Pre Proposal Inquiry (PPI) LOG

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	N/A
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.	0004
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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.	0004

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 #
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.	0004
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.	0004
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	N/A
21	20-Apr-16	Spec 01 58 00.00 25, Para 1.3	Please indicate where the project sign will be located.	Project sign is usually located just outside the construction fencing and the exact location is coordinated with the contracting officer.	N	N/A
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.	Refer to answer to PPI 89 and 90.	N	N/A
23	20-Apr-16	General	Who is providing the CxA for this project? Specs are not clear who is responsible.	No CxA required. Refer to answer to PPI # 85.	N	N/A
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.	The Government cannot guarantee the GoldHill Borrow pit can provide materials to the specifications of this contract.	N	N/A
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	N/A
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?	No	N	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A

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	19-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	N/A
32	19-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.	FAR 252.247-7023 states that the contractor shall use U.S. flag vessels when transporting any supplies by sea under this contract. If the contractor intends to deliver materials to Guantanamo Bay, then U.S. Flag vessels shall be used. The only time that a foreign flag vessel would be used is if the contractor or a subcontractor believes that (1) U.S. flag vessels are not available for timely shipment (2) The freight charges are inordinately excessive or unreasonable; or (3) Freight charges are higher than charges to private persons for transportation of like goods.	N	N/A
33	19-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 of 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	19-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.	The Government cannot guarantee an existing concrete batch plant can provide concrete to the specifications of this contract. Contractor to provide batch plant dedicated to this project.	N	N/A
35	19-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	N/A
36	19-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	N/A
37	19-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.	Pier Charlie is anticipated to be complete prior to construction start for this project, so no impact is anticipated	N	N/A
38	19-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	N/A
39	19-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.	0004

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 #
40	19-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	N/A
41	19-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.	0004
42	19-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.	0004
43	19-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.	the 0.60% soluble chloride content refer to in Par 1.7.2 Table 1 is for prestressed concrete. Cannot locate a reference to water soluble content in section 1.7.4.2 b.	N	N/A
44	19-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.	Table 1 refers to ASTM C1152 requires calculation be reported in percent of cement content.	N	N/A
45	19-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.	As indicated in para 1.7.4.1a, refer to ACI 301 for exposure to determine required air content.	N	N/A
46	19-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	N/A
47	19-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	N/A
48	19-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.	Per para 2.2, the 18-8 may be waived for certain conditions stated in the paragraph.	N	N/A

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 #
49	19-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.	The 0.08 percent level and extended time(28 days) found in the specification is more stringent than the standard 0.10 percent value and 14 day time. No changes will be made to these requirements.	N	N/A
50	19-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 accounted for in the revised drawings issued with amendment 0004	0004
51	19-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 accounted for in the revised drawings issued with amendment 0004	0004
52	19-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?	Contractor's Responsibility. See Note 2 of Structural Demolition Notes on S001.	N	N/A
53	19-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?	The distance between the back face of the new pile cap and the existing wharf face does vary along the length of the project. Requirement of the project is to provide a consistent berthing face. Detail will be revised to show that variation exists between new pile cap face and existing pile cap face.	Y. In drawings that are already being revised.	0004
54	19-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.	0004
55	19-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.	Refer to para 1.3 regarding what services the Corrosion Engineer is to provide.	N	N/A
56	19-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?	The one year warranty requirement will be removed from the contract.	Y	0004
57	19-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?	Due to the remote nature of the project, Government is considering revising post installation testing requirements.	Y	0004

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 #
58	19-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.	0004
59	19-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.	Existing reinforcement in the repair areas is epoxy coated. Welding will be provided as an option but Contractor will be required to completely remove existing epoxy coating for any welded splice.	Y	0004
60	19-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.	0004
61	19-May-16	Drwg. S012, Table	Please confirm that there are only two (2) repairs which will require work to be done underwater.	Two underwater repairs are identified in the Contract drawings.	N	N/A
62	26-Apr-16	Note 2, Plan Sheet G003	Please provide the Contractors Laydown area.	Contractor laydown area will be near recycling area. Actual location of the storage area will be determined after award thru the Base Site Approval process.	N	N/A
63	26-Apr-16	N/A	Please provide the proposed location for the Construction Man Camp along with the utility points of connection.	Refer to answer to PPI 75	N	N/A
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.	Refer to answer to PPI 31.	N	N/A
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?	Yes	N	N/A
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.	Will be considered.	Y	0004
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.	Anchor rods shown in detail B2/S505 are ASTM A449 threaded rods. Material specification will be updated to reflect this change.	Y	0004
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.	Stainless Steel will be utilized for foundation bolts/rods for fendering and connections supporting electrical/mechanical equipment.	Y	0004
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.	0004
70	19-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 sheets. Is this correct?	Additional information will be provided in next revision.	Y	0004

