July 8, 2016

GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
PHYSICAL SUICIDE DETERRENT SYSTEM
FEDERAL-AID PROJECT: BHLS-6003(051)
and
WIND RETROFIT
FEDERAL-AID PROJECT: BHLS-6003(052)

Contract No. 2016-B-1

To: Prospective Bidders

RE: Response to Bidders’ Question No. 281 through 285

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The following are the responses to questions submitted by prospective bidders and designated as Bid Question No. 281 through 285:

**BID QUESTION No. 281:**

Protection of SDS during construction; 60-1.03C(6) & 60-1.03C(7)

60-1.03C(6) - Protection
Protect finishes of metal specialties from damage during construction period with temporary protective coverings approved by metal specialties fabricator. Remove protective covering at time of Substantial Completion. Restore finishes damaged during installation and construction period so no evidence remains of correction work. Return items that cannot be refinished in the field to the shop; make required alterations and refinish entire unit, or provide new unit.

60-1.03C(7) - Cleaning
Remove temporary coverings and protection of adjacent work areas. Clean installed products in accordance with manufacturer's instructions before owner's acceptance. Do not use chlorine-based or abrasive cleaners. Remove and legally dispose of all construction debris associated with this work from project site.

Please define which finishes or which metal specialties need to be protected during the construction period.

Also, if the Contractor is required to restore any damage (even after the Contractor attempted to "protect" these surfaces), the Contractor assumes it will be permitted to protect the surfaces it feels are at risk or exposed for potential damage.
Many of the SDS parts are very small. All the SDS materials are stainless steel. What criteria or tolerance will the District use to determine when restoration of finishes is required?

What is the criteria for returning a fabricated member to the shop to repair? Is this option for the Contractor or the District to determine? What is the criteria for disposing of a fabricated member and replacing for new? Can a painted surface be touched up using best practice in the field? Can a galvanized member be touched using industry standards to repair gouges in steel. Can stainless steel be polished or buffed using industry standards?

What is the criteria for returning a fabricated member to the shop to repair? Is this option for the Contractor or the District to determine?

What is the criteria used to determine if a member is to be disposed and replacing for new?

The Contractor assumes a painted surface be touched up using best practices in the field. Also, the Contractor assumes a galvanized member can be touched up using industry standards to repair gouges in the coating. Finally, the Contractor assumes stainless steel can be polished or buffed using industry standards?

Please, confirm this approach is acceptable.

RESPONSE:
See Addendum 5 for revised Section 60-1. The referenced Section 60-1.03C(6), Protection, in the bidder’s question has been deleted from the revised Section 60-1. The referenced Section 60-1.03C(7), Cleaning, has been replaced with revised Section 60-1.03C(5), Cleaning. Revised Section 60-1.03C(5) states:

"Clean the installed SDNS prior to delivery to the job site in accordance with the Manufacturer’s instructions. Do not use chlorine-based or abrasive cleaners. The installed SDNS must be free of all oil, grease, and other surface contaminants and all debris must be removed."

Section 5-1.37, Maintenance and Protection, requires the Contractor to protect the work from damage until the date of the District’s acceptance of the Contract. All of the Contractor’s work including finishes and any metal specialties need to be protected.

Section 5-1.39, Damage Repair and Restoration, states that before Contract acceptance, the Contractor is responsible for restoring damaged work to the same state of completion as before the damage. The Contractor is responsible for the costs of the repair of restoration of work that the Engineer determines was caused by the Contractor’s failure to construct the work in conformance with the Contract or protect the work.

With regard to repair of stainless steel finishes, in accordance with Section 5-1.03, Engineer’s Authority, the Engineer will make the final decision when restoration of finishes is required. In accordance with Section 6-2.01, General, the Contractor is required to furnish new material that conforms to the Contract requirements and in accordance with Section 5-1.37, the Contractor is required to protect the work from damage.
In accordance with Section 5-1.03, the Engineer will make the final decision when a fabricated member that has been damaged can be repaired or needs to be replaced with a new member. If the Contractor wants to repair a damaged member in lieu of replacing it with a new member, the Contractor will need to submit the proposed repair method to the Engineer for approval in accordance with Section 5-1.23A. Generally, a damaged member can be repaired in lieu of replacement only if there is no material or visual difference between a repaired and new member.

