

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program



I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

**SR 520 Evergreen Point Floating
Bridge & Landings Project
RFP Questions and Answers # 5
February 4, 2011
Note: Revised answer to Q # 33.**

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
33	1/14/2011		General	Have any individuals or organizations expressed interest in purchasing or using the existing SR 520 floating bridge pontoons?	<p>Yes, the following individuals and organizations have contacted WSDOT regarding purchasing or using the existing SR 520 pontoons. It will be the Design-Builder's responsibility to dispose of the pontoons, as required in the RFP.</p> <p>1- Noyes Island LLC A Washington Limited Liability Company PO Box 2328, Gig Harbor, WA 98335 Attn: Karl Anderson (253) 404-2205</p> <p>2- Paul A. Hargrove Instrumentation Specialist Pierce County Chambers Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant 10311 Chambers Creek Rd W., University Place, Washington 98467 (253) 798-3009 (253) 798-3023 fax</p> <p><u>3- Mike Cronquist</u> <u>0742909 B.C. Ltd.</u> <u>Unit 111-2506 Beacon Avenue,</u> <u>Sidney, BC V8L 1Y2</u> <u>(250) 655-4844 office</u> <u>(250) 889-4163 mobile</u> <u>mikecr@shaw.ca</u></p> <p>The list of interested individuals and organizations will be updated as needed.</p>	N
78	1/12/2011	1	1-02.	Design-Builder specifically acknowledges and agrees that: (a) The Conceptual Design is preliminary and conceptual in nature and has not been signed or sealed. (b) The Design-Builder is responsible for correcting any errors, omissions,	Refer to Section 1-02.1 for responsibility for design and Section 1-01.3(1) for definitions of "Basic Configuration" and "Necessary Basic	N

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
				<p>inconsistencies and other defects in the Conceptual Design through the design and/or construction process. There will be no increase in the Contract Price or extension of the Contract Time for correcting any errors, omissions, inconsistencies and other defects in the Conceptual Design, except as provided herein with respect to Necessary Basic Configuration Changes.</p> <p>(c) The Design-Builder's warranties and indemnities hereunder cover errors, omissions, inconsistencies and other defects in the Project, even though they may be related to errors, omissions, inconsistencies and other defects in the Conceptual Design, except as otherwise provided herein with respect to Necessary Basic Configuration Changes.</p> <p><u>Please confirm the design of Pontoon's furnished by the state have been stamped and sealed by others and that the Design Builder will not be responsible for errors, omissions, inconsistencies and other defects in their design and construction. Also please confirm that the design of Pontoon's to be constructed by the Design Builder have been stamped and sealed by others and that the Design Builder will not be responsible for errors, omissions, inconsistencies and other defects in their design.</u></p>	<p>Configuration Change". WSDOT will provide stamped and sealed final design drawings of the PPDB, as specified in Section 2.12.1.4. Stamped and sealed As-Built Plans of these PFS shall be made available, as specified in Section 2.12.1.3.</p>	
79	1/12/2011	1	1-08.8	<p>4. Any other conditions for which these Specifications permit time extensions such as:</p> <p>(a) In Section 1-04.4 if a change directed by WSDOT increases the time necessary to achieve Substantial Completion;</p> <p>(b) In Section 1-04.5 if increased time is part of a protest that is found to be a valid protest;</p> <p>(c) In Section 1-04.7 if a changed condition is determined 1 to exist which caused a delay in achieving Substantial Completion;</p> <p>(d) In Section 1-07.13 if the performance of the Work is delayed as a result of damage for which the Design-Builder is not responsible under the Contract;</p> <p>(e) In Section 1-07.17 with respect to Utility Delays and Major Underground Utilities not identified with Reasonable Accuracy;</p> <p>(f) In Section 1-07.24 if a delay results because of WSDOT's failure to provide access to Right-of-Way necessary for the construction by the date specified in the Contract;</p> <p>(g) In Section 1-08.6 if the performance of the Work is suspended, delayed, or interrupted for an unreasonable period of time that proves to be the responsibility of WSDOT; or</p> <p>(h) In Section 1-09.11 if a dispute or claim also involves a delay in completing the Contract and the dispute or claim proves to be valid; and <u>Request adding an additional condition (g) under Item #4. "Any delays in or failure of performance by Design-Builder shall not constitute a breach or</u></p>	<p>No change will be made. The quoted specification in Section 1-08.8 item 4 says "...such as:". Refer to Sections 1-05.16(8) for exclusions and 1-07.13(1) for the DB's responsibility for work.</p>	N