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 #
71	19-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?	Additional information will be provided in next revision.	Y	0004
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	Contractor will be responsible for design of soil stabilization. Specification will be revised with minimum requirements.	Y	0004
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?	Any state is acceptable.	N	N/A
74	20-Apr-16	Spec Sect. 00 73 01.00 25, Para 1.3.1.5	Regular work hours is defined as 0730 to 1630 Monday through Friday. We would ask that Saturday, 0730 to 1630 be included as a regular work day.	It is acceptable to include Saturday 0730 to 1630 in the schedule as a regular work day for the contractor.	N	N/A
75	20-Apr-16	Spec Sect. 00 73 01.00 25, Para 1.3.20.1	Contractors is to provide man camps for its work force. Please provide details on where this man camp will be located. Are utilities local to the area. Provide utility map for the area.	Man camp will be located on Corinaso Point. Actual Man camp location will be determined after award thru the Base Site Approval process. Utilities will be available locally to the mancamp site.	N	N/A
76	20-Apr-16	Spec Sect 00 73 01.00 25, Para 1.3.20.3	Referenced paragraph conflicts with paragraph 1.3.20.1. Will contractor be required to provide a mancamp for its work force or will the Government be providing ESBFs?	Yes, the contractor is required to provide a mancamp, but we understand that a contractor will need temporary lodging to establish their berthing so ESBFs were included in the SPECs to help in the process. ESBFs are not intended to be long-term (project duration) accommodations.	N	N/A
77	20-Apr-16	Spec Sect 01 11 00.00 25, Para 1.5	Does the Government anticipate salvaging any materials for your use?	NO	N	N/A
78	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 01 14 00.00 25, Para 1.2	Specs require Pier Charlie to be in operation prior to starting Wharf Bravo project. When is the anticipated date for Pier Charlie to enter operation?	Pier Charlie is anticipated to be complete prior to start of construction activities.	N	N/A
79	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 01 14 00.00 25, Para 1.3.1.2 (a)	Please confirm that RapidGate is available for GTMO.	NA, Spec Edited.	Y	0004
80	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 01 14 00.00 25, Para 1.3.2	The working hours here conflicts with working hours in spec section 00 73 01.00 25, para 1.3.1.5. Please confirm the working hours. Recommend Monday through Saturday, 10 hour days.	It is acceptable to propose normal working hours of Monday thru Saturday, 10 hour days.	N	N/A
81	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 01 30 00.00 25, Para 1.8	Due to the remote nature of GTMO, can attendees attend the preconstruction meeting via teleconference?	Yes, it is acceptable for attendees to attend the preconstruction meeting via teleconference.	N	N/A
82	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 01 32 16.00 25, Para 1.3.1.1	Schedule settings specified require setting time periods for a standard 40 hour week. Please confirm the schedule settings can be changed to match the actual work hours permitted in other spec sections.	The schedule must reflect actual working days/hours.	N	N/A
83	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 01 32 16.00 25 & section 01 32 17.00 25	Two different scheduling section have been provided. Which one is applicable to this project?	Deleted Section 01 32 16.00 25. The applicable section is 01 32 17.00 25	Y	0004
84	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 01 33 00, Para 1.8 (e)	RFP allows 15 working days for QC Manager approval and 20 working days for Contracting Officer approval of submittals. Is working days defined as Monday through Saturday or just Monday through Friday?	No, a government working day is defined as Monday through Friday as it relates to time allowed for Government actions.	N	N/A

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 #
85	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 01 45 00.00 25	Specs make reference to commissioning. Is commissioning required for this contract?	No. Edited Spec to remove references to commissioning.	Y	0004
86	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 01 50 00.00 25, Para 3.5.3	Please indicate where the storage area will be for this contract?	Contractor laydown area will be near recycling area. Actual location of the storage area will be determined after award thru the Base Site Approval process.	N	N/A
87	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 01 50 00.00 25, Para 3.5.2	Please indicate where the administrative field office will be located for this contract? Are local utilities available for power/telephone/internet? If this office is not deemed necessary by the contractor, is it still required?	A field office is required per this project and can be adjacent to the laydown area or the construction site depending on contractor preference. A point of connection for utilities will be provided.	N	N/A
88	20-Apr-16	Spec Section 01 57 19.00 25, Para 1.4.1.1	Environmental Manager is mentioned briefly in this spec section. No qualifications are mentioned. What are the minimum qualifications needed for the Environmental Manager? For cost reduction, can the QC Manager also be the Environmental Manager?	There are no additional qualifications for the environmental manager not mentioned in the referenced specification. The QC manager may also be the Environmental Manager.	N	N/A
89	6-May-16	RFP Front End - Page 25 of 48	FAR 252.247-7022, Representations of Extent of Transportation by Sea allows the contracting officer to authorize shipments in foreign flag vessels. Please confirm that we should assume the contracting officer will give us such authorization for purposes of our bid.	The Contracting Officer will only authorize shipments in foreign flag vessels if the Contractor or subcontractor believes that (1) U.S. flag vessels are not available for timely shipment (2) The freight charges are inordinately excessive or unreasonable; or (3) Freight charges are higher than charges to private persons for transportation of like goods.	N	N/A
90	6-May-16	RFP Front End - Page 25 of 48	FAR 252.247-7022, Representations of Extent of Transportation by Sea allows the contracting officer to authorize shipments in foreign flag vessels. Given that the cost differential for U. S. flagged versus non U. S. flagged vessels will be in excess of $1 million for this project, please confirm that we can use non U. S. flagged vessels for shipments as well as working vessels onsite.	The contractor must submit any request for use of foreign-flag vessels in writing to the Contracting Officer at least 45 days prior to the sailing date necessary to meet its delivery schedules. The Contracting Officer will process requests submitted after such dates(s) as expeditiously as possible, but the Contracting Officer's failure to grant approvals to meet the shipper's sailing date will not of itself constitute a compensable delay under this or any other clause of this contract.	N	N/A
91	11-May-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00	What is the overall goal of the CDSM program?	To stabilize soils for seismic design and liquefaction.	N	N/A
92	11-May-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00	What are the specific design requirements for the CDSM program in terms of replacement ratio, design earthquake loading criteria, stability factors of safety, others?	Specification to be revised to provide minimum requirements	Y	0004
93	11-May-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00	The quoted Specification refers in several locations to replacement ratio requirements (for instance, 1.5.a.2, page 4, 3.1, page 9 and 3.4.3, page 14), yet no requirements are noted. Please define the required minimum replacement ratio	Specification to be revised to provide minimum requirements	Y	0004
94	11-May-16	N6945016R1607/Spec 31 62 00	Is the intent of the CDSM program to provide confinement of liquefied soils or to provide post liquefaction structural support of the pavement area and utilities?	To stabilize soils for seismic design and liquefaction.	N	N/A
95	11-May-16	N6945016R1607/Geotechnical Engineering Report	In the Geotech Report prepared by Schnabel, it appears that the earthquake PSA used in the liquefaction analysis differs from that used in the global stability analysis. Please clarify	Per Geotechnical report, reduced acceleration was used for global stability analysis based on procedure found in FHWA-NHI-11-032.	N	N/A
96	11-May-16	N6945016R1607/PPI rev. 04 May 2016/Responses 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20	Please clarify what is the additional information in Amendment 0001 the Responses refer to	Refer to Page 2 "Summary of Planned Changes" of Amendment 1 dated 19-Apr-2016. Note, these changes were provided in final form with the revised drawings and specifications provided with Amendment 0004, dated 14 JUN 2016.	N	N/A
97	11-May-16	N6945016R1607/PPI rev. 04 May 2016/Response 30	Please confirm that construction/repair projects were similar soil conditions/design were used are acceptable as references	Sites using similar soil conditions and construction requirements are acceptable; however, this answer does not change the definition of a relevant project	N	N/A

