



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
.SAMPLE	test	Pending	05/07/2015	05/17/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jeannine Kerran		To: Webcor Construction LP Adib Sassine	Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: THIS IS OUR TEMPLATE		SUGGESTION: DO NOT ENTER HERE	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
0001	SCS - Transfer Girder Clarification	Void	05/15/2014	05/25/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please clarify the designer's intent: Sheet SI-2303 indicates that the south end of Transfer Girder TR9 extends beyond the B87 and B88 beams southern edge and partially into the intersecting MFBI beam which is angular to the B87 beam. Section 8/S 1-3701 indicates that there are welded rebar couplers at the top flange of the TR9 girder to match the B78 beam reinforcing, but the B78 beam ends at the B87/B88 intersection prior to the southern end of the TR9 girder.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
0002	Wedge Barriers at Beale Street	Void	06/09/2014	06/19/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44/APA 1.2.E Shows only two wedge barriers at Beale Street (Bus Plaza). The drawings show four wedge barriers at Beale Street (Bus Plaza) at GL 33. Revise and coordinate documents accordingly.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
0003	Coating for Metal Surfaces	Void	06/09/2014	06/19/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per 05 15 21 Steel Castings (see attached), steel castings		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
0004	<p>(most notably the cast nodes) are to be furnished as bare metal. This was confirmed in the construction issues meeting held on 04/17/14 (see attached), with the indication that coating of the bare metal is to be included in TG16.5 Painting. 09 97 16 High Performance Coatings & Superstructure Package (see attached) identifies a coating system for exterior exposed factory-primed metal surfaces, and a coating system for galvanized steel, but not a coating system for exterior exposed unprimed/non-galvanized metal surfaces. Please provide the coating system for all unprimed/non-galvanized metal surfaces.</p> <p>Watertight Condition 07 14 13</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST: Reference: 07 14 13, 1.8.B</p> <p>See P1-0116. Same requirement for completely watertight building during new construction -waterproofing installation is not feasible.</p>	Void	06/11/2014	06/21/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By:				
			SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
0005	<p>Seismic Joint Coordination Between A Drawings</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST: Reference: A1-8880, A1-2302, A1-7001</p> <p>Per A1-8880, WJC8 and RJC1 are located between Stair 201 and the adjacent existing building. Per A1-2302 and A1-7001, there does not appear to be a seismic joint at this location. Please revise so that drawings match each other.</p>	Void	06/11/2014	06/21/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By:				
			SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
0006	BGP - Bracing removal sequence on the East end of Zone 4	Void	07/25/2014	08/04/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Bracing removal sequence on the East end of Zone 4 WOJV is proposing the following sequence for the bracing removal for the east side of Zone 4. See sketch SK1, attached.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sequence 1. Remove level D struts and walers from within the green clouded area up to GL- 32.2 once the mat slab beneath has reached adequate strength. 2. Remove level D struts within the Blue clouded area STD-65 to 74, 82 & 83 and all corresponding walers once the mat slab beneath has reached adequate strength, the sequence for de-stressing will be the diagonals struts should be all de-stressing prior to the 4 remaining cross lot struts (STD-65,66,67 & 68).							
For the remaining levels A, B and C WOJV is proposing to follow a similar removal sequence as Level D							
Please confirm if this sequence would be acceptable.							
<hr/>							
0007	Void	Void	07/25/2014	08/04/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Void					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
0007.1	BRP - Contaminated Materials Location Meeting 6/20/14 - Action Items	Closed	06/23/2014	07/03/2014	06/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Judith Long				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Per the Contaminated Materials Meeting held at 1:30PM in BRAVO conference room at the WOJV office on 6/20/2014 between SCCI, WOJV, Turner, TJPA, PMPC, and Treadwell & Rollo, please address the following post-meeting action items (meeting minutes to be distributed):					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			See attached Site Plan from Langan Treadwell Rollo				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 4 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>1) Provide site map characterizing locations of Class I and Class II contaminated materials on site and the depths of contamination at these locations (Map to be provided by Treadwell & Rollo to TJP A for distribution to SCCI). SCCI will use this map to plan safe excavation and handling of excavated materials.</p> <p>2) Confirm that Federal RCRA classified waste is not expected to be encountered on the site at this time per soil boring logs and testing. Further stockpile testing will be performed by Treadwell & Rollo at the direction of the TJPA as necessary to determine final soil classification for disposal.</p>						
0008	SCS - Pendulum Bearing Test Results From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang REQUEST: RFI T-1591 response noted two requirements to waive the testing requirements. 1. Provide specifications for the product that is intended to be used in the project that meets the design requirements outlined in the contract documents. See attached preliminary Pendulum Bearing product information and drawing. 2. Provide test data for a bearing that is comparable in size and performance to those intended to be used in this project tested with conditions that are comparable to the design requirements. Please see attached additional performance test results from other bearings of comparable size and performance. Also reference T-1591 for previously submitted test results. Please confirm that the mentioned test reports could serve as evidence of the proper functioning of mageba pendulum bearings, as well as the fulfillment for the	Void To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello SUGGESTION:	09/10/2014 Answered By:	09/20/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i><u>Number</u></i>	<i><u>Subject</u></i>	<i><u>Status</u></i>	<i><u>Date Created</u></i>	<i><u>Date Required</u></i>	<i><u>Date Answered</u></i>	<i><u>Cost Impact</u></i>	<i><u>Proceed</u></i>
----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------

testing requirements in the specifications.

0009	Sloping to Drain on Bathroom Floor Plans	Void	09/18/2014	09/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--	------	------------	------------	--	-------------	--------------------------

From: Webcor Construction LP

Andrew Kitchen

To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello

Answered By:

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference: 2/A1-9001, 2/A1-9002, 2/A1-9004, 2/A1-9012, 2/A1-9015, 2/A1-9017, 2/A1-9021, 2/A1-9023, 2/A1-9024, 3/A1-9033, 3/A1-9034, 5/A1-9041, 10/A1-9042 (IFC Main Set 03/31/2014)

Bathroom floor plans show sloping adjacent to the drain, but flat at the remainder of the field tile (see 2/A1-9001, 2/A1-9002, 2/A1-9004, 2/A1-9012, 2/A1-9015, 2/A1-9017, 2/A1-9021, 2/A1-9023, 2/A1-9024, 3/A1-9033, 3/A1-9034). 5/A1-9041 and 10/A1-9042 call out for a setting bed on topping slab at the restroom floors. Please confirm only the areas around the floor drains, as shown on the floor plans, are to be sloped, and that a setting bed is not required where tile is not sloped (i.e. the tile is thin set on the topping slab).

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
0010	BRP - Number of Barrette Pile Tremies	Void	09/18/2014	09/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titche</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Contract drawing S-3191 indicates two openings (for two tremies) in each Barrette's rebar cage. This drawing is in conflict with Contract Specification 31 63 32 3.4 D 3 that indicates that three tremies are needed for each Barrette (one tremie for each 7 feet of wall length). Please note that the Response to RFI-0050 allowed for the length of the barrette piles to be increased from 20'-0" to 21 '-0".</p> <p>The European Standard EN 1538 indicates two tremies (properly spaced so that the concrete does not have to travel more than 8 feet) is sufficient for each Barrette. Additionally, in reference to RFI BRP-0055 and, in an effort to reduce rebar congestion, 2 tremies are preferred.</p> <p>Please confirm that two tremie pipes per Barrette are acceptable.</p>							
0011	Unit Pricing	Void	09/23/2014	10/03/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author:</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Reference Specification Section 32 91 30 3.6.A.1 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)</p> <p>This section states to "Provide allowance for 15 eight-hour days of adjustment grading work with a work crew of six using rakes ans shovels to smooth and shape the planting area surfaces. Provide unit cost per day." If a unit price is desired, it needs to be part of the Unit Price Specification. Unit Prices should not be in the technical specifications. Please remove and place in the Unit Price Specification.</p>							
0012	SCS - Electrical Conduit in Foundation Wall	Void	09/29/2014	10/09/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titche</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author:</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Reference: ES-2107(Dated: 04/24/14) , A1-3010(Dated:</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 7 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>07/18/14)</p> <p>Detail A & B on ES-2107 provides the section view for PG&E 12 KV Main Service coming into North Electrical Room (B1289) but A1-3010 doesn't refer to an Elevation view identifying these sleeves in the walls. Please confirm the section views and the elevation of the bottom of the conduits in Detail A&B/ES-2107 are correct.</p> <p>Reference : A1-9244(Dated: 07/18/14), ES-2107 to ES-2111(Dated: 04/24/14)</p> <p>Detail D/A1-9244 specifies center to center vertical spacing between 2" and 6" electrical conduits as 1'-5"(See attached). Please confirm this spacing is applicable to all the section details in ES-2107 to ES-2111 entering the building, if not please provide the center to center vertical spacing between 2' and 6" conduits called out in ES-2107 to ES-2111.</p> <p>Reference: ES-2107 to ES-2111(Dated: 04/24/14)</p> <p>The section view on ES-2107 to ES-2111 calls out the bottom of the conduit elevations for 2" and 6" conduits. Please confirm these elevations are accurate for all the ES drawings.</p>						
0013	<p>TTC - Civil Station to Architectural Gridline Correlation</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST: The Architectural and Civil drawings contain no correlation between Stations and gridlines. Please provide a correlation so that points can be referenced between different sets of drawings.</p>	Void	10/08/2014	10/18/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By:				
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 9 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
0017	TTC - Reference Error	Void	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	04/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2505 Location: Zone 3, Bus Deck Level Gridline: E.2/22-23 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #037 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #037. There is a not recognizable reference mark at E.2/22-23 grids on A1-2505 plan. The probable mark is B/XA1-5615. Incorrect reference should be corrected. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI was submitted under the wrong RFI number. I am voiding and submitting with the correct number - see RFI T-2680.		
<hr/>							
0018	VOID	Void	05/05/2015	05/15/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
0019	BRP - Deck Drain Rebar Tail Conflict	Void	05/07/2015	05/17/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By:				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S-6300, S-3170 Location: Bent 8-1/8-2 Lot G Add'l Doc: RFI B-0246 Per RFI Response B-0246, SCCI is to place the deck drain pipe in columns 8-1 and 8-2 at 1 foot from the center of columns. As shown in the attached sketch, SCCI will have to cut the rebar tails to make this new layout work. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 10 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
0020	Voided	Closed	05/27/2015	06/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Aseem Goyal	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:		
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company		Orvil Anthony					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1205.1	BGP - Lower Concourse Blockouts to Pour Train Level Partition Walls	Closed	03/22/2014	04/01/2014	04/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titcher	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Transbay Joint Powers Authority		Sylvia Wong					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please see attached drawing for the general layout of Lower Concourse blockouts taking into account the response to RFI T-1205. Due to limited site access to the Train Level once the Lower Concourse is poured, the partition walls will have to be poured in 2 lifts, except for the tank walls which will be poured monolithically. In the case where a blockout coincides with features above or below (ie beam below or future partition wall above) the blockout will be offset and the train level partition wall be poured using the "Bird's Mouth" method (see Detail 3 on attached drawings). To ensure consolidation in differing height wall pours, SCCI will install top bulkheads on walls with lower heights due to overhead beams. SCCI will maintain minimum separation gap between the top of partition wall and Lower Concourse elements as detailed. The blockouts will be installed with styrofoam per Detail 4 in the attached drawings, prior to the Lower Concourse being poured. The blackouts will have a keyway on each side with top and bottom rebar dissecting the blockouts per Details 1 and 2 in the attached drawings. Once the partition walls have been poured, the blockouts will be poured back with the same grout that will be used to pour back the trestle pile blockouts. Please confirm this is acceptable.				Where the RFI states that walls will be poured in "two lifts", this is interpreted to mean "two phases". Blockouts shall be poured back with concrete or product approved through the submittal process. Coordinate layouts and phasing plan with comments noted on Submittal TG0600-907.0 BGP - Construction Joint Layout - Partition Walls Area 3 and 4. RFI is confirmed in other regards.			
1503.1	BGP - Lower Concourse Grounding Grid Alternate Detail - North Electrical Room B	Closed	08/08/2014	08/18/2014	08/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titcher	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
As a follow up to RFI T-1503, attached. Please confirm the				WSP has no exceptions, subject to SFPUC			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 11 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	below detail, similar to PUC approved detail shown in RFI T-1503 is acceptable and will be incorporated into lower concourse electrical room B1289, Grid Line 1.5/B. Please note all parameters and inspection requirements as confirmed in RFI T-1503 will remain consistent.			acceptance.			
				Judy Long 8/20/14: Please see the attached response for the ground grid. The ground grid was reviewed and approved for the first electrical switchboard service room. The ground grid for the second room is essentially the same.			
				The ground grid for the second electrical service must be inspected by PUC and DBI prior to the concrete pour.			
				Walter Melville, PE			
				Electrical Engineer			
				SF PUC Power			
				dated 8/20/14 via email (see attached)			
2793.1	VOID	Void	04/24/2015	05/04/2015	Potentially		
	From: Webcor Construction LP	To: Turner Construction Company	Answered By:				
	Quang Le	Phil Militello					
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California Dis						
	Ryan Clayton						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 12 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
2953.1	SCS - GL 11 Architectural Wall follow up	Closed	05/28/2015	06/07/2015	06/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-7303, SKS 0315 Location: Ground Level Gridline: 11 Add'l Doc Ref: Sketches Attached and RFI 2953 Per conversation with SEOR field representative regarding RFI T -2953 response, please confirm the following: Response to RFI T -2953 Question 3: Within the plan area of the knock out slab, (1a) No connection to the upper slab will be made (1b) The wall shall be placed hard against the existing TR -II closure plate. (1c) Please confirm it is acceptable to provide pour holes in closure plate as required by the contractor's means and methods. Response to RFI T -2953 Question 2 may be amended, and Question 3 supplemented, as follows: Within the plan area of a knock out slab, each wall shall: (2a) be a 6" concrete wall reinforced with #5's at 12" o.c. ea. way located at wall mid-depth. (2b) have vertical reinforcing consisting of "L" shaped bars with horizontal legs lapped a distance "LTS" per Detail/SI-3001 as Category I. Horizontal legs shall be kept as near the deck as possible, but no less than 5/8". Provide continuous nosing bar at bend. Response to RFI T-2953 Question 2 may be amended, and Question 3 supplemented, as follows: Between knock out slabs (GL D.6 to E.4), (3a) the lower (TOC 19.76) and upper (TOC 23.26) slabs shall be continuous with the wall. (3b) Provide similar wall reinforcing and detailing as per knock out panel areas using "Z" shaped vertical reinforcing bars. (3c) Cut TR-11 closure plate as required to provide full concrete continuity. (3d) Construction joints may be located at the contractor's discretion and shall be roughened. Response to RFI T-2953 Question 6 clarification: Within			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			1. Confirmed on all counts.				
			2. Confirmed on all counts.				
			3. Confirmed on all counts.				
			4. Confirmed on all counts.				
			Answered by Design Team: 6/13/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/16/15				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 13 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the plan area of a knock out panel, each wall may have:</p> <p>(4a) a cold joint between the top of wall and the TR-11 closure plate,</p> <p>(4b) a smooth vertical cold joint between the knock out panel wall and the wall located between knock out panels, and</p> <p>(4c) a smooth vertical cold joint between the knock out panel wall and the intersecting curb such that the knock out panel wall can be removed along with the knock out panel. No reinforcing is to cross these joints. For waterproofing 2/A1-8718 (sim at the W-2 curb) shall be applied.</p>						
<hr/>							
B-0001	BRP - Project Alignment Coordinates	Closed	05/29/2014	06/08/2014	06/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Note 58 on Contract Drawing C-0005 gives a project start location of Alignment BBTT as 1722.28 feet at bearing S67°27'21"E from DPW Survey Control Point No. 54. Though the entire BBTT alignment could be calculated from this information, there would be no check tie at the end of the alignment and significant errors could result. Shimmick Construction Company Inc. (SCCI) requests that the coordinates of the begin curve (BC) and end curve (EC) be supplied to supplement the given curve data. Additionally, SCCI requests that the coordinates for the BC and EC locations for the curves of all alignments be supplied.		The distance and bearing from DPW Control Point No. 54 to Station 29+88.82 is 403.97 feet at N16°26'45"W. Contractor to verify.					
<hr/>							
B-0001.1	BRP - Project Alignment Coordinates	Closed	06/16/2014	06/26/2014	06/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>SCCI has received the response to RFI #0001 which provided a way to determine coordinates of the end of the "BBTT" alignment. However, no begin of curve (BC) or end of curve (EC) coordinates were given as requested. In order to properly lay out the alignments, SCCI will have to rely on CAD drawings provided in Transmittal No. 150-00268 from Jon Valencia (PMPC). SCCI would like to confirm that the CAD drawings provided in this transmittal are warranted to be used for construction.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						<p>Coordinates of the begin and end of curves (BC and EC) can be calculated with the alignment data presented in the drawing. The distance and bearing to and from the survey control points can be used for checking the alignment layout.</p>
B-0002	BRP - Hazardous and Contaminated Materials Location	Closed	05/29/2014	06/08/2014	06/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Phil Sandri				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Bid Items 40,41, and 42 cover contaminated soils and debris off-haul and disposal. Contract drawings and specifications do not provide information regarding the specific expected locations of this material and the expected quantities at these locations. Please provide an explanation of how these bid item quantities were determined and a map indicating where contaminated materials should be encountered on the project.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				Bid items were estimated based on data from "Transbay Transit Center Program Limited Phase II Soil and Groundwater Invetsigation Report Transbay Terminal West Loop Bus Ramps and Future Transit Center Site East of Beale St." (ERM-West, December 2008) as well as "Transbay Program Site Management Plan Addendum Transbay Transit Center Bus Ramps" (Treadwell & Rollo, February 2013).			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0003	BRP - Project Control Points	Closed	05/29/2014	06/08/2014	06/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Notes 53, 54 and 56 on Contract Drawing C-0005 reference control points utilized by Martin Ron Associates for the job topographic survey Shown on Contract Drawing Sheets 386-397. Only one Survey Control Point, DPW Survey Control Point No. 54, is shown on these drawings. SCCI requests that at least three additional job control point coordinates be supplied along with a description of those points.				The Contractor shal refer to additional survey control points provided within the Reference Survey Drawings.			
<hr/>							
B-0003.1	BRP - Project Control Points	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	06/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
SCCI has received and reviewed the response to RFI #0003 which directed attention to the reference survey drawings. SCCI has reviewed these drawings and found control points far from the Bus Ramps project. SCCI would like to confirm that no additional control points have been established within a reasonable distance of the work area. If additional survey control points are available, please provide				The survey control points for this project are provided in the survey reference document.			
Please see attached map for current control points given by the contract and reference survey drawings.							
<hr/>							
B-0004	BRP - Bent 8 CIDH Pile Construction Joints	Closed	06/05/2014	06/15/2014	06/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
As shown in the CIDH elevation detail on Contract Drawing S1-3190, there is an optional construction joint at the elevation of the bottom of column rebar cage, 18 feet below the cut off line. However, the Bent8 CIDH Elevation detail does not allow for an optional construction joint at the elevation of the bottom of column rebar cage. In order to facilitate the proper installation of the column rebar				This is acceptable.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>cages in CIDH Piles B8-1 and B8-2, it is necessary to have an optional construction joint at this location (see attachment for illustration). Therefore, SCCI proposes to revise the drawings to include this joint. Is this acceptable?</p>							
B-0005	BRP - Fremont Off Ramp Bent Weakened Plane Joints	Closed	06/06/2014	06/16/2014	06/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: The elevation view of the bents on sheet S-3100 show 5 weakened plane joints at the base of the columns. These can be seen in further detail from sheet S-3102, details H and 1. SCCI proposes that these weakened joints be removed so that bents match the condition of the existing Fremont street offramp bents.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is not acceptable. The weakened plane joints are required.			

B-0006	BRP - Utility Demolition Plan - Tehama Street	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Tsu Ling Peng				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Sheet U-1005 shows utility demolition work in the area surrounding Clementina Street, and Sheet U- 1006 shows utility demolition work in the area surrounding Howard Street. There is no sheet showing any utility demolition work (or lack thereof) in the area surrounding Tehama Street (between Clementina and Howard). Please provide plan sheet showing utility demolition work surrounding Tehama Street.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no existing utility demolition work proposed surrounding Tehama St, hence no demo drawing for this area is included in the set. Note - The proposed Bus Ramp is overhead crossing the Tehama St. The proposed footing and foundation construction do not impact the existing utilities and Tehama St. curb & gutter.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 17 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0006.1	BRP - Utility Demolition Plan - Tehama Street	Closed	06/25/2014	07/05/2014	07/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Tsu Ling Peng				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
In response to "RFI B-0006 BRP-Response-Utility Demolition Plan - Tehama Street", Shimmick requests a utility demolition/relocation plan for Tehama Street be provided (between Sheets U-1005 and U-1006). There is an existing CCSF Street Light in the path of the proposed new bus ramp, as well as an overhead utility line (Comcast fiber optic) and associated poles (PG&E) which will interfere with the proposed bus ramp construction. Please confirm CCSF streetlight and Comcast fiber optic line and poles on Tehama to be moved by others.			Contractor shall coordinate and relocate the existing above-ground and underground utilities impacted by the proposed bus ramp construction through the TJPA Representative.				
<hr/>							
B-0007	BRP - Hazardous and Contaminated Materials Location	Closed	06/12/2014	06/22/2014	06/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Phil Sandri				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Follow-Up To RFI B-0002 ERP-RESPONSE- Hazardous and Contaminated Materials Location:			Please see attached Treadwell & Rollo memo "Preliminary Estimate of Volume of Fill Material" dated 4.25.13. This document served as the basis for assumed material off-haul quantities included in the Bus Ramps bid form.				
RFI B-0002 ERP-RESPONSE- Hazardous and Contaminated Materials Location listed "Transbay Transit Center Program Limited Phase II Soil and Groundwater Investigation Report Transbay Terminal West Loop Bus Ramps and Future Transit Center Site East of Beale St." (ERM-West, December 2008) and "Transbay Program Site Management Plan Addendum Transbay Transit Center Bus Ramps" (Treadwell & Rollo, February 2013) as the basis of bid item estimates for bid items 40, 41, and 42.							
These documents do not provide for specific quantities and locations of Class I (Bid Item 40), Class II (Bid Item 41) and Federal RCRA (Bid Item 42) contaminated materials on site.							
Please provide a detailed map and/or plan indicating the locations of Class I, Class II, and Federal RCRA contaminated materials similar to the site plan sheets titled "Site Plan With Boring Locations and Map Extents" (Figures 2-7, Treadwell & Rollo) and provided in Spec 0113 50/ AP A - Site Mitigation Plan of the project							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	documents (provided as an attachment to this RFI).						
	Please confirm that all contaminated soils identification, testing, and analytics shall be provided by the TJPA and/or the prime contractor.						
B-0007.2	BRP - Hazardous Materials - Class I/II Locations	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Judith Long			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
In Figure 1 of "Site Plan of Preliminary Limits of State of California Class I Non-RCRA and Class II Non-Hazardous Fill Material", provided by Treadwell Rollo, the locations of the Class I and Class II materials are labeled incorrectly. The data provided in "Transbay Transit Center Program Limited Phase II Soil and Groundwater Investigation Report Transbay Terminal West Loop Bus Ramps and Future Transit Center Site East of Beale St." (ERM-West, December 2008), "Transbay Program Site Management Plan Addendum Transbay Transit Center Bus Ramps" (Treadwell & Rollo, February 2013) and per our meeting on 6/20/14, indicate that the Class I material was found in borings SB-04 through SB-09 as well as S-3 through S-5. These borings are identified as Class II material on the map provided. Borings SB-10 through SB-12 and S-1 /2 contained Class II material. It appears the colors in the legend are reversed. Please provide map with a revised legend.				See attached corrected site plan.			

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
B-0007.3	BRP - Hazardous Materials Location Follow Up	Closed	07/22/2014	08/01/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titcher</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div>Answered By:</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>							
<div>REQUEST:</div> <p>Per RFI-0007.2 Response, a map of locations of Class I and Class II contaminated soils located on the Bus Ramps site was provided by Treadwell & Rollo for use by SCCI. During the meeting held 6/20/2014 at the Webcor Offices to discuss the hazardous materials on site and development of a hazardous materials location map, it was indicated that there would be no federal RCRA material encountered on the site and that Class I and Class II contamination depths would vary between 1' and 2' below grade.</p> <p>During waste profiling with our disposal site, SCCI has encountered the following discrepancies:</p> <p>Per the T &R map, the area around sample SB-05 should be Class I material. Per the soil test analytics provided in the Bus Ramps Site Mitigation Plan and the ERM-West Phase II Soils Report, samples SB- 5-3 and SB-5-6 test over the Class I limit for Lead and Barium, respectively. Without the STLC (Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration) and TCLP (Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure) test results to confirm otherwise, material with these TTL (Total Threshold Limit Concentration) results would have to be classified and disposed of as a federal RCRA material which is in conflict with the direction provided by the T &R map and the 6/20 meeting discussion.</p> <p>Per the T&R map and meeting discussion, areas approximately north of Folsom Street would be contaminated with Class I material to a depth of 2' below grade, and areas approximately south of Folsom Street would be contaminated with Class II material to a depth of 1' below grade. A small portion of the area east of the Sterling substation would be contaminated with Class I material to a depth of 1 '. Per the soil test analytics provided in the Bus Ramps Site Mitigation Plan and the ERM-West Phase II Soils Report, samples SB-5-3 and SB-5-6 are both potentially contaminated to a Class I or federal RCRA classification level at depths below 2', which is in conflict with the direction provided by the T &R map and the 6/20 meeting discussion.</p> <p>The following is a list of possible soil samples provided which may be in conflict with the T &R map and 6/20 meeting discussion direction and may require additional</p>		<div>SUGGESTION:</div>		<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <p>Peter Cusak 8/12/14:</p> <p>As requested, additional samples were taken at deeper depths and tested including STLC and TCLP. The test results show soils locations and depths below 2' are Class II and as Class I Non-RCRA (See attached map dated 8/5/14).</p> <p>Based on the recent samples taken at various location mentioned in the tables 1 & 2, and recent analytical report (copies attached), the results confirmed presence of Class I & Class II contaminations, and no Federal RCRA material encountered on site (map provided)</p> <p>The abovementioned information is consistent with the Bid documents.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 20 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>testing to confirm soil classification:</p> <p>SB-4-3 Need STLC and TCLP for Lead SB-4-28 Need STLC for Chromium SB-5-3 Need STLC and TCLP For Lead SB-5-6 Need STLC and TCLP for Barium SB-7-3 Need STLC and TCLP for Lead SB-7-5 Need STLC for Chromium, Need STLC for Copper, Need STLC and TCLP for Lead SB-8-3 Need STLC and TCLP for Lead SB-8-21 Need STLC for Chromium SB-9-3 Need STLC for Chromium, Need STLC and TCLP for Lead SB-9-6 Need STLC for Chromium, Need STLC for Nickel SB-10-12.5 Need STLC for Chromium</p> <p>Please advise on discrepancies and additional test results and provide additional detail on location and depth of contamination on the site map.</p> <p>Also, all soil samples begin at 3' or greater depth below grade - please advise how contamination classification was determined for 1-2' depths below grade as the landfill will not accept the information as currently provided.</p>						
<hr/>							
B-0008	BRP - Bus Ramp to Transit Center Elevation Confirmation	Closed	06/12/2014	06/22/2014	06/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference attached Contract Documents.		The elevation discrepancy within the Bus Ramp drawings (Sheets S-2063 and C-2202) shall be governed by the elevation shown on C-2202.					
Elevation discrepancy's exist between the Transbay Transit Center drawings and the Bus Ramp Bridge drawings, see below.		The elevation discrepance within the TTC Building drawings (Sheets A1-2502 and A1-6102) shall be addressed by the Architect.					
TTC building drawing A1-2502: 57" - 11 1/4" (57.938') [HP of Bus Deck Level] A1-6102: 57' - 10" (57.833') [Bus Deck Level]		The elevation discrepancy between the Bus Ramp drawings and the TTC Building drawing appears to be citing elevations from different locations. BBTT STA					
Bus Ramp drawing							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 21 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>S-2063: 56' - 1 3/16" (56.10') ["BBTT" STA 29+04.81 FB] C-2202: 57' - 11 3/4 (57.98') [Calculated at STA 29+04.81 per vertical curve information]</p> <p>Please confirm which elevation governs.</p>			29+04.81 does not			
				appear to coincide with the location of the 57'-11 1/4" elevation along the TTC Building bus deck. The elevations cited for this discrepancy should be checked.			
B-0009	BRP - Exist Bent 20 Demolition	Closed	06/18/2014	06/18/2014	06/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: <p>As shown in Contract Drawing D-1005, the entire existing Bent 20 foundation is to be removed. However, USA North ticket #219688 located two ATT duct banks 3' away from, and running parallel to, the property line on the south sidewalk of Clementina St. This utility is not shown on the Contract Drawings. The utility is located directly on top of the Bent 20 foundation as shown on the attached sketch.</p> <p>Per SCCI's understanding, the reason to remove Bent 20 is to facilitate the installation of CIDH B4-3 and the drainage system shown on Contract Drawings U-1005 and C-4102. Shimmick proposes to remove the Bent 20 foundation only to the extent needed to enable the installation of CIDH B4-3 and the drainage system (the catch basin and sewer manhole will still be protected and supported in place). The extent of demolition should end roughly 4'-8" north of the CIDH pile to allow sufficient room for shoring yet not intrude on the utility. See attached drawing for proposed limits of demolition. Is this acceptable?</p>		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			SCCI's proposal is acceptable.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0010	BRP - Discrepancy Between Contract Drawing and As-Built	Closed	06/20/2014	06/30/2014	06/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: SCCI has reviewed Contract Drawing D-1006 and compared it to the Tieback As-built Document SH- 2600 per the Tieback Final Package from Balfour Beatty. The tieback angles are all different, most varying by roughly 8 degrees. The angle change affects the locations of the tiebacks as well. The precise location and angle of the tiebacks is paramount to the installation of shoring for pylon 9. SCCI would like to confirm that the As-builts are correct for layout use.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As indicated on Contract Drawing D-1006, location of tiebacks is approximate. The as-built tieback drawings should be used.	
<hr/>							
B-0011	BRP - Discrepancy In Girder layout	Closed	06/25/2014	07/05/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: On contract drawing S-6066 "Girder Layout- Frame No. 3", the sum of the dimensions for girders 3A through 3F is 51 '-0" while the plans scale to 52'-0". It appears that the error is in the dimension "3 EQ Spaces = 29'-0"" which is dimensioned as 29' -0", but scales to 30' -0". Please advise.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> On contract drawing S-6066 "Girder Layout- Frame No. 3", the "3 EQ Spaces = 29'-0" should be read as "3 EQ Spaces = 30'-0".	
<hr/>							
B-0012	BRP - Requirements for Shoring Design	Closed	06/26/2014	07/06/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Section 1.6H1 of Contract Specification Section 02 41 06 - Selective Site Demolition - Bus Ramps states that the "removal plan shall be prepared, wet-signed, and stamped by an engineer who is registered as a Structural Engineer in the State of California". This specification also applies to the design of temporary shoring for use in the demolition of existing foundations. Per California Business and Professions Code, licensed Professional Civil Engineers may design structures except			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> SCCi's proposal to allow the design of temporary shoring for demolition of existing foundations by a licensed Professional Civil Engineer deemed qualified by SCCI to have the qualifications and experience necessary for this work would be acceptable.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 23 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>for public schools and hospitals. Therefore, SCCI proposes to allow the design of temporary shoring for demolition of existing foundations to be prepared, wet-signed and stamped by a licensed Professional Civil Engineer deemed by SCCI to have the qualifications and experience necessary for this work.</p> <p>Is this acceptable?</p>						
B-0013	BRP - Existing Conditions As-Built Utility Drawings	Closed	06/26/2014	07/06/2014	07/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Tsu Ling Peng				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
<p>SCCI requests existing condition as-built utility drawings for TG 18.1. Existing utilities have been provided for Howard St in Contract Drawing U-1006, however, U-1003, U-1004 and U-1005 do not include any utilities (Harrison St, Folsom St, Clementina St and Tehama St).</p> <p>SCCI requests that Contract Drawings U-1003, U-1004 and U-1005 be updated, or new drawings issued, to reflect all existing utility locations similar those shown in Contract Drawing U-1006. As-built utility drawings are needed for Harrison St, Folsom St, Clementina St, Tehama St and Howard St in between 1st St and 2nd St. This includes, but is not limited to, the roadway and adjacent sidewalks, the area surrounding the Caltrans Sterling Substation adjacent to Interstate 80, as well as all areas and lots in between the above mentioned streets.</p>			<p>The available information of existing utilities during the design are shown on the contract drawings. Contractor shall perform site investigation, potholing and other requirements per specifications and the General Notes - Existing Utilities on sheet U-1001.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0014	Construction of Bent 20A, 21, 22, 23	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract drawings S-3100 and S-3102 show the bent details for Bent 20A, 21, 22 and 23. SCCI proposes to pour Section D of the main column using the following steps - Step 1: Pour the inner section (shown in green on the attached drawing) using a round, steel column form Step 2: Lateral reinforcement drilled and bonded to inner round core using an approved adhesive, from the Cal trans list of approved chemical adhesives (please see document attached). Step 3: Pour the outer square (shown in blue) in 4 lifts (with the weakened joint installed after each lift) to maintain the concrete finish, as per Spec 03 30 06. 5 lifts total: 1 center round core 4 outer separated by weakened joints Is this proposal acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed construction method is acceptable. The contractor should submit shop drawings for review prior to construction.		
<hr/>							
B-0015	BRP - AS-Built of 303-2nd st	Closed	07/08/2014	07/18/2014	07/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Per Contract Drawing D-1003 and Section I on D-1103, there is an existing retaining wall to be removed adjacent to the building 303 2nd St. In order to properly design our temporary shoring system at this location, SCCI needs to know of any possible conflicts in the immediate proximity of the excavation. Please provide the foundation as-builts of 303 2nd St.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The design team does not have foundation as-builts for 303 2nd St.		
<hr/>							
B-0016	BRP - Design Calculations for Connection to TTC	Closed	07/08/2014	07/18/2014	07/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 25 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0017	BRP - Frame 5 Dimension Discrepancy	Closed	REQUEST: Can the TJPA provide SCCI with ARUP's Frame 5 design calculations? This will allow OPAC to ensure that Frame 5 redesign will provide the same response characteristics, at the cable-stayed bridge and Transbay Terminal building interfaces, as were intended.				
			SUGGESTION:				
B-0017	BRP - Frame 5 Dimension Discrepancy	Closed	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Calculations for Frame 5 (the drop-in span) are attached.				
B-0017	BRP - Frame 5 Dimension Discrepancy	Closed	07/11/2014	07/21/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon ANSWERED By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
B-0017	BRP - Frame 5 Dimension Discrepancy	Closed	REQUEST: 1) Distance from RDS line to centerline bearing is shown to be 1'-3". Distance from centerline bearing to "TTBB" STA 29+07.235 is shown to be 3'-0". So the distance from RD5 to "TTBB" STA 29+07.235 should be 4'-3". However RD5 is shown to be at "TTBB" STA 29+03.000 which is only 4.235' or 4'-2 13/16" from "TTBB" STA 29+07.235. Please explain why there is a discrepancy of 0.015' or 3/16". 2) LD5 is shown to intersect the left edge of deck at "BBTT" STA 29+02.21, 10.51' left. LD5 is shown to intersect the right edge of deck at "BBTT" STA 29+02.67, 13.00' right. SCCI took the "BBTT" and "TTBB" alignments shown on sheet C-2101 and drew in the RD5 line at "TTBB" STA 29+03.00. SCCI then extended the RD5 line to create the LD5 line. When doing so, SCCI found that the LD5 line intersects the left edge of deck at "BBTT" STA 29+03.135, 10.51' left and intersects the right edge of deck at "BBTT" STA 29+02.594, 13.00' right. Please clarify whether the LD5 stations shown at edge of deck are correct.				
			SUGGESTION:				
B-0017	BRP - Frame 5 Dimension Discrepancy	Closed	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please see attached design sketch for clarification.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 26 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
B-0018	BRP - Bottom of Existing Footing Elevations	Closed	07/17/2014	07/27/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titcher	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup			Kevin Clinch
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon								

REQUEST:

SCCI bid and planned the shoring necessary for demolition of the existing footings per the response to Question TG18.1-037 of IFB Questions & Answers TG18.1 Set #3 which included the statement that the bents north of Folsom Street were similar to Section P on Contract Drawing D-1106. This section shows a footing that is immediately below existing grade and is eight feet thick.