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
				default hereunder if and to the extent such delays or failures of performance are caused by occurrences beyond the reasonable control of Design-Builder, including but not limited to, acts of God or the public enemy; compliance with any order or request of any governmental authority; fires, floods, explosion, accidents; riots, strikes or other concerted acts of workmen, whether direct or indirect; or causes, whether or not of the same class or kind as those specifically names above, which are not within the reasonable control of Design-Builder.”		
80	1/14/2011	2	2.17.21.3	<p>RECEPTACLES</p> <p>Provide at a minimum power receptacles, 208VAC two phase and 208 three phase receptacle, and 240VAC two (2) phase and 240VAC three (3) phase in the shop area of the Type I sheds.</p> <p>What is the amp rating of the 208VAC two phase receptacles?</p> <p>What is the amp rating of the 208 three phase receptacles?</p> <p>What is the amp rating of the 240VAC two (2) phase receptacles?</p> <p>What is the amp rating of the 240VAC three (3) phase receptacles?</p>	The requested amp rating shall be developed by the Design-Builder during design as specified in Section 2.17.21.3.	N
81	1/18/2011	2	2.8.4.5	Will the Section 404 permit provide clearance for geotechnical borings with respect to ESA consultation or will a separate Biological Evaluation be required? If a separate consultation is required, will WSDOT be responsible for conducting this?	WSDOT borings are being covered as exploratory activities and are being addressed under separate permit and ESA processes. It is possible that the final permit and ESA processes could be updated prior to issuance so that proposed DB's geotechnical borings could be included, according to Section 2.8.4.4.	N
82	1/18/2011	App E6	3	The timing for anchor installation from February to October does not match the in-water work window shown in the earlier table on Pg 2-38 July 16 to March 16 - is this work subject to the in-water work window?	The dates stated in the narrative are intended to be guidance only, referring to the parameters of weather conditions considered suitable for this construction activity (i.e. they are not timing restrictions). The table on Pg 2-38 shall supersede the narrative.	N
83	1/18/2011	App E6	3	What are the required lighting intensities for the lighting along the pedestrian bridge?	Per 2.16.4.3.3 there are no required lighting intensities for the pedestrian wayfinding lighting on the floating bridge; however, the size of luminaires, nighttime visibility, and distribution pattern shall meet the requirements included in this section. In addition, light spillage onto the lake surface shall meet the	N

