

Addendum Date: March 29, 2023

CITY OF PENSACOLA, FLORIDA
ADDENDUM #5

BERTH 6 REHABILITATION PROJECT

BID NO: 23-013

The following items take precedence over the documents for the above named item. All other terms and conditions shall remain the same.

**A SIGNED COPY OF THIS ADDENDUM MUST BE RETURNED
WITH YOUR SUBMITTAL AS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.**

Company: _____

Date: _____

Authorized:

Representative: _____
Printed Name

Title: _____

Signature: _____

1. Project completion to be 400 Calendar days after the commencement date set by the City of Pensacola.
2. Listed below are emailed questions received from potential bidders with responses indicated in red:
 - a. Article 5.14(2) of the General Conditions states the awarded Contract will be no damages for delay. This is contrary to the industry standard and places a significant risk upon the Contractor. Please confirm that Contractor shall be entitled to seek an equitable adjustment to the Contract price and/or time to complete the Work as a result of City caused delays, or explain what is intended.
No additional compensation will be provided by the City. The Contractor may request an extension to the contract time as stated.
 - b. Please confirm that in the unlikely event of Contractor's untimely completion, the City's sole damages shall be the set Liquidated Damages amount, or explain what is intended.
Damages will be per the documents included in the project manual.
 - c. The Contract Documents do not expressly exclude damages other than direct damages or liquidated damages. These other damages would be in the nature of indirect damages. Please confirm that each Party expressly waives any claim for

indirect or consequential damages that could be demanded by either Party against the other, or explain what is intended.

Damages will be per the documents in the project manual.

- d. Please confirm that if the City takes beneficial occupancy of the Project or any identifiable portion of the Project, such beneficial occupancy shall constitute Substantial Completion and commence warranty obligations with respect to the occupied portion of the Work, or, if not, clarify what is intended.

If the City begins utilizing a portion of the project prior to the completion of the entire project, the occupied portion being utilized will be deemed substantially complete and the warranty obligations will begin for said portion only.

- e. Please consider extending the overall project duration to 450 days due to the complexity of the structure, phasing requirements, operational maintenance and operation impacts of the facility.

Refer to item 1 above.

- f. Can the Port provide a basis of ship impact delays or operational delays per month that can be included as a baseline for all contractors to incorporate into their bids?

Cemex has an average of two (2) ships a month and it takes approximately 3-4 days to unload a ship.

- g. In order to provide a thorough bid, we request an additional 2 week extension of the bid date.

Bid date has been extended per Addendum #4.

- h. Please clarify the requirements for the catwalks to remain in place during construction. The current design of the cat walk will cause it to interfere with the construction of the deck and be required to be removed during deck construction.

It is understood that portion(s) of the catwalk must be removed during construction of the new deck. Coordination with Cemex and the Port will need to occur to ensure bollards can be accessed and vessels can be serviced.

- i. Refer to Sheet D4, section labeled "Demolition – Typical Beam Section" indicates that the contract shall utilize hand tools for demolition near transverse beam and deck slab tie ins. Please provide a criteria of what is considered acceptable hand tools.

The intent is to utilize to hand operated concrete chipping hammers.

- j. Refer to Sheet D4, section labeled "Demolition – Typical Beam Section", the vertical face of the existing wall/haunch be wire sawed in lieu of hand demo? The new reinforcing in that location appears to be drilled and epoxied and the existing rebar does not appear to be incorporated into the new beam.

Yes.

- k. We understand the testing specification for the concrete ready mix. However we were unsure if the concrete testing requirements pertained also to the infill grout for the Cathodic Protection (CP) life jackets. Since this testing is atypical, we wanted to clarify our current understanding. Please confirm if there are any field or lab testing requirements for the life jacket infill grout.

No testing is required for the life jacket grout.

- l. Sheet S10 – Pile Repair Details & Notes: The concrete pile repair detail shows a water tight seal at the base of the jacket. The manufacturer requires water to wick into the infill in order for the CP jacket to properly function.

- i. Can this be understood as a “Mortar Tight Seal”?

Yes.

- ii. If water tight seal is desired, could this seal be removed after initial set of filler grout? The intended result of removal would be to allow water to saturate the hardened grout over time thus benefiting the current within the Cathodic Protection.

Yes.

- m. Contractors were advised during the site visit that they will periodically have to move barges and tugs away from Berth 6 and clear the work area to allow CEMEX to moor ships for unloading operations. This would be an effective suspension of work each time this happens. We don't find any provision for this in the contract. So that all bidding contractors can approach it the same way, please advise how many relocations and stoppages of related Work (and for what duration) that contractors should allow for in their bid.

Reference item “f” above.