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 #
98	13-May-16	RFP Section 00202, Subsection E. 3. (b) (1) (i) (1) Construction Experience	Relevant projects must have been completed by the offeror, within the past seven (7) years from the date of the RFP.Can an offeror use a current NAVFAC project where at least two of the three Relevant Project features have been completed including soil stabilization using deep soil mixing, and the dollar value of contract work completed to date exceeds $10 million, and the offeror can provide either an interim CPAR evaluation or completed Past Performance Questionnaire for the work completed to date. We have a very large ongoing NAVFAC wharf improvement project that includes installation of a significant sheet pile bulkhead and Cement Deep Soil Mixing (CDSM) where both of these elements have been 100% completed to date. Given that there have been very few, if any, NAVFAC pier or wharf renovation or new construction projects that include deep soil mixing, we would like to use this project given that the relevant features of work have already been completed.	The definition of a relevant project is not relaxed. Relevant projects must be construction complete.	N	N/A
99	24-May-16	Drwg. S301 / Detail A3	The elevation detail indicates that flowable fill is to be placed between the existing sheetpile and the new between elevations -45' 0" and the existing mudline. This would imply that the contractor needs to dredge out the material down to elevation -45' 0" after installing the new sheets or dredge out a substantially larger quantity prior to installation of the new sheets. Two questions: 1. For bidding purposes, what elevation should the contractor assume the existing mudline is at? This will result in an estimate of the amount of material to dredged prior to placement of the flowable fill. 2. Given the difficulty in removing material between the new and existing sheets down to an exact grade, how will the contractor be compensated for the flowable fill quantity placed? Will the contractor be granted an allowance for over-digging to ensure that flowable fill is present at elevation -45' 0"?	The fill requirement between the old and new sheet pile walls in Phase 1 has changed. Refer to Amendment 004 dated 14-Jun-2016	Y but accounted for in revised drawings issued under Amendment 004.	0004
100	26-May-16	Factor 2 - Past Performance, Page 12	When utilizing the experience of a subcontractor to meet the past performance requirements within Factor 1, will the Government accept a PPQ within Factor 2 for the subcontractor project utilized in Factor 1 that is filled out by the general contractor of the project, rather than the project owner/client?	Past performance questionnaires are only accepted from the project owner/client.	N	
101	26-May-16	03 31 29 Marine Concrete, 1.6.3	This section states the laboratory and testing facilities shall meet ASTM C1260 and be inspected by the CCRL. Due to the timeframe for the project, can the CCRL inspection requirement be waived?	No.	N	N/A
102	26-May-16	Spec Section 32 13 11, Part 1.4.2	Other Staff adds significant cost to the project. Will all of these professionals be required?	Paragraph 1.4.2 in specification 32 13 11 provide for the minimum professional requirements of individuals that will fulfill the indicated role. These requirements will not be waived.	N	N/A
103	26-May-16	Spec Section 32 13 11, Part 1.4.4.3	This section includes a requirement that cement mill test reports "shall be no more than 1 month old, prior to use in the work." Given the shipping requirements, can this requirement be waived?	No, This section "cement mill test reports" will not be waived for this project.	N	N/A
104	26-May-16	Spec Section 32 13 11, Part 2.10.1, Batching and Mixing Plant	Can an on-site volumetric plant be utilized as long as the concrete quality meets the specification requirements & tolerances (including all testing requirements in the specs)?	Volumetric batch plan are permissible in this project as long concrete quality meets the specification requirements & tolerances. The concrete Specification requirements will not be waived.	N	N/A
105	26-May-16	Spec Section 32 13 11, Part 2.10.5, Paver Finisher and Part 2.10.6, Curing Equipment	Part 2.10.5, Paver Finisher and Part 2.10.6, Curing Equipment both have very strict requirements. Will other means and methods be acceptable for both finishing and curing of the concrete paving?	Specification are formulated for this project. These requirements will not be waived.	N	N/A