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
					requirement in Appendix E6, according to Section 2.16.4.3.6.	
84	1/18/2011	App E6	1.5	How much wider than the 30 ft minimum width is allowed for the temporary work bridge? Was 30 ft used in the shading and over-water calculations?	The overall area of shade created by work bridges is the significant factor for impacts that related to mitigation. However, any changes to the dimensions as described in E6 are subject to updating the environmental documentation, according to Section 2.8.4.	N
85	1/18/2011	App M1	EU02	What is the status of the Utility Services that served the demolished residences north of SR520 within WSDOT ROW? Have all the services been capped, abandoned, or removed? If they need to be capped, abandoned, or removed will that be part of the SR 520: Medina to SR 202 Eastside Transit and HOV Design-Build Project (Eastside Project)?	Water lines were disconnected at the meter (house side), overhead PSE utilities (Power) were removed by PSE, cable was cut, spooled and left on the corresponding utility pole, and sewer lines were capped at Trunk line (south property line).	N
86	1/18/2011	1	1.4.7	This reference states that for Work related to an ATC that the Differing Site Condition comparison is to the Design-Builder's geotechnical investigation conducted for purposes of the ATC prior to the Proposal Due Date. 1) If the investigation in prior to the Proposal Due Date, should the reference be to the Proposer and not Design-Builder? 2) If the condition of the ATC is such that the Proposer determines that the GBR contains sufficient information and no additional geotechnical investigations are required, can the comparison for determining a DSC be made to the GBR data?	1) At the moment in time when existing conditions would be compared to pre-bid investigations, the Proposer will have become the Design-Builder. No change will be made. 2) It may be addressed by future addendum.	N
87	1/18/2011	2	2.24 & 2.29	The Port of Olympia site is mentioned in 2.24 but not mentioned in 2.29. Please clarify is the provisions of 2.29 apply to the Port of Olympia site.	It will be addressed by future addendum.	Y
88	1/18/2011	App M1	EU02	Will the service lines to the existing building at approximately ML LINE Sta. 234+00, 200' RT be capped, abandoned, or removed as part of the SR 520: Medina to SR 202 Eastside Transit and HOV Design-Build Project (Eastside Project)?	All services will be terminated, capped, abandoned, or removed in accordance with the requirements of the supplying utilities by the Eastside Project.	N
89	1/18/2011	2	2.10.8.7	The following two requirements seem to be mutually exclusive: 1) The Design-Builder is required to develop a design that does not require Relocations of Utilities identified as "Prior Relocations" (All Utilities listed in the Conflict Matrix for WSDOT Contract 7963, SR 520: Medina to SR 202 Eastside Transit and HOV Design-Build Project (Eastside Project), are identified as Prior Relocations). 2) The Design-Builder shall provide final design information to the State's Design-Builder for the Eastside Project and coordinate the relocation of the existing Utilities so that after initial Relocation the Utilities are not in conflict with the Project or the Work.	It will be addressed by future addendum.	Y

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
				<u>If you follow the first requirement, the second requirement is not needed because you wouldn't impact Prior Relocated Utilities. If you follow the second requirement it implies that you are impacting Prior Relocations and therefore have not met the first requirement. Please indicate which requirement shall be met.</u>		
90	1/18/2011	2	2.10.8.7	line 9-11 indicates that all Utilities listed in the Conflict Matrix for WSDOT Contract 7963, SR 520: Medina to SR 202 Eastside Transit and HOV Design-Build Project (Eastside Project), are identified as Prior Relocations. <u>Are all the Utilities listed, including those that are not labeled as Potential Impact w/ Conceptual Design, intended to be Prior Relocations?</u>	Yes.	N
91	1/18/2011	App UO 3	EU02	Does WSDOT have a listing of all the Utilities within the Project Right-of-Way? WSDOT provided a listing of two utilities that are likely in conflict, but no other utilities. A complete listing will be especially helpful to define the Category of each of the Utilities in the Project Right-of-Way.	WSDOT has listed all known utilities within FB&L construction limits. Utility serviced stubs may exist within those limits and are not shown at the matrix.	N
92	1/19/2011	2	2.12.4.2.4	2.12.4.2.4 Load Combinations Load combinations and load factors for design of the Elevated Structure, Transition Spans and anchors shall be as specified in the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications with the additional limit states as specified below. <u>Please confirm that the loads provided in Appendix S15 Glostern Wind-Wave Analysis Report are unfactored and when used in design of the anchor elements must be increased by the appropriate load factors.</u>	The loads provided in Appendix S15 are unfactored.	N
93	1/19/2011	2	2.8.4.6.6.1	2.8.4.6.6.1 Potential Soil and/or Groundwater Contamination As part of the NEPA process, WSDOT has conducted an initial survey of potential soil and groundwater contamination. WSDOT has not identified any areas within the Project limits with known or anticipated contamination. Appendix G01_01 Geotechnical Baseline Report For baseline purposes, the Design-Builder shall assume the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Materials removed from the upper 10 feet below the mudline will consist of sediments that contain contamination at levels that would require disposal at a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle D landfill. Appendix E04_01 Hazardous Materials Discipline Report Sediments from Lake Washington, Union Bay, and Portage Bay Two sediment-related studies were conducted in Lake Washington and Portage Bay (Cabbage 1992; Moshenberg 2004). These studies show that relatively low concentrations of pollutants such as metals, PCBs, PAHs, and phthalates are present in the sediment of Lake Washington and Portage Bay compared to pollutants found in Lake Union. However, because the existing sediment quality data is limited and the samples were not collected from areas anticipated to be directly impacted by project construction, the risk of encountering contaminated sediments during	It will be addressed by future addendum.	Y