Additionally, SCCI reviewed the reference documents to confirm the bottom of footing elevations for these footings. Supplemental Drawing Nos. 7A and 8A of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge Railway Facilities drawings show the elevations of the bottom of footings. The first note on the Supplemental Drawing No. F-112 of the SFO Bay Bridge Railway Facilities drawings states to subtract 11 . 71' from these elevations to correct them to the city datum. SCCI has done this and compiled these elevations below.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Arup does not have any more information than the Contractor has. We could not find a datum correction on the 1937 Contract R2 drawings, only on the 1939 Contract R3 drawings. For the purpose of proceeding with the work, we recommend that the contractor apply the datum correction from the Contract R3 drawings to the Contract R2 drawings and determine the existing foundation elevations based on this. Note the datum correction on Contract R3 drawing F-112 is from San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge Datum to City Datum. Refer to the survey drawings prepared by Martin M. Ron (specifically sheet 1 of 10) in the Contract Documents for the datum correction from NAVD88 to City datum.

This RFI will use the Bent 5 footing for example to show why SCCI does not believe that this is the correct datum correction to use. Section P on Contract Drawing D-1106 shows the Bent 5 footing immediately below grade and eight feet thick with a bottom of footing elevation of 53'-8". As shown in the table above, the elevation shown for this bottom of footing elevation on Supplemental Drawing 8A and correcting it to the city datum would provide an elevation of 29.29'. The same issue is easily seen using the section views on Bent 2 and 3 on the same Contract



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 27 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Drawing. Please confirm that the Datum Correction shown on Supplemental Drawing F-112 does not apply to Supplemental Drawings 7 A and 8A and provide the correct datum correction if necessary.						
B-0019	BRP - Selective Demolition of Foundations for CIDH Piles	Closed	07/17/2014	07/27/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
On July 11, SCCI performed potholing for the existing foundations to be demolished and discovered that the depths of these foundations are significantly deeper than expected due to contradictory information provided in the responses to Bidder Questions and Reference Documents at bid time. The results of the potholing has allowed SCCI to eliminate certain information from these documents and is now proceeding under the assumption that the elevations provided in the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge Railway Facilities and SFO Bay Bridge Railway Facilities are correct. These drawings indicate that these foundations are at depths as great as 34.5' from grade. SCCI requested that these elevations be confirmed in RFI B-0018 - Bottom of Existing Footing Elevations, submitted July 14.				This is acceptable. The extent of existing footing to be removed shall equal the radius of the CIDH plus 1'-0" plus the maximum allowed tolerance (alignment and verticality) for the CIDH installation. Following removal, the excavation shall be backfilled and compacted in accordance with the requirements in Specification Section 31 00 06.			
The foundations to be removed are located adjacent to major San Francisco thoroughfares and buildings of up to ten stories. SCCI believes that large excavations next to these structures could potentially undermine these streets and the foundations of these buildings. SCCI also believes that it is possible to reduce the number of these large excavations by reducing the volume of concrete to be removed from these foundations.							
SCCI has reviewed Contract Drawings D 1000 through D 1106 and has determined that the existing foundations Bent 5, 7 and 11 need only to be partially removed to facilitate the installation of CIDH piles. Additionally, SCCI							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 28 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>is in receipt of Bus Ramps Change Order Request B-002 in which foundations similar to those in the base contract and in the same Bus Ramp alignment are only demolished to depths of five feet below grade.</p> <p>Therefore, SCCI proposes to demolish Bents 5, 7 and 11 to a depth of five feet below grade and, below that, only to the extent necessary to allow for CIDH installation. Please see the attached drawing for reference.</p> <p>Is this acceptable?</p>						
B-0019.1	BRP - Selective Demolition - Additional Foundations	Closed	08/01/2014	08/11/2014	08/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
SCCI has received the response to RFI #B-0019 which allows for limited and selective demolition of existing foundations for Bent 5, 7 and 11. SCCI proposes to also demolish existing foundations for Bent 9 and 16 in a technique pursuant with the response to RFI #0018. Please see attached RFI #0018 for reference.			This is acceptable				
Is this acceptable?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0019.2	BRP - Selective Demolition of Existing Foundation Bent 17	Closed	11/19/2014	11/29/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
SCCI has received the responses to RFI #B-0019 and RFI #B-0019 .1 which allow for limited and selective demolition of existing foundations 5, 7, 9, 11 and 16. SCCI proposes to also perform selective demolition of existing foundation 17 in the same method proposed in these previous RFI's. SCCI would demolish Bent 17 to a depth of five feet and, below that, only to the extent necessary to allow for CIDH installation (footprint of CIDH plus one foot plus allowable tolerance on all sides) and the installation of the Bent 8 Pile Cap (Bottom of Footing Elevation 12.29').					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Is this acceptable?			This is acceptable				
<hr/>							
B-0020	BRP - Building Foundations at Pylon 9	Closed	07/17/2014	07/27/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Drawing D-1006 has a callout pointed at the Pylon 9 foundation that states "Remove existing building foundation and basement slab to place new foundation". SCCI found drawings in the Reference Document Transbay Transit Center Program Existing Terminal & Ramps Demo Plans - REVISIONS that show that the foundations under 564 Howard and 568 Howard, the buildings with foundation conflicts with Pylon 9, had been removed in a previous contract. SCCI, therefore, engineered and planned the work as if these foundations did not exist.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
This reference drawing set also shows that the Bent 17 foundation on the south side of Howard was also removed in this same previous contract. Recent potholing for this foundation has led SCCI to believe that this foundation has not been removed. If the Bent 17 foundation was not removed, it is possible that building foundations in conflict with Pylon 9 may also not have been removed.			It is Arup's understanding that the drawings attached to the RFI which show the extent of demolition of 564 Howard and 568 Howard are correct.				
Please confirm that the foundations of 564 Howard and 568 Howard have been removed per the Reference Drawings.							
<hr/>							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0021	BRP - Surcharge Loading for Pylon 9 Equipment	Closed	07/18/2014	07/18/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>Based on discussion in Tuesday's (7/15/2014) meeting (Movement Review Committee), the following heavy equipment is required to install the barrettes at the Pylon 9 foundation:</p> <p>1. 'Manitowoc 888 crawler crane: Maximum total load when holding full length barrette rebar cage = 705± kips. As shown on Figure 1, the crane will be set back a minimum of about 40' clear from the back of the TTC shoring wall when it is working. The "footprint" of the crane (defined as a rectangle with a length equal to the bearing length of the tracks and a width equal to the outto-out track dimension) is 24.6'x23.2', which has a total area of 571 sqft. The average vertical surcharge load acting over the machine footprint is 705,000/571 = 1235 psf.</p> <p>2. Bauer MC128 Foundation Crane with a BC40 Trench Cutter (Hydromill): Maximum total load when working = 540± kips (includes pull force when retrieving mill from trench). As shown on Figure 2, the hydromill will be set back a minimum of about 13' from the back side of the TTC shoring wall when it is working. The "footprint" of the hydromill is 23.0'x20.5' = 472 sqft. The average vertical surcharge load acting over the machine footprint is 540,000/472 = 1144 psf.</p> <p>3. Liebherr HS855HD crawler crane with clam. Maximum total load when working = 260± kips. As shown on Figure 3, the clam will be set back a minimum of about 10' from the back side of the TTC shoring wall when it is working. The "footprint" of the clam is 17.6'x16.2' = 285 sqft. The average vertical surcharge load acting over the machine footprint is 260,000/285 = 912 psf.</p> <p>Please confirm whether the TTC shoring system is capable of resisting the surcharge identified above.</p>					<p>This is a Contractor's means and methods issue. The Contractor shall provide estimates for additional horizontal loading on the internal bracing system for evaluation by the TG06 trade subcontractor. This shall include a horizontal pressure diagram which can be added to the plots shown on TG06 drawing GT-1110 and additional kips per linear foot of wall values which can be added to Table 1 and Table 2 on TG06 drawing GT-1110.</p>		
<hr/>							
B-0022	BRP - Surcharge Loading For Equipment Walking Off the Trestle	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 31 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>As discussed in Tuesday's (7/15/2014) Movement Review Committee, please confirm whether the TTC shoring system is capable of resisting the surcharge loads from the following equipment walking off the trestle to the east of the Pylon 9:</p> <p>1. Manitowoc 888 crawler crane: Maximum total load when walking off trestle = 565± kips. The "footprint" of the crane (defined as a rectangle with a length equal to the bearing length of the tracks and a width equal to the out-to-out track dimension) is 24.6'x23.2', which has a total area of 571 sqft. The average vertical surcharge load acting over the machine footprint is 565,000/571 = 990 psf.</p> <p>2. Bauer MC128 Foundation Crane with a BC40 Trench Cutter (Hydromill): Maximum total load when walking off trestle = 460± kips. The "footprint" of the hydromill is 23.0'x20.5' = 472 sqft. The average vertical surcharge load acting over the machine footprint is 460,000/472 = 976 psf.</p> <p>3. Liebherr HS855HD crawler crane with clam. Maximum total load when walking off trestle = 240± kips. The "footprint" of the clam is 17.6'x16.2' = 285 sqft. The average vertical surcharge load acting over the machine footprint is 240,000/285 = 842 psf.</p>						
B-0023	BRP - Restrainer Pipe Clarification	Closed	07/21/2014	07/31/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
1. Detail C on sheet S-6217 shows an API 5L80X Schedule 120 pipe. At the right, an end plate is shown welded to the pipe with a ¼" fillet weld. Please clarify the size and thickness of the end plate. Also please clarify the extent of the pipe since the length is not shown. It is not clear how far the pipe extends beyond the stiffener plate which is 1'-0" behind the end plate. The pipe is also shown in plan view of sheet S-6216 but the length is not given there either.				See attached SK-S-0003 in Arup Response Transmittal.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	2. Please clarify the vertical location from the profile grade of the API 5L80X Schedule 120 pipe shown on Diaphragm LD1/S-6104, Diaphragm RD1/S-6107, and detail C-S6217.						
B-0024	BRP - Shear Key Clarifications	Closed	07/21/2014	07/31/2014	07/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: On section A/S-6216, please clarify the locations of the centerline of shear key and the centerlines of bearings.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See S-6104 and S-6107 for centerline of bearings. See S-6216 for location of shear key relative to bearings.				
<hr/>							
B-0025	BRP - Diaphragm Dimension Clarifications	Closed	07/21/2014	07/31/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: 1. On Diaphragm LD5/S-6106, Diaphragm RD5/S-6109, Section H/S-6113, Section J/S-6113, and Section K/S-6113, please clarify the vertical dimension from the profile grade to the bearing surface at the top of the sole plate. 2. On Diaphragm RD5/S-6109, the centerline of tie to TTC column is how at the centerline of the web plate. Please clarify the location of the web plate.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The dimension shall be consistent with the depth of Hinge 9 shown on B/S6111. 2. Locations of web plates shall be consistent with centerlines of columns. Column locations are shown on S-6218.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 33 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0026	BRP - Steel Box Girder Detail Clarification	Closed	07/21/2014	07/31/2014	08/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: On section K/S-6113, please clarify the vertical dimension from the profile grade to the center of the pin.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			As shown on K/S-6113, the centerline of the pin is located at the intersection of TTC Grid Line H and the centerline of the inclined pipe, i.e., the workpoint of the cast node. Refer to the TTC structural drawings for the elevation of this work point.				
<hr/>							
B-0027	BRP - Restrainer Pipe Clarification 2	Closed	07/21/2014	07/31/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference CD sheets S-6217. Would it be acceptable to substitute a member of equal axial tension capacity for the 12" API 5L80X Schedule 120 Pipe? It is SCCI's understanding that this pipe acts as a seismic longitudinal catch and will only experience axial tension, is this the designer's intent?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			The pipe is serving as a seat extender should the drop-in span become unseated during a seismic event. This criteria was requested by the TJPA's SSRC to provide a redundant support.				
<hr/>							
B-0028	BRP - Bus Deck Level Slab Zone 1	Closed	07/21/2014	07/21/2014	07/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please confirm that the bus deck level slab at Zone 1 does not need to be placed prior to installation of the Steel box girders.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			All bus deck structural framing west of TTC Grid 10, including the concrete slab, need to be completed before connecting the drop-in span to the TTC.				
<hr/>							
B-0029	BRP - Clementina Pedestrian Access	Closed	07/23/2014	08/02/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>SCCI has found a conflict between demolition drawing D-1005 and specification section 011570 3.2G.</p> <p>According to drawing D-1005, existing Bent 22 extends underneath the entire south Clementina sidewalk width and 3' into the street. The shoring required to remove this footing along with the water barriers will extend another 5' into the street totaling to 8' intrusion into the street. The street is 18' wide at this bent location leaving a 10' for vehicle traffic as noted in approved traffic control plan 002 (TG 1801-036.1).</p> <p>Specification section 011570 3.2G requires a 5' pedestrian walkway on the north and south side of Clementina. This is not possible due to the demolition of Bent 22 described above. SCCI proposes to keep the sidewalk on the south side of Clementina closed during demolition and re-open it to pedestrians once the footing and shoring has been removed.</p> <p>Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 35 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>horizontal link beam rebar that extends beyond the width of Pylon 9?</div>							
B-0030.1	BRP - Construction of Pylon 9 and Link Beam	Closed	08/04/2014	08/14/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Further to RFI 0030, SCCI is proposing to pour Pylon 9 and the link beam in 3 separate pours and have 2 construction joints at the locations shown on the attached drawings. All horizontal rebar will remain as per the contract drawings and will be continuous at the link beam & Pylon 9 connection.</p> <p>Pour # 1 will be Pylon 9 and the center section of link beam, to the extent of Section B and Pylon 9 (see attached drawings).</p> <p>Pour #2 and #3 will be the left and right sections of link beam (see attached drawings).</p> <p>Is this acceptable?</p>		<p>This is not acceptable. Refer to note 1 on S-3176: "Construction joint is not allowed in Pylon 9 link beam."</p>					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0031	BRP - Harrison and Folsom Falsework Design	Closed	07/30/2014	08/09/2014	07/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
SCCI has received the rejection of Traffic Control Plan numbers 007 (Folsom) and 008 (Harrison) and has attempted to design the falsework to span the entire width of the roads. Upon review by SCCI and VAK Construction Engineering Services, this design does not comply with the project specifications.		WOJV to confirm the spans that are reported in the RFI as they are considerably longer than those listed in the August 10, 2012 memo from Sandis to WOJV.					
Please see our concerns with spanning the full length below: - In order to cross Harrison without a center falsework support, our required span is 79'-6". Per specification section 03 11 14 1.7-A4, the maximum allowable falsework span is 60'-9". -In order to cross Folsom without a center falsework support, our required span is 76'-8". Per specification section 03 11 14 1.7-A4, the maximum allowable falsework span is 50'. - The minimum possible depth of the falsework is 3'6" (36" beam + 4x4s + plywood). The vertical clearance would be 14'-2" which is under the required 15' clearance. - Reference VAK's memo and Folsom Falsework Schematics attached		Please provide all dimensions including sidewalks and parking lanes which may be able to be used for Falsework.					
Due to these design issues, SCCI proposes to use traffic islands to give the falsework a center support. This will divert traffic into the parking and maintain the same number of open lanes as shown in Traffic Control Plans 007 and 008. Is this acceptable?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 37 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0032	BRP - Barrette Acceptance Criteria	Closed	07/30/2014	08/09/2014	08/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please see attached Memo from Bencor, SCCI's Barrette subcontractor. In light of the recent issues they have encountered at a nearby project with similar design and specifications and the fact that we only have two production barrettes, restricting us having test barrettes, SCCI asks the following questions:		Specification Section 31 63 32 1.7 A requires the Contractor to submit qualifications for the contractor / subcontractors performing the barrette foundation work. Arup has not yet received this.					
1. Can the drill core verification process be substituted for the Crosshole Sonic Logging as the post installation acceptance criteria?		In response to the questions listed in the RFI:					
2. If not, please provide actual acceptance criteria for the Crosshole Sonic Logging. 31 63 32 does not provide any criteria for what defines a rejected pile. The specification only references ASTM 06760, which SCCI understands only provides how to do the test and provide results, but not acceptance criteria.		1. No. Specification Section 31 63 32 1.8 D 1 a states "Crosshole sonic logging will be used to test the concrete density of the pile for homogeneity."					
3. Can the #6 cross-tie rebar spacing be opened up? Possibly even increasing the rebar size, as remediation for the increased spacing.		2. The test results will be reviewed for anomalies. An anomaly will be indicated by the CSL test if the first arrival time increases significantly, or if the energy reduces significantly, relative to a moving baseline. The evaluation of the test results will include the location, extent and quantity of anomalies. Acceptance or rejection of a pile will be based on the evaluation of the CSL test results, pile construction reports (see Specification Section 31 63 32 1.5 E), the results of additional testing if deemed necessary by the TJPA (see Specification Section 31 63 32 1.8 D 4) and any other information or observations which indicate conformance / nonconformance of the installed work with the Contract Documents.					
		3. The Contractor may propose alternate reinforcing steel arrangements for review. The capacity of the reinforced concrete section shall be the same as or greater than that shown on the Drawings and each longitudinal bar along the long faces of the pile shall be confined with a stirrup or tie as shown on the Drawings.					
		Arup will not comment on the July 29, 2014 Bencor memo attached to the RFI. This is internal correspondence between SCCI and their subcontractor. The Contractor's requests for interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents are the three questions listed on the Webcor Obayashi Joint Venture letterhead.					
		Arup has not yet received the Comprehensive Construction Work Plan required by Specification Section 31 63 32 1.5 D.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 38 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0033	BRP - Discrepancy in Location of Pylon 9	Closed	08/05/2014	08/15/2014	08/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Shimmick Construction (SCCI) has verified the BBTT alignment per the beginning bearing and distance from the contract drawings, and the End bearing and distance per RFI B-001. The pylon center at Pylon 9 is listed per the alignment stations of BBTT & TTBB on S-2261. SCCI has noted a discrepancy in this position of .16 feet between the alignment position of the pylon and the center position of the pylon as shown in CAD drawing S-2261. SCCI has checked/verified the BBTT alignment positions of other CIDH centers as shown on the CAD S-2261 drawing. SCC realizes that CAD drawings are not for record, but this may indicate a possible issue of the pylon location. SCCI also noted that the pylon centerline coordinate on S-6079 (Cable stay drawing) is different from these values. Supporting documents are attached.		See attached SK-S-0004 for the correct location of the pylon. Drawing S-6079 will be revised and issued in a forthcoming ASI.					
Please confirm the center coordinate for the bent 9 pylon.							
B-0034	BRP - Folsom Falsework Vertical Clearance	Closed	08/06/2014	08/16/2014	08/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per the traffic coordination meeting between SCCI, Turner and SFMT A on 8/4/14, a traffic island for the falsework on Folsom Street will be avoided. The lane widths and striping will be changed in order to meet the falsework width requirements.		SFMTA has stated they would allow a formwork vertical clearance of 14'2" or greater at Folsom Street overcrossing with an approved Traffic Control Plan. The Traffic Control Plan (TCP) for this street overcrossing shall be submitted via Constructware by the Contractor's licensed traffic engineer in accord with Spec. 01-15-70 and include the details (proper lane striping and 14-2" signage etc.) that are required					
The falsework doesn't meet the 15 foot vertical clearance requirements per specification section 01 15 70 3.2H.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 39 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Reference RFI B-0031 and attached drawings for further detail. SFMTA has proposed to allow a vertical clearance of 14'2" or greater with proper signage. Please confirm and provide any signage requirements and restriping details to shorten lane widths.						

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>this submittal was that the soldier piles "may not be removed by pulling as this will reduce the strength of the soil and its ability to resist later load-resisting capacity of the soil at the top of the barrettes". SCCI plans to remove these piles using a vibratory hammer as this will increase consolidation of the soil as the pile is removed.</p> <p>Is this acceptable?</p>						
B-0039	BRP - Removal of Unexpected Structure in Lot G	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: While excavating around existing Bents 16 and Bent 17 in Lot G, SCCI encountered an unexpected structure comprised of concrete and brick at a depth of approximately six feet. The extent and dimensions of this structure have yet to be detennined. SCCI has determined that this structure will conflict with the Bent 8 pile cap to be constructed as well as the shoring system to be used for the demolition of existing Bent 16 and 17 and the construction of new Bent 8.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Bashar Dayoub 8/14/2014 CR B005 "Unknown building foundation" is being processed Please track your time to this CR, and coordinate daily with TJPA representative.			
Please advise on how to proceed.							



PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0040	BRP - Existing Column Foundation Removal for CIDH C1	Closed	08/15/2014	08/25/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Drawing D-1005 calls for the removal of an existing column foundation at the location of new CIDH C1. The detail on this drawing shows a column coming up from a spread footing. Therefore, SCCI expected this bottom of this spread footing to be at a reasonable depth similar to other foundation to be removed. No as-builts of this footing have been provided. Potholing performed by SCCI on August 14 determined that no spread footing exists within 40 feet from grade. Without additional drawings or information about this footing, SCCI believes it is possible that this foundation is actually a CIDH installed in a retrofit contract. If this foundation is indeed a CIDH pile and extends as deep as to bedrock, its removal would be both cost and time intensive if it is possible at all. As shown on the attached picture, the edge of CIDH C1 is in conflict with the existing foundation at grade. This condition will prevent the installation of CIDH C1. Possible solutions include decreasing the diameter of the CIDH or moving the CIDH and column away from the existing foundation. Please advise on how to proceed.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Demolish the existing CIDH to an elevation of +14.00 (NAVD88). The location of column C1 will shift to clear the remaining portion of the existing CIDH. This will be issued in an upcoming ASI.	

B-0040.1	BRP - Additional Foundation Adjacent to Exisitng Bent 5 CIDH	Closed	08/27/2014	09/06/2014	09/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: SCCI previously submitted Rfl B- 040 which stated that the footing to be demolished adjacent to new CIDH C1 appeared to be a CIDH pile. SCCI has since received Reference Drawings SFOBB - San Francisco Approach Replace which appears to confirm that this footing is actually the CIDH at Bent 5 installed in this 2004 retrofit. While doing hazardous material removal for new CIDH C1 on August 27, SCCI encountered an additional footing adjacent to the Bent 5 CIDH. Pictures of this footing are attached. Also attached are sketches for clarification that show the footing as currently exposed.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketch SK-S-0007 for zone of removal.	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0042	BRP - Existing Bent 16 Retrofit Anchor Tiedown Length	Closed	08/19/2014	08/29/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Drawing D-1005 calls for the existing Bent 16 foundation to be removed to allow for the installation of the new Bent 8 CIDH piles and pile cap. The response to RFI B-0019.1 Selective Demolition - Additional Foundations stated that it was acceptable to demolish the Bent 16 foundation one foot plus the maximum tolerance outside of the CIDH footprint.				See enclosed Requested Tie-Back As-Built.			
After reviewing the Reference Drawings Seismic Retrofit No. 14B, TT Ramps, SCCI has determined that CIDH B8-3 is in direct conflict with one of the anchor tiedowns installed at the Bent 16 retrofit as shown on the attached drawing. Sheet 23 of this Reference Drawing set shows the minimum unbonded length of this anchor tiedown to be 20 feet but does not specify the bonded length. SCCI needs to know the bonded length used for this tiedown to determine the appropriate removal method.							
Please provide complete as-builts of this retrofit that show the total depth of these anchor tiedowns.							
<hr/>							
B-0043	BRP - CIDH Permanent Casing	Closed	08/21/2014	08/31/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
SCCI proposes to use corrugated metal pipe (CMP) as permanent steel casing for the CIDHs when using the optional construction joint, is this acceptable? The specifications are confusing on this subject.				The use of corrugated metal pipe (CMP) as permanent steel casing for the CIDHs when using the optional construction joint is acceptable provided the following:			
Per Specification Section 31 63 30 3.5-B, " ... The permanent casing must:" then in section 3.5-B-5 " ... must comply with article 3.3." Per 31 63 30 3.3-C,"Temporary casings must be:" then in section 3.3- C-2; "noncorrugated with smooth surfaces." Since we are discussing a permanent casing and this section applies to temporary casings, does the noncorrugated rule apply?				- The casing complies with Specification Section 31 63 30 3.5-B. In regard to paragraph 5 in Section 31 63 30 3.5-B, casings placed in a drilled hole must comply with Caltrans Standard Specifications section 49-3.02C(5) "Permanent Steel Casing Installation".			
Project Specification 31 63 30 appears to be based on the Caltrans Standard Specification. Using the 2010 version of				- Contractor submits for record stamped calculations demonstrating that the CMP is capable of withstanding loads from installation, lateral concrete pressures and earth pressures, and will support personnel working			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 45 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the CTSS, 49-3.02C(6)-5 is similar to the project specification 31 63 30 3.5, except it refers the "must comply" to a section on "Permanent Steel Casing Installation" {49-3.02C(5)}. As SCCI's Project Specification does not include a section on permanent steel casing materials, SCCI believes the reference to the Temporary Steel Casing to be inadvertent.</p> <p>If safety and/or quality is a concern, SCCI can provide stamped engineering to stating that the CMP is capable of withstanding loads from installation, lateral concrete pressures and earth pressures and will support personnel working inside the casing after the CIDH installation is complete.</p>						
				</			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 46 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: For the design of the sliding bearings at Hinge 9 as part the post bid VE for Frame 5, please provide the maximum seismic displacement demands, at Hinge 9, for the cable-stayed bridge.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See table on attached SK-S-0006			
B-0046	BRP - Erection Sequence and Diagrams	Closed	09/04/2014	09/14/2014	09/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Are the camber diagrams on drawing S-6069 and the cable loads shown on column 5 of Stay Cable data table, drawing S-6079, based on the erection sequence analysis shown on drawings S-1200 and S-1201? SCCI intends to adhere to the design engineer's specified erection sequence shown on the contract plans. Therefore, for our erection analysis and plan, it is important to understand if the design engineer calculated these girder cambers and stay cable loads based on the shown sequence of installing the dropin span after frame 4 has its cables stressed, barriers and rails installed and the falsework removed.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached TTC Cable Stay Bridge Erection Sequence which shows the sequence assumed in Arup's analysis.			



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
B-0048	BRP - Changes to Barrette Pile Slurry Parameters	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Part 2.4.A of Specification Section 31 63 31 - Barrette Piles - Bus Ramps provides the design criteria for the sodium bentonite slurry to be used at the Pylon 9 barrette piles. Based on their experience and their knowledge of constructability, SCCI's barrette pile subcontractor, Nicholson Construction Company (NCC), would like to propose the following changes. 1. 2.4.A.4.b.1 and 2: A mix of water and bentonite at the minimum 5.5% per unit weight of water produces a slurry density of 65 pounds per cubic foot (62.4 pcf + 0.055 x (bulk density of bentonite around 50 pct)= 65 pcf). A 3.5 - 4% per unit weight of water is required in order to produce an initial slurry density of 64 pounds per cubic foot as required in §2.4 A 4. Please confirm that a mix of water and bentonite at the minimum 4% per unit weight of water is acceptable. 2. 2.4.A.4.c.3: The maximum fluid loss, by filter press, is the same for in-trench as it is for initial slurry. This is not attainable in field conditions as the slurry fluid loss increases as the slurry is being reused. The widely utilized European standard (EN 1538) specifies the maximum fluid loss values of 50 cc (for in-trench slurry) and 30 cc (for initial slurry). As these are more attainable values based on experience, please confirm 50 cc (for in-trench slurry) and 30 cc (for initial slurry) is acceptable. 3. A significant part of the Barrettes will be excavated in clay and, when mixed with the bentonite slurry, the viscosity will increase. If the initial and in-trench slurry viscosity minimum is 40 seconds as specified, there is very little tolerance available on the slurry viscosity before it causes excess stress on the desanding pumps. The widely utilized European standard (EN 1538) specifies 32 seconds as a recommended minimum. Please confirm 32 seconds is acceptable as a minimum for slurry viscosity.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The changes proposed by the Contractor are acceptable provided all of the slurry test requirements and acceptance criteria, not just those listed in the RFI, follow Tables 1 and 2 from EN 1538.	
<hr/>							
B-0049	BRP - Barrette Pile Slurry Retention	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 48 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Slump retention requirements specified in the Contract Specifications 31 63 32 § 1.8 C 4 indicate a minimum slump of 7" after "duration of the pour" + 2 hours. The anticipated pour duration for each Barrette is 8-10h leading to a slump retention of 10-12h. Such slump retention is difficult to control which may delay setting time (well above 12h) and increases risks of excessive bleed and segregation. Based on experience, Nicholson and its concrete supplier recommend 6-8h of slump retention.</div><div>Please confirm min. 7" slump 6-8h after batch time is acceptable.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>This is acceptable.</div><div>Note: The title of the RFI was incorrectly changed from SCCI's original RFI. The title of the RFI should be Barrette Pile Slump Retention.</div></div>		
B-0050	BRP - Length of Barrette Piles	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div></div>		<div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>		<div>Answered By: Arup</div>		<div>Kevin Clinch</div>	
<div><div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent</div></div>							
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Drawing S-3191 indicates a Barrette pile length of 20 feet. The standard construction method to build the barrettes involves two full primary bites being dug first followed by a middle bite in between the previously dug primary bites. With a Barrette measuring 20 feet in length, the middle bite will only be 1.6' in length. Such small middle bite may collapse on itself while digging a primary bite which could affect the verticality of that primary bite. Nicholson proposes to increase the length of the Barrettes to 21' to decrease the chance of the middle bite to collapse.</div><div>Please confirm Barrettes 21 feet in length is acceptable.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>This is acceptable provided there is no additional cost to the TJPA.</div></div>		



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>		
B-0051	BRP - Intumescent For Frame 5	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>		
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent									
REQUEST: SCCI is actively pricing and re-designing the frame 5, drop-in span as part of CR B-005 and needs to better understand the original design intent for this bridge section as it relates to the intumescent paint. 1. The only drawings SCCI see reference to intumescent are S-5068, S-6111 Detail B, S-6112 Detail D, S-6113 Detail H and K, and S-6114 Detail N. Per these it appears the design intent is to install intumescent on the underside of the "tub" (S-5068), the additional "Tub" piece (N/S-6114), and all of the exposed steel on the frame 4 side, except the lowest horizontal steel (B/S-6111 and C/S6-112). At the building side, it is confusing as only H/S-6113 shows intumescent similar to the frame 5 side. K/S-6113 only shows the intumescent on the bottom of the restraining rod steel box. J/S-6113 and L/S-6114 do not show intumescent. Also of note, the steel link beam on details D and B of S-6115 do not show intumescent. Please confirm design intent of intumescent coverage. 2. Per specification 09 96 46 Intumescent Paint 2 Bus Ramps, SCCI is to "provide the specified fire resistance classification approved by Authorities having Jurisdiction" Who are the authorities having jurisdiction? What is the fire resistance classification for frame 5? SCCI assumed during bid time and currently a 1- hour rating.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The response to this question contains Sensitive Security Information and is available only to individuals who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question.					
<hr/>									
B-0052	BRP - U-Turn Ramp Temporary Supports	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>		
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent									
REQUEST: SCCI has received the following Memo from VAK, please advise on the following. Not 3 on sheet S-6062 indicated that temporary supports/tie downs are required adjacent to the closure pours on either end of the U-Turn Ramp in order 2to prevent uplift/twist during construction stages". All else being equal, it seems that the most effective way to		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please see attached for response.					
<hr/>									



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 50 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>		
B-0053	prevent this twisting tendency would be to leave the falsework in place until after the closure pours are made. However, note 3 on sheet S-3164 indicates that the falsework must be removed proper to the closure pours being made; thus requiring the temporary supports. The intent of this sequence is not readily obvious. If the falsework must indeed be removed prior to the closure pours being made (to allow the curved tubs to deflect under their own self weight, for example), please provide the required loading that must be resisted at the indicated temporary support locations.	Closed	09/12/2014	09/22/2014	09/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché								
	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello								
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent								
	REQUEST: Please see attached. ASI 150-003 contained Rev 2 of S-2001. The changed was summarized as: "Revise barrier along outside of Fremont Street off-ramp to existing. Add Signature for Caltrans Structures Design Oversight" Please describe in detail what changes were made within the revision cloud shown on S-2001 Rev 2.							SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> In Section B, Caltrans requested that the existing barrier along the opposite side of Fremont Street off-ramp change from a solid line to a dashed line. In the plan, Caltrans requested that the reference to sheet note 2 be deleted.