Regarding damage of painted, galvanized or stainless steel surfaces, the Contractor is required to perform the repair in accordance with Contract requirements not what the Contractor deems to be “best practices” or “industry standards.” For painted surfaces, in accordance with Section 59-1.03D, Painting, the Contractor is required to repair painted surfaces damaged during work activities with materials and to a condition equal to that of the specified coating. For galvanized surfaces, the Contractor must follow the requirements in Section 59-3.03C, Field Repair of Damaged Galvanized Structural Steel Surface Coatings. For stainless steel surfaces, the Contractor is required to repair the surface to a condition comparable to new material that meets the Contract requirements. Prior to performing any repair, the Contractor is required to submit the proposed method of repair to the Engineer for approval in accordance with Section 5-1.23A.

**BID QUESTION No. 282:**

15-4.01A(2)

The third paragraph begins, "At the Suspension Bridge, you may use the existing travelers..., provided you perform a complete investigation of the existing travelers..., and you must allow the District access to the travelers."

What is the current traveler loading criteria and service restrictions followed by the District?

What analysis and inspection is performed regularly / annually by the District on the existing travelers?

Will these reports be made available to the field prior to bidding?

Additionally, the Contractor assumes it may use the current established criteria (and down grade based on current condition of travelers relative to the most recent inspection and analysis performed by the District) for the traveler capacity based on the existing structural conditions. Please, confirm this practice will be acceptable to the District.

**RESPONSE:**

In accordance with Section 48-3.01C(1), General, the Contractor must perform its own complete investigation of the existing travelers and traveler supports to determine their condition and limitations, and operate the travelers within those limitations. The District’s forces will instruct the Contractor on how to operate the existing travelers.
BID QUESTION No. 283:

48-3.01D(3)(d)

The third paragraph reads, "The existing seawall is a historic structure. You are responsible for protecting the seawall from damage during all stages of work conducted near the seawall. You must anticipate that the existing seawall is not capable to act as a freestanding cofferdam or breakwater, and that the existing seawall concrete is of poor quality."

Please, confirm the intention of this requirement is to protect the sea wall from construction debris or incidental construction damage only and not from the existing environmental conditions (wave, wind, weather, or vessels not associated with the Project).

RESPONSE:
Yes, the intention of this requirement is to alert the Contractor of the general condition of the seawall and of the requirement to protect the seawall from the Contractor’s construction activities. The Contractor is not responsible for protecting the seawall from existing environmental conditions such as wave, wind, weather or vessels not associated with the Project. See District response to Bidder Question No. 242.

BID QUESTION No. 284:

48-3.01D(3)(d)

The fifth paragraph begins, "Perform and record pre-construction and post-construction condition surveys, including photographs, of the seawall. Submit the results of the pre-construction survey to the Engineer as part of the Seawall Protection Plan."

Please, confirm the District anticipates normal deterioration to the seawall from environmental conditions. The intent of the pre and post surveys will be used to verify no construction activities have damaged the sea wall.

RESPONSE:
The intent of the pre- and post-construction condition surveys, including photographs, of the seawall, is to document the pre-existing condition of the seawall for comparison with the post-construction condition of the seawall and to determine if the wall was damaged by the Contractor’s construction activities during execution of the work.

BID QUESTION No. 285:

RESPONSE:
The Live Load requirements assumed for the SDNS design contained in the referenced report are as follows:

JL = the live load, including impact, associated with a 250 pound object falling 27.5 feet down into the net. This load was assumed to be applied over a 2.8-foot by 2.8-foot square area of the net. The impact was derived from structural analysis of the net model.

ML = the live load, without impact, associated with 3 individuals performing routine maintenance or emergency response directly on the net; the weight of each individual with tools and equipment load was taken as 310 pounds and applied over a 2.8-foot by 2.8-foot square area of the net.

PL = the 85psf pedestrian live load on the bridge sidewalk was used in the design of the vertical Tension Rods connection to the Bridge sidewalk at the South and North Approach Viaducts. The load factor of 0.5 for combining the PL with JL was assumed per AASHTO Table 3.4.1-1, Extreme Event II.

Sincerely,

John Eberle, P.E.
Deputy District Engineer