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
				<p>construction is unknown.</p> <p>Eastside Transition Area The analysts did not identify any low- to moderate-risk or high-risk sites in the Eastside transition study area based on WSDOT's screening criteria.</p> <p>Eastside Transition Area The analysts identified no hazardous materials sites of concern in the Eastside transition study area.</p> <p>The RFP documents state that there are no known or anticipated contaminated soils or groundwater. This appears to be contrary to both Appendix G01 Geotechnical Baseline Report and Appendix E04 Hazardous Materials Discipline Report, reference documents. Appendix G01 states that soils for the West Approach Pier 36, East Approach, Bridge Maintenance Facility, and Retaining walls contain contaminated soil materials, as noted above. Even though Appendix G04 is considered a reference document, if the Design Builder is held to the recommendations for soil disposal as stated, this will add significant cost impact on the proposal price. <u>Please clarify.</u> Appendix E04 recommended further analysis of Lake Washington sediments. <u>Has an analysis been completed or scheduled to further analyze the chemical properties of the Lake Washington sediment as recommended? Is there any additional information that can be provided? Is the Design Builder supposed to assume the excavated material above 10' requires disposal at a RCRA Subtitle D landfill facility?</u></p>		
94	1/20/2011	Add #3	Item #70	<p>On page 166, Section 2.12.5.10.1 PONTOON CASTING SYSTEMS AND TEST SECTIONS, after line 14: Add the following paragraph: "If the Design-Builder elects to construct PPDB interior walls with precast concrete, then the following requirements apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design-Builder shall be responsible for producing calculations and design drawings for the precast concrete walls. • Design-Builder shall submit complete precast shop drawings showing all design elements, reinforcing steel, joint details, reinforcing inserts, and handling devices. • Precast walls shall be the same size, weight, and have the same stiffness as cast-in-place concrete walls in the final condition. • Design documents shall be sealed and signed by the Structural Lead Engineer. • Design documents and shop drawings shall be submitted to WSDOT for review and approval." <p>As the designer of record for all pontoons (both PFS and PPDB), WSDOT is responsible for providing a design that is complete, accurate and reliable.</p> <p><u>Will WSDOT remove the following clauses from the amended language?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design-Builder shall be responsible for producing calculations and design 	Revised in addendum # 6, however will require DB to provide lifting calculations in future addendum.	Y

