sheet piles (refer also to vertical cross sections on S301). On S112 and following drawings, at Sta. 5+09 the width of the improvement is reduced to 29'-5" ending well away from the existing sheet piles. Considering that the that the scope of the soil improvement is to meet current site seismic requirement, can you please confirm the reduction of soil treatment to 29'-5" is what the Government wants?	The 29'-5" dimension is measured to the back face of the pipe trench. Revised dimensions to show extents to the back face of the existing sheet pile wall will be provided during next revision.	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
3	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Bid Drawings/Sxxx series	For design purposes, the spacing between existing tie-rods can be assumed as 8.5ft as scaled from the drawing?	Refer to Note 1 found on Sheet S301. Existing tie-rods are approximately 8'-10" on center based on record drawings. Contractor must confirm actual locations and spacing in the field.	N	
4	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Bid Drawings/Sxxx series	Please confirm that the existing Utility/Fuel Trench cannot be temporarily removed	Temporary removal of the Utility/Fuel Trench has not been included as part of this Contract. Re-use of existing reinforced concrete trench will not be allowed, new will be required. If Contractor chooses to perform this operation as part of their means and methods, then Contractor shall be responsible for restoration of the trench and its contents to existing conditions per Government Unified Facilities Criteria requirements.	N	
5	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Bid Drawings/S302	Please confirm that the typical section A3 found on this drawing applies south of Sta. 5+09 (i.e., Phase 2)	That is correct.	N	
6	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Bid Drawings/S302	It is our understanding that the inclined Grout Soil Anchor shown in this drawing is not present North of Sta. 5+09 (i.e., Phase 1): is it correct?	Per record drawings, grouted soil anchors are not indicated in the Phase 1 area.	N	
7	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Bid Drawings/S113-115	Please confirm that ALL dashed lines perpendicular to the sheet piles are existing tie-rods (either 1942 or 1994)	The phantom lines shown (two short dashes followed by a long dash) are either existing 1942 tie-rods and/or 1994 soil anchors depending on location. Refer to record drawings.	N	
8	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/As-Built Drawings/S-2	Please confirm that the two pipelines at approx. Sta. 7+00 are still existing	Refer to Existing Condition Note 1 found on Sheet S001 of the Structural Repair Drawings.	N	
9	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/As-Built Drawings/S-4	Please confirm that the two pipelines at approx. Sta. 8+00 are still existing	Refer to Existing Condition Note 1 found on Sheet S001 of the Structural Repair Drawings.	N	
10	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/As-Built Drawings/S-6	Please confirm that the three pipelines at approx. Sta. 10+20, 10+40 and 10+60 are still existing	Refer to Existing Condition Note 1 found on Sheet S001 of the Structural Repair Drawings.	N	
11	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00, page 1	In consideration of the numerous made-made "obstructions" (tie-rods, soil anchors, pipelines, abandoned sheet piles, fuel trench - especially south of Sta. 5+09) please clarify if any other soil-improvement method alternate to soil mixing is acceptable	Other methods of improvement may be considered if they meet contract requirements. Refer to additional information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016	N	
12	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00, page 5/1.5.1.2.f	Please clarify the requirement of measuring continuously and in real time the cement grout's specific gravity. In our experience the SG is measured by a Field Engineer at the batch plant usually twice per shift or at any change of mix	Quality control measures must demonstrate that soil repairs meet contract requirements. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016	N	
13	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00, page 8/2.2.1	The specification mentions "...previously installed and hardened soil-cement..." of which we can't find reference in the Geotechnical Report; please clarify where soil mixing was previously performed	"previously installed and hardened soil-cement" means adjacent columns installed under this contract. Refer to Specification 31 62 00, page 10/3.1 third paragraph from top of page.	N	
14	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00, page 9/2.2.3	Again, in our experience the SG is measured by a Field Engineer at the batch plant usually twice per shift or at any change of mix without any detriment to the quality of the soil mixing performed	Quality control measures must demonstrate that soil repairs meet contract requirements. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016	N	
15	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00, page 9/2.2.5	Please confirm that the inline mass flow meter is not a mandatory requirement. We typically work for the Government without it which is particularly true when working with relatively high pressures	Required Quality control measures must demonstrate that soil repairs meet contract requirements. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016	N	
16	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00, page 9/3.1	The specification refers to "...dense crust..." of which we can't find reference in the Geotechnical Report; please clarify	Crust is not mentioned in the Geotechnical Report. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016	N	

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

PPI#	Question Date	RFP Section/Page/Paragraph	Question	Government Response	Change RFP (Y/N)	Amend #
17	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00, page 11/3.2	Please clarify where the test area is indicated in the drawings	Test location(s) will be identified in final design drawings. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