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 #
106	6-Jun-16	Specification 03 31 29, page 27, paragraph 2.7	The specification requires that all reinforcing steel be galvanized to ASTM A767/A767M, after fabrication. There are several challenges this creates: (1) finding a galvanizer that can accommodate this requirement due to the limitations on the length and width of the dip tanks; and (2) procedures for field bending or modifying the galvanized reinforcing steel after it arrives onsite. Please consider revising the specification to allow the contractor the option to use ASTM A767/A767M Class 1 galvanized; prefabricated epoxy coated, ASTM A934/A934M; or ASTM A1035/A1035M Alloy Type CM, Grade 100 bars all of which have been shown to be effective for the intended application.	A Class II (two) coating as specified by ASTM A767 is the minimum requirement for hot dipped galvanizing of the reinforcement under this specification. Epoxy coated reinforcement has not been utilized for this project due to concerns regarding the shipping and remoteness of the site.	N	N/A
107	15-Jun-16	General	Due to the number of changes in Amendment 0004, we respectfully request a bid extension to the 29 June 2016 due date.	Proposal due date extended to July 7, 2016. See amendment 0005.	Y	0005
108	15-Jun-16	Section 00100, Subsection B - Delivery of Proposal, Proposal Submittal Date	Due to the significant amount of changes issued with Amendment No. 4 dated 14-Jun-2016 we respectfully request a 30 day extension to the Proposal Submittal Date.	Proposal due date extended to July 7, 2016. See amendment 0005.	Y	0005
109	20-Jun-16	Factor 2, Past Performance	If the offeror has a completed CCASS available, can the offeror include the CCASS in lieu of a PPQ or CPARS?	Adhere to the Factor 2-Past Performance Submittal Requirements on page 12 of the RFP: "If a completed Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) evaluation is available; it shall be submitted with the proposal. If there is not a completed CPARS evaluation, the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) included in the solicitation is provided for the offeror or its team members to submit to the client for each project the offeror includes in its proposal for Factor 1, Construction Experience and Personnel Qualifications. An offeror shall not submit a PPQ when a completed CPARS is available."	N	N/A
110	20-Jun-16	Factor 2, Past Performance	If the offeror currently obtains a PPQ similar to Attachment E, will the offeror be allowed to provide the similar PPQ in lieu of Attachment E?	The use of the PPQ form provided as Attachment E is encouraged.	N	N/A
111	24-Jun-16	All Drawings	Most of the drawings show limits of construction or limits of disturbance. The limits vary in their offset to the south of the bulkhead line and on some drawings are as close as 12' to the bulkhead. Please confirm that the contractor may have barges tied up alongside the wharf that could extend 50' - 60' in width out from the bulkhead.	Barges may have barges tied up alongside the bulkhead but must not restrict access to the area for other waterborne traffic.	N	N/A
112	24-Jun-16	As Built Drawing S-8, Detail A + S401, Detail C5	Looking at as-built Drawing S-8, Detail A, it appears that the offset from the existing sheetpile line to the face of the new bulkhead is 54". Detail C5 on Drawing S401 indicates this dimension is closer to 98". Please confirm this dimension. Its relevance is critical in determining the amount of space available behind the redesigned concrete cap as shown on Drawing S502, Detail B4 and whether on not there is adequate enough space to construct the cap as drawn and at the same time continue the same bulkhead line that exists in Phase 2 through the Phase 1 cap construction.	Detail 1 on record drawing S-8 (NAVFAC # 4221177) does not provide an offset of the face of the new (1990) pile cap to the face of the previously existing pile cap. Information found in Detail C5/S401 (NAVFAC #15102424) is based on recent topographic survey performed by NAVFAC SE.	N	N/A
113	24-Jun-16	S001, Combination Sheet Pile Wall System, Note 4	The note indicates that tierods are to be spaced at a maximum of 10' 0" on centers. Given that the combi-wall system has a dimension of 81.38", this will entail a number of additional tierods to avoid a layout that hits the King Piles. Is there any way this spacing could be revised to 13' 6" maximum to coincide with the King Pile system?	The tie rod spacing of maximum of 10'-0" on center is to allow for matching the existing tie-rod spacing so as to allow for more efficient soil stabilization efforts.	N	N/A
114	24-Jun-16	S001, Combination Sheet Pile Wall System, Note 4 + S111	The note indicates that tierods are to be spaced at a maximum of 10' 0" on centers. Please confirm that this requirement also applies along the Wharf Tango face resulting in 6 tierods along this face.	The same tie-rod spacing applies to the portion of the wall along Wharf Tango. Quantity of tie-rods is to be determined by the Contractor.	N	N/A
115	24-Jun-16	S111	This sheet, prior to Amendment 004, showed two tie-rods connected to a single anchor for the first two tierods along the Wharf Bravo face at the corner. Please confirm that this layout is still acceptable as a means of anchoring the combiwall in the vicinity of the corner and with the utility trench interference.	The two tie-rod to a single anchor has been removed in the final set of contract drawings. Comply with current drawing and contract requirements.	N	N/A

