

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 11
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0006	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 07-Apr-2016	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. ACQR3898725		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY NAVFAC SOUTHWEST DESERT IPT CODE ROPDA 1220 PACIFIC HWY SAN DIEGO CA 92132-5190	CODE N62473	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)		X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N62473-16-R-4602	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 31-Jan-2016	
			10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.				
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)				
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.				
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.				
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).				
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:				
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)				
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.				
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) N62473-16-R-4602 (P 378 F-35C HANGAR MODERNIZATION AND ADDITION, NAS LEMOORE, CALIFORNIA) SEE CONTINUATION PAGE 2				
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.				
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		
		TEL:	EMAIL:	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 07-Apr-2016

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION SF 30 - BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

The following have been added by full text:

AMENDMENT 0006

AMENDMENT 0006 – DATED 07 APRIL 2016

Contract: N62473-16-R-4602
CS/Phone: Christopher Rosario 619-532-4569
Solicitation Date: 31 January 2016
Subject: P 378 F-35C HANGAR MODERNIZATION AND ADDITION, NAS LEMOORE, CALIFORNIA

This is an amendment to subject solicitation:

A. Revised Factor 1, Experience, is provided below:

FACTOR 1: EXPERIENCE (See definition)

a. Proposal Submission Requirements:

Submit **Exhibit “A”** (Construction Experience Project Data Sheet) under **Tab “1.”**

Submit a minimum of two (2) and maximum of five (5) relevant construction projects for the Offeror that best demonstrates your experience as a prime contractor on projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the RFP.

For purposes of this evaluation, relevant projects are further defined as New construction / renovation of aircraft maintenance hangars, airport buildings (i.e. shops, administrative spaces), and high bay industrial-type facilities with a construction cost of \$20,000,000 or greater. **Relevant projects shall be located adjacent to an active runway and shall be directly related to aircraft operations.**

In addition, **all** submitted projects shall demonstrate at least two of the following to be considered relevant:

- High bay construction
- Renovation/addition to an existing occupied facility
- Construction of temporary facilities
- Phased construction.

Exhibit “A” must clearly address how the project meets the above requirements.

Projects submitted for the Offeror shall be 100% complete (see definition) within the past ten (10) years of the date of issuance of this RFP, and 100% complete as of the date of issuance of this RFP.

A project is defined as a construction project performed under a single task order or contract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole shall not be submitted as a project; rather Offerors shall submit the work performed under a task order as a project.

The attached Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Exhibit “A”) is MANDATORY and SHALL be used to submit project information. Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. Individual blocks on this form may be expanded; however, total length for each project data sheet shall not exceed one (1) double-sided page (or two (2) single-sided pages).

For all submitted projects, the description of the project shall clearly describe the scope of work performed and the relevancy to the project requirements of this RFP (i.e.: unique features, area, construction methods).

If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant project experience shall be submitted for projects completed by the Joint Venture entity. If the Joint Venture does not have shared experience, at least one relevant project shall be submitted for each of the Joint Venture members. Offerors who fail to submit experience for all Joint Venture members shall be rated Unacceptable. Offerors are still limited to a total of five (5) projects combined.

If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name and DUNS number is not exactly as stated on the SF1442), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of this contract in order for the past performance information of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies commit to the performance of this contract. In particular, the proposal will clearly state the specific commitments of resources of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member that will be located at the worksites and company offices in the city/area of the project. The proposal shall also describe specific roles of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies in terms of the work it will either self-perform or manage of behalf of the Offeror in performance of the contract. Any projects submitted in excess of five (5) will not be considered.

The Offeror may utilize experience of a subcontractor that will perform major or “critical aspects” of the requirement to demonstrate construction experience under this evaluation factor. For the purposes of this solicitation, only structural construction of high bay facilities and construction of airfield pavement are defined as “critical aspects”. The proposal must provide a letter of commitment and an explanation of the meaningful involvement that the subcontractor will have in performance of this contract.

b. Basis of Evaluation:

The requirement for acceptability will be based upon the Offeror's demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing relevant construction projects submitted by the Offeror. The offeror shall provide a minimum of two (2) and a maximum of five (5) projects in its proposal, with at least two (2) projects that meet relevancy requirements.

