



INFORMATION TO BIDDERS

for

MARINE PARK DECKOVER Contract No. BE21-203

ISSUED BY:

City and Borough of Juneau
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Date Issued: June 3, 2022

The following information is posted online. Please refer to the CBJ Engineering Public Purchase webpage at: <https://www.publicpurchase.com/gems/juneau.ak/buyer/public/home>. This is **not** an addendum.

CLARIFICATIONS:

QUESTION: *“On sheet E2, the last Luminaire on the right side of the page is shown as a dual head pole with a camera, also noted as existing. On site I noted this pole as a single head pole with no camera. Are there any mistakes with this depiction that may increase the scope of work?”*

RESPONSE: The noted luminaire was recently replaced and no longer includes a camera as stated.

QUESTION: *“On sheet E5, detail 3 shows the front and side installations of the capstan control post. It is not clear to me who is to provide the Capstan, Capstan control cabinet, & Foot Pedal storage. Is the intent for these boxes to be provided with the capstan or by the electrical contractors under division 26? If to be provided by the electrical contractor, can specifications be provided for these junction boxes for their sizes and contents?”*

RESPONSE: The provisions of products need to be coordinated within the Project Contract. The enclosure dimensions are dependent on the products within. They should be similar to those provided for other capstans at the CBJ docks.

QUESTION: *“Comparing Sheet E2 to E3, there are several of the (R) of the Cathodic Protection System junction boxes. The locations appear to be very similar between the two drawings. Can direction be given as to where the individual boxes are to be relocated from and to so that a scope of work can be established?”*

RESPONSE: Some of the junction boxes will conflict with the new deck. They need to be relocated to avoid such conflict, generally downward.

QUESTION: *“In regards to the Cathodic Protection System junction boxes, can the number of raceways, conductors and enclosed equipment associated with each box be provided so that a scope of work can be established?”*

RESPONSE: Contractor review in the field is required.

QUESTION: *“On sheet E2, in the middle of the page there is a conduit that changes to an underground raceway and appears to terminate into a handhole. This is not labeled as new, existing, relocated or to be removed. Is there a scope of work with this raceway or is it simply shown for reference?”*

RESPONSE: The conduit, conduit, and handhole are shown for reference.

QUESTION: *“On sheet E2, sheet note 1 directs us to remove the spare conductors. Can the number, & size of the conductors be provided along with the extent these conductors are to be removed back to?”*

RESPONSE: There are two or three No. 10 or 12 conductors. Their destination is unknown.

QUESTION: *“Can the make & model of the Switchboard-SWBDN be provided in order to identify the 40/3 breaker required for the new capstan?”*

RESPONSE: The switchboard was fabricated by RSE-SIERRA. The circuit breakers are manufactured by Siemens. The Contractor should confirm this in the field.

QUESTION: *“S101 - Distance between grids 6 & 7, grade break and existing dock references detail on transition to existing (S107). No distance is listed for figuring this section of dock.”*

RESPONSE: The intent is to field fit from existing to new. For bidding purposes, the distance is approximately 6 feet. The contractor is responsible to adjust the final length of members in this section to field fit according to the plans and specifications.

QUESTION: *“Are the spin fin tips required to be galvanized as well?”*

RESPONSE: No, the spin tips are not required to be galvanized.

QUESTION: *“Reference Section 03420 Part 3.1.E - Can the dimensional tolerances be increased to those found in PCI MNL 135?”*

RESPONSE: Yes, this is acceptable, as panels will be ultimately buried with soil/landscaping so dimensional differences will not be a factor.

QUESTION: *“Reference Section 03420 Part 3.1.I – Can the sandblast requirement be waived or substituted with pressure wash?”*

RESPONSE: Yes, this is acceptable.