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 #
116	24-Jun-16	S301, Section A3	This elevation shows the new deadman anchor installed beyond the limits of the deep soil stabilization which coincides with the layouts as shown on Drawings S111 + S112 for Phase 1. Please confirm that the contractor's means and methods may allow for these anchor walls to be positioned within the footprint of the deep soil stabilization thereby shortening the length of tierods required.	In general, provide anchors as shown on detail A3/S301 except for the anchors along Wharf Tango as shown on sheet S111. Sheet S112 does not show anchors in the stabilized soil.	N	N/A
117	24-Jun-16	Drawing S301, Section A3 + Drawing S401, Typical Plan C3 + Drawing S502, Typical Cap Section B4	Now that we will be installing a combi-wall, the concrete forms required on the shore side of the new concrete cap will be significantly different. Specifically, the forms needed to close off the bottoms in between the I beams at El. -3.0' will be challenging. Please clarify the intent of the 2" sand layer which is required below the bottom of the concrete cap on Drwg. S502, Section B4. Is this intended to allow the contractor to place the concrete without having a bottom form for the soffit at this elevation? If not, please clarify its purpose and advise if the contractor may use stay in place expanded metal forms for the soffit forms.	The sand layer is to reduce any potential down drag on the cap from the surrounding gravel back fill. Refer to specifications for form requirements.	N	N/A
118	24-Jun-16	Drawing S003, Soil Stabilization Areas	Note 8 under SOIL STABILIZATION REQUIREMENTS states, "If phase 2 of the contract is awarded,...". Please clarify. We do not see a revised bid sheet or discussion regarding the possible award of only one phase.	Bid schedule is being revised to include a base bid for Phase 1 and a bid option for Phase 2.	Y	0007
119	24-Jun-16	Drawing S003, Plan View of Stabilization Areas	The plan view shows 4 test areas and indicates dimensions for each. Please advise if the test areas in Phase 2 can be performed during Phase 1 or if they cannot be performed until authorization to proceed to Phase 2 is received, in which case, please confirm that until the results of the Phase 2 test areas have been reviewed and approved by the government, work in Phase 2 cannot commence.	All work for Phase 2 cannot be accomplished until Phase 2 is awarded.	N	N/A
120	24-Jun-16	Drawing S003, Conceptual Sketch	Note 2 under the conceptual sketch addresses soil column compressive strength and overlap and reads, "Provide improved soil cap at top of impacted columns to develop resistance." Please clarify what calculations will be required to be provided with the soil design and if a demonstration of the improved soil cap will be required in the test areas.	Partial or full demonstration of the soil cap should occur in the portion of the test areas where obstructions would dictate that it is required.	N	N/A
121	24-Jun-16	Drawing S401, Sheet Notes + Drawing S301, Section A3	Note 2 on Sheet S401 indicates that flowable fill should be provided between el. -40.0' and -36.0' yet Section A3 on Sheet S301 has been revised to eliminate the flowable fill. Further, note 4 on S301 would indicate that Section A3 applies only in the proximity of the desalinization plant intake which we do not see on the civil drawings. Please clarify.	Note 2 on Sheet S401 applies only to the area shaded for the Northern tie in at Wharf Tango. Note 4 on Sheet S301 applies to the typical section as shown and to the entire length of Phase 1 area.	N	N/A
122	23-Jun-16	Sheet S003, Soil Stabilization Notes	Sheet S003 lists Soil Stabilization Requirements and specifies that the contractor is responsible to design the soil stabilization necessary to meet the seismic loading anticipated and further defines the performance requirements of the system. Please confirm that the contractor is responsible for developing a soil stabilization design that meets the performance requirements of the specifications and further may modify that design as it sees fit to meet the performance requirements.	The Contractor is responsible for development of the soil stabilization. Once the Final design is accepted by the Government, requested changes to the soil stabilization design will be subject to Government review and acceptance.	N	N/A

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 #
123	23-Jun-16	Section 31 32 23 Jet Grouting Spec. Section 1.1.2 (a); Sheet S003, Conceptual design table; Sheet S003, Soil Stabilization Notes	On sheet S003, under section A1 (Conceptual design), a table is included which lists "conceptual values" and indicates "improved soil compressive strength" of 150 psi. Is this only for deep soil mixing/low pressure grouting? A minimum UCS of 500 psi is specified in Section 31 32 23, paragraph 1.1.2. Sheet S003 lists Soil Stabilization Requirements and specifies that the contractor is responsible for the soil stabilization necessary to meet the seismic loading anticipated. Please confirm that the contractor may establish its own strength based upon the contractor developed design to meet the necessary performance requirements as specified. Please note that 500 psi may not be possible to achieve with either method and may not be required for the seismic design and performance requirements.	The improved soil compressive strength shown in the "Conceptual Sketch" on S003 are the values that the Government has utilized for conceptual development of the soil improvements that meet the required seismic loading on the sheet pile wall. Specification 31 32 23 Jet Grouting provides minimum requirements in the event Jet grouted columns are utilized during the course of this contract.	N	N/A
124	23-Jun-16	S001, Note 7. S002, Seismic Pressure Diagrams. S003, Note 7	On Sheet S003, Note 7 specifies that a 475 year return period is to be used as the design seismic event and references Sheet S001 that shows a PGA of 0.29g. However, on sheet S002, pressure diagrams are provided for each of the two construction phases. Should the contractor develop pressure diagrams based on 0.29g PGA or use the pressure diagrams that are presented on sheet S002.	The pressures shown on B3/S002 are the basis of design for the sheet pile wall system and are based on 0.29g PGA taking into account backland soil improvements.	N	N/A
125	23-Jun-16	Section 31 32 23 Jet Grouting Spec. 1.1.1. S003, Conceptual design table. Section 31 62 00 Cement Deep Soil Mixing Spec. Section 1.4	Estimated soil replacement percentages per phase are identified in the table for conceptual values. Are these requirements the same for all methods of soil stabilization? Will the contractor be permitted to to establish its own replacement ratios based on its design to meet the performance requirements as detailed in the soil stabilization requirements notes. The CDSM spec says "Contractor shall provide soil stabilization analysis and design that meets or exceeds the performance requirements found in the contract drawings." Section 3.1 also mentions that the CDSM must achieve the minimum area replacement shown on the approved plans. Jet grouting spec 31.32.23 says "This section is a performance spec in so far that the contractor be responsible for the selection of jet grout parameters, equip., and construction of the Jet Grouted elements to meet the design intent and the engineer is responsible for overall design of elements/soil cement structure." Please clarify.	The Contractor is responsible for the design of the soil stabilization including all layout of stabilized soil columns so as to achieve the performance requirements stated on sheet S003.	N	N/A
126	23-Jun-16	Section 31 32 23 Jet Grouting Spec. Section 3.1.1	A minimum distance of 50 foot or 3 ft column diameter (whichever is greater) is required prior to adjacent jetting. Is the intent of this minimum distance only along the seawall?	Indicated portion of para 3.1.1 of specification 31 32 23 states "...jet grout columns are not placed within 50 feet or 3 column diameters (whichever is greater)…" means along the seawall and refers to locations under the utility trench.	N	N/A
127	24-Jun-16	Section 31 32 23 Jet Grouting Spec. Section 3.1.1	"Jet grouting shall not occur in a location until adjacent soil stabilization areas have reached their 28-day strength." Does this refer to the seawall/ utility trench areas only or applies to the whole soil stabilization areas outlined in the drawings?	This refers to the seawall/trench locations only.	N	N/A
128	24-Jun-16	Section 31 62 00 CDSM Spec. Section 3.1. S003 Note 11	Section 3.1 of the soil mixing spec requires a 9 inch minimum clearance from tie-rods, soil anchors and other structures. Note 11 from S003 indicates stabilized soil shall have a minimum clearance of 9 inches. Please clarify if you mean CDSM/jet grouting tooling requires a minimum clearance of 9 inches, or the actual stabilized soil which could effect the design performance requirements?	The intent of the 9 inch clearance is to avoid damage to existing anchorages and structures that could be caused by equipment tooling.	N	N/A
129	24-Jun-16	Amendment 004	In light of the significant changes in Amendment 004 and the above resulting questions it has generated, we request that the bid date be extended to at least two weeks past the date when we receive responses to the above questions to give us time to develop the construction program needed for the contract.	Bid date has been extended to 14 July 2016	Y	0006
130	27-Jun-16	Amend. 0005/Page 1/14	Due to the numerous and substantial modifications, we respectfully request to postpone the bid date to 21 Jul. 2016	Refer to answer to PPI 129	N	N/A