- n. Reference Drawings S3, S4, S5 & S6. Section A / Detail 1 on S6 gives a section through the proposed temporary walkway and calls out an Elevation of EL. 8.75' for bottom of the support for the 30" dia pipe that will support the walkway. It also shows the height from the bottom of the support to the center of the pipe as 1'-10 ³/₄". This puts the bottom of the support pipe at approx.. Elevation 9.39'. The top of concrete elevation in that area is approx. 11.3'. According to the Scope of Work, contractors are to: *“Furnish & install new structural steel walkways W1 & W2 and associated stairs and landings S1 & S2. Includes relocation for Phase 2 and removal after completion of Phase 2.”* The existing concrete deck will have to be demolished prior to the installation of the walkway. The new concrete conflicts with the new walkway by almost 2', so it would have to be removed before the new concrete deck and beams could be constructed in that area. This essentially leaves no period of time during which the temporary walkway could be installed, as it's not available to install until the existing concrete is demolished and, as soon as the existing concrete is demolished, the new concrete must be formed and placed. Please advise how this phasing and location conflict it to be resolved.

Yes, the existing berth 6 concrete deck must be removed to install the temporary walkways. It is anticipated that the entire phased section will not be poured at once and a number of the walkways would be installed to access the bollards. If this is not the case, means to access the existing bollards will have to be provided. As pointed out in your RFI regarding elevations, the stairs and end sections of the walkways cannot be installed as currently drawn. Revisions to the stairs and end section of the walkways will have to be made to appropriately interface with the existing/new dock elevations.

- o. Is the sheet pile along the length of Berth 6 the same type of steel throughout it's entire length?

Yes, refer to the Original Berth 6 Construction reference drawings provided; specifically drawings W-S4 thru W-S6.

- p. In order to select the correct weld rod for welding patches underwater we need to determine the carbon equivalent of the sheet pile steel. Can you provide the carbon equivalent and or the chemical analysis of the sheet pile steel? If not can you specify what underwater weld rod is to be used to install the patches?

Per the existing reference drawings, the existing sheet pile is USS Section number MZ38 or Bethlehem Section Number ZP38. These are hot rolled, carbon steel sheetpile with minimum yield strength of 50 ksi and it is expected that typical welding rods can be utilized.

- q. Reference is made to drawing D4 – section “DEMOLITION-TYPICAL BEAM SECTION. Reference also Berth 6 Original Construction Drawing W-S9 sections 2, 3 & 5.

Question: APTIM drawing D4, referenced above, does not indicate that there are existing dowels extending from the top of the piles into the existing cast in place concrete beams. Sections 2, 3 & 4 of the above referenced Original Construction Drawings show vertical reinforcing in the area of the top of the piles that could represent vertical reinforcing projecting from the top of the piles into the existing concrete beams. This makes a significant difference in the demolition approach for the project. Please confirm whether or not there is reinforcing steel or prestressed tendons that extend from the existing piles into the existing cast in place concrete beams.

The reference drawings have been provided for the contractor's use and interpretation of the existing construction. Aptim's interpretation of the sections shown on drawing W-S9 is that there are (2) sets of #4 ties shown above the piles and those are for the transverse beams.

- r. Reference Drawing D1 and Scope of Work - Demolition and disposal of existing ship unloader storm lock tower foundations. Questions: The tower foundations, located on sheet D1 on NW corner – to what extent do these need to be removed? Can a detail be provided?

No existing drawings are available on these foundations and the intent is to remove the concrete pile cap in its entirety. Plan dimensions of the concrete pile cap are approximately 3.5' x 8.0', depth unknown.

- s. Reference Dwg. D1 Note on the upper left: On the 1" deep cut, on sheet D1 on NW corner – is the slab to be removed 1", leaving concrete on the back side of the rebar, or is it simply a score cut and demo to reveal the top mat of rebar for re-pour?

The 1" deep cut is to score the top. The entire concrete slab is to be removed while preserving the existing reinforcing steel.

- t. Reference Addendum #3. An aerial view of the Port was provided identifying a Transload Area from Water to Land, well West of the Berth 6 site. Question: Is there an option to move the transload area, if we see fit, to the East or West of our work areas instead of the side as shown in Addendum 3?

The area shown in Addendum 3 was chosen to maintain port operations along the berth. The contractor may not move the transload area as they see fit. A meeting with the port and tenants would be required to determine a possible different location.

- u. During demolition related concrete sawing, is there any slurry containment / recovery requirements other than that required for turbidity control?

No.

- v. Note 2 on Plan Sheet G6 states: *"For both phases, the 75MT bollards currently located on the top of the mooring & breasting dolphins shall be removed for Re-use on the new concrete deck. Removal of the existing bollards shall be scheduled such that no more than two bollards are removed and out of service at a time. Relocated Bollards shall require new anchor bolts."* Question: Please advise if mooring bollard removal / installation / re-installation can be performed independent of the demolition and new construction phases (I & II) so long as there are a minimum of 5 bollards available for use at all times.

The intent is to keep a minimum of five (5) bollards in operation at all times to service vessels.

- w. Berth 6 Breasting & Moring Dolphins Water Line Replacement Sheet U1 – Indicates bottom of concrete is at Elevation 6.5. The original construction plans sheet S8 (typical section 4) indicates top of concrete is at Elevation 11.00 and bottom of concrete (or beam) is 4' below which is elevation 7.0. Can you please confirm the correct elevation for the existing bottom of concrete.

Per the Original Berth 6 Construction drawings, the elevation for the bottom of the transverse beams is shown at 7.0'.