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0054	BRP - Barrette Pile Concrete Cover	Closed	09/12/2014	09/22/2014	09/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
REQUEST: Section A and B of Contract Drawings S-3191 call for 6" concrete cover around the reinforcing cage in the barrette piles. Per Nicholson Construction Company's experience, given the rebar congestion of the reinforcement cage, the 6" concrete cover allows for a path of least resistance for the concrete to rise faster on the outside of the cage and increase the risks of having bentonite being trapped inside the cage during the concreteting operation. Nicholson believes that reducing the concrete cover to 3" will decrease the risk of this happening. SCCI's proposal will not change the width of the barrette pile, it will increase the width of the rebar cage by 6". Please note that the response to RFI B-0050 allowed for the barrette pile to be on foot longer in length. These changes will be shown on the shop drawings, to be submitted in a forthcoming submittal.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Arup does not believe that the 6" clearance will allow for a path of least resistance for the concrete to rise faster on the outside of the cage and, therefore, increase the risk of bentonite being trapped inside the cage during the concreteting operation as posited in the RFI. The rate of placement of concrete, i.e., the velocity, is very low at the perimeter. If anything, fresh concrete tends to flow around the tremie annulus. However, if SCCI believes that reducing the clearance will reduce the risk of defects, then Arup takes no exception to reducing the clearance to 4" provided there is no additional cost to the TJPA.			
Is this acceptable?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 52 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed	
B-0055	BRP - Barrette Pile Reinforcement Cage	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	09/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titcher	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Arup			Kevin Clinch
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
<p>Contract Drawing S-3191 details the reinforcement needed for the Barrettes. The current reinforcement details indicate a clear space between rebar as low as 3.75" in some areas. Per Nicholson's experience and several codes (such as EN 1534 and US FHW A), a larger clear space is recommended as small clear spaces may impede the flow of concrete inside the cage and increase the risks of concrete anomalies.</p> <p>As a result, Nicholson proposes to increase the bar sizes and use anchor heads (in lieu of hooks) in order to increase the clear space between rebar. Please see attached sketches SD-02 and SD-03. Note that the section of steel remains similar in any direction in order to avoid impacting the structural capacity of the Barrette.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to space constraints at the site the cage will be built in two (2) 10ft wide by three (3) 60ft long sections approximately (the length will vary depending on the reinforcement requirement by elevation). Each 10ft x 60ft section will be prefabricated and transported to the site. Two 10ft sections will be joined together to form a 20ft section. Our sketches include the required horizontal reinforcement to join the sections. The three 20ft by 60ft sections will be lifted and installed in the trench.</p> <p>Please confirm the reinforcement cage proposed is acceptable.</p>				<p>SCCI's proposed reinforcement layout included with this RFI is not acceptable as it does not satisfy the requirements of AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, Fourth Edition (2007) with 2008 Interim Revisions which is the governing Code for this project as noted on drawing S-0005. According to AASHTO 5.10.6.3, #11 bars shall be tied at a maximum 6" o.c.. The proposed layout shows spacing of the ties as 10.5" and 5'-0" o.c. .</p> <p>Additionally, the horizontal bars which link the two cages, as proposed by SCCI, must have hooks to develop their capacity to make them effective in resisting the applied load.</p> <p>The clear spacing between reinforcement is measured and codified along a distance normal to the length of the bar, not at hooks and not at two bars crossing perpendicular to each other, which is presumably where the quoted distance of 3.75" is measured. The clear spacing between bars in the reinforcement layout on Contract Drawing S-3191 is as follows:</p> <p>Horizontal distance between ties: 8.9"</p> <p>Vertical distance between ties: 5.4"</p> <p>Horizontal distance between longitudinal bars: 6.4"</p> <p>SCCI's proposed layout included with the RFI increases the horizontal clearances by only 0.48 inches.</p> <p>The reinforcement layout on Contract Drawing S-3191 satisfies the requirements of EN-1538 (we believe the standard quoted in the RFI, EN 1534, is incorrect as this standard pertains to parquet flooring) which is a reference document, not a Code that applies to this project.</p> <p>Arup has worked with the Nicholson, SCCI's subcontractor, in recent days to develop alternates to their proposal which satisfy the Code, which provide the same structural capacity as the layout shown on Contract Drawing S-3191, and which increase the</p>				

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Ironton-Russell Bridge project in Ironton, Ohio (ongoing) Audubon Bridge project in St. Francisville, Louisiana (recent) A25 Bridge project near Montreal, Quebec, Canada (recent)</p> <p>In addition to being more widely utilized on recent stay cable projects than its 0.6" diameter counterpart, the 0.62" diameter strand has a slightly larger cross-sectional steel area (0.2325 sq in vs. 0.217 sq in for the 0.6" diameter strand). Using the larger individual strand steel area allows for the overall steel area in a particular stay cable to be achieved using fewer strands. Using fewer strands in a stay cable allows for extra unused holes in the cable anchorages, which allows for future expansion of load capacity within the stay. VSL's stay cable anchorages are designed to use either 0.6" or 0.62" diameter strand.</p> <p>To illustrate the principle described above on the Transbay project, the currently project parameters specify that VSL's 109-strand anchorages be utilized with 109 EA, 0.6" diameter strands. In this configuration, the anchorages are completely filled with strand and thus cannot allow for future expansion of load capacity within the stays. The total required steel area for each cable is: 0.217 sq in x 109 = 23.653 sq in. By using 0.62" diameter strands, the strand count for each anchorage could be reduced to 102 EA (0.2325 sq in x 102 = 23.715 sq in > 23.653 sq in). Using 102 EA strands in each cable leaves seven open holes in each anchorage, allowing for a significant expansion of load capacity should the need arise in the future. As noted above, VSL's stay cable anchorages are designed to be used with either strand size, and therefore the anchorages could sustain the extra loading that would come with any future addition of 0.62" diameter strands.</p> <p>As one can see from the list above, 0.62" diameter strand has also become the norm for current and recent projects that VSL has worked on here in the USA. As such, it is more readily available from domestic strand suppliers.</p> <p>VSL therefore proposes to use 0.62" diameter strands on the Transbay Transit Center Bus Ramp project stay cables in lieu of 0.6" diameter strands. The 0.62" diameter strand</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 55 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>will meet all of the other criteria specified within the contract documents and the current edition of the PTI Stay Cable Recommendations."</p> <p>Is it acceptable to replace the 0.6" diameter steel stay cable strands with 0.62" diameter strands?</p>						
B-0057	BRP - Stay Cable Geometry and Loading	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
SCCI has received the following RFI from VStructural LLC.		Kevin Clinch 10/10/2014:					
After a review of the contract drawings and specifications, the following items are requested for the design of the saddle body/system:		1. See attached SK-S-0010 and SK-S-0011. The coordinates of the tangent point can be determined by the Contractor using the information provided. Note: The northings and					
1. Change the tangent points of the saddle to the locations shown in the drawing and provide coordinates to VSL for final design		eastings of the "P" points have been revised in accordance with the response to RFI B0033. See attached SK-S-0014.					
2. Review the Stay Cable Data on Sheet No. S-6079 and update as necessary. In particular, it appears that Note 3 may need to be revised to reflect the revised conditions.		2. The Stay Cable Data table and the notes have been revised. See attached SK-S-0012 and SK-S-0013.					
3. The stay cable strands are continuous through the saddles. Update stay cable lengths "Ls" and nominal stay steel weights "Ms" in the table on Sheet No S-6079 to reflect the cable lengths from bearing plate to bearing plate, inclusive of the saddle in the pylon		3. Cable lengths and nominal stay steel weights have been updated. See attached SK-S-0012 and SK-S-0013.					
4. Provide work points at the bearing plate location on the deck		4. Work points at the bearing plate can be determined by the Contractor using the information provided.					
5. Provide cable rotation in ULS and FLS (characteristics and fatigue)		5. See attached Excel file RFI B57 Saddle.xlsx.					
6. Provide angular rotation of each anchorage under ULS, SLS, FLS		6. See attached Excel file RFI B57 Saddle.xlsx.					
7. Provide tension variation under SLS, ULS, FLS		7. See attached Excel file RFI B57 Saddle.xlsx.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 56 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please advise on the above points.							
B-0058	BRP - Stay Cable Design Temperatures	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
SCCI has received the following RFI from VStructural LLC			The stay cables have been checked for the following				
-			thermal loads:				
After a review of the contract drawings and specifications,			Mean Temperature: 60 degrees F				
the following item is requested for the design			Maximum Temperature: 80 degrees F				
of the stay cable system:			Minimum Temperature: 10 degrees F				
Please provide the design temperature range (maximum							
and minimum temperatures) for the stay cables							
in order to determine the correct HDPE stay pipe lengths							
and the lengths of connecting elements.							
Expansion and contraction of the HDPE pipes must be							
taken into account when specifying the lengths							
of these components.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
B-0059	BRP - Hangers for Slurry Lines off Of Fremont St. Off-Ramp	Closed	09/18/2014	09/28/2014	09/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: As shown on the Site Logistics Plan, Submittal TG 1801-81.1 , Case Pacific's mud plant and baker tank will be staged in Lot H, North of Clementina St. In order to provide slurry and water to the CIDH locations in Lots G and I, SCCI has installed trenches across Clementina St. and Tehama St. for piping. However, due to the number and type of utilities (shown on the attached excerpt from SCCI Transmittal WOJV-0001 - Utility Locates per USA North) below Folsom Street, SCCI would like to avoid trenching at this location by hanging two 4" slurry pipes from the Fremont Street Off-Ramp. Based on this, SCCI has two questions: 1. Will Cal trans allow SCCI to install hangers of any sort from the Fremont Street Off-Ramp to facilitate this work? 2. If yes, is the attached detail provided by Case Pacific (SK-I) acceptable? SCCI will work to prevent damage to the existing structure and would be responsible for any repairs caused by these hangers.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Bashar Dayoub 9/23/14 This is SCCI & Sub Means and Methods WO need to facilitate approval from Caltrans and City We recommend to pursue this method as a last resort	
<hr/>							
B-0060	BRP - Number of Barrette Pile Tremies	Closed	09/18/2014	09/28/2014	09/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract drawing S-3191 indicates two openings (for two tremies) in each Barrette's rebar cage. This drawing is in conflict with Contract Specification 31 63 32 3.4 D 3 that indicates that three tremies are needed for each Barrette (one tremie for each 7 feet of wall length). Please note that the Response to RFI-0050 allowed for the length of the barrette piles to be increased from 20'-0" to 21 '-0". The European Standard EN 1538 indicates two tremies (properly spaced so that the concrete does not have to travel more than 8 feet) is sufficient for each Barrette. Additionally, in reference to RFI BRP-0055 and, in an			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The cross tie layout documented in the response to RFI B0055 can be revised to allow room for a third tremie pipe. It is the Contractor's option to use two tremie pipes or three.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 59 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0062	BRP - Expansion and Fixed Bearing Clarifications	Closed	09/24/2014	10/04/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please see questions below regarding the PTFE Bearings				Drawing S-6250 "Fremont Street Off Ramp (Widen) PTFE Expansion Bearing Details" (revision date 5/21114):			
-				1. The asterisk "*" refers to re-using existing in-situ bearing assemblies. Note: See attached sketch SK-S-0015 for revised bearing plate			
Drawing S-6250 "Fremont Street Off Ramp (Widen) PTFE Expansion Bearing Details" (revision date 5/21114):				dimensions.			
1. Dimensions in the "Expansion Bearing Table" show a " * " for the Concave, Convex and Masonry plates at "Hinge 23 Bearing A" and "Hinge 23 Bearing B" with a note that says" * =use existing assembly parts". Does this imply a refurbishment using pre-existing components? or does this imply that the dimensions are the same as what is shown for Hinge 23 Bearing C?				2. Pre-drill and tap the hole to receive the stainless steel screw called for in the detail.			
2. Top view of the Sole Plate shows a call-out for a total of (16) 114" DIA x 3/4" Stainless Steel Countersunk Cap Screws. Is there a requirement for drilling and tapping the Sole Plates to provide for CTSK cap screws? If so, what does the installation consist of?				3. See attached sketch SK-S-0016.			
3. Plans are missing anchorage details showing the complete stud layout for the Masonry Plate. Please provide.				4. Use AASHTO M 169-06 headed studs and threaded studs for the welded anchorages shown.			
4. We plan to use ASTM A108 Headed Studs and Threaded Studs for the welded anchorage shown. Please advise if this is acceptable.				Drawing S-6251 "Fremont Street Off Ramp (Widen) PTFE Fixed Bearing Detail" (revision date 5/21/14):			
Drawing S-6251 "Fremont Street Off Ramp (Widen) PTFE Fixed Bearing Detail" (revision date 5/21/14):				1. See attached sketch SK-S-0017 for revised dimensions.			
1. Section A detail shows the call-out for "H ACT" from the bottom of the Masonry Plate to the bottom of the recess. If this detail is incorrect, please confirm the maximum thickness of the Convex Plate is 1.45" and the Assembly Height is 4.50" as shown in the "Fixed Bearing Table".				2. Use AASHTO M 169-06 headed studs and threaded studs for the anchor bolts shown.			
2. Note 1 says "anchor bolts shall conform with ASTM F1554 Grade 105.". We plan to use ASTM A 108 Headed Studs. Please advise if this is acceptable.				Drawing S-6252 "Bus Ramp Viaduct PTFE Expansion Bearing Details" (revision date 4/21/14):			
				1. Drill and tap holes in the Sole Plate to receive the bolts. See attached sketches SK-S-0018, SK-S-0019 and SK-S-0020			
				2. See attached sketch SK-S-0018.			
				3. Use AASHTO M 169-06 headed studs and threaded studs for the anchor bolts shown.			
				Drawing S-6253 "Bus Ramp Viaduct PTFE Fixed Bearing Details" (revision date 4/21/14):			
				1. Drill and tap holes in the Sole Plate and masonry			

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Drawing S-6252 "Bus Ramp Viaduct PTFE Expansion Bearing Details" (revision date 4/21/14):</p> <p>1. Sole Plate shows a call out for (20) ASTM A325SC H.S. 3/4" DIA x 8" Stud Bolts. Will we need to drill and tap holes in the Sole Plate to accommodate this type of assembly? If so, please send a detailed drawing showing anchorage requirements for the Sole Plate.</p> <p>2. Plans are missing anchorage details showing the complete stud layout for the Masonry Plate. Please provide.</p> <p>3. We plan to use ASTM A 108 Headed Studs for the welded anchorage shown. Please advise if this is acceptable.</p> <p>Drawing S-6253 "Bus Ramp Viaduct PTFE Fixed Bearing Details" (revision date 4/21/14):</p> <p>1. Sole Plate shows a call out for (20) ASTM A325SC H.S. 3/4" DIA x 8" Stud Bolts. Will we need to drill and tap holes in the Sole Plate to accommodate this type of assembly? If so, please send a detailed drawing showing anchorage requirements for the Sole Plate.</p> <p>2. Section "Hinge H Bearing Details" and section "1 Detail" show different Masonry Plate anchorage details. Please advise correct anchorage details and complete stud layout for the Masonry Plates.</p> <p>3. We plan to use ASTM A108 Headed Studs for any welded anchorage. Please advise if this is acceptable.</p>				<p>plate to receive the bolts. See attached sketches SK-S-0021, SK-S-0022 and SK-S-0023.</p> <p>2. See attached sketches SK-S-0021, SK-S-0022 and SK-S-0023.</p> <p>3. Use AASHTO M 169-06 headed studs and threaded studs for the anchor bolts shown.</p>		
B-0063	BRP - Pylon and Barrette Reinforcing Conflict	Closed	09/26/2014	10/06/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 62 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0064	BRP - Linkbeam Stressing Requirement	Closed	09/26/2014	10/06/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please reference CD S-6070. On sheet S-6070 Pjack is given as 1095 Kips. Is this per tendon?				Pjack = 1095 kips at top prestressing, Pjack = 1095 kips at bottom prestressing. We assumed 0.6" diameter x 25 tendons at each the top and bottom prestressing.			
Please clarfiy							
<hr/>							
B-0065	BRP - Use of Non-Domestic Stay Cable Wedges	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	10/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
VSL is proposing to use non-domestic wedges for the stay cable system to be supplied on the Transbay Bus Ramp Project. This request is based on the following:				TJPA please respond.			
-The wedges make up a very small portion of the total steel quantity on the project, yet serve a critical role in anchoring the cables of the stay cable system.				See attached			
- VSL has used the same proprietary stay wedges (VSL Switzerland) on all US stay cable projects for more than a decade, including projects that were governed by the "Buy America" provisions.							
- All VSL stay cable projects worldwide utilize stay wedges supplied by VSL Switzerland.							
- Stay cable wedges are a specialty item, and at the present time are produced solely by VSL Switzerland exclusively for use with the VSL Stay Cable System.							
- 100% of the wedges are inspected and approved by VSL Switzerland as part of our quality process prior to shipment to the projects.							
- All fatigue and static strength tests on VSL's stay cable systems have utilized wedges produced by VSL Switzerland.							
- The wedges cannot be produced in sufficient and reasonable quantities in the USA and there is no domestic product that is equal in quality to the wedges VSL is proposing.							
Pursuant to the "Buy American Provisions" as well as the guidelines in Subpart 25.3 of the "Federal Acquisition Regulation," a waiver for non-domestic materials may be							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 63 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>granted if it is determined that (1) "the application of 'Buy American Provisions' would be inconsistent with the public interest and/or (2) such materials are not produced in sufficient and reasonably available quantities and of a satisfactory quality."</p> <p>VSL proposes that wedges be manufactured in either Spain or Brazil and heat treated in Switzerland for the Transbay Project. The total cost of these materials is \$5,250.00.</p> <p>Is this acceptable?</p>						
B-0066	BRP - Vertical Alignment of CIDH Piles	Closed	10/02/2014	10/12/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Section 3.2 A of contract specification section 31 63 30 states "The axis of the drilled hole must not deviate from plumb more than 6 inches per 00feet of length". ACI 336 specification for the construction of Drilled Piers states in section 3.1.1, "Out of plumbness of piers shall not exceed 1.5%". ACI 117-8 section 3 "Foundations", 3.1 "Vertical Alignment", States in 3.1.1.3, "Category C " for reinforced concrete shafts " not more than 2.0 percent of the shaft length". Caltrans 2010 Standard Specification Section 49-3.02C(2) "Drilled Holes" states, "The axis of the drilled hole mist not deviate from plumb more than 1-1/2" per 10 feet of length. Will 15" out of plumb vertical alignment over 100 feet of length be acceptable? The Sonic caliber device will be used to verify this requirement.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 15" out of plumb vertical alignment over 100 feet of length is acceptable.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 64 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0067	BRP - CIDH Pile Gamma Gamma Inspection Tubes	Closed	10/02/2014	10/12/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Caltran's Foundation Testing Branch has calibrated their gamma gamma testing probes for perfonning testing with water in the inspection pipes. Will the PVC inspection pipes need to be dewatered at the time of testing for the selected testing agency?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable provided the tester's probe is qualified to test in a submerged condition. Also, the tester needs documentation of a pressure test for their sealed radioactive source. WOJV received 10/21/14		
<hr/>							
B-0068	BRP 732 MOD Concrete Barrier Form Liner	Closed	10/02/2014	10/12/2014	10/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Based on Section A of Contract Drawing S-6400, the 732 Mod Concrete Barrier has indentations in the concrete, with the bottom line of the indentation showing to have a ½" draft. The same detail shows the other indentation lines being square which would not be able to be stripped. Attached is a drawing for a proposed form liner for the Barrier that is to be installed showing the same ½" draft, which is on the bottom of the indentation, all the way around the recess opening. This 1/2" draft around will allow the form liner to be stripped. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable.		
<hr/>							
B-0069	BRP - OCS Pole Relocation	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	11/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: See the attached sketch of the proposed OCS pole relocation per SCCI's field walk with Turner, MUNI, and WOJV on 10/2/2014. Please provide direction on scope with design documents and specifications for construction.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RESPONSE TO RFI B-00069: The attached sketch provided by the Trade Subcontractor for a temporary configuration of the Howard Street OCS system during the bus ramp construction is helpful and has been forwarded to SFMTA/MUNI. To assist the Contractor, the		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 66 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
See Jack Adams reply enclosed							
B-0070	BRP - Clarification of Section Detail on S-6705	Closed	10/09/2014	10/19/2014	10/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Drawing S-2043, Retaining Wall 3 - Plan and Elevation, calls out the new slope paving section detail on drawing S-6705. Please clarify how this section detail relates to the paving slope on Retaining Wall 3, drawing S-2043. If the section detail shown on S-6705 is not intended for Retaining Wall 3, please clarify where the section is applicable (as no other retaining walls call out the section detail on S-6705).		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The demolition of the existing retaining wall at this location and the construction of RW-3 will require the demolition of the existing slope paving. The detail on S-6705 shall be used to replace the slop paving following completion of RW-3 construction.			
<hr/>							
B-0071	BRP - Clarification Striping Detail C-7002	Closed	10/13/2014	10/13/2014	10/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Refer to attached drawings C-7002. Please advise where striping callout #40 ends and striping callout #9 begins and ends.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The transition from striping callout #40 and striping callout #9 occurs at sta. 24.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 67 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0072	BRP - Clarification of Specification Section 31 63 32	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Section 3.4-B-1 of Contract Specification Section 31 63 32, States:				The survey targets on the tops of the soldier piles are currently not being read by an AMTS due to the unexpected request to remove the AMTS from the top of 545 Mission. The inclinometer I-40 is not accessible because it is beneath the crane mat. Therefor, Contractor shall perform an optical survey of the survey targets on the tops of the soldier piles to obtain a baseline reading. The survey targets on the tops of the soldier piles shall again be read following the installation of the barrettes.			
"Do not begin excavation of the barrette piles until geotechnical instrumentation for monitoring ground movements, other than that to be installed within the barrette pile itself, is installed and stabilized baseline reading sets have been taken."							
Please provide clarification as to what geotechnical instrumentation outside of the barrette pile has been installed and who is monitoring it. If baseline readings have been established, please provide them.							
Additionally, please provide clarification as to what geotechnical instrumentation is to be installed within the barrette pile to monitor ground movement.							
<hr/>							
B-0073	BRP - HDPE Pipe Specification	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
SCCI has been unable to find any specifications for the HDPE pipe in drawings C4300-4302. Please see submittal #TG1801-621 regarding SCCI's proposed HDPE pipe. Is this acceptable?				THE HDPE pipe product included with this RFI is acceptable for the HDPE pipe called-for in drawings C-4300 thru C-4302.			
<hr/>							
B-0074	BRP - Cable Stay Bridge Jacking Forces	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	11/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
SCCI has received the following RFI from OPAC Engineers:				As part of the design of the bridge, Arup determined jacking forces at each stage which we considered feasible to achieve, but these were not optimized. It is the contractor's responsibility to optimize these forces			
This bridge, like all cable-stayed bridges, is a highly							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 68 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	redundant structure and there is an infinite number of combinations of dead load superstructure moments, superstructure axial load, cable forces, etc. It is understood that the designer has selected an optimal dead load/cable jacking force combination for the design of the bridge based on the designer's suggested construction sequence. Since OPAC will follow the designer's suggested construction sequence in general, it will be helpful for the designer to provide the jacking forces at each stage that will produce the final cable forces.						and submit for Arup's review.
	Please advise.						
B-0075	BRP - Fremont Off-Ramp Overhead Sign Removal	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: SCCI will be removing the sign shown contract drawing D-1007, C-7000, and C-7004. SCCI does not intend on using any temporary signage in the interim while the new sign is being constructed since there is already sufficient signage for the off-ramp (see attached photo). Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		This is acceptable.	
B-0076	BRP - Conduit Type In Roadway Cells	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Sheet E-5005 Detail 1 shows EMT conduit inside the roadway deck while the spec section 26 05 36 Part 3.3C calls out for galvanized rigid steel conduit. Please confirm that it is acceptable to use EMT in roadway cells.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		Galvanized rigid steel conduit is required in the roadway cells.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 69 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
B-0077	BRP - Catch Basin #3 Invert Elevation Discrepancy	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	11/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: There is a discrepancy between the slope of the pipe and the invert elevation of CB#2 in drawing C- 4300. CB#2 invert elevation is 89.52 which is downstream of CB#1, yet the invert elevation is higher than CB#1. SCCI intends to use an invert elevation of 88.83' for CB#2 so that this slope is maintained. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketches SC-C-0001 thru 0003 for revised elevations.		
<hr/>							
B-0078	BRP - Correct PTI Edition	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	11/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: VSL is requesting clarification on the correct edition of the "Recommendations for Stay Cable Design, Testing, and Installation" published by the Post Tensioning Institute (PTI) to be used on this project. On drawings S-0005 (71 of 470) dated October 1, 2013, the contract drawing refers to the "Recommendations for Stay Cable Design, Testing, and Installation" Fifth Edition (2007) by the Post Tensioning Institute (PTI) as the basis for design of the bridge. On page 05-16-33-1, section 05-16-1.2-C-1, of the project specification, dated October 1, 2013, the specifications specify the "Latest edition issued" be the standard for the project. The latest edition of the "Recommendations for Stay Cable Design, Testing, and Installation" published by PTI is the Sixth Edition dated May 2012. Please clarify which edition of the "Recommendations for Stay Cable Design, Testing, and Installation" as published by PTI should be used on this project.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The latest edition shall be used. Therefor, use the Sixth Edition dated May 2012.		
<hr/>							
B-0079	BRP - AWSS Submittals	Closed	10/24/2014	11/03/2014	10/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:City and County of San Fr Michael Smith				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 70 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: As confirmed by SFDPW at the AWSS meeting, on 10/23/14, with Synergy Project Management (AWSS subcontractor), SCCI, WOJV, TCCO and SFDPW, submittals are not required for the following items: AWSS Dewatering Plan AWSS Valves and Fittings (also see attached email) Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Submittals are not required for the valves and fittings. A submittal for the dewatering plan is not required at this time unless water is encountered at the site.				
B-0080	BRP - Anti Ram Barrier Specification	Closed	10/28/2014	11/07/2014	11/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION Please see below questions from Shimmick's Anti-Ram Barrier subcontractor, FutureNet. Question 1 Spec Section 28 16 34, 2.1 A 3 states "the design and structural materials of the vehicle barrier shall be the same as those used in the crash test." Discrepancy: The original crash tested barriers are installed in dirt for a permanent in-ground installation. This project requires the barrier be installed into a bridge section. The barrier foundation will need to be modified to fit into and react with the bridge section. Dirt reacts differently than a concrete bridge section during impact and the bridge section has space restrictions. Therefore we need to provide a foundation design that varies from the original crash tested design for both fit and function. Proposed Solution: Allow a modified foundation design, proven to absorb the minimum force via engineering calculations. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The response to this question contains Sensitive Security Information and is available only to individuals who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question.				



B-0081	BRP - Contract Drawing S-2053 Not Provided	Closed	10/28/2014	11/07/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titcher	To: Turner Construction Company		Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup	Kevin Clinch
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0082	BRP - Removal of Concrete Structure in Lot A	Closed	10/29/2014	11/08/2014	11/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached SK-S-0024 for corrected sheet references				
REQUEST: Contract Drawing S-2040 provides reference to drawing S-2053 for Retaining Wall 10 details but SCCI is not in receipt of drawing S-2053. Please provide this drawing if it exists.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Demolish this concrete structure to allow for construction of the MSE wall.				
REQUEST: Offhaul of hazardous material and excavation around existing foundations in Lot A have exposed what appears to be a spread footing for a previously demolished concrete wall. The concrete is 2'-0" wide by 1'-6" tall and 85'-0" long with rebar extending vertically out of it. SCCI has checked all reference drawings and was unable to determine what this structure was and when it was built. This concrete will interfere with the future installation of Retaining Wall 10. SCCI proposes to demolish this concrete structure and bill towards Bid Item 25 Demolition/Removal of Concrete Foundations. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 73 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0083	BRP - Overhead Sign Foundation Demo	Closed	10/29/2014	11/08/2014	11/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per the note on D-1007, the overhead sign square pedestal post foundation is to be removed. It is SC CI's understanding that the grout pad and bolts are to be removed and the concrete corbel is to remain intact.				The overhead sign structure including posts and base plates shall be removed. As noted in the RFI, the sign support at the west side of the Fremont Street Off Ramp shall be removed as part of the demolition work. At the east side of the Fremont Street Off Ramp, the grout pad and the bolts shall remain.			
Please confirm.							
Note: The West side will be removed as part of the Off Ramp Demo, the East side is in question.							
B-0084	BRP - Barrette Pile Concrete Allowable Delivery Time	Closed	10/31/2014	11/10/2014	11/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Section 2. 7 C 6 c. of Specification Section 03 05 15 Portland Cement Concrete - Bus Ramps states that concrete that uses an admixture to retard the set time has a time limit from batch to placement of two hours. The mix design for the concrete to be used in the Barrette Piles uses admixtures that ensure that the slump is greater than seven inches up to eight hours from batch time. Therefore, SCCI proposes to revise the allowed time from batch to placement to three hours. This would apply to approved Barrette Pile mix designs only. Is this acceptable?				Revising the allowable time from batch to placement to three hours is acceptable provided the trial batch tests show that the mix retains its slump value in accordance with the specifications, and the mix temperature does not exceed 80 degrees at time of placement.			
B-0085	BRP - CIDH Pile Concrete Allowable Delivery Time	Closed	10/31/2014	11/10/2014	11/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Section 2. 7 C 6 c. of Specification Section 03 05 15 Portland Cement Concrete - Bus Ramps states that concrete that uses an admixture to retard the set time has a time limit from batch to placement of two hours. The mix design for the concrete to be used in the Cast-In-Drilled-Hole Piles uses admixtures that				Revising the allowable time from batch to placement to three hours is acceptable provided the trial batch tests show that the mix retains its slump value in accordance with the specifications, and the mix temperature does not exceed 80 degrees at time of placement.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 74 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	ensure that the slump is greater than seven inches up to eight hours from batch time. Therefore, SCCI proposes to revise the allowed time from batch to placement to three hours. This would apply to currently approved CIDH mix designs only. Is this acceptable?						
B-0086	BRP - AWSS Pipe Sample Submittal	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	11/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
	Spec Section 02723, 3.28, A States:		See SF-DPW Response				
	"The Contractor's Independent Testing Laboratory shall inspect and approve in writing the welds on two (2) test welded collar stops".						
	Following the AWSS meeting on 10/23/14, with Synergy Project Management (AWSS subcontractor), SCCI, WOJV, TCCO and SFDPW, it was confirmed that the only inspection required by SFDPW on the Sample Collar Stops (Submittal TG 1801-103) was the SF Water Department (SFWD) inspection. It was also confirmed that all SFWD inspections were to be requested through the BIM 360 IR process.						
	Please confirm no further inspection is required on Submittal TG 1801-103 and required SFWD testing will be arranged through the TJPA representative.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 75 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0087	BRP - Fremont Off-Ramp Closure TCP Clarification	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent ANSWERED By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher							
REQUEST: As discussed, between CalTrans and CMC Traffic, on 10/31 /14 regarding TCP B1 (Fremont Off-Ramp Closure) of the Traffic Management Plan, the 84" wide SC7 sign will be relocated inside the lane closure as it is too wide to be installed prior to the cone taper. 48"x48" roll up signs will be used on the 2' shoulder of the bay bridge and only 2 legs of the sign stand will be deployed. Tie-wire will be used to attach the stand to the vertical cables of the bridge. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Bashar Dayoub: 11/6/2014 See Caltrans Response.			
B-0088	BRP - Unknown Foundation in Lot A	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent ANSWERED By: Arup Kevin Clinch							
REQUEST: Please see the attached photograph and sketch of an unknown concrete foundation in Lot A. It is between existing Bent G and 303 Second. SCCI has checked all reference drawings and was unable to determine what this structure is and when it was built. This concrete will interfere with the future installation of Retaining Wall 9. SCCI proposes to demolish this concrete structure and bill towards Bid Item 25 Demolition/Removal of Concrete Foundations. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketch SK-RFIB0088 for limits of removal.			
B-0089	BRP - Barrette Pile Initial Slump Range	Closed	11/05/2014	11/15/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent ANSWERED By: Arup Kevin Clinch							
REQUEST: Approved Submittal TG 1801-302.1 indicates the structural mix design planned to be used for the barrettes. The initial slump indicated is 9" (+ 1"). Findings on several similar jobsites indicated that an initial slump 8" (+ 1 ") improves concrete stability (less		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed slump is within the range specified in Specification Section 03 05 15.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 76 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>bleed and decreased risks of segregation) without significantly impacting concrete placement or slump retention.</p> <p>Please confirm an initial slump of 8" (+ 1 ") is acceptable.</p> <p>Note that the mix design will remain the same, only the initial slump requirement will be adjusted (see attached).</p>						
B-0090	BRP - Fremont Off Ramp Overhead Sign Pedestal Removal	Closed	11/05/2014	11/15/2014	11/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Drawing D-1007 states that the removal of the overhead sign truss on the Fremont Street Off Ramp is to be removed, including the "square pedestal post foundation". SCCI interprets the square pedestal post foundation to be the square block of concrete on top of the larger beam that extends from the bridge deck, as shown on the attached drawing. SCCI believes that this beam is intended to remain as Evans Brothers' experience has shown that these beams are tied into the bridge structure. Is this correct?			See attached Sketch SK-D-0001 for reduced limits of demolition.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 77 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0091	BRP - Fremont Off Ramp Limits of Demolition	Closed	11/05/2014	11/15/2014	11/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Drawings D-1003 and D-1007 show the limits of removal of the existing Fremont Street Bus Off Ramp. SCCI would like to confirm the extent of the demolition off the off ramps concrete barrier at the limit of the demolition. SCCI believes that the concrete barrier should be removed to the limits shown on the attached picture as existing cracks in the concrete could lead to spalling if this section is not completely removed.					See attached mark-ups to photo which was included with the RFI. Sawcut top of concrete at location indicated. Minimum sawcut depth 3". Concrete to remain, where noted on sketch, shall be protected. Cut rebar at face of sawcut line.		
Please confirm.							
<hr/>							
B-0092	BRP - Proposed Mofification to Welded Barrette Pile Reinforcement	Closed	11/06/2014	11/16/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
A Quality Control inspection was performed by Nicholson on the reinforcement cage of Barrette Pl. During the inspection, it was observed that 2 ea. 3"x3"x0.25" angles (which are part of the assembly to pick the cage) are welded to a total of 4 ea. #10 structural bars (2 bars on each angle).					This is acceptable. If the coupler option is chosen, stagger the splices.		
After a discussion with ARUP, Nicholson proposes to install 4 ea. additional #10 bars 13' long to lap splice the structural bars affected by the weld. Those additional #10 bars will be centered on the weld location and installed before the Barrette is poured (see attached sketch).							
Alternatively, if the additional #10 bars cannot be supplied in time, Nicholson proposes to install Lenton mechanical couplers at the weld location.							
Please confirm this modification is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 78 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0093	BRP - Pylon 9 Coordinates	Closed	11/06/2014	11/16/2014	11/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: In the response to RFI B-0057, the Northing and Easting of the pylon anchors were changed from 21 14752.046, 6013323.549 to 2114752.130, 6013323.580. Has the pylon centerline also moved to 2114752.130, 6013323.580, or are the saddles offset from pylon centerline?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The saddle work points P1 thru P7 are at the pylon centerline. The northings and eastings were revised to be consistent with our response to RFI B-0033.			
<hr/>							
B-0094	BRP - Circular Hoops for Pylon 9	Closed	11/10/2014	11/20/2014	11/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: The configuration of the #8 "ultimate spliced" hoops shown in the referenced sections as well as the varying dimensions of the Pylon present a challenge in both the fabrication as well as the splicing of these bars. SCCI suggest the use of circular "ultimate spliced" hoop, interlocking when section permits and single above that, at the required spacing. Attached is preliminary drawings which provides sections at various vertical locations. Additionally, #5@12 skin reinforcing would be added to accommodate the increased clearance created by the circular hoops. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is not acceptable.			
<hr/>							
B-0095	BRP - Pylon 9 - Vertical Reinforcing Clarification	Closed	11/10/2014	11/20/2014	12/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Sections A thru D/S-3178 call for #10 vertical bars. Sections E, F/S-3179 call for #11 vertical bars. Detail G/S-		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The #10 bars from the lower portion of the pylon shall be spliced with the #11 bars above the bridge deck.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 80 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>					
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent												
	REQUEST: Please see attached schematic showing the locations of street lights and poles that will be in the way of the new structure and falsework. Per contract drawings U-1003 through U-1006, SCCI is instructed to relocate one street light and deenergize and demolish two street lights. The rest of are not shown on the contract drawings or include a note stating "street light removed." Please provide direction on how to proceed with the removal/relocation of these street lights not shown on the contract drawings and those that SCCI assumed were already removed.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See reply enclosed									
B-0099	BRP - Additional Pylon Dimensions	Closed	11/12/2014	11/22/2014	11/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>					
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent												
	REQUEST: Please see attached preliminary drawings of cable saddles from VSL. VSL needs confirmation on the blister dimensions as well as the work points. Also, any definition of pylon dimensions would be helpful. currently, the only pylon dimensions that we have is shown on Drawing S-3173.	SUGGESTION:						ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The pylon dimensions are shown on S-3173 with additional dimensional information shown on S-3178 and S-3179. See attached Excel file for work points. These are based on the locations of the EP, WP and TP shown on the Contractor's drawing included with this RFI and a revised drawing sent to us on 11/19/14. Contractor to verify these work points.				
<hr/>												
B-0100	BRP - Additional Pylon Geometry	Closed	11/12/2014	11/22/2014	11/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>					
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent												
	REQUEST: See attached e-mail/sketch of the pylon 9 orientation from VSL. Please provide coordinates to one of the vector orthogonal to any face of the pylon.	SUGGESTION:						ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The orientation of the pylon is shown on S-2261.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 81 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
B-0101	Bent 8 Footing Rebar	Closed	11/12/2014	11/22/2014	11/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Please review the attached plan excerpt and acknowledge that it is acceptable to use an HRC-555 T-Head on the # 11 top and bottom bars that pass thru the column vertical reinforcing. This will facilitate installation. The HRC-555 and the 90 regular right angle would be alternated.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Substituting an HRC-555 head for a standard hook at the top #11 bars where they pass through the columns is acceptable provided there is no additional cost to the TJPA. Provide 3" concrete cover at the face of the head and the edge of the head. The orientation of the headed end vs the hooked end shall be staggered. Comply with the requirements of Specification Section 03 20 56.			
<hr/>							
B-0102	BRP - Pile Tip Elevation of CIDH 6-2	Closed	11/13/2014	11/23/2014	11/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: While drilling CIDH 6-2 Case Pacific hit refusal at an approximate elevation of -73.3' due to extremely hard rock. The CIDH Table on Contract Drawing S-3190 calls for a pile tip elevation of -75.9' but SCCI is proposing to cease drilling and revise the pile tip elevation of -73.3'. The cut-off elevation of 26.3' would not change.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable.			
Is this acceptable?							
<hr/>							
B-0103	BRP - Stainless Steel Convex Plates	Closed	11/13/2014	11/23/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Per section 03 15 16, the Convex Plates for the PTFE Bearings must comply with ASTM A240, Type 304 stainless steel. The maximum thickness of convex plates at Hinge 9 and Hinge H are 3" and 3.5" respectively. This thickness is not available in Domestic ASTM A240 Type 304 stainless steel plates. Please advise if another specification is acceptable for the convex plates at Hinge 9 and Hinge H (ie ASTM A276 stainless steel). Please note: If ASTM A240 is required for the convex plates at Hinge 9		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We understand ASTM A240 Type 304 stainless steel plates are available in the thicknesses required from Samuel Plates Sales. If not, submit a copy of the ASTM A276 standard for review.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	and Hinge H, WOJV will issue a 'Buy America' substitution request.						
B-0104	BRP - Stay Cable Forces	Closed	11/17/2014	11/27/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Per the conference call between OPAC and Arup on 11/13/2014 to discuss OPAC's current stage-bystage time dependent erection analysis, OPAC finds slightly higher final stay cable forces than shown on drawing S-6097, about 10% to 15% higher. Please advise on which of the following cable tuning options is preferable?			Arup and OPAC had a conference call on 12/1/14. Arup understands that OPAC has prepared an erection analysis and an erection plan that provides more detail and would assist us in evaluating the question in this RFI. Contractor to forward the erection analysis to Arup for our review.				
1. The cables tuned such that, although the forces are higher, they result in a similar pattern as S-6097. 2. The cables tuned such that they all have approximately the same force, say approximately 12% of the ultimate strength.			Note: Specification Section 34 80 06 requires the Contractor to submit a conceptual erection plan prior to submitting a final erection plan. Arup has not yet received this.				
B-0105	BRP-Pylon 9 Footing	Closed	11/18/2014	11/28/2014	11/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached marked up drawings of the Pylon 9 footing shoring. SCCI is proposing to pour the (N) Pylon 9 footing against the temporary shoring wall, as shown on the attached drawings. A plastic sheet (visqueen) will be attached to the temporary shoring wall to provide a bond breaker for easier extraction of the shoring system.			This is acceptable for the removal of steel plates.				
Is this acceptable?			Regarding the soldier piles, the portion of the soldier pile below the bottom of the pile cap may not be removed by pulling.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 83 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0106	BRP - CCTV Pole	Closed	11/19/2014	11/29/2014	11/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Turner Construction Company Bashar Dayoub							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: At the meeting with CalTrans Maintenance on 11 /5/ 14, CalTrans advised that the CCTV pole shown on drawing D-1007 does not contain CCTV equipment, only a battery operated radar. 1. Please confirm the radar is the only equipment on the pole. 2. Please confirm the radar is battery operated and the pole has no wiring into the barrier wall.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Find Caltrans response to RFI (enclosed) It appears that it is not a CCTV camera, it is a MVDA unit it is not battery operated but rather powered, however caltrans already de-energize lines. Please follow instruction enclosed in the email and location and contact of individuals who should be receiving the equipment and pole. Reminder, SCCI required to have their electrician confirm that both pole and OH sign power have been de-energized prior to removal.			
B-0107	BRP - Pile Tip elevation of CIDH 5-2	Closed	11/19/2014	11/29/2014	11/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: While drilling CIDH 5-2, Case Pacific hit refusal at an approximate elevation of -66.9' due to extremely hard rock. The CIDH Table on Contract Drawing S-3190 calls for a pile tip elevation of -69.1' but SCCI is proposing to cease drilling and revise the pile tip elevation to -66.9'. The cut-off elevation of 29.7' would not change. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable			
B-0108	BRP - Rebar Couplers	Closed	11/19/2014	11/29/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: As approved onsite by the ARUP representative, please confirm that in the case of the Barrette pile, if a rebar coupler for the #10 vertical steel cannot be coupled, it can		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> At barrette pile P9-1, four lap splices in lieu of couplers are acceptable between the first and second cages. Eleven lap splices in lieu of couplers are			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 84 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	be replaced with a splice bar that overlaps the end of each uncoupled bar by 6'-6".						