18	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00, page 11/3.2	Please clarify if for the test it is required a minimum number of soil-mixing columns	Quantity of test columns will be indicated in final design drawings. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
19	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00, page 12/3.3.2.a	The specification requires the Contractor to remove an obstruction that prevents the completion of the soil improvement. Considering that in the area of the soil improvement there are tie-rods, soil anchors, pipelines, abandoned sheet piles, etc., please define "obstruction"	Existing backland objects such as tie-rods, grouted soil anchors, and active anchor walls shall be protected from damage. The Government will review and determine what other manmade buried objects may require removal and replacement.	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
20	20-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00, page 12/3.4.1.1	We respectfully suggest to consider alternate ways to control the quality of the soil improvement to the wet grab that is time-consuming and expensive	Required Quality control measures must demonstrate that soil repairs meet contract requirements. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016	N	
21	20-Apr-16	Spec.01 58.00.00.25, Para 1.3	Please indicate where the project sign will be located.			
22	20-Apr-16	General	GTMO contractors have utilized Jamaican vessels for delivery of materials such as gravel, sand and fill materials. Please verify that contractor will be permitted to utilize this foreign vessel for this contract.			
23	20-Apr-16	General	Who is providing the CxA for this project? Specs are not clear who is responsible.			
24	20-Apr-16	General	In the past, contractors have obtained fill & bedding materials from goldhill burrow pit. Please confirm that fill materials/bedding materials can still be obtained from this area for this contract.			
25	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 03 01 32, Para 3.2.3 & 2.2.4	Impacting tools are permitted, but the only impacting tool listed is hand held breakers. Hand-held breakers are limited to 30 lbs. and 15 lbs. depending on location of concrete. Please confirm contractor is permitted to use other impact tools, such as those mounted to heavy equipment to perform the demolition.	Larger impact tools may be used in locations where they will not cause damage to structures that are to remain in place.	N	
26	20-Apr-16	General	The Government has a concrete batch plant and testing laboratory under contract. For bidding purposes, are we to assume this concrete batch plant & testing laboratory meet the requirements of this contract?			
27	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 03 31 29, Para 1.6.1	Contract requires extensive requirements for the QC personnel needed for the concrete requirements. These will be very expensive due to the remote nature of GTMO. Examples are requiring the CQC personnel to have a professional engineer. Consider reviewing these requirements and reducing.	There will be no change in CQC requirements.	N	
28	25-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Specification 00202.E.3.(b)/page 11 of 48	(1) Construction Experience seems to call for experience in soil stabilization by deep soil mixing, not necessarily related to repair of wharf and pier structures. Please confirm	At least one relevant project must include soil stabilization by deep soil mixing.	N	
29	25-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Specification 00202.E.3.(b)/page 11 of 48	DEFINITION OF A RELEVANT PROJECT seems to call for experience in soil stabilization by deep soil mixing, not necessarily related to repair of wharf and pier structures. Please confirm	Refer to answer to PPI 28	N	
30	25-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Specification 00202.E.3.(b)/page 11 of 48	The way we are interpreting DEFINITION OF A RELEVANT PROJECT, if the Bidder is a Joint Venture it would be acceptable if, for instance, one of the Partners can demonstrate experience in renovation or new construction of a pier or wharf in mandatory feature (i) or (ii) only while another has the experience in soil mixing but not in renovation or new construction of a pier or wharf. Similarly, in another example, it would be acceptable if the General Contractor can demonstrate experience in renovation or new construction of a pier or wharf in mandatory feature (i) or (ii) only while its proposed Subcontractor has the experience in soil mixing but not in renovation or new construction of a pier or wharf.	Refer to answer to PPI 28. The subcontractor providing the deep soil mixing is not required to have experience in wharf repairs, but should show experience in soil stabilization within a wharf repair or construction project.	N	

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

PPI#	Question Date	RFP Section/Page/Paragraph	Question	Government Response	Change RFP (Y/N)	Amend #
31	4-May-16	RFP Front End - Page 8 of 48	The project completion date is indicated as 880 days from award which is broken into two Phases, each with 440 calendar days. Please consider revising the time to complete Phase 1 to 560 days and Phase 2 to 320 days as our initial schedule indicates that Phase 1 will take significantly longer due to the time it will take for submittals, materials procurement, mobilization and the added scope of work which is in Phase 1 vs. Phase 2.	The Government is amenable to providing an amendment to alter the time allotted to the two Phases which is in line with the construction schedule provided by the successful contractor.	N	
32	4-May-16	RFP Front End - Page 25 of 48	Reference is made to FAR 252.247-7022, Representations of Extent of Transportation by Sea. Please advise us if the restriction to use only U. S. Flag vessels or barges to perform work or deliver materials to Guantanamo Bay applies or advise us if foreign flag vessels may be used.			