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
				<p>drawings for the precast concrete walls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Precast walls shall be the same size, weight, and have the same stiffness as cast-in-place concrete walls in the final condition. • Design documents shall be sealed and signed by the Structural Lead Engineer. <p><u>Will WSDOT modify the following clause as shown?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design documents and sShop drawings shall be submitted to WSDOT for review and approval. 		
95	1/24/2011	App & 2.1	02-WS03 (sheet 3 of 3)	This sheet gives removal limits for the West approach. Please confirm removal limits on this page are part of the contract requirements per <i>RFP Chapter 1, 1-01.3(1) Basic Configuration</i> and removal depths will be similar on the East Approach.	Yes, it is part of Section 1-01.3(1). Removal depth is defined in Sections 2-02.3(2) and 2.13.5.4. Removal limits are defined in Sections 2.1.1.4 and 2.13.1. Also, removal limits are shown in WS03, EA1, EA2 and East Approach Falsework plan sheets of Appendix M1, V2.	N
96	1/24/2011	2	2.17.15.2	<p>MEDIUM VOLTAGE EQUIPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watt-hour Meters and Watt meters: ANSI/IEEE C12.1; three-phase induction type with 3 stators, each with current and potential coil, rated 5 amp and 120 volts at 60 Hz. Meter suitable for connection to 3 wire circuits. Include potential indicating lamps; adjustments for light and full load, phase balance, and power factor; four-dial clock register; removable meter with draw-1 out test plug; semi2 flush mounted case with matching cover, integral demand indicator. <p>With each circuit breaker, provide a power circuit monitor with digital display multifunction microprocessor-based metering/data acquisition device. Also, provide a tripped indication input to the PLC system for each circuit breaker.</p> <p>Since most power monitors include watt and watt hour indication, <u>is it acceptable to provide a power monitor with each medium voltage feeder breaker, instead of both a power monitor and induction disk watt-hour/wattmeter?</u></p>	The reliability of the separate induction disk watt-hour/wattmeter is the requirement. Therefore, providing a single power monitor to provide both functions is not acceptable.	N
97	1/24/2011		General	Which appendix includes plans for existing SR520 anchors?	Plans for existing SR520 anchors can be found in Appendix AB (CD provided to the Design-Builders) under the following: Contract # 006486 and Contract # 017802.	N
98	1/24/2011	App	M23, M24	Appendix M23, sheet A3 has a design for marine fenders typical at grid lines 2L and 12L. Appendix M24, sheet RD1, specifies that marine fenders are only required at SSP GSW, GNW, QSW, and QNW. Which pontoons require fenders to be installed?	Refer to Section 2.12.4.2.7.5 for the insert requirements. Appendix M11 provided the insert locations in the PFS for fender attachment. Appendix M24 is reference only.	N

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
99	1/24/2011	App	M23	Do the "Ballast Location Restrictions" shown apply only to the final ballast in the pontoons? In other words, are we free to place temporary ballast in any pontoon cell prior to the final ballast condition?	The ballast restrictions shown in Appendix M23 apply to both temporary and permanent ballast, according to Section 2.12.5.14.	N
100	1/24/2011	App	M23	Appendix M23, drawings A2 & A3, Pontoon Joint, Detail 1 & Detail 2 indicate the 1/4" neoprene sheets are fully bonded to pontoon end walls. We believe WSDOT's intent is for the contractors to bond these sheets to the end walls in a dry environment. <u>We cannot locate in Appendix M11 State Furnished Pontoon Minimum Technical Requirements where the 1/4" neoprene sheets are fully bonded to the appropriate pontoon end walls i.e. pontoons B thru W and all SSP's. Please clarify PFS's will be transferred to the D-B contractor with neoprene sheets attached and protected for towing.</u>	Section 2.12.5.12.1.4 specified "The Design-Builder shall provide neoprene sheets at the Pontoon joints as indicated in the Outfitting and Assembly Minimum Technical Requirements (Appendix M23)".	N
101	1/26/2011	App	G2 G7 G12	There is a significant disconnect between the design Flute Anchor parameters provided in the 2005 WSDOT memorandum and the January 20, 2011 Preliminary Conceptual Engineering Report, Floating Bridge Anchors report. A. The 2005 WSDOT Design Memorandum states that back-analyses of actual anchor test results for the I-90 bridge anchors implied a soil strength of $\Phi=4$ degrees with an Effective Unit Weight of 20 pcf. The net passive coefficient for a friction angle of 4 degrees is 0.28 (Kp-Ka). The memorandum also states that flute anchors will likely settle through the mud into the underlying clay even where the mud exceeds 50 feet thick. B. The 2011 Preliminary Conceptual Engineering Report Floating Bridge Anchors report recommends using $\Phi=26$ degrees (Kp-Ka=2.19), Total Unit Weight = 75 pcf with effective Unit Wt of 75-62.4 or 12.6 pcf. The report also states that a 30 feet tall by 60 ft wide anchor would be required to resist a factored anchor load of 365 kips (unfactored of 730 kips with a 0.5 factor). <u>Please Clarify the Design Soil Parameters:</u> Using the design values in the 2005 Memorandum, a 30 foot high by 60 foot wide anchor would need to be installed through 50 feet of mud at an effective unit weight of 20 pcf and buried completely into the underlying soft clay in order to develop a nominal unfactored net passive pressure of about 806 kips with a factored passive (using 0.5) of 403 kips. By comparison, using the design values of the 2011 Report, a 30 foot high by 60 foot wide anchor only needs to be installed so that the top is just below the mud line in order to develop a nominal unfactored net passive pressure of about 745 kips with a factored passive (using 0.5) of 373 kips. <u>Will WSDOT please clarify which design soil parameters should be used?</u>	Appendix G7 was prepared by WSDOT prior to obtaining additional explorations along the alignment of the floating bridge. Appendix G12 was prepared based on new explorations and related laboratory testing. Both documents are Reference documents. The design-builder is responsible for selecting soil parameters for fluke anchor design.	N
102	1/26/2011	App	Appendix M11 Drawing	Appendix M11, drawing LP46, Sleeve Alignment Detail indicate the bolt sleeve and a tapered recess in the pontoon walls with what appears to be a 6"d to 8"d taper. Appendix M23 Drawing A4 Circular Rubber Seal	It will be addressed by future addendum.	Y