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
B-0110	BRP - Mass Concrete - Pylon 9	Closed	11/20/2014	11/30/2014	12/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Section 03 70 06 of the Contract Specifications calls out Pylon 9 from top of pile cap to top of bridge as mass concrete. Per approved as noted submittal TG 1801-257, SCCI is planning to pour this section in 2 stages - -1st stage (2 pours): From top of pile cap to 1" above bottom of link beam -2nd stage (1 pour): Link beam and Pylon 9 from 1" above bottom of link beam to top of link beam Is it acceptable to consider the Pylon 9 mass concrete upper limit at the top of the 1st stage (i.e. at the construction joint 1" above the bottom of the link beam)? Please reference attached sketch.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The link beam shall also be placed following requirements of Specification Section 03 70 06.			
B-0111	BRP - Frame 4 Soffit and Stems Construction Joints	Closed	11/21/2014	12/01/2014	01/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: SCCI is proposing construction joints in Frame 4 between the soffit and stems, in the locations shown in the attached drawing. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is not acceptable. Construction joints are shown on S-6072.			
B-0112	BRP - Maximum Force Allowable Through Anti-Ram Barrier Foundation	Closed	11/21/2014	12/01/2014	11/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: What is the maximum force allowable as applied to the bridge section through the Anti-Ram barrier foundation over a period of 0.25 seconds?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This question cannot be answered as it depends on the type, orientation and magnitude of action (axial force, shear force, moment, torsion, etc.) occurring during the time interval requested. In order to check the structure, Arup needs accelerometer data (as noted in response to RFI B0080) including the location and orientation of the accelerations and detailed drawings which indicate how the load from the barrier			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 86 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
system will be applied to the structure.							
B-0112.1	BRP - Maximum force Allowable Through Anti-Ram Barrier Foundation	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	02/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Following RFI B-0112 response, SCCI has provided the requested anti-ram barrier information in submittal TG 1801-162 - Anti-Ram Barrier Test Data (Minimum Stopping Capacity), dated 12/2/14. What is the maximum force allowable, as applied to the bridge section through the anti-ram barrier foundation over a period of 0.25 seconds?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Arup has stopped work on this RFI in accordance with Arup's memo to the TJPA dated February 2, 2015 and titled "Bus Ramp Anti-Ram Barrier".				
B-0113	BRP - Deck Drain Pipe Material	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Per contract drawings S-2160 and S-2161, the pipe connecting the deck drains to the storm sewer system are HDPE. Caltrans Standard Detail B7-6 is referenced which specifies steel pipe. Please confirm that SCCI is to use HDPE pipe per the contract drawings.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pipe shall be steel in accordance with Caltrans Standard Detail B7-6.				
B-0114	BRP - Proposed Barrier Demolition for Caltrans Substation Access	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: SCCI proposes to demolish a 30 foot section of the Essex Street on-ramp barrier rail in order to allow trucks a safe entrance to the Caltrans Substation area per the attached drawing. SCCI will replace the barrier and landscaping upon completion of work in the are. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Following discussions with TJPA and Caltrans Representatives SCCI request is not approve.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0115	BRP - Deck Drainage Clarification	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Per contract drawing S-2161 and C-4102, two deck drains are shown to feed into column 7-2. Per contract drawing S-6066, one deck drain feeds column 7-1 and the other feeds 7-2. SCCI assumes the intent is for both deck drains to feed into column 7-2.				The drains shall be split between column 7-1 and 7-2. See attached sketches SK-C-004, SK-C-005 and SK-S-0026			
Please confirm.							
B-0116	BRP - Bridge Removal Hammer Striking Energy	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Section 3.3-A-8-a of Specification Section 02 4116 states that the Contractor shall not use a tool with a striking energy greater than 1,200 ft-lb per blow for breaking or removing concrete attached to the bridge. SCCI's demolition subcontractor, Evans Brothers, proposes an exception to this requirement in order to limit the number of Fremont Off Ramp closures by using a 11,000 ft-lb hammer attached to a 349 Excavator, or equivalent, staged at the below grade elevation in the Caltrans Substation work area. The 11,000 ft-lb hammer's use would be limited to horizontal striking on the vertical concrete barrier, as shown on attached SK-1.				This is acceptable to Arup provided it is acceptable to Caltrans.			
				Further to Arup comment, proposal was presented to Caltrans and was denied			
Is this acceptable?				see response attach.			
B-0117	BRP - Fremont Off Ramp As-Built	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	11/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Bashar Dayoub				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please provide any available as-built drawings of the existing Fremont Off Ramp bridge structure. These drawings are required by the civil engineer to prove the stability of the bridge structure during bridge removal as required by Section 1.3-C of Contract Specifications Section 02 41 16.				Project As-built drawings are reference in Section 00 03 31 1.2			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
B-0118	BRP - CIDH 20A Utility Drawings	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Comç Bashar Dayoub	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
SCCI has made an overlay of the CIDH piles with the utility demolition drawings. It appears that there is a conflict with the CIDH at Bent 21 and a street light conduit. Please confirm. There are also no utility drawings for the area around CIDH 20A. Please investigate whether there is a utility conflict and provide utility drawings.					Updated Response 12/2/2014		
					Further review of project contract drawings, determine that SCCI is responsible to field verify existitng utilities in the Vacinity of caltrans Substation		
					Please refer to Contract Utility plan sheet - U-3000 "General Notes"		

					This response is to confirm our verbal instruction to SCCI during the Site walk we had on Nov 24, 2014 adjacent to Caltrans Substation. Proceed potholing alleged utility conflict areas, as deemed necessary to identify exact location of underground service line adjacent to new bus Ramp Bent 20A and Bent 21. Please coordinate all work with Caltrans maintenance personal to gain access to existing manholes.		
					Work should be tracked on Force account and will be billed against CR B004 Unknown Utilities; additional \$5000 will be allocated to ensure sufficient funds available.		
					Please notify TJPA representative 24 hours prior to commencing any work. All tags for Daily Force Account Reports (T&M) are to be reviewed by both WOJV and TCCO and turned in daily per Contract.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 89 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0119	BRP - Protection of Transverse Rebar in Fremont Off Ramp	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Per Contract Drawing D-1007, a 3'-0" section of the Fremont Street Off-Ramp is to be demolished. Per Contract Drawing S-5000, the transverse reinforcement in the 3'-0" section is to remain with no damage. SCCI and its demolition subcontractor, Evans Brothers, plan to take measures to satisfy this requirement and protect this reinforcement in place. However, it is possible that reinforcement is damaged during the demolition process. In the case of a transverse rebar being damaged, SCCI proposes to install a #6 dowel with 1 O" embedment with Hilti RE-500 epoxy adjacent to the damaged rebar ensuring that the necessary 2'-0" lap splice is provided.			This is acceptable provided non-destructive testing methods are utilized to locate in-situ reinforcement prior to drilling and provided the number of damaged bars does not exceed 10% of the total number of bars exposed. If, as the work progresses, the total number of damaged bars exceeds 5% of the bars exposed to that point, the work shall stop and demolition methods re-evaluated.				
Is this acceptable?							
<hr/>							
B-0121	BRP - Guard Booth Equipment Cabinet	Closed	12/01/2014	12/11/2014	12/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please see below RFI from WPCS, SCCI's security and communication subcontractor.			See attached response from SMW.				
Specification 27 1117 3.1.C. I , requests a Cabinet to be a minimum of I 8RU with a usable depth of 32" and sized to fit within the footprint of the guard booth. Upon looking into the B-line wall mount cabinet WPCS submitting on as an "or equal ", WPCS have looked into all the other manufactures listed as well as additional manufactures, and have found that no manufacture offers a half size wall mount cabinet with 32" of usable depth. The only way the specification can be met is if a full size 7' minimum cabinet were to be installed, however taking into account that this cabinet is being located in a fairly small guard shack, a full size cabinet will require a larger foot print and may not be the designer's intent.							
1. Please confirm the specification requirements are correct. If not, please provide new cabinet dimension criteria.							
2. If specification is confirmed, please confirm a full size							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	cabinet is what is desired to be installed in the guard shack.						
B-0122	BRP - Seat Extender at Hinge 9	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1. During the December 1, 2014 conference call to discuss the seat extender/vertical restrainer, Arup stated that the seat extender/vertical restrainer was initially intended to perform as only a vertical restrainer. As shown on the bid drawings and incorporated into OPAC's redesign, if the bridge falls off of its bearing, any deflection of the seat extender/vertical restrainer pipe would prevent the bridge from reseating on the bearing. An alternative to the seat extender would be to follow Caltrans MTD 20-22, "Seismic Design of Bridges with Isolation Bearings", which recommends that isolation bearings, such as PTFE sliding spherical bearings, have adequate sliding surface to permit 1.25 times the MCE displacement and that unseating be prevented through the use of catcher blocks at displacements higher than 1.25 time the MCE displacement. Is it acceptable to replace the seat extender component of the seat extender/vertical restrainer with bearings designed according to Caltrans MTD 20-22?				1. This is not acceptable as the proposed solution does not provide a restraint against uplift.			
2. As discussed and agreed upon, during the December 1, 2014 conference call, the Hinge 9 pipe vertical restrainer shown in the bid drawings and incorporated into OPAC's redesign prevents the Hinge 9 bearings from rotating as intended. Arup proposed providing a gap between the restrainer pipe and vertical restrainer assembly to allow the Hinge 9 bearings to rotate as intended. OP AC commented that a gap would allow for some uplift at Hinge 9. Arup agreed and said that some uplift maybe acceptable. We find that the vertical restrainer assembly requires a 2.5" gap top and bottom for the Hinge 9 bearings to be able to rotate the 2 degrees as specified. Is a 2.5" gap acceptable for the vertical restrainer assembly to perform as intended?				2. A 2.5" gap is acceptable for the vertical restrainer assembly. Related to this, the "WSP" dimension at the top sliding plate shown on S-6252 shall change to 30".			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 91 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0123	BRP - Hinge 9 Bearing Sole Plate	Closed	12/02/2014	12/12/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Please confirm that the Hinge 9 Seismic displacement provided in RFI B-0045 should be used to design the Hinge 9 bearing sole plate.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				Confirmed.			
B-0124	BRP - Removal of Trees in Lot A"	Closed	12/04/2014	12/14/2014	12/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: As shown on the attached survey of the existing grade of future Retaining Walls 8 and 9, there are five trees that will be affected by the excavation required to safely slope to the elevation of the foundations of these retaining walls. In order to be able to safely excavate to this elevation, SCCI proposes to remove these trees prior to the start of this work. Please note that this requires work beyond the TJPA property line.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				Safety is the responsibility of the Contractor.If the Contractor feels a condition is unsafe, then the Contractor's means and methods shall address the condition.			
				Refer to Specification Section 01 15 42 Protection of Trees which requires the Contractor to protect existing trees.			
Is this acceptable?							
B-0125	BRP - Lap Splice of CIDH 4-1 Reinforcement Cage	Closed	12/03/2014	12/13/2014	12/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: The rebar cage for CIDH 4-1 was fabricated with "C2" bars 80'-0" rather than the 84'-0" length required by Contract Drawing S-3190 and the approved shop drawings, Submittal TG1801-345.1. SCCI proposes to install a lap splice with a lap length of 8'-9" above the bottom of the installed C2 bar.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				This is acceptable.			
Is this acceptable?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 92 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0126	BRP - Longitudinal Bars in CIDH 4-1	Closed	12/03/2014	12/13/2014	12/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per approved CIDH shop drawings in Submittal TO 1801-345.1, the "C1" bars were shown to be two bars mechanically coupled together to reach the design length of 84'-0". However, the cages were fabricated with the "C1" bars as a single bar that is 84'-0" long. Please confirm that this is acceptable.			This is acceptable.				
B-0126.1	BRP - Longitudinal C1 Bars in CIDH 4-2 and 4-3	Closed	12/12/2014	12/22/2014	12/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per approved CIDH shop drawings in Submittal TG 1801-345.1, the "C1" bars in the Bent 4 CIDH's were shown to be two bars mechanically coupled together to reach the design length of 84'-0". RFI 0126 allowed these bars to be substituted with a single bar that is 84'-0" long in the CIDH 4-1 reinforcement cage. Please confirm that this is also acceptable for the "C1" bars in CIDH 4-2 and 4-3.			This is acceptable				
B-0127	BRP - Traffic Signal Conflict at Essex and Harrison	Closed	12/04/2014	12/14/2014	12/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please see the attached sktech. The traffic signal at the intersection of Harrison and Essex may potentially conflict with the Harrison right bridge overcrossing falsework. In addition, the falsework supporting the new Fremont Off-ramp structure will obstruct the view of the signal. SCCI is still designing the falsework and the attached sketch is conceptual, but illustrates the issue. This traffic signal is not shown on the contract utility drawings and SCCI cannot erect falsework without creating a public safety hazard in the present condition. Survey information is attached for your reference. Please provide direction.			See CMO comments and Photo attached				



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
B-0128	BRP - MSE Wall Ripped Texture Detail	Closed	12/04/2014	12/14/2014	12/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup			

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Andrew Kitchen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent					Kevin Clinch		
REQUEST: Per contract drawing S-6068, several of the Frame 4 bent plates have a slight curve (see attached sketch for some examples). SCCI is proposing to install only straight bent plates at Frame 4, including all curved locations. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is not acceptable				
B-0132	BRP - PG&E Line Relocation at Harrison	Closed	12/06/2014	12/16/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Andrew Kitchen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Turner Construction Comç Steve Cunningham				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Per contract drawing U-1003, note 5, the existing electrical line is to be relocated by PG&E. Per Turner's direction, a survey was performed to see ifremoval was necessary (survey attached). SCCI believes this duct bank will be above the sidewalk grade if the line is to remain. Please confirm this line is to be relocated.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See RFI Response Attached				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
B-0132.1	BRP - PG&E Line Relocation at Harrison	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Steve Cunningham				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			Following discussion during the Wednesday weekly progress meeting on 12/10/14. The approach to address the existing 12kv ductbank at Harrison Street Abutment #1 is as follow:				
Please see attached visual interpretation of the survey notes from RFI#132 of the (E) electrical duct bank at (N) Abutment 1. As noted in previously submitted SCCI's RFI # 132, per contract drawing U-1003, note 5, the existing electrical line is to be relocated by PG&E. Per Turner's direction, a survey was performed to see if removal was necessary (survey attached). SCCI believes this duct bank is above the sidewalk grade if the structure is to remain. Please confirm this line is to be relocated.			Shimmick to evaluate if they can complete demolition and install new work while protecting the existing 12kv ductbank in place? SCCI will submit their plan and cost impact for review?				
			SCCI plan will be submitted to PG&E to gain their approval.				
			Arup have confirmed that the existing ductbank does not appear to have significant impact on the structural components at Abutment #1.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 96 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0133	BRP - Potential Tree Conflict at Folsom	Closed	12/08/2014	12/18/2014	12/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: SCCI has noticed a potential conflict with five large trees and the new bridge structure south of Folsom Street. These trees are not shown on the contract drawings. Survey information and a photograph are attached. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> These trees are on adjacent private property and not on TJPA property. The Contractor's is responsible to perform the work on TJPA property and has no right to access or excavate or remove trees on private property. Contractor shall exercising due care to avoid damage. Contractor shall will be held responsible for all damage caused by the Contractor. REF: SECTION 01 15 40 i PROTECTION OF PROPERTY and SECTION 01 15 42 i PROTECTION OF TREES. REMINDER: RFI's shall not be used for " Questions relating to construction means, methods, techniques, sequences, procedures or safety precautions. (These are the Contractor's responsibilities exclusively). If the Contractor needs assistance reaching out to adjacent property with a request to trim the trees, RFI is not the appropriate vehicle. CM/GC to contact Singer Associates as the TJPA Representative who will arrange a meeting with CM/GC and the Private Property owner. GENERAL CONDITIONS 00 07 00 Para 12.02 PERSONS AND PROPERTY A. CM/GC shall take all necessary precautions for safety of, and shall provide the necessary protection to prevent damage, injury or loss to other property at the Site or adjacent thereto including, but not limited to, trees, shrubs, lawns, walks, pavements, roadways, structures and utilities not indicated to be removed, relocated or replaced on the Contract Documents				
B-0133.1	BRP - Potential Tree Conflict at Folsom	Closed	01/05/2015	01/15/2015	01/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 97 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Add'l Doc Ref: B-0133 Location: Bus Ramp</p> <p>Per RFI Response B-0133, SCCI is not allowed to remove or trim trees on private property. SCCI has looked into available options and had certified arborists from The Professional Tree Care Company and Bartlett Tree Experts visit the site. They both refused to trim the trees at the property line due to stability concerns. They stated that these are Lombardy Poplars with soft wood, a short life span, and a tendency to drop limbs and have trunk or branch failures if the weight of the tree is shifted by significantly trimming them. The bridge cannot be built with these trees remaining in place as significant amount of branches directly conflict with the bridge structure. Please see the attached schematic and photo for reference. Please advise if the trees can be removed.</p>						<p>TJPA Representatives met again with 303 Second Street 1/13/14 and again on 1/22/15 and explained the Contractor's request.</p> <p>Further information is needed from the Contractor.</p> <p>Please provide:</p> <p>1.A survey of the property line and the drip line of the concrete viaduct - at the Folsom trees (including staking or ribbon on the perimeter fence at Folsom and walkdown with the TJPA)</p> <p>2. A survey of the property line and the drip line of the concrete viaduct - at the Abutment trees (including staking and walkdown with the TJPA)</p> <p>3.A survey of the Abutment adjacent to these trees - not the excavation, but the footing/abutment (including staking the corners of the footing/abutment and walkdown with the TJPA)</p>
B-0135	BRP - Deck Drain Column Pipe Outlet	Closed	12/15/2014	12/25/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Per Caltrans Detail B7-6, the deck drain pipe exits the columns 6" above finished grade. This is inconsistent with the attached civil and structural sheets showing slots in the catch basins for the pipes to enter.				Drain pipe shall be installed as shown in the Contract Documents.			
Please clarify which detail is to be used for the connection between the deck drainage and the catch basins.							
<hr/>							
B-0136	BRP - Utility Conduit Clarification at Pylon 9	Closed	12/15/2014	12/25/2014	12/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Per contract drawing S-3173, the utility conduits leave Pylon 9 from the base of the column. Per contract drawing E-5006, the utility conduits leave Pylon 9 from the pile cap. SCCI proposes to have the utility conduits leave Pylon 9 from the base of the column as shown in contract drawing S-3173. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The utility conduits shall leave Pylon 9 from the base of the column, not from the pile cap. The elevation at which the conduit leaves the pylon shall be coordinated with the TTC work in the area of the vehicle and bike ramp.				
B-0137	BRP - Barrier Gate at Harrison St. Off Ramp	Closed	12/15/2014	12/25/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract drawing E-3000 calls out a semaphore arm at the Harrison St off ramp, which is in a different location to the barrier gate shown in the civil drawings (see attached). 1. Please confirm the barrier gate is a 20' arm barrier gate, not a semaphore arm. 2. Please confirm the location of the barrier gate is per the civil drawings, not E-3000.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The barrier gate is a 20' arm barrier gate. 2. The location of the barrier gate shall be according to the civil drawings, not E-3000.				
<hr/>							
B-0138	BRP - Recycled Material for Backfill	Closed	12/16/2014	12/26/2014	12/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: SCCI proposes to use Class II recycled aggregate that meets the requirements of Contract Specifications Section 31 00 06 - Earthwork, Section 2.1 for non-structural backfill. Please confirm that this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The following information is needed to evaluate: 1. Provide the contents of the recycled aggregate 2. Provide the proposed locations where it would be placed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
B-0139.1	BRP - AWSS Demolition and Sequence of Work	Closed	12/23/2014	01/02/2015	01/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Contract Doc Ref: Sheet MA-0 Specification Section 02723			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Location: Bus Ramp			RFI B-0139.1 Revised Response - updated 1/12/2015				
Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI B-0139 Response			Comments on the (3) proposed item work described in the original RFI				
Further to WOJV's response to RFI 0139, SCCI would request to proceed with the work as follows:			1. Acceptable.				
1. Excavate and begin demolition of the upper abutment at the Caltrans lot. This Abutment is well clear of the AWSS line based upon the as-built drawings, USA markings, and a surface field investigation, where trench lines in the pavement are clearly visible.			2. Acceptable.				
2. As demolition of the upper abutment is ongoing, SCCI will pothole the AWSS near the lower abutment and sidewalk. The information gathered from this potholing will be transmitted to WOJV at this time.			3. Acceptable.				
3. Once it has been determined if the AWDD is far enough from the demolition work to safely remain in service, SCCI will proceed with the excavation and demolition of the lower abutment and sidewalk. If AWSS is in conflict with the excavation and demo work, SCCI will proceed with excavation and demo to the extent that is safe and practical to do so with the line remaining in service. The remainder of the excavation and demo will occur after the AWSS phase 1 removal and cap installation is complete.			This sequence is at the contractor's risk and at no cost to the TJPA. This sequence will require mitigating measures by the Contractor to ensure the AWSS piping materials required to safely restore AWSS are on-site. Also, welders, qualifications etc. are all approved and ready, if during excavation and demo AWSS damage occurs. If AWSS excavation and demo damage occurs, the start AWSS phase 1 removal and cap installation may then start with AWSS phasing as detailed on the drawings including the duration must be adhered to.				
SSi believes the intent of the drawings and notes to state that the AWSS system can only be disconnected for a maximum of 6 months to facilitate construction. By proceeding with the demolition and excavation work that does not affect the AWSS, SSi will be able to leave the AWSS in service longer than originally anticipated and reduce the downtime that this line must be sent out to service, which serves both the project and public interest.			*****				
Please advise if the above sequence of work is acceptable.			This is a work sequence request and is an inappropriate use of an RFI. RFI's shall not be used for "Questions relating to construction means, methods, techniques, sequences, procedures or safety precautions."				
			The sequence of both demolition of the upper abutment, excavation and demolition and potholing near the AWSS at the lower abutment and sidewalk is a contractor sequence question. The sequence and scheduling of excavation and demolition of footing and the AWSS relocation is contractor responsibility. The AWSS phasing is clearly detailed on the drawings including the duration of AWSS line remaining in or out of service.				
			If there are questions on sequence or scheduling, this is to be coordinated by the CM/GC and Trade Subcontractor outside of the RFI process. The AWSS				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
work phases are clear and to be coordinated by the Contractor with SFPUC.							
B-0140	BRP - Overhead Sign Structures Signal Face Dimension	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Please provide the location of the signal face from the top of the SP-2 & SP-3 truss (see attached).		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Caltrans RSP ES-14C for signal face placement.			
B-0140.1	BRP - Overhead Sign Signal Face Dimension SP-2 & SP-3	Closed	01/29/2015	02/08/2015	02/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: RFI B-0140 Location: Bus Ramp The RFI B-0140 response directs us to the Cal trans Standard Plans ES-14C. The details on ES-14C pertain to a light weight sign structure with a 4'-0" tall EMS panel. The drawings for ES-14C appear to have the signal in the center of the EMS panel. The sign structure we are fabricating (SP-2 & SP-3) will have an aluminum sign panel that is 6'-8" tall. It appears from the project plans that the signals are located near the top of the panel, which is contradictory to Caltrans ES-14C. Based on the project plans and our experiences we would assume the centerline of the signals would be located approximately 12" to 24" below the top of the sign panel. Please provide the location of the signal face from the top of truss or from the top of the sign panel.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The location of the top edge of signal indication and associated backplate shall be placed below the top truss member and clear it. There is no exact dimension, the location of the signal backplate just needs to be clear of this member.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 101 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
B-0141	BRP - CIDH Pile Slurry Testing Requirements	Closed	12/22/2014	01/01/2015	01/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 31 63 30 Location: Bus Ramp Contract Specification Section 31 63 30 - Cast-In-Drilled-Hole Piles details the material and testing requirements for the bentonite slurry used in the CIDH piles. This specification states that slurry testing should be performed every two hours. Per Case Pacific's experience, the slurry in the shaft during the drilling operation will not meet the specifications per the Mineral Slurry Requirement table in Section 2.4-A-6 because suspended material created by drilling will make the slurry thicker. Therefore, SCCI and Case Pacific propose to only test the bentonite slurry in drilled CIDH shafts once the slurry has been recirculated before the concrete placement. Per Arup's previous request, slurry testing will be possible after periods of 48 hours of no drilling operation. Please confirm that this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is not acceptable. The slurry shall be re-circulated, de sanded or replaced as necessary to maintain the pH, density and viscosity requirements in the specifications. Exceptions to this will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.		
B-0142	BRP - Overhead Sign Structure Post Height	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	12/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract drawing C-7004 states the overhead sign posts must be a minimum of 18' 6" from top of deck to bottom of sign frame. SCCI's subcontractor, Midstate Barrier, is proposing a 19' post (from top of deck to bottom of sign frame). Please confirm this height is acceptable for all 4 overhead sign posts.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable.		
B-0143	BRP - Overhead Sign Structure SP-1 Post and Mast Dimension	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: The contract drawings do not provide a post and mass size for SP-1, the lightweight sign structure. SCCI's			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The member sizes shown are acceptable		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 102 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	subcontractor, Midstate Barrier, have used the 2006 CalTrans design reference sheets for these dimensions.						
	Please confirm these dimensions are correct or please provide the correct dimensions.						
B-0144	BRP - Rebar Splices in Pylon 9 Vertical Reinforcement	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent						
	REQUEST: Please reference S-3177, S-3180, attached sketch of the pylon 9 reinforcement and draft drawing of the cable stayed bridge saddle assembly. In order to efficiently utilize the splices in the pylon 9 vertical reinforcement, SCCI proposes to shift the splice locations as shown on the attached sketch: Lower splice (near EL 64.80') will be shifted up approximately 6', and the upper splice (near EL 102.80) would be shifted up approximately 12".	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Is this acceptable?		The splice locations as shown on the sketch included with the RFI are acceptable. Contractor to verify that no construction joints are located at the saddles as shown on S-3177.				
B-0145	BRP - Bent 8 CIDH Pile Reinforcement Cage C1 and C2 Quantities	Closed	12/22/2014	01/01/2015	01/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent						
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 31 63 30, S-3190 Location: Bus Ramp	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	The CIDH Table on Contract Drawing S-3190 calls for 29 ea # 11 bars for the C1 bars and 26 ea # 10 bars for the C2 bars. Please confirm that this is correct.		See attached SK-S-0027 for size and number of C2 bars				
B-0146	BRP - Type 60 Series Concrete Barrier Mix Design	Closed	12/22/2014	01/01/2015	01/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 103 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 34 71 06 Location: Bus Ramp Per contract specification section 03 30 06 2.1 A, barriers require 3,600 psi with minimum 590 lb/cu yd concrete. However, per the 2010 CalTrans Standard Specifications Type 60 series barriers are considered minor concrete. SCCI is proposing to use the attached approved minor concrete mix design (from TG1801-367 Minor Concrete Mix Design, Agg Grading and Cert of Compliance) for Type 60 and Type 60C concrete barriers. Is this acceptable? Please note: The Type 60 and Type 60C barriers fall under the CalTrans ROW.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Type 60 and Type 60C barriers may be constructed using minor concrete.			
B-0147	BRP - Type 732 and 732MOD Concrete Barrier Mix Design	Closed	12/22/2014	01/01/2015	01/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 03 30 06 Location: Bus Ramp SCCI is proposing to use the approved mix design from submittal TG1801-303 - Pile Cap Concrete Mix Design, Gradation and Certificates, for the Type 732 and Type 732MOD concrete barriers, as it meets the concrete barrier mix design specifications in 03 30 06. Please confirm this mix design can be used for Type 732 and Type 732MOD concrete barriers.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is not acceptable. Specification Section 03 05 15 requires that bridge superstructure concrete to have a maximum length change of laboratory cast specimens at 28 days drying of 0.038%.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0148	BRP - Bent 8 CIDH Reinforcement Cage Headed Rebar	Closed	12/22/2014	01/01/2015	01/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: 03 20 56, TG1801-345.1 Location: Bus Ramp			Use HRC-120 heads.				
Drawing P2R1 in Submittal TG1801-345.1 - CIDH Reinforcement Cage Shop Drawing shows that the headed rebar on the Bent 8 CIDH reinforcement cages are to be HRC-555 T-Heads. Upon further review of the Contract Specifications, CMC Rebar noted that Contract Specification 03 20 45 - Headed Bar Reinforcement, Section 1.4 B states that "headed bar reinforcement must have full size heads and must be on the Caltrans Authorized Material List". HRC-555 T-Heads are on the Caltrans Authorized Material List but under the reduced size heads not the full size heads. Please confirm that the HRC-555 T-Heads are acceptable. An alternative to the HRC-555 is the HRC-120 which is on the Caltrans list and has full size heads.							
<hr/>							
B-0149	BRP - Bent 8 CIDH Reinforcement Cage C2 Splices	Closed	12/23/2014	01/01/2015	01/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: 31 63 30, S-3190 Location: Bus Ramp			C2 bars are main reinforcement. If splices are needed in the C2 bars, use ultimate splice couplers.				
Note 3 on Contract Drawing S-3 190 states that there is a "No splice zone at top 60'-0" of shaft cage for main reinforcement. Ultimate splice coupler shall be used for reinforcement C1". CMC Rebar assumes that the C2 bars are also considered main reinforcement but no splice requirement is provided in this note. If splices are needed in the C2 bars, is it acceptable to use a 6-3 stagger lap splice and can it encroach the 60'-0" no splice zone.							
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 105 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0150	BRP - Grout For Inspection Tubes	Closed	12/19/2014	12/29/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Per communications with ARUP, grout consisting of Portland cement mixed at a ratio of no more than 5 gallons of water per 94 lb. bag can be used to fill the inspection tubes in the CIDH and Barrette piles, provided the mix is pumped from the bottom up. Please confirm this is acceptable.				This is acceptable for shafts 5-2, 6-1 and 6-2.			
				For all other shafts, comply with Specification Section 03 38 06 2.5 B. thru F. and the following:			
				Mix the grout as follows:			
				1. Add water to the mixer followed by cement and any admixture.			
				2. Mix the grout with mechanical mixing equipment that produces a uniform and thoroughly mixed grout.			
				3. Do not exceed 5 gallons of water per 94 lb of cement. Retempering of grout is not allowed.			
				4. Agitate the grout continuously until the grout is pumped.			
				Mixing and placing of grout shall be observed by the TJPA Representative.			
<hr/>							
B-0151	BRP - Painting of Stay Cable Armor	Closed	12/22/2014	01/01/2015	01/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: 05 16 34 Location: Bus Ramp Add'l Doc Ref's: VSL - Trade Subcontractor RFI (Attached)				Details and/or illustrations of the armor system are needed in order to understand and answer this question. Please provide.			
VSL is requesting clarification from designer on the following: Will the stay cable armor need to be painted for aesthetic purposes? If so, please specify RAL #, Product manufacturer to be used for this work, and applicable specifications to be used.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 106 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0151.1	BRP - Paint of Stay Cable Armor	Closed	01/20/2015	01/30/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: This question contains Sensitive Security Information and is available only to individuals who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The response to this question contains Sensitive Security Information and is available only to individuals who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question.	
B-0152	BRP - Stay Armor Thermal Cutting Device	Closed	12/22/2014	01/01/2015	01/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 05 16 34 Location: Bus Ramp Add'l Doc Ref's: VSL - Trade Subcontractor RFI (Attached) When testing the armor for thermal cutting, please confirm the thermal cutting device is an exothermic torch of 1/4 inch diameter rods, 18 inch long with up to 40 ft3 of oxygen (2 ea x 20 ft3 oxygen tanks).		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The response to this question contains Sensitive Security Information and is available only to individuals who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question.	
B-0153	BRP - Stay Cable Armor Testing	Closed	12/22/2014	01/01/2015	01/22/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 05 16 34 Location: Bus Ramp The following questions pertain to the Bus Ramp Stay Cable Bridge: #1 - Please confirm that unstressed strands are acceptable when performing physical testing of the armor. #2 - Please confirm that 1 test is acceptable for each threat category when performing physical testing for the armor. #3 - Please confirm that 2 months advance notice is		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The response to this question contains Sensitive Security Information and is available only to individuals who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 107 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	acceptable prior to performing physical testing of the armor. Physical testing will be performed at VSL's facility in Pocomoke, MD.						
B-0154	BRP - Bollard Quantity Clarification	Closed	12/22/2014	01/01/2015	01/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:City and County of San Fr Michael Smith			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: MA-4 (Sheet 343) Location: Bus Ramp Per contract Drawing MA-4 (Sheet 343) there are 7 bollards to install. SCCI is only able to locate 4 bollards on this sheet. Please confirm that there are only 4 bollards to furnish and install per contract drawing MA-4.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Furnish and Install Four (4) Bollards as shown on the plan drawings			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0156	BRP - Stay Cable Weight Included in Stay Cable Catenary	Closed	12/22/2014	01/01/2015	02/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 109 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch			
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 32 17 28, C-7000 Location: Bus Ramp Contract Drawing C-7000 calls for painted lines outside of the CalTrans substation in the no parking area but the actual "NO PARKING" pavement marking is not called out (see attached). Please confirm the "NO PARKING" pavement marking is to be paint, not thermoplastic.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The "NO PARKING" pavement marking is to be paint, not thermoplastic.			
B-0159	BRP - Striping Detail 40 on C-7002	Closed	12/23/2014	01/02/2015	01/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen Co-Author:		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch			
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: C-7002 Specification Section 32 17 28 Location: Bus Ramp Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Please confirm the striping highlighted on the attached contract drawing, C-7002, is striping detail #40.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The striping highlighted on the drawing attached to the RFI is striping detail #40.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 110 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>	
B-0160	BRP - CR B-002 Additional Footing clarification-1	Closed	12/29/2014	12/29/2014	01/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup			Kevin Clinch
Co-Author: Obayashi USA, LLC		Hideki Fukumi						
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: D-1004		See attached spreadsheet from Turner.						
Locatoion: Bus Ramp, Bent 8								
Gridline: N/A								
Add'l Doc Ref's: CR B-002 TG18.1 Additional Footing, PCI#310293								
RFI is for reviewing of scope and quantities for CR B-002 TG18.1 Additional Footing, PCI#310293								
Per D-1004 Rev X, SCCI is to demolish the top 5' of existing Bent 8. Per reference document San Francisco-Oakland Bridge Railway Facilities (aka 1937 drawings), the details of this Bent are on sheet 24A, which is missing.								
Provide the missing sheet.								
<hr/>								
B-0161	BRP - CR B-002 Additional Footing clarification-2	Closed	12/29/2014	01/08/2015	01/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp			Bashar Dayoub
Co-Author: Obayashi USA, LLC		Hideki Fukumi						
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: D-1004		Please refer to response to RFI 160, and discussion took place during the weekly progress meeting Please expedite your pricing of this work, as TJPA need to process as soon as possible.						
Locatoion: Bus Ramp, Bent 7								
Gridline: N/A								
Add'l Doc Ref's: CR B-002 TG18.1 Additional Footing, PCI#310293								
RFI is for reviewing of scope and quantities for CR B-002 TG18.1 Additional Footing, PCI#310293								
Per D-1004 Rev X, SCCI is to demolish completely an unnamed existing foundation just east of existing Bent 7. Per reference document D1 San Francisco-Oakland Bridge Railway Facilities (aka 1937 drawings), this foundation appears to be called 224 and appears to pre-date these as-built.								
a. Please provide as-build information.								
b. Confirm that only the top 5' similar to the surrounding foundations is to be demolished.								