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 #
131	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 32 23/Page 1/1.1.2.a	What is the reason for setting such very high minimum UCS? Why more than three times higher than for DSM?	500 psi is the minimum requirement for specification 31 32 23.	N	N/A
132	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 32 23/Page 1/1.1.2.b	The vertical tolerance of 4" over the length of the jet grouting (JG) column of 50ft or more means <1% which is below the industry standard. We respectfully request that the requirement is uniformed and relaxed to 1%	The verticality tolerance for jet grouted columns will be changed to a maximum of 1.0%.	Y	0007
133	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 32 23/Page 2/1.5	Please clarify where is the Field Demonstration Test	If jet grouting is used as part of the Contractor's design, the Government would anticipate that the test area would occur under a trench/valve pit within the Phase 1 portion of the project.	N	N/A
134	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 32 23/Page 5/2.1	Confirm that the use of pozzolans is not mandatory	Pozzolans will be made as an optional component.	Y	0008
135	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 32 23/Page 5/3.1	Please clarify the purpose of this Specification	This specification is provided as minimum requirements in the event that the Contractor design requires the use of Jet Grouting.	N	N/A
136	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 32 23/Page 6/3.1.1	The requirement of not placing a new column "*...within 50ft or 3 column diameters of* <u>*uncured*</u> *adjacent grout columns...* " and "*…until adjacent* <u>*soil stabilization*</u> *areas have reached their 28-day strength…* " seems to require that no JG column can be overlapped to an existing one until the former cured (i.e. 28 days) or already performed soil improvement by DSM (same duration). If that's the intent of the Specification, then the impact on the schedule is huge. Please either reconsider or clarify the Specification (however, please consider that in some instances a fresh-on-fresh sequence of installation of the JG columns is standard industry practice)	Refer to response to PPI 126	N	N/A
137	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 32 23/Page 7/3.2.2	The vertical tolerance of 1/200 (or 0.5%) seem to conflict with previous 1.1.2.b. Moreover, it is much stringent than the industry standard for JG. We respectfully request that the requirement is relaxed to 1%	Refer to response to PPI 132	N	N/A
138	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 32 23/Page 8/3.3.4	Please clarify is 1.5.4 should be read instead as 1.5	It should read 1.5	Y	0007
139	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 32 23/Page 8/3.3.5	Coring 10% of the production columns is much higher than the industry standard (3-5%) and will have an appreciable impact on schedule and cost; please reconsider	Maintain 10% as indicated in contract	N	N/A
140	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 62 00/Page 2/1.3	Please clarify where is the Field Demonstration Test	Refer to Detail C1 on Sheet S003 (NAVFAC #15081088)	N	N/A
141	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 62 00/Page 3/1.5	Confirm that the additional soil investigation is not mandatory	Additional soil investigation is required by specification 31 62 00.	N	N/A
142	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 62 00/Page 3/1.5.a.2	The Specification refers to replacement ration requirements in Acceptance Criteria that cannot be found; please clarify	The Contractor is responsible for the design that would determine required replacement ratio. Refer to Drawing S003.	N	N/A
143	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 62 00/Page 5/1.5.1.2.f	Real-time monitoring of the specific gravity is not an industry standard; please confirm that the monitoring performed by a QC/Field Engineer is sufficient as it will be outlined in the CDSM Improvement Plan	Provide real time monitoring as indicated in specification.	N	N/A
144	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 62 00/Page 6/1.5.3	Similarly to the Specifications for the JG, we respectfully request that the requirement is relaxed to the following business day	24 hours is the requirement.	N	N/A
145	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 62 00/Page 8/2.2.1	The use of air is specifically permitted for JG so we respectfully require to potentially allow its use during DSM too	Air shall not be used during deep soil mixing.	N	N/A
146	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 62 00/Page 8/2.2.3	Continuous monitoring of the specific gravity is not an industry standard; please confirm that the monitoring performed by a QC/Field Engineer is sufficient as it will be outlined in the CDSM Improvement Plan	Refer to response to PPI 143.	N	N/A
147	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 62 00/Page 10/3.2.a	Please clarify where are Test Areas and why there are more than one	Refer to sheet S003 (NAVFAC # 15081088). The two test areas reflect significantly different soil conditions at the site.	N	N/A
148	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 62 00/Page 11/3.3.2.a	The Contractor cannot be held responsible for obstructions not know at the time of bid as disclosed by the Government; please revise accordingly	Paragraph 3.3.2.a refers only applies to newly placed fill.	N	N/A
149	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 62 00/Page 13/3.4.1.3	The requirement of 1h seems unnecessarily strict; please relax it to 4h	1 hour is the requirement.	N	N/A
150	27-Jun-16	Solicitation	Can the bid date be extended an additional 30 days to allow a more accurate and refined bid to be submitted?	Refer to answer to PPI 129	N	N/A