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
			LP46	Attachment Detail and Section C identify the size of the circular seal and 1/4" expansion anchors to be used. We do not believe the 8"d opening leaves sufficient concrete to attach these seals. <u>Please clarify the interface between the rubber seals and the tapered opening.</u>		
103	1/26/2011	App	Appendix M23 Drawings A2, A3 & A4	Appendix M23, drawings A2, A3 & A4, Pontoon Joint - Detail 1, Detail 2 & Detail 3 indicate perimeter and circular rubber seals attached to pontoon end walls. Whereas these seals are critical to ensuring a water and grout tight seal, we believe WSDOT's intent is for the contractors to install these to the end walls in a dry environment. <u>We cannot locate in Appendix M11 State Furnished Pontoon Minimum Technical Requirements where these seals are shown to be attached to the appropriate pontoon end walls i.e. pontoons B thru W and all SSP's. Please clarify that PFS's will be transferred to the D-B contractor with seals attached and protected for transport.</u>	Section 2.12.5.12.1.3 specified "The Design-Builder shall provide closed cell rubber sealing strips for Pontoons as indicated in the Outfitting and Assembly Minimum Technical Requirements (Appendix M23)".	N
104	1/27/2011	App	O8	As shown on sheets CH09 and CH10 included in Appendix A of Design Deviation #1 and Design Deviation #2 included in RFP Appendix O8, the on-connection from 84th to WB SR520 does not meet all WSDOT DM standards, and these design deviations are not included in the text of Deviation #1 or #2, or identified as Design Variances on sheets CH09 and CH10. For example, the 46:1 taper at the merge with mainline does not meet the standard 50:1 rate, and the distance from the stop bar (existing) to the painted gore point (ML 241+04.62) is less than the required 1200 feet for acceleration from 0mph to 60mph. Re-designing this ramp to meet standards would impact the "existing" Regional Path and Points Loop Trail immediately to the north of the ramp. <u>Is WSDOT going to obtain Design Deviations for this ramp, or will the Design Builder need to re-design to meet standards, and re-align and re-build the Regional Path and Points Loop Trail?</u>	It will be addressed by future addendum.	Y
105	1/31/2011	2	2.27.1.1.3 & 2.27.4.1	2.27.1.1.3 Requirements for Pontoons Furnished by the State (PFS) The Design-Builder shall be responsible for towing all PFS from one of the identified moorage locations of the PCP Contract shown in Appendix M9 to one or more moorage site(s) chosen by the Design-Builder... 2.27.4.1 PONTOONS FURNISHED BY THE STATE (PFS) The Design-Builder shall remove each PFS from the moorage location(s) shown in Appendix M9 on the identified transfer date. PFS will be available to the Design-Builder for transfer at the moorage location(s)... Comment/Question: Sections 2.27.1.1.3 and 2.27.4.1 state that Appendix M9 illustrates the moorage location(s) of the PCP contract for the PFS transfer from the PCP Contractor to the Design-Builder. Appendix M9 only contains 1 Vicinity Map showing Grays Harbor Project Area, which indicates what appears to be	The PCP Contractor moorage site shall be one of the four locations identified in Appendix M9.	N