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 112 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Does any information on the Provide as-built information for the wall footing exist? This is important information as the wall footing is very close and in between the columns of the in-service Fremont Street off-ramp and Clementina Street.						
B-0164	BRP - CR B-002 Additional Footing clarification-5	Closed	12/30/2014	01/09/2015	01/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams					
Co-Author: Obayashi USA, LLC Hideki Fukumi							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: D-1005, D-1008 Locatoion: Bus Ramp Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: for CR B-002 TG18.1 Additional Footing, PCI#310293 RFI is for reviewing of scope and quantities for CR B-002 TG18.1 Additional Footing, PCI#310293 Per Note 3 on D-1005 Rev X & D-1008 Rev X, SCCI is to "Remove AC paving within entire under-ramp park boundary." Provide the boundaries of the under-ramp park.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to response to RFI 160, and discussion took place during the weekly progress meeting Please expedite your pricing of this work, as TJPA need to process as soon as possible.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 113 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
B-0165	BRP - CR B-002 Additional Footing clarification-6	Closed	12/30/2014	01/09/2015	01/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Obayashi USA, LLC			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams	
Stephanie Azzolino			Hideki Fukumi				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: D-1008 Location: Bus Ramp, Existing Bent 31 Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: for CR B-002 TG18.1 Additional Footing, PCI#310293 RFI is for reviewing of scope and quantities for CR B-002 TG18.1 Additional Footing, PCI#310293 Per D-1008 Rev X, Existing Bent 31 shows a storm drain running through it, which in the field, appears to still be active. Various other utilities appear along Clementina, and may cross into the wall footing demo. Confirm the intent is to not replace in kind any utilities uncovered as part of this work.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> to refer to reply to RFI B-0160 To clarify the scope of this demolition, The assumption is made that contractor will not replace any ABANDONED utilities uncovered as part of this work such as abandoned conduits, old storm drain pipes etc.	
B-0166	BRP - Mass Concrete Temperature Monitoring Equipment Installation	Closed	01/05/2015	01/15/2015	01/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch	
Claude Titché							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Specification 037006-1.3B Location: N/A Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached sketch Per Specification 03 70 06-1 .3B, SCCI will install temperature monitoring devices at specified locations and depths to be selected in the thermal control plan. These instruments use RFID Tag technology for communication with the data logger. The RFID transmitter, which is wired to the temperature monitoring device will be elevated out of the concrete. SCCI will tie a 1 /4" diameter fiberglass, or similar non-corrosive, rod to the reinforcing mat, the temperature monitoring RFID transmitter will then be elevated clear of the concrete. Once thermal monitoring activities are complete, this non-corrosive rod and cable will be cut flush with the concrete (same procedure as below grade concrete package). Reference attached brochure and SCCI sketch.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
<div>Is this method acceptable?</div>							
B-0167	BRP - Pylon 9 #6 Cross Tie Spacing	Closed	01/05/2015	01/15/2015	01/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3178, S-3179 Location: Pylon 9 Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: See attached Reference attached sections B-D on S-3178 and F on S-3179. SCCI and CMC have reviewed the drawings and were not able to identify the spacing of the #6 cross ties. Please provide spacing for the #6 cross ties shown in the referenced sections.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The cross ties shall match the spacing of the #8 ties: 3 1/2".			

B-0168	BRP - Pylon 9 Limits of Sections	Closed	01/05/2015	01/15/2015	01/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3177, S-3179 Location: Pylon 9 Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: See attached Reference S-3177 thru S-3179. Please advise if it is acceptable to use Section B/S-3178 in lieu of A/S-3178 for the bottom 24'-0" if Pylon 9. This will facilitate the assembly of the cage.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is not acceptable			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 115 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0169	BRP - CalTrans Lot Landscaping and Irrigation As Built with WOJV Comments	Closed	01/06/2015	01/16/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Location: Bus Ramp Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV email with attachments (Attached) WOJV has provided three plan sheets for the landscaping and irrigation of the Caltrans lot. SCCI requires a full set of the as-builts and specifications for this work in order to replace any disturbed landscape in kind. The sheets currently provided are mostly noted in abbreviations and diagrams, of which no key or legend is provided. Please provide a full set of as-builts and specifications for this work. WOJV Comment: The three plan sheets were provided by TJPA on 8/22/14. See attached email and drawings.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans will not submit as-built and specifications for this work in order to replace any disturbed landscape in kind. However; per the numerous meetings and discussions regarding Bus Ramp TG 18.1 Landscape walk at the Sterling Substation area, including meetings Cal Trans, WOJV, SCCI and Turner, the following landscape actions were agreed to by Shimmick (all in accord with the Contract): 1.Existing plantings - Shimmick will have to purchase and replace/replant all plants damaged by the work (qty. of 84 new plants). K Rail protection is to be provided where practical , in an attempt to preserve as much of the hillside planting as possible. 2.Existing Trees - Shimmick will have to purchase and replace/replant all trees damaged by the work (qty. of 6 new trees) 3.Existing Irrigation lines - Shimmick will have to repair any irrigation lines damaged by the work immediately as these lines are feeding water to other areas. Caltrans landscaping will work closely with SCCI when the landscaping restoration is scheduled to assist with any concerns with specifics or details	

B-0170	BRP - Bent 8 Reinforcement Footing Vertical Ties	Closed	01/08/2015	01/18/2015	02/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 31 63 32 Location: Bus Ramp The footing section calls for #6 @6 each way vertical ties with a 90 degree at bottom. With the spacing of the typical (main) reinforcement at 6" OC and the hook length being 1'-0" long this presents a congestion and constructability issue. One solution would be to use an HRC-555 head at the			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable provided there is no additional cost to the TJPA.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 117 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0174	BRP - Fremont St. Off Ramp CIDH Permanent Casing Material	Closed	01/12/2015	01/22/2015	02/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: 31 63 30 Location: Bus Ramp				See Arup comments below			
The Elevation View on Contract Drawing S-3100 shows that 12'-0" permanent casings are to be installed below the cut-off elevation. Section F on Contract Drawing S-3102 calls for this to be a "permanent steel casing". Case Pacific is proposing to use 12 gage corrugated metal pipe as this permanent steel casing. CMP meets the requirements for Permanent Steel Casing in the Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 49-3.02C(5).				As discussed and highlighted in Arup response to RFI B-174, Caltrans review and approval is required, be sure to allow sufficient time for Caltrans review. We recommended expediting submission of the plan; to date we have not received. (Refer to CMO email sent 2/18/2015)			
Please confirm if this is acceptable.				Please note, In the event proposed modifications potentially delay the schedule of work, contractors always have the option to proceed per contract plan.			
				ARUP COMMENTS:			
				Subject to acceptance by Caltrans:			
				It is acceptable to use 12 gage corrugated metal pipe for the permanent casing provided all the requirements of Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 49-3.02C(5) are met.			
				It is acceptable to use "Class R Steel Pipe Piling" as described in Caltrans Standard Specifications section 49-2.02B(3) for both the permanent casing and the isolation casing.			
				It is acceptable for the permanent casing and the isolation casing to be one continuous pipe.			
				Specification Section 09 97 06 3.6 A. requires that all steel be painted. It is acceptable to not paint the length of the pipe defined as permanent casing.			
				It is acceptable to increase the inside diameter of the permanent casing and the isolation casing to facilitate drilling of hole. The maximum inside diameter shall be 88".			
				It is acceptable to install the permanent casing in an oversized hole (maximum 8 ft diameter) then grout the annular space in accordance with the requirements in Caltrans Standard Specification section 49-3.02C(5).			
				Contractor to submit a plan that indicates the			

[illegible]



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 119 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please note - This RFI pertains to the SFDPW contract drawings.</p>							
B-0176.1	BRP - AWSS Reinforced Concrete Pad	Closed	01/20/2015	01/30/2015	01/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: City and County of San Fr Michael Smith			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: AWSS 03200, MA-4, B-0176.1 Location: Bus Ramp				Please find Design details enclosed			
Further to the response to RFI B-0176, the AWSS contract drawings do not specify a design criteria for the 10' x 10' by 1' thick pad; an engineer will need to know what type of loading will be encountered in order to design the pad. Is this pad to be traffic rated for H-20 loading or just for pedestrian usage {seeing as there are x4 bollards surrounding the concrete pad).				WOJV Note: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI			
Please provide the design criteria for the concrete pad and what type of loading will be placed on the concrete pad that is surrounded by the x4 bollards OR approve the city standard detail for bus pads as these pads are designed for traffic rating and are reinforced.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 120 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0177	BRP - Bent 8 Tiedown Clarification	Closed	01/15/2015	01/25/2015	02/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-6067, 03 30 06 Location: Bus Ramp Data table on referenced drawings depicts a temporary tiedown at hinge 8 on the ζseatζ portion of the hinge. Based on the construction sequence shown in the contract drawings and current TG18.1 schedule, SCCI believes that this tiedown at Hinge 8 is not needed. It's SCCI interpretation that temporary tiedown at hinge 8 would be needed only if the frame 4 is constructed independently without frame 3 and hinge 8 to counter the "curling" effect of the frame 4 on bent 8, once falsework on frame 4 is removed. If frame 3/hinge 8 is constructed prior to completion of frame 4, as currently shown on the schedule, the tiedown at hinge 8 would not be required. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> If frame 3/hinge 8 is constructed prior to completion of frame 4, the temporary tiedown at hinge 8 is not required.			
B-0178	BRP - Pylon 9 Rebar Cage Support	Closed	01/21/2015	01/31/2015	02/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 03 30 11 Section 1.2.D.8 Location: Bus Ramp Add'l Doc Ref: Attached schematic, WOJV Email, ACI 318 Section 5.7 The construction of Pylon 9 will entail placing the pile cap and pylon rebar on top of the existing sub grade using standard concrete dobies, SCCI expects unwanted settlement if only concrete dobies are used. To prevent this SCCI proposes to place 8" x 8" x 3/4" plywood sheets between the dobies and the subgrade. See attached schematic for reference. Is this acceptable? WOJV Comment: See attached email thread between WOJV and SCCI		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 121 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0179	BRP - Columns 3-2 and 5-1 Drain Outlets	Closed	01/19/2015	01/29/2015	02/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: S-2160, C-4102 Location: Bus Ramp							
Per contract drawing S-2160, the deck drain pipe flows to the top of columns 3-1, 3-2, 5-1, and 5-2. Per contract drawing C-4102 the deck drain pipe only exits from columns 3-1 and 5-2.							
Please clarify where the deck drain pipes flow to from the tops of columns 3-2 and 5-1.						Deck Drain Outlet to be added to columns 3-2 and 5-1. See attached sketches (SK-C-0006 and SK-C-0007) for location and details of added outlet drains and associated connections. Note the slight shift in location of CB #15 to allow installation of column 5-1 outlet drain connection. CB #15, as approved in submittal TG1801-600.2, is still sized appropriately for adjusted invert level. No change in CB manufacturer details required.	
<hr/>							
B-0180	BRP - Pylon 9 Hoop Testing Requirements	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	02/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Location: Bus Ramp Add'l Doc Ref: Attached CMC Rebar Shop Drawing P3, attached email							
Due to the taper of Pylon 9 (see attached drawing), there are 59 sets of varying diameter hoops (both resistance welded and coupled). Whereas the specifications define a Lot as 150 count or fraction thereof, of each hoop diameter, CMC Rebar's experience has been that when the design is such as to require minimal quantity of hoops in varying diameters (as in Pylon 9, quantities of 5 to 10 per diameter) each set would not be treated as an individual lot. It is CMC Rebar's position that the intent of the specifications is not necessarily based on quantity per size, rather than a means of quality control which would meet good engineering perspective. Fifty nine lots (59) on 236 hoops is clearly not the intent.							
CMC Rebar proposes propose the following: Welded Hoops - 140 Required - Provide sets 1 QA (4 samples), 1 QC (4 samples) Coupled Hoops - 129 Required - Provide sets 1 QA (4 samples), 2 QC (8 samples) Coupled Hoops - 117 Required - Provide sets 1 QA (4 samples), 2 QC (8 samples)						Consider each section view on drawings S-3178 and S-3179 as representative of one lot each provided the bars within a given section are from the same heat.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 122 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>The samples to be randomly selected from the smallest diameter or as directed by the engineer. Is this acceptable?</p> <p>Please note that this RFI was discussed at the 12/17/14 BRP Progress Meeting.</p>						
3-0182	BRP - CB #12 Down Drain Pipe Clarification	Closed	01/21/2015	01/31/2015	01/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: S-3215, C-4302, 33 46 06 Location: Bus Ramp			Use 12" diameter pipe for the down drain at CB #12.				
Contract drawing C-4302 says that the down drain pipe beneath CB #12 is per MSE wall drainage detail. Per MSE wall drainage inlet at RW10 detail on sheet S-3215, no pipe type is called out. SCCI intends to use a 3" to 4" PVC connection as is shown on sheet S-3214.			WOJV Note: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI				
Is this acceptable?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 123 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0183	BRP - Headed Rebar in Pylon 9 Barrette Pile Cage	Closed	01/26/2015	02/05/2015	02/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3191, TG1801-346.1, B-0055 Location: Bus Ramp Per RFI B-0055 ERP-RESPONSE- Barrette Pile Reinforcement Cage, headed rebar are an acceptable equivalent to the standard hooks detailed at the top of the longitudinal bars of drawing S-3191. Submittal TG 1801-346.1 - Barrette Pile Reinforcement Shop Drawings approved shop drawing of barrette piles indicate the use of the HRC-555 anchor head. The HRC-555 proposed and installed is an equivalent of standard hooks that meets Section 12.6 of ACI 318-08 (please refer to the technical documentation attached). Please confirm the HRC-555s installed at the top of the Barrettes are acceptable.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> HRC-555s installed at the top of the Barrettes are acceptable	
<hr/>							
B-0184	BRP - Hinge 9 Seismic Expansion Joint	Closed	01/23/2015	02/02/2015	02/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-6283, 03 15 06 Location: Bus Ramp See attached sheet for section view and movement rating for proposed Watson Bowman Acme seismic expansion joint. Please confirm the attached joint will be acceptable for the hinge 9 expansion joint.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided the joint can accomodate movements of +/- 1'-6" in the longitudinal direction and +/- 2'-6" in the tranverse direction under seismic loading as shown on sheet S-6283, this is acceptable.	
<hr/>							
B-0185	BRP - TTC Foundation Stiffness for Cable Stayed Bridge	Closed	01/26/2015	02/05/2015	02/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 05 16 33, TG1801-521 Location: Bus Ramp In Comments to submittal TG1801-521, Designers asked			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached Excel files	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 124 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>that foundation stiffness be incorporated into the stage-by-stage erection model. Can Design team please provide SCCI/OPAC with the cable-stayed bridge geotechnical report with the assumed foundation stiffness?</p>							
B-0185.1	BRP - TTC Foundation Stiffness Follow-up	Closed	02/19/2015	03/01/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: RFI B-0185 Location: Lot F			Upon further consideration, we agree that it is appropriate to fix Bent 8 and Pylon 9 at their foundations for the erection analysis.				
The soil springs provided in RFI B-0185 appear to be nonlinear p-y and t-z springs typically used for Nonlinear Time History Analysis. It is our understanding that for Arup's service load analyses Bent 8 and Pylon 9 were fixed at their foundations. If this is true then it would be appropriate to fix Bent 8 and Pylon 9 at their foundations for the erection analysis.							
Please confirm.							
<hr/>							
B-0186	BRP - Viaduct Prestressing Force Coefficient	Closed	01/29/2015	02/08/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: S-6065 Prestressing notes Location: Bus Ramp			See attached sketches SK-S-0028 through SK-S-0030.				
The force coefficient at the point of no movement is given as 0.850 for all girders. This value is directly dependent on the length of the tendons, number of spans, and tendon profile, and cannot be the same for all the tendons.							
Please provide a correct value for the force coefficient for individual tendons.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Retaining Wall 2 and Retaining Wall 5 without completely demolishing Bent A.</p> <p>SCCI proposes to selectively demolish the concrete slab, the upper wall portion of Bent A (as shown on attached Supplemental Drawing 14A) and the pilasters and spread footing only to the extents required to provide access to the new retaining walls and demolition of existing Bent B.</p> <p>Is this acceptable?</p>						
B-0190	BRP - Conduits at Pylon 9 Base	Closed	02/02/2015	02/12/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: E-5007 Detail A Location: Bus Ramp							
CD A/E-5007 calls out for 6 ea (5x4" and 1x2" dia.), and 5 ea. (3x4" and 2x2" dia.) conduits coming out of West and East side of the pylon column, respectively. These conduits are coming from the racks that runs down the bridge girders, which implies that conduits will have 3 ea. 90 degree bends in them between bridge girders and exit point at the base of pylon 9. Due to the code requirements and coordination with the other trade packages, SCCI believes that these conduits need to be stubbed out at a specific elevation and orientation. Reference documents provided to SCCI do not have necessary information to establish these parameters.						See attached sketch SK-E-0001 for alignment between the Bus Ramp contract drawings and TTC drawing A1-7432 revision date 12/16/14. As noted in the sketch, two of the telecom conduit route to the future light trench at the base of the pylon rather than to the vaults.	
Please provide details with specific elevation and orientation for each conduit coming out of the pylon 9. These conduits are depicted on noted A/E-5007.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 127 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
B-0191	BRP - Bent 8 Reinforcement Cages	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract doc Ref: TG1801-345.1 Location: Lot G Per Arup's comments in regards to the length of the Bent 8 CIDH reinforcement cages shown in Submittal TGI801-345.I - CIDH Reinforcement Cage Shop Drawings, the overall length of the cages should be 153'-9 1/2". The reinforcement cage for CIDH 8-1 was delivered to the site with an overall length of 150'-0". Upon review with CMC Rebar, it was confirmed that all four Bent 8 CIDH reinforcement cages were fabricated to this length. SCCI proposes to correct this issue by installing a lap splice per the attached drawing. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable. The added cage shall be well tied to the main cage so there is no displacement of the added cage during installation.			
B-0192	BRP - Confirmation RFI for Pylon 9 Subgrade	Closed	02/12/2015	02/22/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: TG1801-420 Location: Bus Ramp Lot F This RFI is to confirm that the agreed method of dealing with the saturated native soils at the bottom of the Pylon 9 Mat foundation, is to place a layer of Geotextile, topped with 12" of drainage stone (3/4" drain rock per our approved submittal TG 1801-420). This rock will be tamped down with a vibratory plate tamper, with particular attention paid to the center of the mat (between the two Barrette Piles) which will be supporting the weight of the Pylon Rebar cage during construction of the pile cap. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable			
B-0193	BRP - Barrette Piles Vertical Bars Repairs	Closed	02/12/2015	02/22/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 128 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>		
<hr/>									
REQUEST: Location: Bus Ramp Pylon 9 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached email, Lenton Lock Product Data, and photos Per the attached e-mail correspondence, and the discussion during 2/11/2015 TG18.1 progress meeting SCCI proposes to repair the damaged #10 vertical reinforcement bars using Caltrans Approved Erico International Lenton-Lock rebar couplers (see attached Caltrans authorized list of couplers for reinforcement steel). As discussed in the noted progress meeting these couplers shall be for ultimate splice condition. The only applicable coupler for this condition would be Lenton-Lock B-1 Series couplers (data sheets are attached). Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to repair the damaged bars with mechanical couplers. The mechanical couplers shall be rated as an ultimate splice.					
<hr/>									
B-0193.1	BRP - Barrette Piles Vertical Bars Repair	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	03/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>		
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon									
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: RFI B-0193 Location: Lot F In recent developments, due to unsatisfactory sample couplers testing results of the Lenton Lock couplers, CMC Rebar (SCCI Subcontractor) proposes to use HRC 500/510 type couplers on the damaged vertical reinforcement in the barrette piles. All previously installed Lenton lock couplers will be replaced with HRC 500/510 coupler. HRC 500/510 coupler satisfies ultimate condition requirement and is on the authorized list of couplers for reinforcement steel. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
B-0194	BRP - Clearances to Reinforcement in Deck and Pylon 9 Link Beam	Closed	02/17/2015	02/27/2015	03/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: A/S-3076, S-5067			See attached mark-ups to sketches included with the RFI, and sketches SK-S-0033, SK-S-0034 and SK-S-0035.				
Location: Lot F							
Please provide clearances to the reinforcement in the referenced sections. Section A/S-3176 shows the #10 soffit longitudinal bars passing over the # 11 bottom link beam longitudinals. If 2" clear is used on the link beam stirrups the location of the # 10 would be 4 1 /8" from the soffit. Also the clearances in the typical section on drawing S-5067 come into play. The deck thickness is 6" and the thickness of the bars called out is 4 1/4" (2#5, 2#7, #10).							
B-0195	BRP - Link Beam Tendon Anchorages Layout	Closed	02/17/2015	02/27/2015	03/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: S-6070, S-3176, 03 38 06			See revisions to link beam issued as ASI 150-006.				
Location: Lot F							
Add'l Doc Ref: Attached Drawings							
Please see attached preliminary drawings for the pre-stressing cables layout, and reference S-6070 and S-3176. Due to the constructability anchorages at the end of the link beams will not work as shown on the noted contract drawings. SCCI proposes PS layout as shown on the attached preliminary drawings.							
Is this acceptable?							
B-0196	BRP - Rebar Size Confirmation for Link Beam	Closed	02/18/2015	02/28/2015	03/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: S-6071			The ties have been revised in ASI 150-006.				
Location: Lot F							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 130 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
B-0197	BRP - Pile Tip Elevation of CIDH 8-2	Closed	Link Beam rebar details are shown on Contract Drawing S-6071. An excerpt of this drawing is attached for reference. Per this drawing, please confirm that crossties at the #6 ties at the Guide Pipe are #3 bars. Please also confirm that the #6 ties occur only at the Guide Pipe and that they are (6)#6 at 4 inch spacing.					
			From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		
			Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			02/19/2015 03/01/2015 02/24/2015 Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>		
						Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch		
			REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		
			Contract Doc Ref: S-3190 Location: Lot G			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Contract Drawing S-3190 calls for a pile tip elevation of -136.00' for CIDH 8-2. Due to the hardness of the rock encountered, SCCI proposes to revise the pile tip elevation for this pile only to -133.41 '. The cut-off elevation of 12.54' would not change.			This is acceptable.		
Is this acceptable?			WOJV Note: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 131 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0198	BRP - Drain Pipe Conflicts	Closed	02/20/2015	03/02/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S-6501, S-6502, S-6503 Location: Around Harrison St.				Use 4" diameter HDPE slotted pipe at the Harrison Street Overcrossing abutments and at retaining walls 1 through 7.			
Details on contract drawings S-6501 - S-6503 have the following pipe size/type conflicts:							
-Detail A/S-6503 calls out 4" slotted plastic pipe, and references Detail 1/S-6501, which calls out 3" slotted plastic pipe.							
-Detail C/S-6501 calls out 3" slotted plastic pipe, and references D/S-6501, which calls for "Drainage Pipe." Detail B/S-6503 calls out 4" unslotted plastic pipe, and references C/S-6503, which calls for "drainage pipe." S-6501 shows that C/S-6503 and D/S-6501 are the same detail, but it appears that they references two different types/sizes of pipe.							
-S-6502 calls for 4" Drainage Pipe, but gives no details to show the type of pipe.							
Upon contact with multiple PVC pipe suppliers, 4" slotted PVC pipe is not available (see attached product data). Suggestions were made to use either 4" perforated PVC pipe or 3" slotted PVC pipe.							
SCCI proposes to use either 4" perforated PVC pipe or 3" slotted PVC pipe. Please confirm the pipe sizes and types shown in Drawings S-6501 - S-6503.							
<hr/>							
B-0199	BRP - CIDH Cap Pours to Cut off Elevation	Closed	02/19/2015	03/01/2015	03/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S-2190, TG1801-301.1 Location: Lot H				This is acceptable			
Contract Drawing S-3190 shows the cut off elevations and the elevations of the optional construction joint for CIDH							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 132 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>piles. SCCI's subcontractor, Case Pacific, utilized the optional construction joint and made the first concrete placement to this elevation using approved mix design DDJSP8Q3 per Submittal TG 1801-301.1. Upon setting the column rebar cage in piles 5-1 and C-1 , Case Pacific then made a second concrete placement to the cut off elevation using the same mix design. Upon setting, the concrete in the second pour shrunk, lowering the elevation of top of concrete below the cut off elevation. The actual elevation vs. cut-off elevation is shown in the following:</p> <p>CIDH Pile 5-2: Cut-off elevation: 29.7 ft. Actual elevation: 29.5 ft. delta: 4.4 in.</p> <p>CIDH Pile C-1: Cut-off elevation: 31.8 ft. Actual elevation: 31.43 ft. delta: 2.4 in.</p> <p>SCCI proposes to make an additional concrete placement to the cut-off elevation once the column concrete placements have been completed.</p> <p>Is this acceptable?</p>						
B-0200	BRP - Harrison St. Curb Limit of Demolition	Closed	02/19/2015	03/01/2015	02/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: 02 41 06, A/D-1100 Location: Caltrans Substation Lot Add'l Doc Ref: Attached photo		This curb need not be demolished. It may be removed at the Contractor's option. If removed, it shall be replaced when the new sidewalk is placed. If not removed, it shall be protected in place					
The limits of demolition shown on the contract drawings show that a small concrete "curb" will be left behind at Harrison St South (See A/D-1100 at existing Bent B). We believe the remaining "curb section" will be in an undermined condition and not suitable for pouring the new footpath against later. See attached image for limits of							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 133 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	demolition.						
	Please advise if this "curb" section is to be demolished also.						
B-0202	BRP - Foam Pipe Wrap Confirmation	Closed	02/19/2015	03/01/2015	02/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: TG1801-612 Location: Viaduct Columns		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per Submittal TG 1801-612 response for the deck drain pipe, a foam pipe wrap is specified to be used (see attachment). SCCI intends to use the foam pipe wrap attached and wrap it to a minimum thickness of 1/4" and maximum of 1/2" (see attached product data).				This is acceptable.			
Please confirm this is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
B-0203	BRP - Frame 4 Erection Engineering - Seismic Demand	Closed	02/19/2015	03/01/2015	02/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-1200 and S-1201 Location: Lot F SCCI and OPAC are following the Designer's (Arup) erection sequence shown on sheets S-1200 and S-1201. This sequence has been analyzed for seismic demands during construction by Arup as part of their design. Therefore, OPAC need not check the structure for seismic during construction. Please confirm and provide any limiting conditions from your analysis. WOJV Comment: See Specification 34 80 06 1.3.B.1.a: "Contractor shall submit erection plans and structural analysis calculations for each major erection stage including the completed structure under applicable loads at each stage. The erection plan and structural analysis calculations shall demonstrate the Contractor's means and methods to ensure the stability of the structure under the applicable loads at each stage and shall make a stage construction seismic analysis of the partially completed structure per the Construction Evaluation Earthquake indicated on the plans." Also see comment on TG1801-520 Section 5 "Seismic analysis is also required for bridge during construction according to the erection specifications."			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Contractor is responsible for checking the structure for seismic loads during construction. How the Contractor divides this responsibility to their subs and / or engineers is at their discretion.	
B-0204	BRP - Frame 5 Supports Scope Clarification at TTC	Closed	02/20/2015	03/02/2015	03/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Submittal TG18.1- 517 sheet B/S-8013, TG18.1 CD P/S-6114, and TTC CD 4/S1-8014. Location: Zone 1 P/S-6114 (TG18.1) calls out "shear key support done by others". Similarly, 4/S1-8014 shows shear key support being constructed by TG07. These shear key supports are outside SCCI's (TG18.1) Scope as it is clearly noted on P/S-6114.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketch SK-S-0031.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 135 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please clarify and provide details (Shop Drawings from TG07) for the shear key support outriggers, for further coordination.</p> <p>WOJV Comment: After researching this issue, it seems that neither ARUP nor AAI has included the shear key supports in their set of drawings. 4/S1-8014 shows a delineation line with TG07 scope of work, with the shear key support on the TG18.1 side of the line, but P/S-6114 shows that the shear key supports are in the TG07 scope of work. Please advise.</p>						
B-0205	BRP - VCP Pipe Connection Discrepancy	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: C-4100, U-2001, U-2002, 33 44 14 Location: Caltrans Substation Lot Add'l Reference: Attached Sketches				See Aecom reponse			
Per note 2 on contract drawing C-4100, an 18" x 34' VCP pipe connects CB#4 to an existing combined sewer structure. Per contract drawing U-2002, this same structure is to be demolished. Please clarify this connection.							
Additionally, please specify the type of pipe for the (E) 15"SS (shown on U-2001 and U-2002) so the coupling can be designed.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 136 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0206	BRP - Pile Tip Elevation of CIDH 8-3	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: S-3190, 31 63 30 Location: Lot G				This is acceptable			
Contract Drawing S-3190 calls for a pile tip elevation of -136.00' for CIDH 8-3. Due to the hardness of the rock encountered, SCCI proposes to revise the pile tip elevation for this pile only to -125.62'. The cut-off elevation of 12.54' would not change.							
Is this acceptable?							
<hr/>							
B-0207	BRP - Vehicle Feedback Signs	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: 10 14 51 Location: Bus Ramp				1. The locations of the vehicle feedback signs are correct.			
See attached marked-up Contract Drawings. The civil contract drawings show 4 vehicle feedback signs in different locations to the 4 vehicle feedback signs shown in the electrical drawings.				2. The system shall consist of solar powered radar detection speed signs with LED display.			
1. Please confirm the correct location of vehicle feedback signs.							
2. Please provide an updated power plan if the signs are confirmed at the locations shown in the civil drawings.							
<hr/>							
B-0207.1	BRP - Vehicle Feedback Signs	Open	03/27/2015	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: 10 14 51, RFI B-0207 Location: Bus Ramp Deck				1) The location of the vehicle feedback signs is per the civil drawings.			
Please provide the following clarification to the RFI B-0207 response:				2) Power is to be provided per the electrical drawings. See attached sketches SK-E-0002, SK-E-0003 and			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 137 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 138 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
B-0209	BRP - AWSS Concrete Mix Design	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: MA-4, AWSS 03300 Location: South of Harrison St. Please confirm if the approved AWSS concrete mix design can be used for the AWSS 10' x 10' concrete pad and the AWSS valve cover pad. Please note: This RFI is for SFDPW		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: See SFDPW Response		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
B-0210	BRP - Channelizer with Yield Sign	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: C-7002 Location: Lot I Contract drawing C-7002 calls out a "Channelizer with Yield Sign." 1. Please define "channelizer with yield sign" and provide a detail. 2. Please provide the sign designation and size of the yield sign.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: "Channelizer with Yield Sign" refers to tube markers with yellow reflective banding on it. There are no actual designated signs mounted on them.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
B-0211	BRP - Confirmation of Casing Elevations	Closed	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	03/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3100, S-2200 Location: Bent 20A, 21, 22 Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Drawing S-3100 provides the design length of the column isolation casings at Bents 20A, 21 and 22. Drawing S-2200 provides the cut off elevations on the same piles. When combining the values from these two tables the Top		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: See attached SK-S-0032 for revised casing lengths.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 139 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>of Casing elevation and consequently the Finished Grade elevation at each bent is significantly different than what is shown on drawings S-2200 on C-4100. The finished grade in these locations is shown to be the same as original grade.</p> <p>Please confirm the cut-off elevations, "L" value and FG at each of these locations? See attached sketch for further details.</p>						
B-0212	BRP - Coating of Isolation Casings	Closed	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	03/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: 09 97 06 Location: N/A Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI B-0174				1. The outer surface shall be painted from the top of the isolation casing to 2 feet below the cut-off elevation.			
Following the response of RFI B-0174 please confirm the following - 1. Depth of outer surface of isolation casing to be painted? 2. Depth of inner surface of isolation casing to be painted? 3. Color of paint (per 09 97 06 section 2.3 A, color is to be selected by TJP A representative)? 4. Section 09 97 06 section 2.5 is applicable for this coating?				2. The inner surface shall be painted from the top of the isolation casing to 2 feet below the cut-off elevation.			
				3. The color of the final coat shall match Federal Standard 595B No. 36373.			
				4. Section 09 97 06 section 2.5 is applicable for this coating.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 140 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0213	BRP - Location of Drainage Pipes in Column C1 and 5-1	Closed	02/27/2015	03/09/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Column 5-1 and C1 Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A SCCI installed the bridge deck drainage pipes in columns 5-1 and C 1 with the pipe centered in the column at the top but approximately out of plumb by 0'-8" from the center at the bottom. SCCI proposes to keep the pipe installed as is and install all future columns plumb and centered in the column. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable.		
<hr/>							
B-0214	BRP - Cable Restrainer & Pipe Restrainer Detail	Closed	03/03/2015	03/13/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-6220, S-6221, S-6201, S-6202, 05 50 06 Location: Lot F Cable restrainer drawing and procedure notes do not match on the contract drawings. Please confirm the following: 1. Threaded stud length on sheet S-6220 is identified at 9 15/16" long. Restrainer unit installation procedure on sheet S-6221 calls for 12" stud. Please confirm required length. 2. The restrainer unit installation procedures provided on S-6221 do not match the orientation of the swage stud detail shown on sheet S-6220. Please confirm preferred installation procedures. 3. Bearing plate, plate washer and pipe shown on S-6201 & S-6202 do not match. Please confirm preferred detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Threaded stud length should be 12". See attached sketch SK-S-0046 and SK-S-0047. 2. Disc springs should be installed on the bent side. Additionally, tightening is to be performed from bent side. See attached sketch SK-S-0046 and SK-S-0047. 3. See attached sketch SK-S-0044 and SK-S-0045 for details which have been updated to the current Caltrans Bridge Standard Details. Date closed in constructware: 5/26/15 Date closed by WOJV: 5/27/15		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 141 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0215	BRP - Abutments Details Clarifications	Closed	03/03/2015	03/13/2015	03/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3024, S-3026, 03 20 06 Location: Harrison St. Please review the attached excerpts from the contract drawings and answer the highlighted questions. Also, please confirm that the answers given here will apply to other abutments.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See responses on the attached sketches. Note: WOJV and Shimmick shall verify that subcontractor is using the current set of drawings.		
B-0216	BRP - Link Beam Top Reinforcement Bars	Closed	03/03/2015	03/13/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3175, S-3176, 03 20 06 Location: Lot F Please reference CD S-3175 and S-3176, and clarify the number of # 11 bars. S-3175 calls for 15 and S-3176 calls for 30.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached SK-S-0036.		
B-0217	BRP - Link Beam Crosstie Hooks	Closed	03/03/2015	03/13/2015	03/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3176, 03 20 06 Location: Lot F Please confirm that it is acceptable to use T9 type bend in lieu of the T12 bars depicted in the attachment.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached mark-ups to the sketch included with the RFI.		
B-0219	BRP - Unknown Utility Found at South Harrison Sidewalk	Closed	03/04/2015	03/14/2015	04/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Steve Cunningham				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 142 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Contract Doc Ref: U-1003 Location: South of Harrison</p> <p>SCCI's utility locator found a line running alongside the South Harrison sidewalk handrail toward the traffic light located at the corner of Harrison St and Essex On Ramp (please see attached images). This utility line is not shown in the contract drawings. Please advise how to proceed.</p>						<p>There are (2) Services in the Vicinity of sidewalk south of Harrison</p> <p>(see photos attached) 1.Caltrans and City Signal box has been confirmed to be abandon. 2.High voltage Box, SCCI should seek confirmation by PG&E.</p>
B-0219.1	BRP - Unknown Utility Found at South Harrison Sidewalk	Closed	05/12/2015	05/22/2015	05/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</p> <p>REQUEST: SUGGESTION:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: B-0219 Location: Caltrans Substation</p> <p>The response to B-0219 is unclear. SCCI understands that the box is a high voltage box; however the utility line in question is not shown in the drawings. Because the line is not shown in the drawings, further direction by TCCO is required.</p> <p>Please provide direction on how to proceed.</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Regarding the question of the PGE high voltage box; and utility line: 1.Drawing U-1003 shows existing electrical utility boxes at both west and east ends and refers to Key Note 1. "PROTECT/SUPPORT EXISTING UTILITIES. If this is the line in question, follow the contract drawing. 2.2. Please perform an in-field walkdown to identify and confirm which high voltage box; and utility line are in question. 3.3. If you seek to confirm the line is de-energized/abandoned so that SCCI can safely demolish this utility, then use the attached Private Utility Service Abandonment Verification form (SPECIFICATION SECTION 01 10 42 ATTACHMENT 2) that must be used by Webcor-Obayashi and Subs for your safety when seeking to remove underground utilities. Turner and PMPC will assist WOJV/SCCI in scheduling PG&E or other Utility service provider.</p>				
B-0220	BRP - Pylon 9 Pile Cap Top Reinforcement Bars	Closed	03/04/2015	03/14/2015	03/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>			<p>Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 143 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3177, S-3178 Location: Lot F See attached marked up CD S-3177 and S-3178. For the constructability purposes SCCI's Subcontractor CMC Rebar proposes to make all pile cap top mat #11 bars that pass thru the pylon 9 column in 3 pieces. The 3 pieces will be connected with HRC 500/510 coupler as shown in the referenced drawings. HRC 500/510 coupler is on the pre-approved list and satisfies ultimate condition. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable.			
B-0221	BRP - Unknown Foundation at Harrison Abutment Right Bridge	Closed	03/09/2015	03/19/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3022, 02 41 06 Location: Caltrans Lot During Demolition of Bent B an unknown footing was found in the CalTrans lot (see attached survey for location). This footing conflicts with location of the new Harrison Abutment 1 (Right Bridge) footing. Please advise how to proceed.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The existing obstruction within the footprint of the abutment footing shall be removed.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
B-0222	BRP - BBTT Tie Offset at Hinge H Clarification	Closed	03/10/2015	03/20/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-6218 (BRP Drawings), S1-4002 (TCB Drawings) Location: Zone 1 The locations of the CL Tie to TTC Columns are provided on bridge drawing S-6218. The TTBB Tie offset from Building Line "2" is shown as 31'-1.25" which matches the offset shown on building drawing S 1-4002. The BBTT Tie offset from Building Line "2" is shown as 14'-11.125" which does not match the offset shown on building drawing S1-4002 of 15'-1.25". Please confirm that the BBTT Tie offset from Building Line "2" should be 15'-1.25".			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketch SK-S-0037 for corrected dimension.		
<hr/>							
B-0224	BRP - ST-10 Bridge Railing Clarification	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	04/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-6101 Location: Lot F Near the Transbay Transit Center there are no details on how or where to end the ST-10 rails. SCCI assumes that the railing ends at the end of Frame 5. Please provide this information. Please note that this question would have been raised regardless of the VE design.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The railing ends at the end of Frame 5. Cap all discontinuous ends of the ST-10 tubes. See attached sketch SK-S-0040. Date answered by design team: 4/22/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 4/24/2015		
<hr/>							
B-0225	BRP - St-10 Bridge Railing Transition Clarification	Open	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	04/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-2062, S-6066 Location: Lot F Sheet S-6066 and S-2062 do not provide enough			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The ST-10 barrier shall terminate at the back of the crash sushion at BBTT STA 25+35.90 RT 11.90' = TTBB STA 25+37.95 LT 11.33'. There is no "wrap around required for the end of ST-10.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 145 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
information on how the ST-10 barrier transitions at the cable stay section. Please review draft drawings and provide details.							
B-0226	BRP - Paint Color for ST-10 Bridge Railing	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 347106 2.4.E Location: Bus Ramp Specification section 34 71 06 2.4E states that a TJPA Representative is to select a custom color for the California ST-10 bridge railing. Please provide.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Use Benjamin Moore 1550 (Cumulus Cloud) for the ST-10 railings.			