B. The following are responses to RFIs:

Question 172: ROOFING: On the Roof Demo plans, RFP Drawing AD-2.05 includes Keynote 5 ("REMOVE ROOFING AND INSULATION TO DECK, PREP FOR NEW ROOFING AND INSULATION") and Keynote 6 ("REMOVE HANGAR DOOR AND PORTION OF ROOF, PREP FOR NEW EXPANSION"). Keynote 5 appears to indicate the entire existing Roof area, and therefore we would assume the entire roof comes off and will be replaced with a new PVC Roof. RFP Roof Plan Drawings A-2.11, A-2.12, and A-2.13 include Keynote 1 which is placed in numerous locations all over the existing and new roof areas. Again, that would appear to indicate a completely new roof. However, Keynote 1 actually states: "PVC ROOFING SYSTEM AT (E) STAIR TOWER W/ CRICKETS AS REQUIRED PER ROOF MFR." This description seems to limit the new roofing to only the Existing Stair Towers and (maybe) the roof area that has crickets. This would eliminate a large portion of the existing roof area. A "partial" roof replacement is further supported by Sheet Note #1 on Drawings A-2.12, and A-2.13 which states: "PATCH AND REPAIR THE EXISTING BUILT-UP ROOF SYSTEM, WHERE ITEMS HAVE BEEN REMOVED DURING DEMOLITION, TO PROVIDE WATERTIGHT SEALANT." Clearly this Sheet Note describes a partial "Patch & Repair" scope. Please clarify whether the existing roof is to be completely replaced with a new roof, or whether the scope of work is limited to patch and repair of the existing roof (plus a new roof at the new additions).

Answer 172: Keynote 5 on sheet AD-2.05 is correct. Keynote 1 on sheets A-2.11, A-2.12 and A-2.13 should read "PVC Roofing system. At (e) stair tower, install PVC roofing system w/ crickets as required per roof mfr." Sheet notes 1 and 2 on sheets A-2.12 and A-2.13 are not applicable.

Question 173: ROOFING: RFP Roof Plan Drawings A-2.13 includes a thick black line in the LEGEND indicating "ROOF EXPANSION JOINT". That thick black line is shown only on Drawing A-2.13 along Grid Line G.2 (horizontally) & 28/28.5 (vertically). However, RFP Roof Plan Drawings A-2.11, A-2.12, and A-2.13 include Keynote 7 which states: "SEISMIC EXPANSION JOINT COVER." Keynote 7 appears in the following locations: Drawing A-2.11 along Grid Line 10; Drawing A-2.13 along Grid Line 19; and Drawing A-2.13 along Grid Line G.2 & 28/28.5. Is there a difference between the Expansion Joints indicated with Keynote 7 and the one indicated with the thick Black Line? Is there some sort of drawing error? Please clarify.

Answer 173: Keynote 7 indicates existing expansion joint covers that are to be replaced. The thick black line showing the other roof expansion joint around the Module 3 addition is a new expansion joint between the addition and the existing building.

Question 174: Spec 08700-2.3.2: " The item speced, Sargent & Greenleaf Model 2890 PDL is a spin dial type lock.

A mechanical pushbutton lock is speced in hardware sets # 12, 15, 18, 21.

This is different from the spin dial lock. A "Combination Lock" is not listed in any of the hardware sets.

Need to know which type is to be used. If pushbutton type, will need a manufacturer and model number.

"

Answer 174: Basis of design is Sargent & Greenleaf Model 2890 PDL is a spin dial type lock or approved equal. Provide mechanical push button lock compatible to each hardware set. Product type depends on overall functionality and combination of remaining door hardware on individual door. Once the successful bidder is awarded, it is recommended to hold a door hardware preconstruction conference with NAVFAC, Base locksmith, and related security representative. Note that all door hardware items are subject for approval by Base Security.