33	4-May-16	RFP Front End - Page 31 of 48	FAR 52.225-9, Buy American is incorporated into the solicitation. Please advise us if stone, sand and cement to be used in producing the concrete for the project may be purchased from foreign sources or if only U. S. sources may be used.	This clause applies to contracts for construction that is performed in the United States valued at less than \$7,443,000. Since this clause is not applicable to this solicitation, it will be removed via amendment 0002.	Y	0002
34	4-May-16	Front end documents, page 14 of 48	Under Factor 3 - Technical Approach, the top of page 14 lists items that the offeror is to include in his technical approach. One of the bullets is, "The Offeror's plan for mobilization/demobilization, operation and quality control of a concrete batch plant." There appear to be three (3) batch plants on base already which could provide concrete for this project. Please confirm that the bidder may use one of the existing ready-mix sources on base and will not be required to provide an independent batch plant of their own unless they choose to do so.			
35	4-May-16	Drwg. C300	Utility Note 1 depicts removal of a temporary plug and extending the RCP pipe. There appears to be a missing detail reference. Please clarify.	See details 1 and 2 on detail Sheet C502	N	
36	4-May-16	Drwg. S301	Note 1 indicates that the contractor is to verify the location and depth of the existing sheet pile wall deadman and anchor rods. While verifying the depth of the rods is achievable, Drwgs. S111 - S115 would indicate that the existing anchors are beyond the limits of demolition. The specifications have details on procedures for locating utilities but we could not find a reference to procedures for locating the anchor rod elevations or determining deadman locations. Please clarify.	Methods of locating existing sheet pile wall deadman and anchor rods are the Contractor's responsibility.	N	
37	4-May-16	Section 01 14 00.00 25	Paragraph 1.2.a, indicates that Pier Charlie must be ready for operation before work can commence on Wharf Bravo. Please advise us what impact this might have on the construction schedule.			