Pre Proposal Inquiry (PPI) LOG

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 #
151	19-Jul-16	PPI 106 Response	PPI 106 (Log dated 6-24-16) requested clarification on reinforcing steel coating. The government response addressed epoxy coated rebar but did not address the request to consider using ASTM A1035/A1035M Alloy Type CM, Grade 100 bars which have been allowed on previous Navy projects and most recently on an almost identical project, the Wharf Bravo project in Jacksonville, FL, Solicitation N69450-16-R-1102. Please consider a revision to allow its inclusion.	Bidders shall meet the requirements of this solicitation.	N	N/A

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 #
152	27-Jun-16	N/A	The current drawings indicate an additional scope of work to install 18" diameter pipe piles in between the 1945 seawall and the 1994 seawall in Phase II. The 18" diameter pipe pile is close-ended. This will create a lot of displacement at approximately every 5' placement of the pipe piles. We assume that the Engineer of Record calculated the additional load that will be placed on the existing 1994 seawall and the owner does not hold the contractor responsible for any damage that could occur to the existing 1994 seawall. Is this correct?	The existing wall has been reviewed for estimated soil pressures resulting from driving of the pipe piles but the Government will consider the use of open ended pipe piles in Phase 2 if Contractor's Geotechnical Engineer confirms by analysis that use of open ended pipe pile will provide equal or better lateral load capacity as the closed pipe pile. Regardless, Contractor should propose based on use of a closed pipe pile.	N	N/A
153	27-Jun-16	Contract Drawing # S003, Drawing # S301	As per Contract Drawing # S003, Soil Treatment is not needed below trench and up to the face of the sheet pile wall for Phase II work, although typical wharf section in Drawing # S301 shows treatment below trench for Phase II. Please clarify which is correct.	Soil stabilization is required under the trench in the Phase 2 area.	N	N/A
154	27-Jun-16	Spec 32 13 11 Part 2.10.1.b Batching and Mixing Plant	Spec 32 13 11 Part 2.10.1.b Batching and Mixing Plant states, "The plant shall be designed and operated to produce concrete within the specified tolerances, and shall have a capacity of at least 250 cubic yards per hour." Can the production capacity be modified to "as needed"?	The minimum production capacity for the Batching and Mixing Plant will be revised to 150 cubic yards per hour	Y	0007
155	27-Jun-16	Spec 31 62 00 Part 2.1.b Materials	Spec 31 62 00 Part 2.1.b Materials requires Type II/V Portland Cement. Many times Type I is accepted as an industry standard for CDSM Improvements. Can Type I Cement be approved for this application?	The requirement for Type V will be removed from the requirement. Type II Portland Cement per ASTM C150 is required. Type 1 cement is not approved for this application.	Y	0007
156	19-Jul-16	PPI 106 Response	Given that Amendment 07 as well as the latest round of PPI responses was issued on 6-30-16, we respectfully request that the bid date be extended to 7-28-16 to allow us sufficient time to develop our final estimate and proposal for the project which incorporates the clarifications just received.	Proposal due date is currently not being extended.	N	N/A
157	1-Jul-16	General	Does the boundary in the slope stability analyses in Schnabel's report correspond to a practical limit for the liquefied soils? Or is it necessary to check larger slip surfaces extending beyond 180 ft behind the bulkhead?	The Slope stability analysis was based on the factor of safety found in Section 6.1 of the Geotechnical for static and a Factor of Safety of 1.1 for seismic stability analysis.	N	N/A
158	1-Jul-16	General	Please clarify the rationale behind the application of Westergaard forces and their direction, and how they relate to the SlopeW stability analyses.	The Westergarrd Pressues shown in the drawings(B3/S002) and those used for the Stability Check Calculations found in Appendix D of the Geotechnical report are the hand calculated Westergarrd Pressures used for analysis. It is the Government's understanding that the stability analysis program SlopeW accounts for the pressures resulting from the acceleration of the wall in a manner that results in similar pressures as the simplified Westergarrd.	N	N/A
159	1-Jul-16	General	Can the contractor develop its own estimate of forces for the free-body analysis and follow FHWA-HRT-13-046 (Manual: Deep Mixing for Embankment and Foundation Support) for design?	Refer to response to PPI 125.	N	N/A
160	1-Jul-16	General	Can the contractor use the ground acceleration specified in the bid documents of 0.12g ? Or does contractor need to run their own analyses to determine the ground acceleration?	That is acceptable.	N	N/A
161	8-Jul-16	PPI 31 Response + Amendment 007	In PPI 31, specific concerns were raised about the amount of time alloted for Phase 1 vs. Phase 2. The government response was that you would be amenable to revising the time alloted to each phase to coincide with the construction schedule provided by the successful contractor. Amendment 007 does not address that accommodation and puts the contract completion date of Phase 1 at 440 days from the award date. We reiterate that 440 days is insufficient time to complete Phase 1 in light of the time required for submittals, procurement and mobilization, not to mention that there is significantly more work to be accomplished in Phase 1. The detailed schedule we have developed which includes required government review periods for soil stabilization test reports, etc. indicates that we will need 644 days to complete Phase 1. Added time will be required if closeout submittals will have to be accomplished in this period should Phase 2 not be awarded.	Amendment 0008 revises the contract completion dates as follows: CLIN 0001: 660 days from date of contract award and CLIN 0002: 880 days from date of contract award.	Y	0008

