

South Harbor Rebuild Request for Proposals ADDENDUM # 5

TO: All Potential Bidders

DATE: 10/10/22

This addendum forms a part of the South Harbor Rebuild Request for Proposals.

Questions are in Black font, and answers are in blue.

Addendum #5 Questions and Answers

1. Question:

Can you please provide a better definition on the expectations and requirements for the hydrodynamic analysis and modeling required for the Section 408 review and approval? We approached the USACE regarding this and their response was that additional coordination was required between the COE and the City. Additionally, how is the contractor to proceed if the USACE's review of the analysis/model results during the Section 408 review fiat that the bulkhead negatively impacts the harbor and is not allowed

Response:

In ongoing discussions with the USCAE regarding the 408 permits, we have been informed that a full hydrodynamic model will be required for bulkheads. This modeling will need to be performed by the selected DB based on a full-length bulkhead. In prior discussions with the USACE, it was and is not anticipated that the full or a partial bulkhead would be prohibited, given the harbor's geometry and the bulkhead's planned location.

The hydrodynamic analysis will require the use of a phase resolving wave model to analyze the effect of wave reflection off the faces of new sheet pile structures or any structure that would result in a more fully reflective surface. The concern is that replacing the silt barrier or any of the breakwater slopes with fully reflective surfaces is that the wave conditions in the harbor will become unacceptable for moorage resulting in damages to moored vessels and the float system. US Army Corps of Engineers design requirements are that the wave conditions inside the harbor shall be one (1) foot or less for a two percent (2%) Annual Exceedance Percentage forcing event. This will be a fifty (50) year design wave approaching the harbor. The analysis will need to look into winds and waves at the site, determine where the largest waves can come from, and the worst case forcing wave scenario. It could be that the mud flats to the west of the harbor attenuate the energy from that direction, or tidal and surge conditions could provide sufficient depth over the flats to generate or transmit large waves in from that direction. Wind generated waves from the northeast will need to be modeled. The analysis will need a report that provides sufficient detail into the data sources and analysis methods used to determine forcing wave cases, a thorough description of the model's governing mechanics to show that it produces phase resolving results (it models individual waves) and can adequately model wave reflection, methodology for defining the model's domain in terms of bathymetry, friction factors, fluid properties, and any other model parameter that the modeler must choose to run the model. The report will need to describe how the model was calibrated to replicate known conditions to validate results. The modeler's credentials in using the selected model will also need to be provided as this type of software is not something that can be purchased and run in a stock configuration. The modeler needs to show adequate experience in defining model domains and calibrating model results to observed data. Please provide modeler's credentials.

2. Question:

Specification section 4.2.1, items C and K, and 4.2.9 items I, J and K appear to be in conflict. Can you please clarify if a modular concrete system with a through-rod and waler structural system is permitted on this project?

Response:

The use of walers and through rods are allowed for float module-to-module connections but shall not be a component of the internal structural system of the float itself.

3. Question

Can you please clarify Section 4.6.1 item D – are double hose bib risers required on only one side of the float at every fourth stall (potentially servicing 8 stalls) or are the risers to be provided on both sides (servicing 4 stalls)?

Response:

Revise Sec. 4.6.1 to read, "A dedicated hose bib connection shall be provided for each slip. Hose bibb connections shall face inboard on the main float."

4. Question:

Please confirm the design snow load for the moorage float system for freeboard and structural evaluations. Note: Section 3.5 lists 100psf. Snow load for design is 100psf

Response:

The snow load for design is 100psf. If the proposer's design cannot meet the DL+SL freeboard evaluations listed in Sec. 4.1, their Proposal shall clearly indicate what the freeboard condition will be and explain how the in-float utilities and/or other float system elements will be protected under the loading condition.

5. Question:

Please provide a copy of the IHA applications as referenced in Appendix E – Environmental Permitting Summary

Response:

Two IHAs applications are currently being prepared. They will request take of species under the jurisdiction of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (sea otters) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (whales, seals, sea lions, etc.). The applications are based on the current design and will request ample amounts of take.

6. Question:

Appendix F – Section 4.7 Fire Suppression System. Please confirm the requirements of subsections A and B. These sections appear to be in conflict with the requirements of NFPA.

Response:

Follow NFPA 14-2019.

A. Class 1 (dry) Standpipe with the ability to flow at least 300 GPM.

13.5.4 requires 100psi at the most remote 2-1/2" outlet

13.5.5.2 requires the minimum flow rate of 750 GPM

13.5.6.1 requires 250 GPM at (3) hydraulically most distant risers

B. Risers with 1 ³/₄ inch hose connections, no further than every 100 feet 13.5.1.2.1 requires connection every 150 feet

7. Question:

Please confirm the requirements of the pedestal crane. The specifications in the drawings call out a 5-ton hydraulic crane (rated at 10' radius) and a maximum as-rigged lift at 10' radius of 4,000 lbs (2 tons). These values appear to be in conflict.

Response:

Provide a marine pedestal crane with a 5-ton lifting capacity at 10-ft from the edge of the dock. See revised drawings S3.

8. Question

Appendix F - Section 4.1.6 subsection B states that creosote treatment is not allowed, unless approved by the Owner. Will creosote treatment be allowed for glulam members located above water and not exposed to surfaced contact on the trestles and floats? Additionally, many treatment alternatives allowed by AWPA are prohibited by regulatory agencies for over/near water applications. Can you confirm the specific pressure treatments that will be permitted by regulatory agencies for this project?

Response:

Revise paragraph B, Section 4.1.6. of Appendix F as follows: Creosote treated wood will not be allowed in areas of contact with users or boats (i.e., decking, rubboards, handrails and bullrails). Creosote treated timber will be allowed in other areas in accordance with AWPA U1 standards for the applicable type of wood and use category.

This addendum is issued to modify the previously issued proposal documents and/or given for informational purposes and is hereby made a part of the proposal documents. Please attach this addendum to the documents in your possession.

City of Cordova

Signed: Samantha Greenwood

Print: Samantha Greenwood

Its: Public Works Director, City of Cordova



NTS