Question 175: Spec 87100: " An electric strike is speced in hardware sets # 4, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 21.

In these sets the electric strike is not compatible with the locking device speced with it.

Need to confirm if the electric strike is indeed required. If so, then the locking device will need to change.

"

Answer 175: The specified door hardware is tailored to match the existing building module 1 installation (ongoing construction). Once the successful bidder is awarded, it is recommended to hold a door hardware preconstruction conference with NAVFAC, Base locksmith, and related security representatives to discuss requirements compatible to the existing installation in Module 1. Note that all door hardware items are subject for approval by Base Security Officer.

Question 176: Spec 87100: "Hardware Set # 11, Need clarification on the "Extra Heavy Duty Access Push Pad" specified.

Provide a manufacturer and model number for it?

"

Answer 176: Access Push Pad basis of design is Adams Rite 4590 Deadlatch Paddle or approved equal, intending to replace door lever function.

Question 177: Dwg. A-3.04: Please confirm that the access stairs and decks to the second floor will allow columns as support and be cantilevered out from the building as shown on the elevations. DTL 3/A-3.04.

Answer 177: Exterior stair support is per temporary facility manufacturer recommendation, either via columns or cantilevered.

Question 178: UTILITY TRENCHES: The Demolition Drawings (CD-1.02 thru CD-1.07) show the locations of the utility trenches in the Tarmac area. The width of the trench shown on the Demo Drawings is drawn at 4'-0" wide. The Utility Drawings (CU-1.28 thru CU-1.34) also depict the locations of the utility trenches in the Tarmac for Storm Drain, Electrical and Telecom. Those Utility Drawings show the trench locations (also shown as 4'-0" wide), but refer us to the Improvement Drawings for the

Trenching information (e.g., Keynote #33). The Improvement Drawings (CI-1.09 thru CI-1.15) show the trench locations (also shown as 4'-0" wide), and Keynotes #6 & #7 refer us to Detail 1/C-5.02 for the Trench detail. That detail specifically indicates an overall Trench width of the OD (outside diameter) of the pipe, plus 12" on either side for the trench, plus another 12" on either side for the surface Tarmac Trench Patch. So at the minimum, the trench patch would 4'-0" wide plus the diameter of the pipe. Furthermore, the Electrical Drawing E-5.01, Detail 1 shows the Electrical Duct Bank. An overall dimension for the duct bank is not provided, but it would appear based on the spacing between conduits shown in the Detail, that the duct bank would exceed 6'-10" wide. Therefore, per Detail 1/C-5.02, the Trench might be as wide as 8'-10" wide. Because of the significant cost associated with this Trenching (i.e., sawcutting, break, remove, excavation, backfill, jointing, Tarmac paving, etc.) it is critical that we can rely upon the drawings for take-offs and cost estimating. Currently, we are depending on the numerous Government drawings that show that the trench patches are 4'-0" wide. Please confirm that this is correct.

Answer 178: Detail 1 /C-5.01 refers to utility trench bedding/backfill requirements; however, 4 foot trench width at airfield electrical/telecommunications duct bank should be adequate for the conduits utilized. The exception to this is where full panels are removed as indicated on the drawings.

Question 179: PROPOSAL DUE DATE: Due to the recently issued amendment, and numerous RFI's that are still outstanding we request an extension of at least 2 weeks.

Answer 179: See Amendment 0004, section A.

Question 180: CASEWORK: On Drawing A-2.02, Room 2-109 Maintenance Control and Drawing A-2.05, Room 3-218 I-Division there is another Keynote 9 indicating Casework/Countertop against the wall. There is no Interior Elevation for that Casework provided on Drawing A-6.01. Detail 12/A-9.02 shows a Countertop ONLY, but no casework. Keynote 9 indicates both casework and a countertop. Is there any type of casework in this location? If so, please provide an interior elevation for this casework.