38	4-May-16	S002, Cathodic Protection Notes	The Notes on Sheet S002 indicate that anodes are to be placed on every pair of existing and new steel sheetpiles. Please confirm that in addition to the anodes to be installed on the new sheetpile, there will be approximately 209 additional anodes to be installed on the existing sheetpile.	Additional anodes are to be installed on the southern portion (phase 2 area). Actual quantity to be determined by Contractor.	N	
39	4-May-16	Section 03 01 32 par. 1.4.1.b and c	Air contents for both mortars and grouts are reported to be 5 +/- 1.5%. While this range is normal, grouts and mortars typically do not contain air entrainment as there is no concern for freeze thaw protection for these type of mixes. Please revise the specification so that these mixes only require entrapped air contents.	Specification will be revised such that a minimum air content is not a requirement.	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
40	4-May-16	Section 03 01 32 par. 1.4.1.b and c	The specification requires slumps for grouts to be 2" maximum if no HRWR and 4" with HRWR. Grouts and Mortars are typically placed at slumps of 4 to 6" using a base water reducer. Using HRWR at such low slumps can cause rapid slump loss since the HRWR would need to be dosed at low doses, or dosed on such a low slump as to be ineffective. Please revise the slump range to 4-6".	Comply with specification as written.	N	
41	4-May-16	Section 03 31 29, par. 1.7.4.2 a, and 3.8.4.1	The specification states in part that the strength cannot exceed the design strength by more than 20%. This is not a reasonable requirement in that the overdesign itself, as required by ACI 301, will increase the target strength to more than 20% higher than the design strength (f'c = 4000 psi, f'cr = 5200 psi). The required w/cm in this case (0.39) is likely to push the resulting compressive strength much higher as well, possibly over 7000 psi at 28 days. Please consider eliminating the upward strength limit.	Specification will be revised to reflect that concrete 28-day strength will match minimum required strength values.	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

PPI#	Question Date	RFP Section/Page/Paragraph	Question	Government Response	Change RFP (Y/N)	Amend #
42	4-May-16	Section 03 31 29, par. 1.7.4.2.a 6b and 3.8.4.3	This specification section is similar to sections in 1.7.4.2a and 3.8.4.1 except that these two sections cover cores. The same premise follows in regards to maximum strength.	Specification will be revised to reflect that concrete 28-day strength will match minimum required strength values.	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
43	4-May-16	Section 03 31 29, par. 1.7.2, table 1	The specification requires that the concrete mixture be tested for acid soluble chloride content and have a result of less than 0.6% by weight of cement however section 1.7.4.2 b indicates testing by water soluble chloride content. ACI 301 requires testing via water soluble method as the acid soluble method has been known to report not only free chloride ions but bound chloride ions as well. Please indicate which method is to be used.			
44	4-May-16	Section 03 31 29, par. 1.7.2	The specification indicates that this test should be reported as percent by weight of cement. Mixes for this project may result in high replacement levels of slag, or fly ash to combat potential ASR. It is recommended that the chloride threshold be reported by weight of cementitious and not by weight of cement.			
45	4-May-16	Section 03 31 29, par. 1.7.4	The specification indicates the method of testing air content of concrete but no indication of air requirement was found. Since there is no risk of freeze thaw environments, it is recommended that entrapped air be specified with no testing required.			
46	4-May-16	Section 03 31 29, par. 1.7.4 a 6	Underwater concrete requires testing by placing concrete in a 5 gallon bucket and then coring at specified ages. While this method may indicate the concrete strength as placed in a bucket it does not represent concrete as produced for placement. It is recommended that concrete be tested in standard cylinders and if desired the underwater concrete be cored in place to determine the concrete strength in place.	This refers to the durability of the concrete. Refer to Specification 03 31 29 para 3.8 for appropriate final strength testing requirements.	N	
47	4-May-16	Section 03 31 29, par. 1.8.3.1	The specification requires aggregate sampling for gradation and unit weight for every 100 tons delivered. This will result in every fourth truck delivered to the site being tested. Depending on the activity, this could mean numerous samples in the same day. It is recommended that the sampling and testing protocol should be monthly as opposed to a fixed delivery schedule.	It appears the comment is directed at 1.8.3.1c. Specification to remain unchanged.	N	
48	4-May-16	Section 03 31 29, par. 2.2	The specification requires a combined grading of 8-18 retained on each sieve when proportioning the mixture including the 1" sieve while the maximum size allowed for this project is ¾" according to section 033129 1.7.1. This method has been shown to be effective in only limited situations regarding shrinkage, cementitious reduction and or bleeding. It can also be hard to accomplish in some batch plants with a limited amount of overhead bins when numerous aggregates are required to meet the requirement as well as increasing cost to the owner with little results. It is suggested that this section be waived.			
49	4-May-16	Section 03 31 29, par. 2.2c	The specification requires that the result of C-1260 or C-1567 testing be less than 0.08 at 30 days which is less than the required expansion of the test at double the time. This will produce a higher amount of false positives on the test and could eliminate good aggregates from use. Please indicate if the standard threshold and time from the ASTM test method will be used for aggregates on this project.			
