

CITY OF KODIAK
Channel Transient Float Replacement
Project No. 17-07/8525

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS NO.1

DATE: October 11, 2016

BIDS DUE: **THURSDAY, October 27th, 2016 no later than 2:00:00 p.m. local time**

APPENDIX F, FACILITY MINIMUM PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

1. **Question:** The RFP mentions a design vehicle, but the concept gangway ramp appears to be a pedestrian ramp (5-ft wide) and the float concept drawings show 50psf live load. Please clarify if the gangway and floats are to be designed for vehicle loads, and if so, provide information on the design vehicle.

Response: Please reference Addendum No. 1.

2. **Question:** Fender system talks about fixed UHMW facing but also must meet accidental impact loads defined in UFC and PIANC. A more robust fender system may be required to meet UFC and PIANC.

Response: Please provide UHMW fender system as specified in Appendix F, Section 10.0. The documents listed in Appendix F, Section 1.0 are intended to convey a general (partial) reference of possible standards and codes; the specific applicability and interpretation of such compliance documents is the responsibility of the Design-Builder. The Design-Builder is tasked with providing a functionally complete facility that conforms with good engineering practices. Per RFP Section 2.7.3.C, the Proposal may provide clarifications regarding specific interpretations of the RFP contents; this is the appropriate section to provide any qualifications regarding assumptions relating to compliance documents.

3. **Question:** Design vessel lists the DTW which is a measure of vessel cargo capacity. For berthing and mooring we need the total vessel weight or displacement. This can be estimated by factoring the DWT or by using a block coefficient on the submerged hull dimensions. What is the design vessel displacement or block coefficient?

Response: The intent of the design vessel criteria is to provide a general classification of vessels. The City of Kodiak assumes the 130' LOA vessel has an approximate total weight of 600 tons and the 60' LOA vessel has an approximate total weight of 350 tons. The Design-Builder is responsible for determining a reasonable assessment of total vessel weight based on the described vessel types.

4. **Question:** Design criteria lists several seismic references (ASCE 61 –which is focused on piers, is listed twice!). For this project the seismic risk is generally the potential for a slope failure of the upland and submarine sediments. In large seismic event these soils may spread out and slide toward the channel. Mitigating this risk would be expensive and could require significant ground improvements. Verify the seismic ground improvements are not part of this project.

Response: The documents listed in Appendix F, Section 1.0 are intended to convey a general (partial) reference of possible standards and codes; the specific applicability and interpretation of all compliance documents is the responsibility of the Design-Builder. The Design-Builder is tasked with providing a functionally complete facility that conforms with good engineering practices. Per RFP Section 2.7.3.C, the Proposal may provide clarifications regarding specific interpretations of the RFP contents; this is the appropriate section to provide any qualifications regarding assumptions relating to compliance documents.

5. **Question:** Paragraph 6.4 in Appendix F says bullrails shall not be timber. Please clarify bullrail material requirements or preferences?

Response: No further requirements regarding bullrail materials exists, except as already specified in Appendix F, Section 6.4. Regarding preferences, the City has had positive experiences with steel pipe and/or steel tubing; however, alternative approaches are welcomed.

6. **Question:** Is a Steel Bar Grating decking preferred (assuming budget allows) or can other no-slip surfacing (other than timber) be provided. Please clarify?

Response: No preference exists regarding steel bar grating; yes, other non-slip surfacing (other than timber) is acceptable. The Proposer is encouraged to consider seasonal maintenance (snow removal) and longevity when selecting materials.

7. **Question:** Does the City of Kodiak want an HDPE tub flotation system (assuming budget allows) or is a Coated Billet floatation system allowable if budget requires it? Please clarify?

Response: The City of Kodiak has no preferences regarding the type of floatation system and/or structural design; all types of systems which meet the Project Requirements may be proposed.

8. **Question:** Appendix F Paragraph 6.4 states that bullrails shall not be timber and shall be placed with a clear distance of 12-18” between the edge of bullrail and edge of float. We assume that the inset bullrail is to improve mooring line angle for large vessels. Are both bullrails (i.e., each side of float) to be inset 12-18” from the edge? Or, does this requirement only apply to the channel side of the float where larger vessels will moor?

Response: Yes, both bullrails (each side of the float) are to be intended to be 12-18”. The City intends to collaborate with the Design-Builder during design development to finalize such locations and dimensions.

9. Question: A related question, with the inset bullrail, will power pedestals and/or water/fire risers be required to be located inside of the bullrail (toward the center of the float) to protect them from mooring lines?

Response: Yes; pedestals should be located inside the bullrails.

10. Question: Section 17.6, is it acceptable to change the IP rating of the fixture from IP 66 to IP 65.

Response: Please see Addendum No. 1.

11. Question: Section 17.7, is it acceptable for the main disconnect and MDP enclosures be 304 Stainless Steel. Also, is it acceptable for the CT cabinet shall to be 304, 316 stainless steel or aluminum.

Response: Please see Addendum No. 1.

APPENDIX H, REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

12. Question: What size water line feeds the vault at the top of the Channel Transient Float abutment? Assuming it is larger than the ¾” outflow, likely 2”, would it be considered a good thing if the new float was fed by a larger supply line for more flow and capacity or does the Harbor Department want to restrict water use at that location? What if it was metered? Second, would it be considered a betterment if the system was heat traced and all season capable?

Response: The water feed to the channel transit float is only three-quarter inch. No, a larger supply line and meter is not necessary and/or of value at this time. The system will be shut down for the winter. The vault where the water line will connect does need to be insulated as described in Appendix F.

13. Question: There is an existing light pole in the uplands, however there is no requirement in Appendix F for a light pole in the uplands. Does the owner require a light pole in the uplands to be provided by the contractor?

Response: At this time, the existing uplands light pole is sufficient and no further requirements regarding uplands lighting is required of the Design-Builder.

14. Question: Please confirm the contractor is responsible for all electrical work starting on the secondary side of the transformer, except that KEA will provide the actual meter and will terminate contractor provided conductors on the service transformer.

Response: Confirmed.

15. Question: Please confirm the owner will provide a new electrical service to the new transient float including a transformer sized for the new load and located adjacent to the new abutment as shown on the diagram in Appendix H.

Response: Confirmed.

GENERAL:

16. Question: Please confirm that all requirements stated in Appendix F apply to the contractor, whereas all features of the float and associated systems and work shown in Appendices E and H are conceptual only and thus not binding upon the contractor.

Response: All requirements of Appendix F are binding. Please see RFP, Section 3.13 regarding Appendix E. Introduction paragraph of RFP Section 3, states any use of the information contained in Appendix H is at the sole discretion of the Design-Builder. Appendix E and H are not intended to be interpreted as “preferred” options of design solutions; the provided conceptual information was necessary for permitting purposes and should not restrict innovation, unless specifically noted in Appendix F.

17. Question: Please confirm if a single Proposer may provide multiple baseline options?

Response: Please see Addendum No. 1.

END OF QUESTIONS & ANSWERS NO.1