Answer 180: Follow detail callout at those locations for countertop only

Question 181: Key note 25 on CI-1.14 states" Aircraft Protection Equipment Structure per architectural plans. These are not found on the architectural plans or in the specifications. Please confirm that these are not to be included

Answer 181: Aircraft Protection Shelters will be provided and installed by the Government.

Question 182: We are aware that the time for RFI Questions has expired. However, we have found that a Hazardous Materials report has not been included with the bid documents. Since there is extensive demolition required in the project and give the age of the structure it is likely that ACM, Lead Paint and PCB's will be encountered. Do you know if a Hazardous Materials Report was included in the bid documents? If yes, can you direct us to where to locate it.

Answer 182: There is no hazardous material report available as the entire facility was renovated in 2010 and mitigation was completed at that time.

Question 183: Spec 01 11 00: 1.4.1 Project Description - Please confirm if the Squadron transition from Mods 2 and 3 must be complete prior to commencement of work in Mod D

Answer 183: Squadron transition from Mods 2 and 3 are not required to be complete prior to commencement of work in Mod D. However, commencement of work in Mod D is dependent on completion of the Telecom Hut and crossover of NMCI hub currently located in Mod D.

Question 184: Spec 01 11 00: 1.4.1 Project Description - Please confirm if the Squadron transition from Mods 2 and 3 must be complete prior to commencement of work related to the Hangar Workbay Expansion

Answer 184: Squadron transition from Mods 2 and 3 shall be complete prior to commencement of work related to the Hangar Workbay Expansion.

Question 185: Should the CLIN 0002 Total include the budget amounts for the FF&E and AV and the extended HAR amounts for each, or just the total of the extended HAR amounts.

Answer 185: The total extended HAR amount

Question 186: Regarding P378 Hangar Modernization and Addition at NAS Lemoore, CA (N62473-16-R-4602), please advise as to whether the Small Business Subcontracting Plan referenced in FAR Clause 52.219-9 is required by all Offerors with the proposal submission, or only to the low-bidder once requested. If the Small Business Subcontracting Plan is in fact required of all bidders at the time of proposal submission, please confirm where in the Technical/Price proposal the plan should be included.

Answer 186: It will be required prior to award only from apparent low bidder.

Question 187: If we plan to hand-carry our bid. Will our bid runner need a security clearance or need to complete a form before bid day?

Answer 187: No

Question 188: Please provide clarification regarding the Small Business Subcontracting Plan. The NAVFAC has provided a template, but has not specified copies or when the plan is due. We are requesting that the Small Business Subcontracting Plan be submitted NAVFAC via email 48 hours after the bid date. This will allow estimating departments to close their numbers and provide a more accurate percentage & totals of small business goals.

Answer 188: It will be required prior to award only from apparent low bidder.

Question 189: Please confirm if renovation projects at Lemoore NAS are exempt from State or Local taxes

Answer 189: Offerors are responsible to confirm and include applicable taxes.

Question 190: In Amendment 0002, the Government's response to RFI #6 "confirmed" that projects located "anywhere" on a Military Air Installation are relevant. This response essentially means that any "Administrative" project that is located several miles from the actual airfield/runway, as long as it is

located somewhere on a large military installation with a runway, would qualify. In other words, a facility such as the Pass & Decal Office would qualify. It would appear that this is clearly not the intent of the solicitation, as a standard office building located far away from an active airfield would not be considered relevant to the scope of this project. We recommend that the Factor 1 language should be revised to read "...aircraft maintenance hangars, airport buildings located immediately adjacent to an active runway (i.e. shops, administrative spaces), and high bay industrial-type facilities...".

Answer 190: See Amendment 0006, section A, revised factor.

Question 191: The Solicitation item 11 requires performance to be complete within 555 calendar days after receiving the award. Amendment 0002 Section D states that "The Beneficial Occupancy Date (BOD) is required no later than 8/31/17", which would significantly reduce the period of performance. Please confirm the period of performance will remain at 555 calendar days after contract award.