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 #
162	8-Jul-16	Amendment 007	Amendment 007 has replacement language for the Project completion dates for Clins 0001 and 0002. The Completion date for Clin 0002 is shown as "440 days from date of contract award." Shouldn't that read 880 days?	See response to PPI#161.	Y	0008
163	8-Jul-16	Amendment 007	Amendment 007 revises the liquidated damages for the project so that L.D.'s for Phase 1 are $10,761. There is no mention of the L.D.'s for Phase 2 in the replacement language. Please clarify.	LD's not menioned for Phase 2 because Phase 2 is now an Option item. Only one LD amount provided because CLIN 0001 does not require any separate parts or stages of the work (in which case, multiple LD's would be provided). If the Option item (Phase 2) is exercised at award, the amount for LD's will reflect the total contract value (Base bid + Option item).	N	N/A
164	8-Jul-16	Amendment 007	4.E. Evaluation factors for award, we find no difference between the language being deleted and the language that replaces it other than that the word "value" has been bolded. Was there another change that was supposed to be in this language?	The language being deleted should read: "…at an approximate of $10M or higher…" The only change to the language is the missing "value" to the definition of the relevant project.	Y	0008
165	3-Jul-16	Q&A dated 27 Jun. 2106, no. 147, page 12 of 13	The response refers to no. 2 field test areas on sheet S003 but the drawings shows no. 4 areas. Please clarify how many field tests per phase we have to consider for cost analysis purposes	There are 4 test areas in total, 2 in phase 1 and 2 in phase 2.	N	N/A
166	6-Jul-16	Factor 3, Technical Approach	If the offeror will be submitting vignettes to supplement the Technical Approach narrative, will 11x17 size pages be acceptable for the vignettes?	Yes	N	N/A
167	8-Jul-16	Drwg. S003, Note 2.2 + PPI 122 government response	Note 2.2 on sheet S003 gives the contractor's design engineer the ability to adjust soil stabilization if the engineer "determines that adjacent soil stabilization… effectively eliminates liquefaction…" These adjustments must be proved "by appropriate analysis that must be accepted by the government during final design." Please confirm that the government will accept the contractor's stabilized soil strength values If the contractor's final design proves to the government that it "effectively eliminates liquefaction".	If the Contractor's analysis properly demonstrates that liquifaction is effectively eliminated under the trench, then the Government will accept the final design. Note 2.2 on drawing S003 is re-worded as follows "THE SOIL BENEATH THE TRENCH BOX/VALVE PITS AND BETWEEN THESE STRUCTURES AND THE ADJACENT WHARF BULKHEAD STRUCTURES IS STABILIZED AS NECESSARY TO PREVENT LIQUEFACTION DURING THE DESIGN SEISMIC EVENT. IF THE DESIGNER FOR THE SOIL STABILIZATION DETERMINES THAT ADJACENT SOIL STABILIZATION REQUIRED BY 2.1 EFFECTIVELY ELIMINATES LIQUEFACTION IN THE AREAS OF 2.2, THEN THE DESIGNER MUST PROVE THIS ASSERTION BY APPROPRIATE ANALYSIS THAT MUST BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE GOVERNMENT DURING FINAL DESIGN."	Y	0009
168	8-Jul-16	Specification Section 31 32 23, page 7, paragraph 3.2.6	The specification indicates an allowable deflection of 1" for the seaward most wall. Please confirm that In Phase 1 this is referring to the new combi-wall and not the existing sheetpile wall to be abandoned.	That is correct. It is noted that the Government's design is predicated on completion of the new combination wall system in Phase 1 that would include the sheet pile wall system, anchoring, backfill and completion of the pile cap prior to any efforts that would require the use of jet grouting.	N	N/A
169	8-Jul-16	Phase 2, pipe pile installation	In Phase 2, the driving of the 18" diameter close ended pipe piles may cause horizontal deflections to the existing seawall in excess of 1" due to soil displacement during pile installation. Since there is no new wall being installed to correct for wall movement, please confirm that the contractor will be allowed additional horizontal deflection above the 1" specified in Section 31 32 23 to account for the soil improvement and the pipe pile installation.	Refer to response to PPI 152.	N	N/A
170	19-Jul-16	General	With questions and answers ongoing which are essential to clarifying the design and construction scope, please extend the proposal due date to 7/28/16 to ensure we have adequate time to prepare our proposal.	Proposal due date has been extended to July 20, 2016	Y	0009
171	8-Jul-16	Drwg. S003, Soil Stabilization Design	Please confirm that the minimum dimensions shown on sheet S003 are to be taken as stated in note 5 as "A conceptual sketch of potential soil stabilization schemes ..." and the actual dimensions whether smaller or larger than those shown will be accepted if substantiated by the contractor's design and supporting calculations?	Note 5 on sheet S003 applies to the conceptual sketch shown in Detail A1.	N	N/A
172	8-Jul-16	Drwg. S003, Soil Stabilization Design	Please confirm that the intent of note 2 on sheet S003 is that the design of the soil stabilization is to perform such that is does not rely on the new bulkhead wall for any stability. If not, please clarify.	Refer to the Geotechnical report for stability analysis.	N	N/A

Pre Proposal Inquiry (PPI) LOG

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 #
173	18-Jul-16	Factor 2, Past Performance	In response to PPI 109, it seems as though the submission of a CCASS in lieu of a PPQ or CPARS is unacceptable. However, it has been our experience that the Government/Navy deems a CCASS as an acceptable form of past performance evaluation. If the Offeror already obtains a final Government evaluation in the form of a CCASS which is registered in PPIRS, than it is our experience that the Government will no longer fill out anymore requested past performance evaluation forms. Please consider allowing a CCASS as an acceptable form of past performance for this solicitation.	If CPARs is not available, CCASS may be submitted.	N	N/A