B-0227	BRP - Bedrock Elevation at Viaduct Abutment 1	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3060 Location: Lot A Drawing S-3060 Note no.1 states that the excavation for the Viaduct Abutment 1 footing must be over excavated to bedrock. The Contract Documents indicate that bedrock can be expected at approximately elevation 50.00'. SCCI's exploratory work indicated that bedrock will be encountered at approximately elevation 42.5 0'. This elevation was surveyed, please see attached, and witnessed by an ISI inspector. The existing ground at the top of the excavation is at Elevation 55.00. Please advise how to proceed with the Viaduct Abutment 1 footing excavation.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Excavate to bedrock and backfill with slurry cement backfill to the bottom of footing elevation. Notify Arup when bedrock is reached for confirmation.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 146 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0228	BRP - Bollard Foundation Conflict	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	05/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: 32 39 06 2.1A Location: Lot H/ Above Clementina St				The basis of design product, SecureUSA K4 Removable Model RSSB3608-4 requires a 6" foundation			
The bollards for this project require a large footing in order to meet the K4 rating per specification section 32 39 06 2.1.A. The minimum depth for the bollard foundation is 13" which is thicker than the 9" bridge deck depth available to set it in. Plans do not show detail of the installation of the bollards.				Date answered in Constructware: 5/4/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 5/5/2015			
Please provide a detail showing how the bollard foundation is incorporated into the ramp in order to ensure it will meet the K4 rating.							
WOJV Comment: WOJV has researched this and it seems that none of the approved manufacturers carry a product that can be embedded less than 9"							
B-0229	BRP - Link Beam PT Design	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	05/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 006 Location: Lot F				The prestress jacking forces and cable arrangement has been revised. Refer to ASI150-007 dated 05/05/2015.			
Attached are sketches for the Link Beams post-tension tendons. As shown in ASI 006 Drawings of the link beams, the Pjack of 1,500 kips requires a tendons size of 32-0.6" with 37-0.6" anchorage. The beam cannot accommodate a 37-0.6" anchorage due to the size of bearing plate (20 dia. With 22 diam. spiral) and the size of the blockout to stress the tendon. We propose (see sketches): 1. For the top Pjack of 1,500 kips , use two 16-0.6" tendons. 2. Place the two tendons side by side. 3. Increase the width of beam at the last two exterior cells to 4'-0" 4. Stress the two top tendons from left end and stress the bottom tendon from the right end. 5. Revise the C.G. of the Prestressing force at the end. If				Date Closed in Constructware: 5/6/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 5/8/2015			

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	revising the C.G. requires additional force, up to 280 kips of additional force can be added to the top tendons by adding 3 strands on each tendons. Is this acceptable?						
B-0230	BRP - Retaining Wall 2 Footing Step Location	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	04/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-2042 Location: South of Harrison		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract drawing S-2042 states that the footing step for retaining wall 2 is located at "RW2LOL" ST A 16+76.05. This station does not exist.			See attached SK-S-0039 for corrected location.				
Please provide the proper location.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0231	BRP - Confirmation RFI for HRC Coupler Repairs at Pylon 9	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Lot F			The described method of repair is acceptable.				
<p>CMC Rebar (CMC) is moving forward with the option of field installing HRC 500/510 couplers to the Barrette vertical bars which were originally repaired with Lenton Lock couplers (that failed during QC/QA testing). CMC was onsite on Saturday March 21, 2015, and brought the head forging tool for the HRC type couplers, as well as sample bars and coupler halves.</p>							
<p>CMC will proceed as follows:</p>							
<p>Using the installation method described in the HRC 500/510 coupler product data, CMC will make up 4 QC samples, 4 QA samples and 2 operator qualification samples. CMC will also make themselves access into the Mat, and remove all of the Lenton couplers from the barrettes in Pylon 9. This will be done by cutting through the bars below the couplers. At that point CMC will stop. On Monday March 23, 2015, SCCI will send off the QC samples to MRT and the QA samples to ISI, so they can get pull tested by noon. If everything passes testing, CMC will proceed to make the full repairs in the field, installing couplers and forging heads on the in place Barrette Verticals and new T-heads they have supplied using the same methods and operators used for making the test samples. They will then splice the bars and repair any bars they had to shift or move to make access to the repair areas.</p>							
<p>Attached is information on the HRC coupler with fabrication information/instructions.</p>							
<p>Please confirm the described method of repair is allowable.</p>							
<hr/>							
B-0232	BRP - Retaining Wall 3 Footing Elevation	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 149 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Contract Doc Ref: S-2043 Location: North of Harrison Lot A Contract drawing S-2043 shows the elevation of the R W3 footing. The footing is noted to be level but has a top elevation of 75.03 at one end and 71 .03 at the other. Please confirm these elevations.					See attached SK-S-0038 with the correction of the typo.	
B-0233	BRP - Non Hazardous Class II Contaminated Soil for Backfill Use	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Bashar Dayoub				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Location: Caltrans Substation, Lot A Per Turner's request, please advise if class II contaminated soils are acceptable to be used as backfill material behind retaining walls and abutment structures? See attached soil sample gradation result taken from the Caltrans lot. The remaining class II contaminated soils on this project are located in the Caltrans lot.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Class II contaminated soils are acceptable to be used as NON Structural backfill throughout the project site. Moreover, No Off Haul of class II contaminated soils from project site is required				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 151 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: TG1801-300 Location: Howard St.</div><div>Currently mix design #1572964 is approved for the OCS pole foundations. Based on the cure time for this mix design (as demonstrated at the Pylon 9 pi le cap), SCCI is proposing to use the approved mixdesign #1517949 (attached) for the OCS foundations. Please confirm that this is acceptable.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>WOJV or SCCI to provide OCS Mix per CCSF Standard Specification and MUNI OCS foundation drawing CL 7971 Rev.2 (attached) as required by MUNI and Submittal Pkg. TG1801-358 Rev. 0 returned to WOJV on 2/16/15.</div> <div>If you have previous MUNI approval to deviate from the 3/4" aggregate specified , please produce it and attach to a revised RFI.</div>		
B-0239	BRP - Abutment 1 Bearing Pads and Shear Key Detail	Closed	04/08/2015	04/18/2015	04/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen</div> <div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>			<div>Answered By:Arup</div> <div>Kevin Clinch</div>				
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: S-3060, S-3061, S-5060 Location: Lot A Add'l Doc Ref: Attached sketches</div><div>The layout of the bearing pads on drawing S-3060 appears to be in incorrect when compared to the location of the stem walls on S-5060. Please confirm the correct location of the bearing pads.</div><div>Detail S-3061 indicates that a flat surface is required at the shear key. Reinforcement was detailed per detail S-3061. However, Drawing S-3060 also includes a drawing that indicates that the face of the shear key is to be curved to match drawing S-5060. Please confirm if detail S-3061 or the curved note takes precedence?</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>The abutment elevation on S-3060 and the shear key detail on S-3061 show the squared end of the girder at the abutment. The squared end is the extension of the end diaphragm at the abutment. Drawing S-5060 shows the typical section of the girder along its length. See attached sketches SK-S-0041 and SK-S-0042 for reinforcement at the diaphragm extensions.</div> <div>Date answered by the design team: 4/22/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 4/24/2015</div>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0240	BRP - Folsom Falsework Final Vertical Clearance	Closed	04/08/2015	04/18/2015	05/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: RFI B-0034 Location: Folsom St. Add'l Doc Ref: Attached sketches Please see attached sketch of the falsework vertical clearance at Folsom Street. The vertical clearance will be approximately 14'-0" at the crest of the road. Per RFI Response B-0034, SFMTA will allow a vertical clearance of 14'-2" or greater with proper signage. Per communication with V AK, this is not possible without a center median to reduce the spans. This option was not allowed per RFI responses and traffic coordination meetings with SFMTA. SCCI proposes to have a 14'-0" clearance at Folsom Street for the duration of the falsework set up at Folsom Street. SCCI will transmit a Traffic Control Plan detailing the signage for the street and will submit this for a Special Traffic Permit upon falsework erection. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No. Design Drawing S-2060 requires 15' MIN TEMP VERT CLR"" and Spec Section 03-11-14 Falsework requires the Contractor to meet Cal Trans standard for Falsework 15' minimum height. 1.Folsom Street Falsework vertical clearance of 15'-0" was Submitted by the Contractor (WOJV/SCCI/VAK) in both Submittal Package TG1801-310 Rev. 0 and Rev 1. VAK Drawing sheet 31. 2.Folsom Street Falsework vertical clearance of 15'-0" is required by SFDPW with " assurance that the minimum vertical clearance at traffic openings will be a minimum of 15'-0" when accounting for falsework deflection and roadway crown (or superelevation - if any)." 3.Per RFI Response B-0034, "SFMTA may allow less vertical clearance if justification can be provided. What was discussed with WOJV/SCCI was that these spans perhaps can be reduced if the temporary falsework pads are placed in parking lanes and or one sidewalk was closed as was allowed per specification and as was discussed last year with SFMTA. NOTE: The response to RFI B-0034 was issued on 8/14/14. Subsequently both Falsework Submittal Package TG1801-310 Rev. 0 and Rev 1. VAK Drawing sheet 31 detailed a 15' clearance at Folsom Street . 4.Since justification was never provided, meetings and were completed and a final Folsom Street walkdown occurred Friday 4/30/15 with SFMTA, SCCI and WOJV. Falsework design is able achieve the required minimum vertical clearance of 15'-0". REF: Spec Section 03-11-14 Falsework Spec Section 01-15-70 Traffic Routing Work Rev 3 Date answered in Constructware: 5/4/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 5/5/2015				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0242	BRP - As Built Location of Fremont Off Ramp CIDH Piles	Closed	04/17/2015	04/27/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S-2200 Location: Caltrans Substation, Lot A The survey calculations and layout for the bents 20A, 21,22 and 23 was incorrect. The centers were set radial to FMT-1 and not at the bearings noted on S-2200. The theoretical out of position (not the as built position) is as follows, all South parallel to the alignment from the plan position. Bent 23 is 0.58 to the South, Bent 22 is 0.21 to the South so the span over Harrison is 0.37 shorter. This is the longest FMT bridge span in frame 1. The connection to abutment 24 would be a 0.58 longer. Bents 20A-22 as built position would result in the span 22 to 21 being 0.25 longer and 21 to 20A being .25 shorter. Bent 20A - 0.19 & Permanent cage set Bent 21 - 0.46 & Hole drilled and cage set Bent 22 - 0.21 & Permanent cage set Bent 23 - 0.58 & As Built of column cage See attached survey sheets for reference. Please confirm if it is acceptable that the column cages are to be set in the as built location (concentric to the as built CIDH cage)?				It is acceptable to set the column cages concentric to the as built CIDH cages. Contractor to make all necessary adjustments to reinforcing steel lengths / bents, and prestressing layout.			

B-0243	BRP - Viaduct Soffit - Grade Break	Closed	04/17/2015	04/27/2015	04/29/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-5064 Location: Frame 2 Please see attached marked up contract drawing. As discussed in the falsework DFOW meeting on 4/10/15. SCCI proposes to construct viaduct soffits without the grade brake shown on BBTT line. The bottom plane of the soffit would be flat single plane. The stem heights would be adjusted to accommodate top slab construction per deck grading Contract drawings. The depth of the girders will be as designed, at a minimum. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable provided there is no additional cost to the TJPA. The difference in depth between any web at a given cross section shall not exceed 2.5". Date Closed in Constructware: 4/27/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 4/29/2015	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0244	BRP - Bent 8 Column Cage Conflicts	Open	04/20/2015	04/30/2015	04/22/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S-3170 Location: Lot G Add'l Doc Ref: SK-1 The locations of prestressing bar ducts and longitudinal rebar in the Bent 8 columns are shown on Contract Drawing S-3170. As shown on attached sketch SK-1 , the vertical #11 rebar have tails that interfere with the ducts at the top of the cage. In order to maintain the correct locations of the ducts, it is necessary to move the vertical bar tails out of the way. Is this acceptable?				This is acceptable. Ensure the tails do no interfere with the shear ties or any of the other beam reinforcement.			
<hr/>							
B-0245	BRP - Grouting of Mass Thermal Cooling Pipes	Closed	04/21/2015	05/01/2015	04/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: 03 70 06 Location: Lot F Section 3.1 F of Specification Section 03 70 06 Mass Concrete - Bus Ramps details the requirements for the grout to be used in the mass thermal cooling pipes once thermal cooling is complete. Following this specification, SCCI attempted to pressure grout the pipes with Dayton Superior 1107 Advantage Grout. However, the grout is unable to be pumped through the pipes, probably due to the viscous consistency and the loops in the cooling pipes. To ensure complete grouting of the tubes, SCCI proposes to fill the cooling pipes with a Type II/V Portland cement and water mixed at a ratio of 5 gallons of water per 94 lb bag of cement. The product will be the same as specified in Submittal TG1801-449. Is this acceptable?				This is acceptable. Date answered in constructware: 4/23/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 4/30/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
B-0246	BRP - Prestressing Draing Pipe Conflict at Bent 8	Closed	04/27/2015	05/07/2015	05/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-2160, S-3170, S-6300 Location: Lot G Per details on contract drawings S-2161 and S-6300, the deck drain pipe running vertically through the columns is to be centered at the column and bent centerline. Per Section A on contract Drawing S-3170, the prestressing duct at Bent 8 also runs vertically centered at the column and Bent 8 centerline. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketch SK-S-0043 for positions of drain pipes at columns B8-1 and B8-2.		
B-0247	BRP - Pylon 9 Column Dimension Change	Closed	04/29/2015	05/09/2015	05/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3173 Location: Lot F Contract Drawing S-3173 shows the dimensions of the Pylon 9 column to be 9'-0"x 11 '-0" at the top of the pile cap, 8'-2"x8'-4" at the bottom of the Link Beam and 8'-0"x8'-0" at the top of the Link Beam. The shop drawings for the Symons form work for the first lift (from top of pile cap to bottom of link beam) of the column match these dimensions. However, the forms were fabricated so that the dimensions of the column at the bottom of the link beam are 8'-0"x8'-0". SCCI proposes to raise the Symons formwork the thickness of the link beam (5'-0") and field build 5'-0" tall forms with dimensions that match those of the Pylon 9 column at the top of pile elevation. See the attached SK-1 for details. SCCI will use the same steel forms as previously approved and may cut the top 5' of Symons form work if conflicts with protruding conduits exist. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable.		
B-0248	BRP - Correction of Abutment 1 Rebar	Closed	04/29/2015	05/09/2015	05/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 156 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 03 20 03 Location: Lot A CMC Rebar fabricated Bar mark 9270 at 8'-8" long. The bars were supposed to be fabricated 9'-8" long. Please confirm that the field splice shown is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable. Date Closed in Constructware: 5/4/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 5/5/2015		
B-0249	BRP - Pylon 9 Column Concrete Slump	Closed	04/30/2015	05/10/2015	05/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
REQUEST: Contract Ref Doc: 030515 Location: Lot F Pylon 9 Add'l Doc Ref's: TG1801-360 In order for the concrete in the Pylon 9 Column to be flow-able and ensure that there are no voids, SCCI is proposing to increase the allowable slump in Mix Design #1538164 from seven inches to eight inches. SCCI has confirmed with their concrete supplier, Cemex, that this increase does not require any change to the mix design. The additional slump will be achieved by increasing the amount of admixture within the limits shown on the original mix design as shown in approved Submittal TG1801-360. The mix design with the revised slump is shown on the attached mix design cover sheet. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable. Contractor to verify that the assumptions made in the formwork design and required rate of placement are still valid. Date closed in constructware: 5/7/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 5/8/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 157 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0250	BRP - MSE Underdrain Drainage System Connection Clarification	Closed	05/05/2015	05/15/2015	06/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-6504 Location: Lot A Per sheet S-6504, the MSE Underdrains are supposed to connect from the end of the pipe run to the drainage system. The invert elevation at the end of the MSE drain pipe is approximately 50.29'. The civil drawings have no detail of this connection and the nearest manhole is MH #1 with invert out elevation of 62.00' per sheet C-4302. Therefore, this connection will be going uphill from invert elevation 50.29' to 62.00'. See attached drawings and sketch. Please advise.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketch SK-C-0010 for connection of MSE underdrain to the storm drain system. Note: This RFI was received by Arup on 5/5/15. Arup understands the forms at the abutment were closed on 5/5/15. Drawing S-6504 calls for 2'-0" blockout at the base of the abutment wall. This blockout was not placed. Date Closed on Constructware: 6/3/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015			
<hr/>							
B-0251	BRP - Abutment 1 Drainage Clarification	Closed	05/05/2015	05/15/2015	06/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-3061 Location: Lot A Per drawing S-3061 , Abutment 1 has a drain pipe at the footing of the wall. There are no details showing where this pipe exits Abutment 1. SCCI proposes to have the pipe relocated 3" +/- above finished and drain out a weep hole through Abutment I stem per Caltrans Standard Detail B0-3. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketch SK-C-0011 for connection of MSE underdrain to the storm drain system. Note: this RFI was received by Arup on 5/5/15. Arup understands the forms at the abutment were closed on 5/5/15. Drawing S-6504 calls for 2'-0" blockout at the base of the abutment wall. This blockout was not placed in the abutment wall. Date closed on Constructware: 6/3/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015			
<hr/>							
B-0252	BRP - Unknown Foundation at Abutment 2	Closed	05/05/2015	05/15/2015	05/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> SCCI is instructed to proceed removing concrete			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 159 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0254	BRP - Isolation Casing Cover Conflict	Closed	05/07/2015	05/17/2015	05/29/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Thomas Barni</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:Arup</div><div>Kevin Clinch</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc: S-3103, S3100 Location: Caltrans Lot				See attached sketch SK-S-0053.			
Per contract drawing S-3103, the isolation casing covers are designed for round columns. This conflicts with the square column section that starts at the top of isolation casing per drawing S-3100.				Date Closed in Constructware: 5/27/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/29/2015			
Please provide further details.							
B-0255	BRP - Deck Drain Rebar Tail Conflict	Closed	05/07/2015	05/17/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Thomas Barni</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:Arup</div><div>Kevin Clinch</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc: S-6300, S-3170 Location: Bent 8-1/8-2 Lot G Add'l Doc: RFI B-0246				The drain pipes will pass though the column reinforcement cage below the hooks.			
Per RFI Response B-0246, SCCI is to place the deck drain pipe in columns 8-1 and 8-2 at 1 foot from the center of columns. As shown in the attached sketch, SCCI will have to cut the rebar tails to make this new layout work.				Date closed in Constructware: 6/3/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015			
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
B-0256	BRP - Jacking Forces - ASI 007	Closed	05/11/2015	05/21/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Thomas Barni</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:Arup</div><div>Kevin Clinch</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contact Doc: ASI150 - 007 Location: Lot F				See attached SK-S-0048.			
ASI 007 increased link beam and diaphragm width from 3' to 5'. This will change the mass and stiffness of the typical link beams and diaphragms.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please provide new jacking forces for the cable stays.</p>							
B-0257	BRP - Fremont Off Ramp Column Rebar Hooks	Closed	05/12/2015	05/22/2015	05/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S-3100 Location: Caltrans Lot, Lot A				This is not acceptable. Arup and the Contractor are currently working together on other solutions.			
Please see attached RFI from CMC Rebar. The vertical bars at Bents 20A, 21, 22 and 23 columns are fabricated straight, instead of hooked, as shown on contract drawings S-3100 & S-3101. Please confirm that it is allowable to splice hooks onto the verticals.				Date closed in Constructware: 5/14/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 5/15/2015			
Note: Hooks to be turned inward or outward as conditions necessitate, to avoid congestion.							
B-0258	BRP - Gutter at RW1	Closed	05/12/2015	05/22/2015	05/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S-2041 Location: South Side of Harrison St.				See attached sketches SK-C-0008, SK-C-0009, SK-S-0049, SK-S-0050 and SK-S-0051.			
Drawing S-2041 and S-2042 show a gutter running at the top of RW1. There is no drainage connection details provided for this gutter.							
Please advise.							
B-0259	BRP - Emergency Zones in the ETC System	Closed	05/13/2015	05/23/2015	06/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 161 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: TG1801-840, 26 09 34 Location: Frame 2</div><div>Please see RFI below from Shimmick's dimming control manufacture - In submittal response TG 1801-840 - Central Dimming Controls there is a general comment - "INCLUDE A UL924 DEVICE TO SENSE LOSS OF POWER, AND ENERGIZED EMERGENCYLIGHTING TO 100% ON".</div><div>Currently there are no Emergency zones on the ETC system. If emergency zones are to be added in the future, please advise how many zones, and what type of fixture may be emergency. Will they be DMX controlled or 0-10 V controlled?</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>See attached sketches SK-E-0005, SK-E-0006, SK-E-0007. For the basis of design lighting control panel, ETC, the new equipment shown on sketch E-SK-0006 are the Emergency Bypass Detection Kit (EBDK) and the DMX Emergency Bypass Controller (DEBC).</div><div>Date Closed on Constructware: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/2/2015</div></div>		
B-0260	BRP - Confirming RFI for Square Column Detail	Closed	05/13/2015	05/23/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: 03 30 06 Location: Caltrans Lot Add'l Detail: Attached Column Formwork Design Sections and Detail</div><div>Please confirm the attached construction detail is acceptable?</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>This is acceptable.</div></div>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 162 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0261	BRP - Embedded Conduit at Fremont Columns	Closed	05/13/2015	05/23/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen				
REQUEST: Contract Drawing Ref: E-3000 Location: Caltrans Lot There has been some discussion about embedding the conduit to feed the pole mounted lighting at bent 21. See drawing E-3000 note 6 for reference. If the conduit is to be embedded in the column, please provide routing details.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Keyed note 6 on E-3000 requires the Contractor to determine the location of the existing underground circuit. This will determine the size of the conduit and the point of entry for the service entering the column. The conduit shall run up inside the center of the column. The path of the conduit at the top of the column shall be determined by the Contractor in accordance with Specification Section 26 05 06 3.1 C. 3. Date Closed in Constructware: 5/26/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015				
B-0262	BRP - ST-10 Mock Up Clarification	Open	05/14/2015	05/24/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 09 97 06 - 2 1.7 Location: Lot F Page 09 97 06-2 1.7 Section C references mock ups. Does the designer want an 8ft section painted and shipped prior to railing fabrication? Is this meant to apply to the ST-10 railing. Please review and advise. Mockups are not typically requested for ST-10 rail and having to wait to fabricate based on approval of the painted mock up could really impact lead time.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A painted 8ft section of ST-10 railing need not be shipped for review prior to railing fabrication. Date Closed in Constructware: 5/27/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/29/2015				
B-0263	BRP - Hinge Cable Restrainer Pipe Repair	Closed	05/16/2015	05/26/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-6201 Location: Lot A SCCI is proposing to cut the bent portion of the cable restrainer pipe at Hinge 23 and weld a new piece as			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable. The backing plate thickness shall not exceed 1/4". The inside corners of the backing ring shall be rounded. A weld procedure specification (WPS) shall be prepared, reviewed and approved by the Contractor's testing agency and the TJPA's testing				

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0264	BRP - Abutment 24 Bearing Pads	Open	05/18/2015	05/28/2015	Potentially		
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</p>							
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: S-3000</p> <p>Location: Abutment 24</p> <p>Please confirm the symmetrical dimensions shown are acceptable for the bearing pad locations at Abutment 24.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			
<p>shown in the attached sketch. Please advise if this is acceptable.</p>		<p>agency, and followed when doing the work. The existing pipe shall be cut and the edges prepared in accordance with AWS and the WPS. The WPS shall identify preheat requirements; contractor to protect the existing concrete from damage due to heat. The Contractor's testing agency and the TJPA's testing agency shall provide full time inspection during the cutting of the pipe, the preparation of the edges, and the welding operation to verify compliance with AWS and the WPS. The full penetration weld shall be ultrasonically tested once the work is complete.</p> <p>Date Closed on Constructware: 6/1/2015</p> <p>Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015</p>					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 164 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0265	BRP - Falsework Inspection Qualification Requirements	Closed	05/19/2015	05/29/2015	06/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sub-section 1.5.C of Specification Section 03 11 14 - Falsework - Bus Ramps requires the Falsework Trade Contractor to employ a Registered Professional Engineer in the State of California with 10 years of comparable experience including 3 similar falsework projects to be present on the site on a daily basis. SCCI proposes to satisfy this requirement through the following:			ARUP recommends that the TJPA reject this proposal as it does not meet the requirements of the specifications.				
-Chad Hummel, a Registered Professional Engineer in the State of California, will be on site on a daily basis and will be responsible for ensuring that all construction confirms to approved drawings, only sound materials are used and quality workmanship employed and that all specifications are met. He will perform inspection of each bent and sign off on it before it is tripped. Chad's resume as well as a memo from the Falsework EOR designating Chad as the qualified onsite inspector are attached to this RFI.			Date Closed on Constructware: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/2/2015				
-Filip Filipic, Construction Manager, and John Harry, Falsework Superintendent, both have ten years of comparable experience and will be on site daily to perform secondary inspections.							
-Nathan Jaques, A Registered Professional Engineer in the State of California and the Falsework Engineer of Record, will perform a final inspection of the falsework prior to each concrete pour. Inspections will be scheduled at least five days before the concrete pour to ensure that there is sufficient time to correct any deficiencies.							
<hr/>							
B-0265.1	BRP - Falsework Inspection Requirements	Open	06/09/2015	06/19/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: 03 11 14							
Sub-section 1.5.C of Specification Section 03 11 14 - Falsework - Bus Ramps requires the Falsework Trade Contractor to employ a Registered Professional Engineer in the State of California with 10 years of comparable experience including 3 similar falsework projects to be							