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
				on-shore Terminals 1, 2, 3 and 4. <u>Please provide the moorage location(s) of the PCP contract.</u>		
106	2/2/2011	2	2.12.5	<p>2.12.5.6 PAINTING CONCRETE, MASONRY AND CEMENTITIOUS SURFACES The Design-Builder shall paint concrete, masonry and cementitious surfaces of sheds, deck access hatch curbs, the area surrounding luminaires inside Pontoon cells, and Pontoon walls for signs.</p> <p>2.12.5.10.12 Concrete Waterproofing Before launching, both sides of all construction joints in the keel slab, walls, and the grouted joint side of the Pontoon end walls shall be coated with crystalline waterproofing material prior to floating the Pontoons in the Pontoon casting basin.</p> <p><u>For PFS, please verify which, if any, of the requirements of 2.12.5.6 and 2.12.5.10.12 will be completed by others and furnished with PFS.</u></p>	For PFS pontoons, the Section 2.12.5.10.12 work will be completed by others, and the Section 2.12.5.6 work shall be completed by the DB for both PFS and PPDB pontoons.	N
107	2/2/2011	2	2.17.21.3	<p>Section 2.17.21.3 Receptacles Paragraph 8: Provide at a minimum power receptacles, 208VAC two phase and 208 three phase receptacle, and 240VAC two (2) phase and 240VAC three (3) phase in the shop area of Type I Sheds. The circuit breakers in the shop areas shall be on separate circuit breakers such that multiple stations can be in use simultaneously. Coordinate the layout with the workstations and workbenches. The Design-Builder shall design and coordinate the receptacles with the WSDOT Maintenance Crew.</p> <p>Comment: Based on the Maintenance Facility Bridge Shop Level drawing E200, it appears that one of each type of power receptacle should be provided at each workstation and workbench. We assume that one type of each power receptacle would be provided at each workstation and workbench in the Type I Sheds as well.</p> <p>Question: <u>As no workstations or workbenches are currently shown on drawings E145-E147, could WSDOT please provide an anticipated number of workstations/workbenches desired per Type I shed? If no additional information is provided we will assume 2 workstations per Type I Shed.</u></p>	The requested workstations/workbenches shall be developed by the Design-Builder during design as specified in Section 2.17.21.3.	N
108	2/3/2011	ITP	3.1.3	Allows charts, exhibits, and other illustrative and graphical information to be submitted on 11" x 17" paper. In keeping with past proposals submitted to WSDOT, it remains our understanding that both narrative text and graphical/illustrative information can be placed on an 11" x 17" sheet so long as the narrative text does not consume more than ½ of the available space. For instance, we might place an org chart on ½ of an 11" x 17" and text on the adjacent ½. This page would then be counted as one sheet. Please confirm that our understanding is correct.	It will be counted as one sheet as long as the information on the chart is readable per this section of the ITP.	N