Answer 191: BOD is required no later than 8/31/17. Contract completion to address miscellaneous punch list items can occur after that date.

Question 192: TEMPORARY BUILDINGS: RFP Drawing A-2.07 show the Temporary Buildings. On the second floor of BLDG 353B, there are (4) areas that are outlined in a heavy dashed line to indicate the STC Perimeter. As an example, RFP PART 3 - CHAPTER 5 - Page 13, the top section states: "Acoustics: STC 45 suite perimeter". The combination of the heavy dashed line and the use of the words "suite perimeter" seem to indicate that the perimeter walls and doors would be STC 45 rated. However, down below the individual Room Requirements indicate Partitions and Doors rated as STC 45. There is no distinction between the "perimeter" walls and doors and the walls and doors that are inside the area. Is every wall and door inside the dashed line required to be STC 45?

Answer 192: Follow STC requirements for each individual room as indicated in the Room Requirements.

Question 193: TEMPORARY BUILDINGS: In Amendment 0003, the Government provided the following response to RFI #57: "Temporary facilities are intended to rest on existing pavement, where possible. Refer to Spec Section 13 34 23.13 for design criteria. Temporary facility design submittals shall consider appropriate support as necessary." The wording "where possible" and "as necessary" appears to place all responsibility of the design on the contractor. Specification Section 13 34 23.13, Page 5 states: "2.1.2.2 Foundation and Anchorage - Provide foundation and anchorage in accordance with the requirements of the IBC. 1. Bearing pads, slabs or foundations shall be concrete, meet the requirement of division 3 specifications and shall be designed in accordance with the loading criteria herein and on 98S-001, as well as the applicable building codes." The Government's response makes it sound as though the intent is to use the existing pavement as the foundation. However, we have no way of knowing if the existing pavement meets the criteria set forth in the IBC. Please confirm that the existing pavement will satisfy all criteria and can be used for the one-story Temporary Buildings.

Answer 193: Temporary facilities are considered to be design build. Foundation requirements must be appropriate to the proposed design of the structure, to be submitted for further review and approval. If a foundation system is included in the design of temporary facilities and ultimately constructed, then appropriate cost for temporary site drainage mitigation in surrounding areas, removal of temporary

structure and foundation, and replacement of the parking lot paving with stripping shall be provided at end state.

Question 194: TEMPORARY BUILDINGS: In Amendment 0003, the Government's response to RFI #57 suggests that the intent is to use the existing pavement for the 2-story Temporary Building. Because the building is 2-stories, there are additional foundation consideration due to the height of the building and overturning. While possible, it is probably unlikely that the existing pavement would meet the IBC criteria to support the 2-story building. The Government's response to RFI #57 used the wording "where possible" and "as necessary" which appears to possibly place all responsibility for the design of the foundation on the contractor. Please confirm that the we should assume the existing pavement is adequate for the 2-story building. If the Government's expects the contractors to take on design responsibility for a new foundation, please provide details as to what design process/submittals will be required.