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>present on the site on a daily basis. SCCI proposes to satisfy this requirement through the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Nathan Jaques, A Registered Professional Engineer in the State of California and the Falsework Engineer of Record, will be on site once every two weeks, at a minimum, to perform inspection of the constructed falsework. Additionally, he will be on site performing inspection at the following two checkpoints, specified in the Cal-OSHA Requirements Inspection section of the Caltrans Falsework Manual section, as is industry standard:<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Prior to opening of city streets after stringers have been installed over the streeto Five days prior to concrete placement- Chad Hummel, a Registered Professional Engineer in the State of California, will be on site on a daily basis and will be responsible for ensuring that all construction confirms to approved drawings, only sound materials are used and quality workmanship employed and that all specifications are met. He will perform inspection of each bent and sign off on it before it is tripped. Chad's resume as well as a memo from the Falsework EOR designating Chad as the qualified onsite inspector are attached to this RFI.- Filip Filipic, Construction Manager, and John Harry, Falsework Superintendent, both have ten years of comparable experience and will be on site daily to perform secondary inspections. Their resumes are attached.						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0266	BRP - Falsework Span for Fremont Off Ramp	Closed	05/21/2015	05/31/2015	06/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: 03 11 14 Location: Fremont Off Ramp			Specification Section 03 11 14 1.7-A.4 is a Caltrans requirement, but it is Arup's understanding that this provision does not apply to box girders. The Contractor need not comply with the span limits in Specification Section 03 11 14 1.7-A.4				
Please see attached RFI from V AK regarding the span of the Fremont Off Ramp Falsework. The Fremont Off Ramp span over Harrison St needs to be increased to accommodate an existing traffic signal pole. The required 80' span for lengthening, exceeds the permitted 65' maximum span per spec section 03 11 14 1.7-A.4. Please advise if this acceptable? And if so, please advise the allowable maximum deflection permitted on the longer span?			Date closed on Constructware: 6/1/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 6/2/2015				
B-0267	BRP - Abutment 2 Shear Key	Closed	05/21/2015	05/31/2015	05/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: S-3021 Location: Lot A			This is acceptable				
Please advise if it acceptable to relocate the abutment 2 shear key per the attached sketch.			Date closed in Constructware: 5/21/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 5/26/2015				
B-0268	BRP - RW10 LOL line	Closed	05/21/2015	05/31/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: Drawing S-2050 Location: Lot A			See attached SK-S-0052.				
Please provide the missing FMT1 station reference for the RW10 LOL in the drawing S-2050.			Date Closed in Constructware: 5/26/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015				
B-0271	BRP - Existing Reinforcement for Retaining Wall 3	Closed	05/28/2015	06/07/2015	06/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 168 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
B-0273	BRP - Bent 2 Beam Property Line Conflict	Closed	06/01/2015	06/11/2015	06/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Location: Lot A Contract Doc Ref: S-3160, C-7004			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached SK-0055, SK-S-0056, and SK-S-0057.				
SUGGESTION: Per Contract Drawing S-3160, the beam at Bent 2 extends out 4'-6" past the edge of bridge to support the CMS sign shown on Contract Drawing C-7004. Per survey of the adjacent property line, this beam would extend approximately 2'-2" past the property line. Please provide a redesign of this beam to ensure that the edge of beam is a sufficient distance clear of the property line.			Date closed on Constructware: 6/11/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 6/15/2015				
B-0274	BRP - AWSS Conflict with 2nd PG&E Duct Bank	Closed	06/02/2015	06/12/2015	06/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Location: Harrison St. Add'l Doc Ref: DPW Harrison St. As-Built			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> -Per our meeting conclusion on 06/02/15, please proceed with routing the (N) AWSS hydrant lateral through the three (E) PG&E duct banks as shown on your sketch, use either or a combination of 22 1/2 and 45 elbows as required and available. -Locate (N) gate valve between the two (E) conduits as discussed at the field meeting. -Maintain 6" minimum clearance between AWSS pipes and (E) utilities.				
SUGGESTION: Per AWSS conflict meeting with TCCO, WOJV, DPW and SCCI on 6/2/2015, it has been determined that the best possible solution is to route the water line over the duct. Please confirm this is acceptable.			Answered By: Michael B. Smith SFDPW/DED/EME Answered on Constructware: 6/3/2015 Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				
B-0275	BRP - Soffit Access Opening and Drain Hole Location Discrepancy	Open	06/04/2015	06/14/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-6020, S-6021 , S-6024, S-6025, S-6060, S-6062, S-6066, S-6068, S-6073, S-6075, S-6076,			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
SUGGESTION:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	and S-6078 Location: Bus Ramps Per contract girder layout drawings S-6020, S-6021 , S-6024, S-6025, S-6060, S-6062, S-6066, and S-6068 soffit access openings are called at all locations to be per Caltrans Standard Detail B14-5. Per girder reinforcement contract drawings S-6701, S-6073, S-6075, S-6076, and S-6078 the soffit access openings are in different locations and have a different detail (S-6701). In addition, the soffit vent locations differ in both groups of drawings. Please clarify which drawings should be used for the locations and details for the soffit access openings and drain holes.						
B-0276	BRP - Bents 20A, 21, 22, and 23 Column Rebar Clarification	Closed	06/04/2015	06/14/2015	06/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Locations: Bents 20A, 21, 22, 23 Contract Doc Ref: S-3100 & S-3102 The vertical bars at Bents 20A, 21, 22, 23 are fabricated straight instead of hooked shown on drawings S-3100 & S-3101. This RFI proposes to use HRC 500/510 combination to mechanically attach an HRC- 110 T-Head to the existing straight vertical bars. Our sketch below depicts the intended work. The deviation in bar lengths from that shown on S-3100 & S-3102 "DRAFT" is due to the minimum length for a bar to have the T-Heads applied is 1-6.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable. Date closed on Constructware: 6/9/2015 Date closed by WOJV" 6/10/2015				
Is this acceptable?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 173 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>												
B-0285	BRP - Guard Booth Acoustical Value	Open	06/10/2015	06/20/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>												
								From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:							
								Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon											
								REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>					
								Location: Guard Booth Contract Doc Ref: 13 34 23, C-2500											
								Contract specification section 2.3.A calls out an acoustical rating of STC 45 for the guard booth walls. The wall system that B.I.G Enterprises is providing does not have any acoustical value. Please advise if this requirement can be removed from the contract specifications.											
B-0286	BRP - Guard Booth Fire Resistant Rating	Open	06/10/2015	06/20/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>												
								From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:							
								Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon											
								REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>					
								Location: Guard Booth Contract Ref: 13 34 23											
								Contract specification section 2.3.A calls for all flooring, walls and ceiling to be fire resistant material. The ceiling and wall panels will be steel, therefore nonflammable. Please provide a fire resistant rating for the floor panels specified.											



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 174 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
B-0287	BRP - Guard Booth HVAC Unit	Open	06/10/2015	06/20/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Drawing: C-2500, 13 34 23 Location: Guard Booth The contract specifications call for a roof mounted HVAC unit with 14,600 BTU cooling and 17,000 BTU heating. This is a specification for a standard through the wall mounted unit that BIG Enterprises provides, not a roof mounted unit. Due to California's energy code requirement of Title 24, BIG will have to provide a roof mounted unit with 23,000 BTU heating and cooling. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
B-0288	BRP - Lot A Soil for Structural Backfill	Open	06/10/2015	06/20/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Location: Lot A Add'l Doc: Product Gradation Is the existing soil in Lot A acceptable as structural backfill? Please see attached soil sample results.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
B-0289	BRP - Deck Elevation Discrepancy at Abutment 1	Open	06/10/2015	06/20/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Thomas Barni		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Location: RW4/Abutment 1L Contract Doc Ref: S-2120, S-2044 The FG elevations of the RW 4 / Abutment 1L transition shown on drawing S-2120 contradict the FG elevation shown on drawing S-2044. Please confirm the correct FG elevations at RW 4 and Abutment 1L. See attached sketch for further details.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
B-0290	BRP - Link Beam 8 Sequence	Open	06/12/2015	06/22/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Thomas Barni</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Location: Lot F		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>During latest analysis, which includes the revised link beams and updated jacking forces, OPAC found that Link Beam 8 (at the pylon) experiences high tensile stresses at the bottom face while supported on falsework. This is due to the PT that is provided to resist load under a cantilever condition which is present after the falsework is removed. A possible solution would be to sequence the installation of the PT at Link Beam 8 in 2 stages. The 1st stage would stress 1 or no tendon when all the other link beams are stressed as per the design sequence. The 2nd stage would stress the remaining tendons when the falsework is removed. This sequence would deviate from the sequence shown on the bid drawings, is this acceptable?</p>							
B-0291	BRP - RW3 LOL Checks	Open	06/17/2015	06/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Thomas Barni</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Location: RW3 Contract Doc Ref: S-2043		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Chaudhary's survey is based on the theoretical location of RW3 per the contract drawings. SCCI has as built the face of the existing RW 3 and that is where the 5.17' offset to Face of Wall comes from. Please confirm RW3 is to match the existing face of wall, not the theoretical location.</p>							
B-270	BRP - Prestressing ASI 007 Revisions	Open	05/27/2015	06/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 150-007 Location: Frame 4		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Per meeting held on 5/14/15 with Schwager Davis, ARUP,</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 176 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>WOJV, and Turner, Schwager Davis proposes to make the following revisions to the prestressing design per ASI 007:</p> <p>1) Bottom tendons: Keep the C.G. of the PT forces at all locations vertically and horizontally as per contract plans, except anchorage location at the end is off by 3" at horizontal direction.</p> <p>2) Top tendons: C.G. at the center of cable not changed but the anchorage location are off by 3" at both directions.</p> <p>3) Fit all tendons (T1 ,T2,T3) side by side 1'-5" from the top.</p> <p>4) If item no. 3 acceptable, the 3'-6" blockout will be reduced to 2'-3"</p> <p>5) Add 4 more strands in order to stay with a comfortable Pjack of 75% ultimate. Pjack (1, 735+890) = 2,625 kips/(0.75x58.59) = 60 strands, use 20 strands for each tendon.</p> <p>Please see attached preliminary design drawings and confirm that these changes are acceptable.</p>						
BALFO900-0001	BSE Natoma Street Trestle Access	Closed	04/18/2011	05/02/2011	04/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Project Bidding Manual (Exhibit A)			The geometric requirements for Access Trestle in Exhibit A, A3 and SL-001 are schematic and minor adjustments can be acceptable based on the actual site conditions.				
Per the requirements outlined in the project bidding manual (Exhibit A), BBII has developed our trestle design to provide access for Natoma street extending from gridline 11.5 at the center of the excavation (grid line E) to gridline 10 at the centerline of the shoring wall. After staking out this point on the shoring wall, it is apparent that the 530 Howard St. building is in conflict with the access point. See the attached sketch and photos indicating the approximate location of 530 Howard in relation to the			For this particular item, it is acceptable to shift the Natoma Access of the Access Trestle to west by approximately 30 ft.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>trestle access. Please advise if the Natoma St. access point should be changed to a more suitable location.</p>							
BALFO900-0001.1	BSE - Natoma Street Trestle Access	Closed	05/05/2011	05/15/2011	05/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Masashi Kojima		Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint V Masashi Kojima			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Project Bidding Manual (Exhibit A)				The Access Trestle design should be included in BSE Trade Subcontractor's scope.			
Per our discussion at our meeting on 4/26/11, the response to BBI RFI 076 indicated that BBII should relocate the access trestle but was not specific enough. Please provide an exact location for the Natoma St. offshoot that will satisfy the access requirements of future trade subcontractors. BBII requests a meeting to discuss any impacts of the relocation.				The geometric requirements for Access Trestle in Exhibit A, A3 and SL-001 are schematic and minor adjustments can be acceptable based on the actual site conditions. The "exact" locations should be designed by BSE Trade Subcontractor as the Design-Built scope.			
				Also, please refer to the General section regarding to the coordination in Exhibit A, Attachment 3.			
<hr/>							
BALFO900-0002	BSE - Scaffolding For Interim Screen Wall	Closed	03/21/2011	03/31/2011	03/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima		Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint V Masashi Kojima			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference attached photo				The scaffolding installation is per the response to RFI T-0034. The conflict mentioned is unconfirmed. BBI shall provide a work plan for pile removal and CDSM installation in zone 4 showing specific activities and schedule dates for coordination purposes.			
Scaffolding is currently being erected for the interim screen wall within Zone 4. It appears that the scaffolding lies in the path of the CDSM wall and will conflict with our work (See attached photo). When is the scaffolding scheduled to be completely dismantled and removed from the area?							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
BALFO900-0003	BSE - Additional Project Control	Closed	04/19/2011	04/26/2011	04/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification 01 10 50 and Drawing GT-0100				Please refer to IFB Documents for TG05.1 Survey Package contained in the compact disk, which sent to BBII on 04/22/2011, Transmittal No. 2011.04.22-0006. After review and define the scope for TG05.1 Survey Package, please identify missing bench marks specified in your specification and TG05.1 Package.			
Drawing GT-0100 indicates four points established for control. Our surveyors, KCA Engineers, are concerned about maintaining consistent control between various contractors on the project with such extensive distance between the provided control points. It is suggested that additional control points with horizontal and vertical coordinates be provided at the following locations: - Howard St. at Fremont St. - Howard St. at First St. - Howard St. halfway between First and Second St. - Mission St. at Fremont St. - Mission St. at First St. - Mission Street at Shaw Alley.							
KCA RFI 001 has been attached for reference.							
<hr/>							
BALFO900-0004	BSE - CDSM Pile Tolerance	Closed	06/06/2011	06/16/2011	06/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Masashi Kojima	Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Masashi Kojima				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification Section 31 56 13				The Trade Subcontractor is responsible for the necessary means and methods to install the CDSM Shoring Wall within the tolerances specified in Specification section 31 56 13.			
In reference to the CDSM Shoring Wall DFOV QC meeting held in BBII's office on June 1, 2011, please find below the following RFI submitted by BBII's sub-contractor DND Construction:							
"The reference specifications for tolerance relative to centerline of wall for both the CDSM and steel soldier beams are extremely strict compared to what is common for this nature of work, particularly given the depth of the work. It is also more strict than if the verticality tolerance (1:150 CDSM/1:200 pile) is applied at a conservative excavation depth of 60 feet. Can the tolerance be changed from 0" in/2" out (CDSM) & 0" in/3" out (piles) to a uniform 0" in/4" out"?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 179 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
BALFO900-0005	BSE - Temporary Power For Construction	Closed	06/21/2011	07/01/2011	07/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Masashi Kojima			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Temporary Power Package TG05.2 was awarded to Bass Electric on 5/12/2011. Drawing SL-003 shows locations for Temporary Power Skids that will be used to facilitate construction. Please provide dates of when the following Temporary Power Skids are going to be made available to BBII:				Please refer to Exhibit A, IV. B., mentioning "Temporary power skids might be available at beginning of the dewatering." For the latest information, please refer to the latest weekly update schedule for the available dates of Temporary Power Skids. The next latest weekly update schedule will be issued on 07/06/2011.			
Skid 1 by Natoma St. Skid 2 by Minna St. Skid 3 by First St. Skid 4 by Fremont St. Skid 5 by Beale St.							
BALFO900-0006	BSE - Discharge Point for Buttress Operation	Closed	06/23/2011	07/05/2011	07/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Masashi Kojima			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference attached sketch.				This question is not appropriate as RFI, but logistics Submittal. Please submit as Buttress Water Discharge Logistics Plan in Zone 4 accordingly.			
BBII is planning to discharge water generated by the Buttress operation into the sewer manholes shown in the sketch. Please confirm that this is acceptable. Note that location of sewer manholes is approximate and will be per As-Built. Temporary piping layout shown in the attached sketch is diagrammatic.							
BALFO900-0007	BSE - Archeological Dig Site D-3 Information	Closed	10/13/2011	10/23/2011	10/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Masashi Kojima			Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Masashi Kojima				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification Section 01 13 50 and Sheet D-1002				The area of archaeological investigation dig approx. D-3 was released to BBII 10/5/2011. Per Ural Yal BBII would perform the backfill of the archaeological investigation dig at no cost to W/O or the TJPA in consideration of CR(s) T-020 & T-005.			
Due to the recent Archeological Investigation at dig site D-3, at the depth of 10-25 feet, BBII request confirmation that the excavation, observation, and all the investigations at that depth have been completed.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 180 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please Confirm.							
BALFO900-0008	BSE - PG&E Dimensions at Tie-in Points - VOID	Closed	10/12/2011	10/12/2011	10/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Nhi Tran	Answered By: Balfour Beatty Infrastructu Ural Yal				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference CR T-017 and attached drawings				Update by BBI -			
The drawings provided for the installation of the PG&E phases 2 utilities do not provide dimensions for the tie ins between the existing utilities and the phase 2 utility installation. Please see attached modified sketch indicating areas of concern.				Per PG&E meeting 10/13/2011 (Phase II Utility Installation) The location of existing PG&E tie in points / connection points will be determined in the field with PG&E inspector & BBII.			
Please provide updated drawings, with dimensions from existing property lines to the tie in locations for the existing utilities and phase 2 utilities.							
Confirm MH/Vault number for the tie north west of A line (see attached drawing)							
BALFO900-0009	BSE - D.I. Installation on First Street	Closed	10/27/2011	11/06/2011	10/31/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Nhi Tran	Answered By: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Nhi Tran				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Sheet U-3021 and D-2230				Catch Basin #501 was deleted per RFI #U-0101, response issued on 2/28/2011.			
The attached drawing shows a new Catch Basin #501 RUP drawing U-3021 BSE drawing D-2230 to be installed on First Street.							
Currently this CB does not exist. Please confirm it will be installed.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 181 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
BALFO900-0010	BSE - Conflicts between revised trainbox columns and internal bracing	Closed	10/31/2011	11/10/2011	11/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Nhi Tran				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Masashi Kojima				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification Section 31 55 00				This RFI was superseded by RFI T-251.1 and the answer is no longer required.			
BBII received additional comments on the internal bracing from Thornton Tomasetti on 10/17/11, after the 100% submittal had already been reviewed and approved by DBI. The comments provided include revised column locations and sizes that differ from our BSE drawings.							
The attached drawings highlight conflicts and reduced clearances presented by these revisions to the trainbox columns. As trainbox drawings are not available to BBII, please provide direction on where to locate bracing elements to resolve these conflicts.							
<hr/>							
BALFO900-0011	BSE - CR T-018 Gate Requirements	Closed	11/02/2011	11/12/2011	11/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Nhi Tran				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Masashi Kojima				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference CR T-018				This RFI was covered by the response for RFI T-256 and the answer is no longer required.			
CR T-018 issued to BBII indicates that the gates need to be installed at the fire lane access of 540-580 Howard. The gates will prevent access to the rear of the building from Howard and Natoma Street.							
Please advise if the gates specified in CR T-018 are due to be installed by BBII.							
If BBII is requested to install the gates under CR T-018, please provide a specification and detail for the gate system that will be in meet fire regulation and standards.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 182 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
BALFO900-0012	BSE - Natoma Street Trestle Access - VOID	Closed	11/01/2011	11/11/2011	12/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Nhi Tran			Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Masashi Kojima	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference CR T-018, Specification Section 01 53 13, BBI Letter #4225-000-0145 (attached), and attached sketch			Please consider the following the response to BBI's RFI(s) 243 & 251.				
CR T-018 included drawings for access to the side and rear of 540 Howard St. BBII issued letter 4225-000-0145 in response and included a sketch highlighting a conflict between the proposed building access and the Natoma St. trestle offshoot.			Please refer to marked-up sheets SH-2202 & SH-2200 for the revised trestle configuration. The depicted configuration is to be effective immediate.				
The Natoma St. trestle offshoot was originally specified to span from Grid 11.5 at the center of the excavation to Grid 10 at the edge of excavation. The offshoot was moved further west per [W/O] response to the conflict with 530 Howard St.							
The 540 Howard St. building access arrangement as proposed in CR T-018 does not provide sufficient access to the Natoma offshoot (see attached sketch). Please provide direction if the offshoot is to be relocated or eliminated.							
BALFO900-0012.1	BSE - Natoma Street Trestle Access	Closed	12/06/2011	12/16/2011	12/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Masashi Kojima			Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Masashi Kojima	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference CR T-018, Specification Section 01 53 13, BBI Letter #4225-000-0145 (attached), and attached sketch			REVISED RESPONSE to BALFO900-0012: Delete the Natoma St. access and provide credit proposal.				
CR T-018 included drawings for access to the side and rear of 540 Howard St. BBII issued letter 4225-000-0145 in response and included a sketch highlighting a conflict between the proposed building access and the Natoma St. trestle offshoot.							
The Natoma St. trestle offshoot was originally specified to span from Grid 11.5 at the center of the excavation to Grid 10 at the edge of excavation. The offshoot was moved further west per [W/O] response to the conflict with 530 Howard St.							
The 540 Howard St. building access arrangement as							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 183 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>proposed in CR T-018 does not provide sufficient access to the Natoma offshoot (see attached sketch). Please provide direction if the offshoot is to be relocated or eliminated.</div>							
BALFO900-0013	BSE - Access Trestle at Gridline 3 - VOID	Closed	11/21/2011	12/01/2011	12/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Nhi Tran		Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Masashi Kojima			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference RFI #T-0251.1 and Specification Section 01 53 13				Please consider the following the response to BBII's RFI(s) 243 & 251.			
In order to avoid conflicts with both the Thornton Tomasetti "pile exclusion zones" provided in response to RFI T-0251.1, the first trestle pier near gridline 3 must be relocated. BBII Proposes two options:				Please refer to marked-up sheets SH-2202 & SH-2200 for the revised trestle configuration. The depicted configuration is to be effective immediate.			
Option A - Move the last pier East to clear the pile exclusion zones and adjacent bracing struts, resulting in a trestle deck that ends approximately 15' East of gridline 3. The capacity of this end span would be increased to allow for the additional reach.							
Option B - Move the last pier West and extend the end span to clear the pile exclusion zones and adjacent bracing struts, resulting in a trestle deck that ends approximately 20' West of gridline 3.							
Please advise how BBII should proceed.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 184 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
BALFO900-0013.1	BSE - Access Trestle at Gridline 3 Revised W/O Response to BALFO900-0013	Closed	12/06/2011	12/16/2011	12/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Masashi Kojima				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Masashi Kojima				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference RFI #T-0251.1 and Specification Section 01 53 13			REVISED RESPONSE to BALFO900-0013: Option A				
In order to avoid conflicts with both the Thornton Tomasetti "pile exclusion zones" provided in response to RFI T-0251.1, the first trestle pier near gridline 3 must be relocated. BBII Proposes two options:							
Option A - Move the last pier East to clear the pile exclusion zones and adjacent bracing struts, resulting in a trestle deck that ends approximately 15' East of gridline 3. The capacity of this end span would be increased to allow for the additional reach.							
Option B - Move the last pier West and extend the end span to clear the pile exclusion zones and adjacent bracing struts, resulting in a trestle deck that ends approximately 20' West of gridline 3.							
Please advise how BBII should proceed.							
BALFO900-0014	BSE - Location of Security Cameras	Closed	01/16/2012	01/26/2012	01/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Webcor Construction LP David Fields				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP David Fields				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
According to Exhibit A - Rev H of the trade subcontractors bid manual. "Temporary poles shall include conduit for security cameras, power at the pole tops for security cameras, and mounting hardware for security cameras." Please advise on quantity and the location of these temporary poles.			Per Exhibit A - Rev H: "Trade Subcontractor shall be responsible for installing and maintaining temporary lighting at the perimeter traffic/pedestrian barricades, at pedestrian walkways, and as required to provide code-minimum lighting at egress paths, as well as sufficient foot candle lighting levels to safety perform the work at all times, including within the excavation. At a minimum, Trade Subcontractor's lighting plan will include temporary poles at street level. In addition to supporting lighting, temporary poles shall include conduit for security cameras, power at the pole tops for security cameras, and mounting hardware for security cameras. Security cameras will be				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 185 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
BALFO900-0015	BSE - Beale St. Trestle Pile Conflict Follow-Up	Closed	02/08/2012	02/18/2012	02/08/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The response to RFI T-264.1 requested BBII provide the loading that would placed onto the CDSM wall. This response leads us to believe that the option to leave the pile in the current location was unacceptable. Please confirm that the pile must be moved and provide a detailed location of where the pile placement would be accepted. Upon receipt of this information BBII can accurately determine the load to placed on the Wall for Arup's review.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Can't find answer in Constructware.				

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
BALFO900-0016	BSE- Stabilization of CDSM Wall	Closed	04/10/2012	04/20/2012	04/10/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal To: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <div> <div> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>BBII is requesting direction for a method to stabilize the unimproved soil conditions along the interior face of the CDSM wall. This request was generated after a field review of the wall conditions revealed a potential safety issue regarding workers working on the mass excavation, bracing and dewatering activities</p> <p>The current condition of the CDSM wall includes unimproved soil conditions that have the potential to become detached from the wall and create a falling safety hazard to workers as the mass excavation and bracing reach lower depths. Please reference attached photo for visual details.</p> <p>Based on our records, the CDSM wall met all the specification requirements for uniformity and improved soil as per section 31 56 13 of the contract specifications.</p> </div> <div> <p>SUGGESTION:</p> </div> <div> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>During the 4/4/12 BSE meeting AAI indicated that a RFI was not the correct format to inquire with regard to a safety issue the responsibility of the contractor. Further in addition to the +1" cavity issue per section 31 00 00.3.8.L, contrary to section 3156 13.3.7.C which indicates no individual lump of unimproved soil shall exceed 6", there are a pervasive amount of +6" lumps of unimproved soil throughout the CDSM. W/O will contact a waterproofing manufacture to investigate this issue further. KN 4/6/12</p> </div> </div>							
BALFO900-0017	BSE - Beale Street Bridge Pile Location Conflicts	Closed	09/19/2012	09/29/2012	09/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Diarmuid Cregg To: Webcor Construction LP David Fields Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Fields</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <div> <div> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>The response to submittals TG0300-206.1 and TG0300-261.1 states that BBII's Beale St Bridge fails to comply with specification section 01-53-13.1.3D with regard to coordination and constructability, but does not elaborate. BBII assumes this is related to future work not included in the BSE contract documents. BBII had previously coordinated pile locations, and cleared future concrete structures shown in drawings that were available to us, however please advise us what clashes you have detected or what specific clearances revisions are necessary for future work, so BBII can properly incorporate into our design.</p> </div> <div> <p>SUGGESTION:</p> </div> <div> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This addresses only one of W/O's multiple comments in response to BBII's submittal TG0300-206.1 and TG0300-261.1. Columns were clearly depicted on, to include however not limited to, 1/S1-2027. Beams atop said columns were depicted on TG03 drawings, to include however not limited to, 2/A1-2005, 3/A1-6000, and A/S1-3201. Should BBII have further inquiries please footnote on BBII's revised submittal and remit.</p> </div> </div>							
BALFO900-0018	BSE - Beale Street Bridge Pile Location Conflicts	Closed	09/24/2012	10/04/2012	09/24/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal To: Webcor Construction LP David Fields Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Fields</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>							

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 189 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
BALFO900-0021	BSE - Sump Pit Location and Dimension	Closed	12/05/2012	12/15/2012	12/05/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Joe Chapman To: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: In Drawing S1-2022 the Sump Pit on the North Side of Zone 1 between GL 4 and GL 5, does not have all necessary dimensions to properly excavate. Please provide the dimensions drawn in blue on Drawing GT-2101, and the dimensions of the bottom footprint of the pit (See G-3004).		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The drawings referenced in BBI RFI #336 have been superseded. Please refer to current drawings, issued via Field Order #00010R2 dated 9/26/2012 which included revised drawings dated 8/30/2012. Refer to drawings including but not limited to S1-2022 and S1-3006.			
BALFO900-0022	BBII RFI # 342: Minna Street Manhole Sewer As-built Video	Closed	01/21/2013	01/31/2013	01/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Dean Wallahan To: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please provide BBII a copy of the as-built CCTV (video recording) of Minna Street sewer from SSMH#203 to SSMH#501.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pleae download videos and reports from the following Box website: https://webcor.box.com/s/3gidqeq942zx0hwiwfg .			
BALFO900-0023	BSE - Chain Link Fence Locations on Beale Street Temporary Bridge	Closed	02/19/2013	03/01/2013	02/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller To: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: CR T-043A Please refer to CRT -043A Scope of Work regarding installation of chain link fence on temporary bridges in lieu of contract specified plywood. CR T-043A references blind spots for "199 Fremont Street and 301 Mission Street onto Beale Street." Please see the attached sketch of Beale Street Temporary Bridge with location for chain link fence to be installed per CR T-043A. Please confirm locations for chain link fence on Beale Street Temporary Bridge.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Per RFI T-293.2			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
BALFO900-0024	BSE - Relocate Zone 3 Dewatering and Electrical Equipment	Closed	02/27/2013	03/09/2013	02/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
BBII will be relocating equipment along the North perimeter wall in Zone 3 per W/O and TCCO direction. Items to be relocated include but are not limited to dewatering header pipe, dewatering control boxes, site electrical, monitoring equipment, etc. Please see the attached photos and sketches and for approval to proceed with relocation of said equipment.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm the utility locations shown herein do not conflict with other trade subcontractors and can remain for the duration of the dewatering system.					1. The direction to evacuate the Muni Hump was provided by QBD #TG0300-0162. 2. WOJV recommends relocating the utilities consistent with BBII's RFI #352 SK(s) 1/2 & 2/2. 3. While WOJV will coordinate as necessary to avoid utility relocation(s) WOJV cannot confirm the utilities may remain the duration of the dewatering system, nor is WOJV obligated to: a. Specification section 31 23 19.1.3.C instructed bidders to "Locate system components to allow continuous dewatering operations without interfering with installation of permanent Work and existing public right-of-way, sidewalks, and adjacent buildings, structures, improvements and construction operations performed under this Contract or other contracts." b. Exhibit-A. Section IV.C.15 instructed bidders to "he design and the installation sequence shall be coordinated with Permanent Structure construction, Temporary Structures / Equipment by other Trade Subcontractors, Internal Bracings, Access Trestle, Temporary Bridges and other structures." BBII was instructed as what to anticipate as it pertains to the permanent structure reference the BSE A-series drawings.		
					WOJV 2/26/13		
BALFO900-0025	BSE - As-built Minna Street Manhole Rim Elevations	Closed	03/04/2013	03/14/2013	03/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller To: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please provide BBII with as-built elevations of Minna Street sewer manholes: MH#201 , 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					See attached As-Built Drawings for Minna Street sewer manholes: MH#201 , 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207.		
BALFO900-0026	Project Milestones and Substantial Completion	Closed	08/08/2013	08/18/2013	08/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Rodney Gordon To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Joanne Filipas			Answered By: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Joanne Filipas				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 191 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Based on conversation in today's progress meeting, please confirm that substantial completion is not a prerequisite of project milestones and is therefore not required to meet any milestone obligations.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to COM2209			
BALFO900-0027	BSE - Waterproofing Damage at Area 2	Closed	11/12/2013	11/22/2013	11/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Diarmuid Cregg		To: Shimmick Construction Comp Ben Gordon		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: During bracing removal at area 2, a section of waterproofing was damaged. This damage is consistent to the top of the concrete. Please confirm the minimum waterproofing material lap needed by the WP subcontractor to repair this Section.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached Grace repair procedure for the burnt waterproofing as requested.			
BRP-0225	BRP - St-10 Bridge Railing Transition Clarification	Void	03/16/2015	03/26/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-2062, S-6066 Location: Lot F Sheet S-6066 and S-2062 do not provide enough information on how the ST-10 barrier transitions at the cable stay section. Please review draft drawings and provide details.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject			Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
NEW-0002	test			Pending	04/28/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: New Vendor									



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 193 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	5.) Meeting Minute Item 9.5 - Please provide the clarification for items 9.5, 9.5.2, 9.5.3, 9.5.4, and 9.5.5						
P-0003	TC1/ TC2: Elevators PE703 & PE704 Phase Discrepancy & Phase 1 & 2 Definition	Closed	09/17/2009	10/01/2009	09/29/2009	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture		To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell		Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: Attached SKA-0488 to SKA-0494, SKA-sheets A-2207, A-2307, TTCSF - OA Phasing Narrative, TTC-MEP Phasing						Passenger elevators PE703 & PE704 are affected by Phase 1 and 2. See the attached revised B1 Level Phasing Drawing. These elevators are now shown as green i.e. constructed in Phase 2. The elevators are located under the east end temporary mechanical compound and therefore serve no useful function in Phase 1. However for Phase 1 the pits should be constructed and provided with a guardrail at the B1 level as well as the ground floor opening framed and provided with a temporary, waterproofed, concrete infill over the opening. The shaft, cabs, roping, associated ME / controls and finishes would be provided in Phase 2.	
Passenger elevators PE703 & PE704 (sheets A-2207 & A2307) at gridlines 35.7/E.6 are indicated as Phase 1 (Red) scope at the Lower Concourse Level (SKA-0489) and as Phase 2 (Green) scope at Ground Level (SKA-0490) on the Phasing Sketches dated 9/8/09. Please confirm of what the planned operation of these elevators will be if they will not go to the ground level.							
In addition, please provide the following pertaining to Phase 1 & 2 Definition:							
1.) Above Grade, Paragraph 4 - Please provide the temporary landscaping information that is to be included in the 50% DD Budget Estimate.						Response to additional questions 1 thru 12:	
2.) Above Grade, Paragraph 5 - Please provide the temporary mechanical and electrical service information that is to be included in the 50% DD Budget Estimate, or note which items on the MEP Phasing PDF provide this information.						see attachment (file too large)	
3.) Below Grade, Paragraph 3 - All four (4) stairs shown on SKA-0488 are shown in orange, which indicates they are temporary, however the narrative indicates differently. Please indicate in plan, which stairs are temporary and which are permanent.							
4.) B2 Train Platform Level, Paragraph - All four (4) stairs shown on SKA-0489 are shown in orange, which indicates they are temporary, however the narrative							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	indicates differently. Please indicate in plan, which stairs are temporary and which are permanent.						
	5.) B1 Train Platform, Paragraph 2 - Please confirm which option of "temporary rated floor assemblies" or "rated GWB on metal stud enclosures" is to be included in the 50% DD Estimate.						
	6.) B1 Train Platform, Paragraph 3 - Please provide the dimensions and rating for the "temporary closure wall" to be provided at the entry.						
	7.) B1 Train Platform, Paragraph 6 - Please provide the location of the "temporary stud and drywall wall" at the glass skylight. Is this to be constructed at the Concourse Level?						
	8.) SKA-0488 - Please provide the general details of what the "temporary" train box East and West end walls will consist of, so this can be included in the 50% DD Budget Estimate.						
	9.) SKA-0488 - Per Thornton Tomasetti (as indicated in DL's Alternate & Phasing document, dated 9/3/09), the "Trainbox of Phase 1 extends to 1/3 bay past grid-line 36 as basis for estimate", this is not consistent with the SKA-0488. Please confirm which is correct.						
	10.) SKA-0489 / Detail 2 - Please provide the general details for the "temporary" train box East end wall will consist of, so this can be included in the 50% DD Budget Estimate.						
	11.) SKA-0490 / Detail 1 - Please provide the general details for the "temporary construction" will consist of at the circular vent structure.						
	12.) SKA-0490 / Detail 2 - Please provide the general wall and roof type details for the "temporary mechanical compound" will consist of at the East end. Is it anticipated that this structure will be completely removed and replaced by the permanent Phase 2 construction?						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 195 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P-0004	Phase 1 & 2 Definition Sketch Questions	Closed	09/18/2009	10/02/2009	10/07/2009	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Ryan Cerri		To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell		Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: SKA-0488 thru SKA-0490				Response to DR 00003.			
1.) SKA-0488 - Please provide the general details of what the "temporary" train box East and West end walls will consist of, so this can be included in the 50% DD Budget Estimate.				1) See attached sketch SSK-012			
2.) SKA-0488 - Per Thornton Tomasetti (as indicated in DL's Alternate & Phasing document, dated 9/3/09), the "Trainbox of Phase 1 extends to 1/3 bay past grid-line 36 as basis for estimate", this is not consistent with the SKA-0488. Please confirm which is correct.				2) Follow SKA-0488			
3.) SKA-0489 / Detail 2 - Please provide the general details for the "temporary" train box East end wall will consist of, so this can be included in the 50% DD Budget Estimate.				3) Same as indicated in SSK-012			
4.) SKA-0490 / Detail 1 - Please provide the general details for the "temporary construction" will consist of at the circular vent structure.				4) Disregard "Temporary Construction" as none is needed			
5.) SKA-0490 / Detail 2 - Please provide the general wall and roof type details for the "temporary mechanical compound" will consist of at the East end. Is it anticipated that this structure will be completely removed and replaced by the permanent Phase 2 construction?				5) "Temporary Mechanical Compound" will consist of a chain link enclosure fencing with privacy screening.			
<hr/>							
P-0005	TC1: Window Washing Equipment 50% DD Budgeting Scope	Closed	09/18/2009	10/02/2009	10/15/2009	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Cerri		To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell		Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: Specifications Vol 1 - Sections 11 24 23				The response to this question is the specification sections should be disregarded and the drawings should be costed at this point.			
Specifications sections 11 24 23 paragraphs: 2.1.2.1, 2.1.2.6 and 2.1.2.9 - references monorail track systems, compatible manual and power driven trolley assemblies				We will be modifying the methods based on meetings yesterday, but we will not be utilizing those things noted in the Specs under any scenarios.			
2.1.4.1 - references to powered platforms							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	2.1.7.3 - references gantry work						
	None of the items listed above can be found on the window washing drawings issued in the current set. Please advise where the window washing monorails, trolley assemblies, powered platforms and gantries be allowed for in the 50% DD Budget.						
P-0006	TC1: Finish Schedule Missing Information	Closed	09/19/2009	10/02/2009	10/13/2009	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Cerri To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell	Answered By:Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell			
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Reference: 1/ A-0005, A-9250, attached mark-up detail sheets		Public Stairs -				
	1.) Schematic design architectural drawing sheet A-9250 (Train Platform Level Finishes Layout Plan) identifies room types "S-1" - Public Stair and "S-2" - Exit Stair. These room types are not identified on 50% DD detail 1/A-0005 (Room Finish Schedule). Please advise what the finish information for floor, base, walls, ceilings, doors and frames for these spaces.		Typical open stairways, to and from the public concourses.				
	2.) Detail 1/ A-0005 does not identify/ list the "Code" and abbreviations for the first column of descriptions (see attached sheet). Abbreviation descriptions for "concrete", "durable sealer", "epoxy terrazzo flooring", exposed", "glassfiber reinforced gypsum, painted", "glass" and "channel glass" are missing. Please provide the missing abbreviations for these material descriptions.		Steel stair construction, with brushed stainless steel finish i.e. sheet stainless steel cladding and trim to exposed stringers, edges and soffits.				
	In addition, please advise if the missing Room Type Codes on the Finish Schedule (1/ A-0005) are intended to similar to codes identified on the Layout Sheet Plan "Room Type Legend" (sheet A-9250).		Epoxy terrazzo treads and risers c/w non slip nosings on steel stair substrate.				
			Stainless steel rails and posts.				
			Exit Stairs -				
			Enclosed exit stairways.				
			Concrete filled steel pan on steel stair structure.				
			Steel handrails, posts, and guard pickets.				
			All metal painted, including stair soffits				
			Landings and tread concrete sealed.				