50	4-May-16	Drwg. S505 Det. C3	This detail indicates that the MC18 X 51.9 wale beams are required to be field welded to the sheetpile on both the top and bottom of the wale beams. Please confirm that the entire 409 WF of sheetpile must be continuously welded to the wale beam where it comes into contact with the sheetpile face.	Detail will be revised. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
51	4-May-16	Drwg. S505 Det. C3	This detail indicates that the MC18 X 51.9 wale beams are required to be field welded to the sheetpile on both the top and bottom of the wale beams. Given the elevation of the wale, this will require underwater welding. There is no specification referenced for underwater welding. We suggest including a reference to AWS D3.6M:2010 in the specifications to address this.	Detail will be revised. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
52	4-May-16	General	During the site visit, it was observed that there were floating rubber fenders tied up or chained to the wharf. Will these fenders be removed by the Govt. or will they be the contractor's responsibility?			

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

PPI#	Question Date	RFP Section/Page/Paragraph	Question	Government Response	Change RFP (Y/N)	Amend #
53	4-May-16	S301 Det. A3	This detail indicates that the dimension between the existing pile cap and the outside face of the new cap is to be 7' 8" (sheetpile line = 5' 2" offset) leaving a space between the inside face of the new concrete cap and the existing concrete of 26". It was observed during the site visit that the existing bulkhead line is not straight. In particular, there were bulges observed in the vicinity of Sta -0+30 and Sta 0+50 (stationing taken from drwg. SD101). These bulges will create significant challenges to forming the backside of the new cap in these areas. Will the new bulkhead line be established by taken that 5' 2" dimension from the point on the bulkhead which extends furthest seaward? If so, how will the contractor be compensated for the quantity of gravel fill and flowable fill which is used to fill the annulus as shown on Drwg. S301? If not, will the contractor be given a change order in the event a section of the existing sheetpile wall and cap needs to be removed in order to accommodate the forms for the new cap?			
54	4-May-16	26 42 13.00 20	Reference is made in the specification to anode lead wires, junction boxes, bonding boxes and test stations. Please confirm that the cathodic protection system consists of only sacrificial anodes and none of these materials are required or consider revising the specification to delete the references.	Drawings and specifications to be revised. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016.	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
55	4-May-16	26 42 13.00 20	Reference is made to employing the services of a Corrosion Engineer. We are unclear what services the corrosion engineer can provide given that the anodes are all to be installed underwater. Please consider deleting this reference and inserting a narrative that the contractor should have a quality control plan to verify the installation of all anodes and test the continuity. This could be accomplished by underwater video inspection and taping.			
56	4-May-16	26 42 13.00 20	Reference is made in this section to a one year warranty. Given that the contractor is installing a sacrificial anode system which has been designed by others, what will the contractor be warranting?			
57	4-May-16	26 42 13.00 20	Reference is made in this section to field testing after one year of service. Are we to assume that we will have to verify electrical continuity between all sheets as well as the sheetpile / anode connections one year after completion of the project?			
58	4-May-16	Drwg. S002 Det. A3	This detail shows continuity welds which are to be made between each individual sheetpile. Please advise us of the weld length and fillet size needed. Please also confirm that it is acceptable to make these welds at the top of the sheet elevation.	Drawings and specifications to be revised. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016.	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
59	4-May-16	Drwg. S002, Concrete repair notes	Note 6 on this sheet indicates that the contractor is to replace all reinforcing steel with a 20% or greater cross section loss. It also stipulates that mechanical splices are to be used. Please advise us of what quantity of reinforcing we should use for bidding purposes. Please also consider allowing welded splices to be used. There may be multiple locations where a mechanical splice cannot be used due to the location of the bar.			
60	4-May-16	Drwg. S302, Section B2	Please confirm that there are nine (9) pin piles to be installed as indicated on Drwg. S111.	Currently, there are nine (9) pin piles shown on DWG S111.	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
61	4-May-16	Drwg. S012, Table	Please confirm that there are only two (2) repairs which will require work to be done underwater.			
62	26-Apr-16	Note 2, Plan Sheet G003	Please provide the Contractors Laydown area.			
63	26-Apr-16	N/A	Please provide the proposed location for the Construction Man Camp along with the utility points of connection.			