Answer 194: See response to RFI # 193

Question 195: TELECOMMUNICATIONS: RFP Drawing TS-2.01 is the Site Plan for the Telecom. At the bottom of the page there is a dashed rectangle that references a "TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE PACKAGE". This drawing shows Manhole 80, and then a connection to Manhole 59, and then it runs off the page. Drawing T-6.03 is the Single Line for the Telecom. The Single Line shows the same Manhole 80 (CMH 80). It then shows a series of manholes eventually terminating at Manhole 797 (CMH 797), with Keynote 2. (Note: Based on "typical" installations, we would assume spacing of 400-feet between manholes, but we have no way of knowing that is the case.) It appears as though Keynote 2 states that CMH 797 is the location of a splice connection. However, the Single Line does not show Manhole 59 (as shown on Sheet TS-2.01). We have not been able to determine the location of Manhole 59 or Manhole 797. Further, the DD1391 for this project includes a line item for ELECTRICAL UTILITIES with a value of \$20,850,000. The description reads: "The telecommunications infrastructure provides connectivity at Hangar 5 to two points of connection (POC) to the main distribution system to be buried in conduits and costing approximately \$1.6 million per mile. These POC are approximately 5 miles to Grangeville Road and approximately 7 miles to Mainside." This raises several questions: 1) Is the TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE PACKAGE included in this contract scope? If so, what is it? 2) Where is Manhole 59? 3) Where is Manhole 797? 4) Is there really 12 miles of Telecom infrastructure included in this contract? Please further confirm that none of this work is included in this contract and whether our Telecom point of connection is at Manhole 80, Manhole 59, or Manhole 797. Please provide a specific description of the Telecom scope.

Answer 195: Manhole 59 is a portion of Telecommunications Infrastructure Upgrade Package that is not applicable to this project. As indicated on T-6.03 Manhole 80 connects a series of existing manholes including CMH 797. Conduit distance between each manhole is listed below. Contractor should estimate a manhole size of 15'L X 6'W X 7'D for each manhole indicated on Drawing T-6.03. Conduit Distance: CMH 797-CMH 798 = 358', CMH 798-CMH 799 = 342', CMH 799 – CMH 800 = 258', CMH 800 – CMH 78 = 160', CMH 78 – CMH 79 = 240' and CMH 79 to CMH 80 = 232'. The Telecommunications Infrastructure Upgrade Package is not included in this package.

Question 196: TEMPORARY BUILDINGS: The Government's response to RFI #57 suggests that the intent is to use the existing pavement for the 2-story Temporary Building. Please confirm that the 2-story Temporary Building will not require Special Foundations (Drilled Piers).

Answer 196: A geotechnical report for this site will be provided to assist with the design of temporary facilities. Type of foundation appropriate to the temporary structure proposed shall be determined by the Contractor.

Question 197: There is a conflict in the contract with regard to the Temporary trailers- and also a major budget issue- The specification for the Temporary buildings states that the buildings will be occupied for a period of 5 years after substantial completion of the project. The contract will be complete in roughly 18 months and we will be demobilized- the contract indicates that we are to remove the mobile/temporary buildings when the project is complete- If we agree to a lease for the temporary facilities will it be until completion of the project, or for 5 years after substantial completion? Are we expected to come back 5 years later and remove the temporary facilities?

Answer 197: Bid Option Item 0003 will be to remove temporary buildings at end of term removal (5 years after substantial completion of the project). If Option Item 0003 is not awarded, removal of temporary buildings will be by others.

Question 198: Spec Section 024100: Please confirm that the government will be considered the generator of any existing hazardous waste discovered at the site and will sign all manifest.

Answer 198: Confirmed.

Question 199: Per sheet CS-1.25 it states "Bid option 3: Remove Temp Facilities and provide striping"; however upon reviewing the offer schedule option is designated for the fixed price of the ESS equipment. Please clarify the intent of this call out.

Answer 199: See revised CLIN schedule.

Question 200: Regarding Question 101 (111 of this RFI log), it is still not clear a particular fence/gate enclosure is to be included in this contract. I have attached a couple of sheets for you to reference. Can you clarify what portion of the enclosure (if any) is to be included in this contract?

Answer 200: On sheet G-2.02, the new fence perimeter is comprised of 3 sides to enclose the two new electrical switch and transformer boxes, and it connects to the existing fence on the north side.

Question 201: The gates at this enclosure do not have gate numbers associated with them. There are two gates listed on the door schedule that I cannot locate on the plans - D3 Gate 1 & D3 Gate 2. Both gates are listed as 7' 10" wide x 8' 8" high. Are these gates the same gates shown at the transformer enclosure?

Answer 201: Yes. Height of gate to match height of fence, which was noted in an earlier RFI to be 6' high.

(End of Summary of Changes)