64	26-Apr-16	N/A	Will the government consider moving 100 days from Phase I into Phase II? This will allow for the needed upfront time to process the submittals for the sheet piles, soil mixing, mobilization of the man camp, and the procurement and shipping of the equipment and materials needed for the project.			

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

PPI#	Question Date	RFP Section/Page/Paragraph	Question	Government Response	Change RFP (Y/N)	Amend #
65	26-Apr-16	N/A	Will access be needed to Buildings 755, 717, & 260 from the Wharf Bravo side during the phase construction work?			
66	27-Apr-16	Drwg. S001, Notes	Under the section for Steel, Tie-back anchor rods are specified as being made from ASTM A615, Grade 75, Continuous Thread. Please consider removing the continuous threaded requirement as the tie-back anchors only need to be threaded at the ends.			
67	27-Apr-16	Drwg. S001, Steel Notes & S505, Detail B2	Under the notes for steel, Anchor rods w/ nut and washer are listed with the material specified as ASTM F1554, Grade 36. Please verify that this is referring to the Fitting Rods & Nuts shown on Drwg. S505, detail B2. If so, this would refer to low carbon, 36 ksi steel. Please confirm. If this is not the intent, please clarify what specification applies to the anchor rods show on S505, detail B2.			
68	27-Apr-16	Specification 05 12 00, Structural Steel, par. 2.3.1 Common Grade Bolts	Under subparagraph 2.3.3, Foundation Anchors, 2.3.3.1 shows anchor rods as being made of ASTM F1554, Grade 36, Class 1A, Stainless Steel ASTM A193/A193M.. Please advise where this might be applicable.			
69	27-Apr-16	Drwg. S001, Detail 1, Typ. P.I. Embed	The detail shows the threaded rods to be used to anchor the Arch Fenders on Drwg. S506, Detail C3. The table appears to be missing all values.	Drawings and specifications to be revised. Refer to information found in Amendment 0001 Dated 4/19/2016.	Y but will be accounted for in the revised drawings which will be provided in a future amendment	TBD
70	4-May-16	Drwg. S401 + S504, Detail B3	The new sheetpile wall tie-in at the South end shows the new sheets being attached to the existing sheets in two places with a 6" x 6" bent plate on one side and a 6" x 14" ± plate on the other. The detail indicates that the plates are to be welded continuously in place. We are unclear on the length of these bent plate. Do they extend from the top of the sheets down to the mudline and are welded in place to the existing sheets continuously for that entire length? Additionally, it will be necessary to demolish the concrete on the existing sheetpile to attach the bent plates to the existing sheetpile to attach the bent plates to the existing sheets. Is this correct?			
71	4-May-16	Drwg. S401, Detail C1 + Drwg. S504, Detail B2	The new sheetpile wall tie-in at the North end shows the new sheets being attached to the existing sheets with a 6" x 6" bent plate. The detail indicates that the plates are to be welded continuously in place. We are unclear on the length of these bent plate. Do they extend from the top of the sheets down to the mudline and are welded in place to the existing sheets continuously for that entire length? Additionally, it will be necessary to demolish the concrete on the existing sheetpile to attach the bent plates to the existing sheets. There will be no room for a diver to fit in between the existing concrete cap and the new sheetpile in order to place the field weld shown on the furthest right side of the Detail B2. Additionally, there appears to be a splice plate shown on the end of the wale beam. We are unclear what this plate attaches to. Won't the end and corner shown be encased in concrete down to el. -3.0' as indicated in section C2 on Sheet S504?			
72	27-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Specification 00202.1.B.2/page 7 of 48	The solicitation is defined as Design-Bid-Build so, for instance, we assume that the design of the soil stabilization is up to the Contractor even if, for instance, Specification 31 62 00, 3.4.3 requires a UCS of 105PSI at 28 days for the soil/cement mix. Please confirm that the design is up to the Contractor			
73	28-Apr-16	N6945016R1607/Specification 00202.1.B.2/page 7 of 48	The solicitation is defined as Design-Bid-Build so if the design of the soil stabilization is up to the Contractor, the PE who signs and stamps must be licensed in Florida or any other US State would be acceptable?			