[illegible]



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P-0007	TC1: Exterior Skin Mockups	Closed	09/21/2009	09/28/2009	11/04/2009	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Cerri		To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell	Answered By: Davis Langdon		Mike Parkyn	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: 50% DD Specifications Sections [08 41 23], [08 44 26] and [08 63 00]				In the absence of further definition, at 50% DD W/O and DL both carry \$500K allowance for glass enclosure mock-ups. This does not include blast testing, as this would be part of RVA add.			
50% DD specifications sections [08 41 23 - 17], [08 44 26 - 26] and [08 63 00 - 16] refer to section 084426A for the extent of glass enclosure mockups. Section 084426A cannot be found in the specifications. Please advise what should be anticipated as mockup requirements for the 50% DD budget estimate. For example, please advise to which skin systems will have performance, blast and/ or visual mockup requirements and what approximate test size areas should be anticipated.							
<hr/>							
P-0008	TC1: Phasing Inconsistancy: 50% Budget - Stair #202 Extension to Platform Level	Closed	09/23/2009	09/30/2009	09/29/2009	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture		To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell	Answered By: Pelli Clarke Pelli Architect: Randy Volenec			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: SKA-0488, A-2102, attached mark-up sheets				Stair 202 is a permanent stair that will rise from the B2 level up to the Ground Floor level. It will serve the (currently) Unassigned Space of the North West Triangle at the B2 level and the Muni Control Center at the B1 level. Stair 202's final configuration and location has not been settle yet, however it will definitely be required permanently and will be built as part of Phase 1.			
Phasing sketch SKA-0488 indicates in RED Stair 202 extending to the Train Platform Level (gridlines F.5/ 1.5). The 50% DD drawing sheets A-2102 & A-2202 indicates the stair terminating at the Lower Concourse Level. Please advise if the Stair 202 extension to the Train Platform Level is a permanent revision or temporary, requiring stair removal and floor opening structural in-fill in Phase 2.				Randy Volenec - PCPA 9/29/2009			
<hr/>							
P-0009	Revised Trainbox Layout for Construction Documents	Closed	11/10/2009	11/10/2009	11/23/2009	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Cerri		To: Transbay PMPC	Alfred Lau	Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please confirm SKA 637 R1, SKA 638 R1, and SKA 646 are the most current trainbox layouts, which shall be used				We confirm that the documents attached to Design Review No. 00012 are the most current versions, at			



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	for preconstruction scheduling and planning, and construction.						
					this time, of the Architectural sketch studies for the 2'4" move and 2 x 10" reduction of the trainbox.		
					These sketches were prepared primarily as study information for the design team and to assist decision making on the location and size of the building relative to adjacent properties. Accordingly they form part of the on-going Design Development process.		
					The Design Team cannot assume any responsibility whatsoever for the interpretation and use by others, of sketches provided for Design Development information. Furthermore, anyone who chooses to use this information will be responsible for verifying the suitability of this data for their own application.		
					To date, none of our sketches have been issued for Construction and under no circumstances will sketches issued prior to the Construction Phase be used for Construction.		
					Regards		
					Paul		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P-0010	TC1: Structural Steel Design Allowance Calculation Clarification	Closed	09/21/2009	09/28/2009	09/30/2009	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture		To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell		Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: S-2302 thru S-2507				The allowances noted on the plans (additional steel for design contingencies and misc steel not shown) should be applied to the steel framed areas.			
Structural sheets S-2302 thru S-2507 identifies a 3 lb/sf allowance for design contingencies associated with structural steel and miscellaneous steel not shown and sheets S-2601 thru S-2607 identifies a 4 lb/sf allowance for the same.				Mark O'Dell - TJPA 9/30/2009			
Please clarify how these lb/sf allowances should be calculated. Should these allowances be applied to the steel framed areas of the overall GSF?							

P-0011	TC1: 50% DD Phasing Sketch Inconsistency - Temporary Stair on Lower Concourses Closed		09/24/2009	10/01/2009	09/29/2009	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture		To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell		Answered By:Pelli Clarke Pelli Architect: Randy Volenec		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: Attached SKA-0488, SKA-0489, SKA-0490				The Stair indicated at gridlines 36-37 / F-G is actually two escalators and a stair. These are E705, E706 and Stair 701. In Phase 2 these provide a vertical connection between the Train Concourse Level and the Ground Level. They are indicated on SKA-0490 (Ground) and SKA-0489 (B1 Train Concourse) in green and are not installed in Phase 1. They do not go down to the Train Platform level.			
Phasing sketch SKA-0489 (Lower concourse level) indicates a temporary Phase 1 stair (enclosed in Red and Orange) by gridlines 36-37/ F-G. Phasing sketches SKA-0488 (Train Platform level) and SKA-0490 (Ground level) do not indicate of a stair or enclosure at the referenced grid location.				In Phase 1, escalator pits are to be provided at the B1 Train Concourse Level and installed with temporary concrete on metal deck on steel framing infill. At the Ground Floor Level, i.e. Train Box lid, in the area to the west of the foundation wall at gridline 36-37, an opening is to be framed to suit the future stair and escalators. This opening will be provided with a temporary concrete on metal deck on steel framing infill and shall be covered with waterproofing similar to the rest of the slab in this area forming the floor of Temporary Mechanical Compound. This will be removed and replaced as part of the Phase 2 Intercity Bus Facility.			
Please advise if the stair identified is to go up to the Ground level or down to the Train Platform level.				Paul McPhail - Adamson Associates 9-29-2009			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 202 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P-0014	Caltrans Spec for Temp Road Design Criteria	Closed	01/13/2010	01/27/2010	01/14/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Ryan Cerri		To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell		Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference: OAC Meeting Minutes 12/10/09; Below Grade Internal Bracing Design Workshop Meeting Minutes 12/15/09, Caltrans Spec 12/18/09				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please confirm that the Caltrans spec you attached to the OAC Meeting Minutes 12/10/09 are to be used as design criteria for the temporary roadways on First St., Fremont St., and Beale St.				Criteria for the design of temprary roadways is contained in the document however the specific criteria will be indicated in the 100% Shoring Construction Documents Specifications. Preliminary indications are that HS20-44 Loading will be used.			
P-0015	East Shoring Wall at Gridline 37	Closed	01/14/2010	01/28/2010	03/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Cerri		To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell		Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Ref: GT-1302, Draft 90% Shoring CD's,37 Line; GT-2114, Draft 90% Shoring CD's, Wall Segment 37-1. Please locate from gridline the East shoring wall between Phase 1 and Phase 2 trainbox.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				As we discussed in the Below Grade Structure Workshop on Tuesday Janurary 12th, 2010, the location of the east shoring wall is still in flux. Current indications are that the wall will be located closet to column line 35 than column line 37. Since the location of the wall will coincide with the location of the future seismic joint, PCPA indicated yesterday (January 13th) in a conference call @ 3:00PM that the final design team recommendation is awaiting feedback from Thornton Tomasetti. We expect this decision will be made this week. The final dimensioned location will be documented in the 100% Shoring Construction Documents however it is likely that the final dimensioned location will be available sooner. The exact dimension is indicated on sheet GT-2013 of the 100% Buttress/Shoring/Excavation Submittal dated 2/26/10. The centerline of the shoring wall is 9'-7 1/2" east of Column Line 35.			
P-0016	PG&E Phase I Duct Banks Weights at Temp Road Decks	Closed	01/14/2010	01/28/2010	01/21/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Cerri		To: Transbay PMPC	Guy Hollins		Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Guy Hollins
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Ref: 50% DD, U-2020, U-2021, U-2022, U-2023				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				Response Notes: Steel conduit = 17.7 lb/ft			



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 204 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P-0019	TC1 Construction Documents Issuance Schedule	Closed	01/19/2010	02/02/2010	03/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Cerri To: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell	Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: A part of our preconstruction scope of services, we are to provide cost estimates at 100%DD, 50%CD, 85%CD, and 100%CD, however there are currently no publish dates for 50%CD and 85%CD. Please provide publish dates for 50%CD and 85%CD for incorporation into the project schedule.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The current date for issuing the 50% Construction Document Submittal is August 30, 2010. The current date for issuing the 85% Construction Document Submittal is December 20, 2010. These dates will most likely change in the future to support revisions to the project and or schedule.				
P-0020	301 Mission Wall - Survey Info, Dim. From A-Line	Closed	03/04/2010	03/18/2010	04/14/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell	Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: email "301 Mission Wall - Survey Info, dated 3/3/10", C-2003 - A Line, A-2306 - A line. Please provide the dimension from the "x" marked on the sidewalk (adjacent to the 301 Mission wall) to gridline A in the 100% Design Development drawings.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The dimension is 6'-4". It's shown on the attached sketch from Sandor.				
P-0021	Site Description After Demo	Closed	03/10/2010	03/24/2010	03/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell	Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: After demolition of the site and upon turnover to Webcor / Obayashi, please provide a description of what the site will look like and drawings containing the following information: 1) Finish grade elevations 2) Locations of fences and gates 3) Properties available for staging and storage 4) Laydown of crushed concrete (Volume and location of crushed concrete available for our use) 5) Condition of existing basements and structures		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This information is to be provided in the bid documents. Constructware DRQ #00021				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 205 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P-0022	Missing 100%DD DWG Files	Closed	03/10/2010	03/24/2010	03/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Listed below are drawings in which the DWG files are missing from the issuance of the 100%DD, please provide:					The files were sent to Webcor / Obayashi on March 10, 2010.		
1) S-2103 2) S-5301 3) SE-4000 4) SE-4001 5) SE-5010 6) SE-5020 7) SE-5030 8) SE-5040 9) SE-5050					Constructware DRQ #000022		
P-0023	UR - Existing Water Line At Fremont Street	Closed	03/11/2010	03/25/2010	04/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: AECOM Early Release Package dated 1-15-10; U-1122, Note 13; U-2023					Sheet U-1123 Note ER10 calls for the demolition of the existing water line between the limits of early release as shown (between STA ~3+80 and ~4+60) due to the existing water line affected by the hammer head portion of the temporary shoring wall.		
Sheet U-1122, Note 13 calls for the water line in Fremont Street to be demolished, but not in the early package. Sheet U-2023 of the early package does call for the relocation of a small portion of that waterline between stations 4+00 and 4+50 to accommodate the shoring wall.					Sheets U-1122 and U-1123 show the temporary shoring wall for Transbay Terminal footing demolition labeled as "TEMPORARY SHORING WALL BY OTHERS". The wall is based on information included in the Buttress/Shoring/Excavation package.		
After review of the demolition drawings as provided by TJPA to Webcor/Obayashi for reference only, and a field review taking into account the extent of the footings we see a conflict with the (E) water line based on the location of the water line provided thru U.S.A. The footings are extensive and demolition will require shoring that will be very close to the existing water line if not on top of the line.					Based on the temporary shoring wall as shown in the Buttress/Shoring/Excavation package, the location of the existing water line as shown in the Program Topographic and Underground Utility Survey, and as shown on U-1122, appears not in conflict with the existing water line south of STA ~3+80.		
Please review and provide a solution. Webcor/Obayashi JV believes that a temporary relocation of that water line from station 2+50 and 4+50 is a potential solution.					AECOM believes that the water line may be improperly marked by CDD in response to USA ticket recently activated. Blue water line markings in the field show the water in the same alignment as the		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 206 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P-0024	DTX 650' HSR Tracks And Platform Extension Study Drawings	Closed	03/19/2010	04/02/2010	04/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell	Answered By: Transbay PMPC Mark O'Dell				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Webcor / Obayashi received drawings regarding the "Updated Figures for DTX 650' HSR Tracks and Platform Extension Study", please provide a transmittal and direction on how to proceed with the following attached files:			Please see attached transmittal.				
1) Sheet-DTX Modifications for HSR FIG1- 03-09-10 2) Sheet-DTX Modifications for HSR FIG2-BLOWUP 03-09-10			Transmittal #140-00069 Remarks (04/15/10): The accompanying information is for your review and reference. No action is required at this time.				
			Constructware DRQ #00024				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 207 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
3) Sheet-DTX Modifications for HSR FIG3-201 Mission 03-09-10							
P-0025	Tieback Anchors Under Natoma And Minna Drawings	Closed	03/19/2010	04/02/2010	04/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell	Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Webcor / Obayashi received drawings regarding the "Tieback Anchors Under Natoma and Minna", please provide a transmittal and direction on how to proceed with the following attached files: 1) 400 Howard Shoring Tiebacks, (Sheet #SH1-1., SH1-2., SH1-3., SH1-4) 2) 500_HOWARD_SHORING-TIEBACKS 3) X-2082-1		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please see attached transmittal Transmittal #140-00070 Remarks (04/15/10): The accompanying information is for your review and reference. No action is required at this time. Constructware DRQ #00025				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 208 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P-0026	Shoring Wall And Buttress Comment Log Clarification Request	Closed	03/19/2010	04/02/2010	04/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell	Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Below is a list of questions that provide an overview of information Webcor / Obayashi needs clarified for the Comment Logs provided with the 100% CD Shoring. These are not the only questions we have or will have.				These comments will be addressed along with the remainder of Webcor / Obayashi Comments dated April 6th 2010 regarding the review of the 100% CD: Buttress / Shoring / Excavation - Issued for Structural Design Review.			
1) The "Design Team Response" comments do not appear to be final answers. For example, the Shoring comments #2 and #5 say items "will" be submitted / provided. What date will they be provided?				Constructware DRQ #00026			
2) What date can Webcor / Obayashi expect the final response / answer for items that are unresolved (i.e. #5 on the Shoring Comment Log- "TJPA to respond", and #329 on the Buttress Comment Log - "PMPC to respond.")?							
3) What is Webcor / Obayashi expected to do with response comments like Shoring comment #5.10 - "Alternate solutions to the buttress scheme should be considered"; and #5.12 - "Needs further discussion"?							
P-0027	100%DD Specification Section 07 18 23 & 09 27 13 Discrepancies	Closed	03/23/2010	04/06/2010	03/31/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell	Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
In Volumes 1 & 2 of the 100% DD specifications, sections 07 18 23 and 09 27 13 have the following discrepancies:				1. Confirmed - Vehicular Traffic Coatings are specified in 07 18 00. Spec Section 07 18 23 no longer exists.			
1) Spec. section 07 18 23 - Vehicular Traffic Coating (02/16/10) is missing from Volume 1 of the 100%DD specifications, but is marked as issued in the Table of Contents. Please confirm spec. section 07 18 23 no longer exists, it's corresponding information has been inputted / consolidated with spec. section 07 18 00 - Traffic Coatings (02.16.10), and update contract documents accordingly.				2. Section 09 27 13 is correct. There is a typographical error in the Table of Contents.			
2) In Volume 2 of the 100%DD specifications, section 09 27 13 - Glass-Fiber Reinforced Plaster-GFRP-Fabrications (02.16.10) is labeled as 09 27 16 in the Table of Contents. Please confirm whether spec. section #09 27 13 or 09 26 16 is correct for the Glass-Fiber Reinforced Plaster-GFRP-				Constructware DRQ #00027			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 209 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Fabrications (02/16/10) specification and update contract documents accordingly.							
P-0028	Missing 100% DD Spec. Section 00 30 00 - Desktop Cladding And Secondary Struc Closed		03/23/2010	04/06/2010	04/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Transbay PMPC Mark O'Dell			Answered By:Transbay PMPC Mark O'Dell				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
In Volume 1 of the 100%DD specifications, section 00 30 00 - Desktop Cladding And Secondary Structure Wind Load Review (12/14/09) is marked as issued in the Table of Contents, but is not included in the package. Please provide specification section 00 30 0 - Desktop Cladding and Secondary Structure Wind Load Review (12/14/09) or confirm it has not been issued and update contract documents accordingly.				The Desktop Cladding and Secondary Wind Load Review Report is listed by mistake. The report is preliminary and not ready for issuance. It was not intended to be issued with the B / S / E Package.			
				Constructware DRQ #00028			
<hr/>							
P-0029	Length Of Concrete Mat Slab Pour	Closed	04/01/2010	04/15/2010	04/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Transbay PMPC Mark O'Dell			Answered By:Thornton Tomasetti Albert Chen				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
As discussed in previous meetings, please confirm it is acceptable to pour the concrete mat slab in the full width of the project and in up to 400' in length.				The 100%DD specification, paragraph 3.2.2A limit the maximum length of the concrete pour for mat slab and train box wall to 60ft. This requirement is to minimize heat gain due to cement hydration during the pour and reduce shrinkage induced cracking and plastic settlement. This practice is very common in the construction of large water containment structures that require good quality concrete for water tightness.			
(Note: Webcor / Obayashi needs this response for 100%DD estimating purposes.)				Please follow the DD Spec.			
				Answered by Albert Chen Thornton Thomasetti 04/05/10			
				Constructware DRQ #00029			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P-0030	TC1 100% DD Train Platform Mechanical Room Door Sizes	Closed	05/12/2010	05/19/2010	05/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Cerri To: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell	Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Ref: A-3001, grids 3-6 and B-D (dated 2/16/10) Per our scheduling exercises, we observed these conditions in the 100% DD drawings: The mechanical rooms in the Train Platform BOH call for CMU walls. We are scheduling to install the mechanical equipment prior to CMU because most equipment in these rooms will not fit through a 3' wide door. Please confirm the door sizes for the following rooms are 3' wide: B2222, B2223, B2230, and B2228.			Confirmed.				
P-0031	TC1 100% DD PE301 & PE603 Phase 1/Phase 2 Clarification	Closed	05/12/2010	05/26/2010	05/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Cerri To: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell	Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Ref: Adamson Associates Transbay Transit Center Phasing, February 26, 2010; A-2106 and A-2103 (dated 2/16/10) Per the referenced phasing document, PE301 and PE603 are identified on the Train Platform level as the core being built in Phase 1 (color red), and the elevator being built in Phase 2 (color green). We have scheduled the CMU installation for Phase 1 and the elevator installation for Phase 2 at both elevator locations. Please confirm this is in compliance with Phase 1 and Phase 2 construction. This is important for the 100% DD schedule development.			Response: Answer provided; no action needed Response Notes: 100% Design Development Architectural Drawings A-2103 and A-2106 do not depict phasing. For phasing refer to SKA-0777 and SKA-0778, dated 02/26/2010. For elevators PE301 and PE603, the Phasing Diagram Legend Note # 5 states: Elevator Pit in Mat Slab. It is the intent to provide elevator/escalator pits in the Mat Slab only for the CalTrain platform, to accommodate low platform height.				
P-0032	TC1 100% DD Stair 202 Landings Clarification	Closed	05/12/2010	05/26/2010	05/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Cerri To: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell	Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Mark O'Dell		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Ref: A-2102, A-2202, A-2203 and A-2204; 1/A-7103 (dated 2/16/10) Per our scheduling exercises, we observed these conditions in the 100% DD drawings: The referenced plan view drawings show stair 202 from			Response: Answer provided; no action needed Response Notes: Stair 202 is to service from Platform Level to the 2nd Level inclusive. The section on drawing A-7103 is				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 211 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	the Train Platform Level to the 2nd Level. 1/A-7103 shows stair 202 from the Train Platform Level to the ground level. We have scheduled stair 202 to service up to Level 2. Please confirm this is correct. This is important for the 100% DD schedule development.						drawn incorrectly.
P-0033	TC1 Vertical Transportation at Grids 10-11 Phase Designation	Closed	06/15/2010	06/30/2010	06/28/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Cerri		To: Adamson Associates, Inc. Sandor Rott	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. Sandor Rott				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Ref: Adamson Associates Phasing Plan, dated 2/26/10; SKA-0778 and SKA-0779; 100% Design Development drawings, dated 2/16/10; A-2203 and A-2303			Acceptable				
SKA-0779 identifies the following vertical transportation areas (grids 10-11) as Phase 1 or Phase 2: - Stairs 309 & 311 (serving lower concourse and ground levels) in Phase 1 (note: SKA-0778 shows these stairs constructed in Phase 2) - Escalators 303 & 304 (serving lower concourse and ground levels) in Phase 2 - Escalators 305 & 306 (serving ground and bus deck levels) in Phase 2 It looks as if the phases for stairs 309 & 311 and escalators 305 & 306 could be reversed seeing the floors that they serve. Please confirm the phases for each area above, so we can provide an accurate 100% DD schedule.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 212 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P-0034	TC1 Control Points per U-0010	Closed	08/12/2010	08/19/2010	11/17/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michael Constable	To: Transbay PMPC	Mark O'Dell			
Co-Author:		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref: U-0010 (dated 7/9/10) The referenced drawing shows four control point locations: 1. Point #101 NE Corner of Second St. & Mission St. 2. Point #105 NE Corner of Beale St. & Mission St. 3. Point #106 SW Corner of Beale St. & Howard St. 4. Project Benchmark at SE Corner of Second St. & Howard St.				Response was never provided by PMPC but work was completed.			
Webcor/Obayashi field engineers have located Point #101 and the Project Benchmark on Second St. However, control Points #105 & #106 on Beale St. are missing. These control points are required for Webcor/Obayashi field surveying. Please physically place points #105 & #106 per U-0010 (dated 7/9/10).							
In addition, please physically place a minimum of two clear Line-of-Sight Survey Control Points on Second, First and Fremont Streets at the Natoma and Minna intersections. This allows Webcor/Obayashi to survey PG&E utility work and additional existing utility As-Built information in PG&E excavations.							
P-0035	P - Steel Basket Column Strut Connection at Glazing	Closed	07/12/2012	07/12/2012	07/18/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath	To: Turner Construction Company	Gary Krutsch			
Co-Author:		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref: 14/SI-6092 1. The strut connecting the basket columns to the glazing sub framing is currently shown as part of the TG08.1 package. Because of structural steel tolerances of the basket columns, the length of the strut will vary depending on the final location of the basket column. The discussions have been going on for months about speeding up the fabrication and installation of the glazing system, therefore we would like to incorporate the strut as part of the TG07.1 Structural Steel package. Please confirm it is acceptable to incorporate the strut into the Structural Steel package.				This request is neither an RFI nor QBD. If W/O would like to pursue this issue, please formalize a letter addressed to PMPC and route through the proper venue.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 213 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>2. Provide details for an adjustable end strut at the glazing sub frame connection.</div> <div>3. Provide a typical length that takes into account the tolerance of the basket columns.</div>							
P1-0001	Perimeter Protection Bollard Cladding	Closed	06/05/2014	06/05/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Provide documents for secondary mitigation to be incorporated for TG07.9 - Eliminate decorative SS cladding from the perimeter protection bollards and provide painted steel jacket in lieu of SS.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Secondary Mitigation updates have been included in section 28 16 44, with VE Round 2 documentation delivered on 06/18/2014.			
<hr/>							
P1-0002	Operable /Retractable Bollards and Wedge Barrier Traffic Lights	Closed	06/05/2014	06/15/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2302, A1-2303, A1-2304, A1-2310 Do operable/retractable bollards and wedge barrier traffic lights interface with street light signals? If so provide specifications for this interaction.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reference to traffic light interface is specified in section 28 16 44/APA - 3.5.I.1 included with VE Round 2 documentation delivered on 06/18/2014.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 214 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0002.1	Additional Information for Operable Wedge Barriers	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44/APA, RFI P1-0002, A1-2302, A1-2303, A1-2304, and A1-2310 RFI response P1-0002: "Reference to traffic light interface is specified in section 28 16 44/APA - 3.5.I.1 included with VE Round 2 documentation delivered on 06/18/2014" Original comment remains. 28 16 44/APA, 3.5.I. indicates that wedge barriers provide an output to the traffic control system. Provide details and output requirements.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor shall provide two (2) dry contact relay outputs to the traffic control system, one per barrier, as a base design.		
P1-0003	HPU Bollard Detail	Closed	06/05/2014	06/15/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2302, A1-2304, A1-2203, A1-2210 Provide detail of HPU for retractable bollards.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> HPU is provided by the bollard manufacturer/supplier. Comment to be addressed by subcontractor.		
P1-0004	Retractable Bollard Hydraulic Connections and Lines	Closed	06/05/2014	06/15/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2302, A1-2303, A1-2304, A1-2310 Provide detail and routing for retractable bollard hydraulic connections and lines.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Retractable bollard is a Design/Build system. Routing from HPU to individual or grouped bollards shall be provided by the bidder. Comment to be addressed by subcontractor.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 215 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0005	Hydraulic Hose Conduit	Closed	06/05/2014	06/15/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference - 28 16 44 Section 3.3.I Specify type of containment infrastructure/conduit required for hydraulic hoses.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Containment conduit to be provided by the Design/Build bidder to suit their hydraulic hose dimensions. Comment to be addressed by subcontractor.			
P1-0006	HPU for Wedge Barriers	Closed	06/05/2014	06/15/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2306, A1-2307, A1-2310, A1-2206, A1-2207, A1-2210 Provide detail of HPU for wedge barriers.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> HPU is provided by the bollard manufacturer/supplier. Comment to be addressed by subcontractor.			
P1-0007	Wedge Barrier Hydraulic Connections and Lines	Closed	06/05/2014	06/15/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2306, A1-2307, A1-2310 Provide detail and routing for wedge barrier hydraulic connections and lines.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Wedge Barrier is a Design/Build system. Routing from HPU to individual or grouped barriers to be provided by the bidder. Comment to be addressed by the subcontractor.			
P1-0008	HPU Containment Pans	Closed	06/05/2014	06/15/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2306, A1-2307, A1-2310 Confirm that HPU containment pans are not required for leakage of hydraulic fluid.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> HPU's are product specific. If a drip pan is not included with the unit, then no additional components shall be required. Comment to be addressed by subcontractor.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 216 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0009	Details and Cuts for Wedge Barriers at Beale and First Streets	Closed	06/05/2014	06/15/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2306, A1-2307 Provide details and cuts for wedge barriers at Beale and First Streets. Coordinate with Structural drawings.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Wedge barriers are located within Landscape/Civil build-up layer, and are not attached to the structural lid of the Train Box. Coordination with structural is not required.			
P1-0010	HPU location	Closed	06/06/2014	06/06/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2303, A1-2203 Provide final location and details of HPU for the retractable bollards at the end of Natoma Street between GL 10 & 11 and J & K. An interim location is called out on A1-2203 on the Lower Concourse.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reference to "interim" HPU locations has been removed from sheets A1-2303 and A1-2203. HPU details to be provided by the wedge bollard manufacturer/contractor.			
P1-0011	HPU location for wedge barriers	Closed	06/06/2014	06/16/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2306, A1-2307, A1-2206, A1-2207 Provide final locations and details of HPU for the wedge barriers at the Muni Bus Plaza on Fremont and Beale Streets. Interim locations are called out on A1-2206 at GL 27 and A1-2207 at GL 33 on the Lower Concourse.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reference to "interim" HPU locations has been removed from sheets A1-2306, A1-2307, A1-2206 and A1-2207. HPU details to be provided by the wedge barrier manufacturer/contractor.			
P1-0012	HPU location for bollard and wedge barriers	Open	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2310, A1-2210		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reference to "interim" HPU locations has been removed from A1-2310 and A1-2210.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 217 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Provide final location and details of HPU for the retractable bollards and wedge barriers at the Vehicle/Bike Ramp on Howard Street. An interim location is called out on A1-2210 at GL3.</p>							
P1-0013	Traffic Light Details for Wedge Barriers	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
Reference: A1-2306, A1-2307, A1-2310			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Provide traffic light details and locations for all wedge barriers.			No indicator lights are required at the wedge barriers in the Bus Plaza (sheets A1-2306 and A1-2307). Indicator lights for the wedge barriers at the Vehicle Ramp are now shown on A1-7402 and A1-7418 delivered with MEPTSc Addendum # 4 to be issued on 06/20/2014.				
P1-0013.1	Traffic Light Details for Wedge Barriers	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
Reference: A1-7402, A1-2306, A1-2307, A1-2310, 28 16 44, P1-0013			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
RFI response P1-0013: "No indicator lights are required at the wedge barriers in the Bus Plaza (sheets A1-2306 and A1-2307). Indicator lights for the wedge barriers at the Vehicle Ramp are now shown on A1-7402 and A1-7418 delivered with MEPTSc Addendum # 4 to be issued on 06/20/2014."			1. Wedge barrier controller to provide two (2) dry contact relay outputs to the traffic control system, one per barrier set.				
Original comment remains. 28 16 44, 3.5.I. indicates that wedge barriers provide an output to the traffic control system. Provide details and output requirements. A1-7402 shows one indicator light for two wedge barriers, while 28 16 44 2.3.H. states that each wedge barrier shall have their own light. Clarify what is required.			2. Custom pylons shown on A1-7402 and A1-7418 should have indicator lights in front and rear sides of same pylon (one set of lights per barrier/traffic direction).				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0014	Impact of Attenuator	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2502 What is the Impact Attenuator located at GL F & 2? Provide specifications and details.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached SKA-3907 for Impact Attenuator location and proposed products.		
P1-0015	Wedge Barrier and Retractable Bollard Details	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Secondary Mitigation Provide updated details for wedge barriers and retractable bollards showing removal of topping slab with proper elevations, etc., as they are impacted by the following secondary mitigation measure: Delete 87K sf topping slab in the west end of the Lower Concourse at the SOC, Engineering and Vehicle & Bike Ramps.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It has been agreed that deletion of the topping slab is no longer a secondary mitigation measure. Topping slab will remain on Lower Concourse at the SOC, Engineering and Vehicle and Bike Ramps. Details for wedge barriers and retractable bollards will not be revised to accommodate removal of topping slab.		
P1-0016	Retractable Bollards on Howard	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2310 Provide locations and dimension retractable bollard traffic lights at the Vehicle/Bike Ramp on Howard Street.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Locations of indicator light pylons and other devices shown on updated sheets A1-7402 and A1-7418 delivered with MEPTSc Addendum # 4, to be issued 06/20/2014.		
P1-0016.1	Additional Information for Retractable Bollards	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2310, ASI 118 A1-7418, and ASI 119 A1-			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 219 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	7418 (SKA-3526), RFI response P1-0016: "Locations of indicator light pylons and other devices shown on updated sheets A1-7402 and A1-7418 delivered with MEPTSc Addendum # 4, to be issued 06/20/2014." A1-7402 is not related to retractable bollards, just to wedge barriers. Sheet A1-7418 from ASI 118 has been superseded by sheet A1-7418 (SKA-3526) issued in ASI 119 which does not show any indicator lights. Clarify which sheet is meant to be the most current version.						
P1-0017	Incorrect Details on A1-8168	Closed	06/09/2014	06/09/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-8168 Detail 3 - Bollard placement is missing on 3/A1-8168. Section cut B/A1-8168 needs to be verified. Section B/A1-8168 and plan view on A1-2502 don't match. Confirm which placement is correct and update details accordingly.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Bollard placement is not shown on A1-8168. However, the issue of bollard placement is dependent on the final layout of the Pre-fabricated Supervisor Booth, which will be delivered with VE Round 4 documentation, at which point the locations of bollards will be finalized.			
P1-0018	Design Build Bollards	Closed	06/09/2014	06/09/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 05 50 00 2.3.E through H - Bollards are indicated as being design build in this specification. Confirm that they are design build.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Bollard scope has been removed from section 05 50 00, and consolidated into section 28 16 44. Bollards are performance specification - design/build.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 220 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0019	Structural Drawings for Bollards	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPAndrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: A1-3190				All bollards are performance specification - design/build items. Provide design to comply with required performance criteria in 28 16 44 issued with VE Round 2 deliverable on 06/18/2014.			
Detail 2 - Says "Refer to Structural Dwgs", but there are no bollard details in the structural drawings. Provide structural details. Confirm that BOL-3 as shown in Detail 2 and 4 is sturdy enough to withstand impact from a vehicle at required forces.							
P1-0020	Bollards Detail	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPZachary Moore</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: 05 50 00				BOL-1 and BOL-2 are performance specification - design/build items. Provide design to comply with required ASTM M-ratings.			
2.5.E. - The specification for BOL-1 and BOL-2 do not indicate that they are concrete filled, however the details on A1-8676 show that they are concrete filled. Coordinate drawings and specifications accordingly.							
P1-0021	WPM Detail for Retractable Bollard Drain	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPAndrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: A1-8721				Slab penetrations required for retractable bollards are located on plans. For the retractable bollard waterproofing details, refer to Details 3,4, and 5 of A1-8721.			
Provide waterproofing details for retractable bollard drain and all penetrations.							
P1-0021.1	Slab penetration for Bollard	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPZachary Moore</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: A1-8721				For the retractable bollard and wedge barrier vertical			

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0021	RFI response P1-0021: "Slab penetrations required for retractable bollards are located on plans. For the retractable bollard waterproofing details, refer to Details 3,4, and 5 of A1-8721"	Open	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
P1-0022	<p>Design Build Bollards - Quality Assurance</p> <p>Provide waterproofing details for all penetrations, including hydraulic and electrical lines which will need to penetrate the waterproofing at the side wall of the pit.</p>	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference: 12 93 30/APA (SSI)</p> <p>1.5 - Quality Assurance - This states that the site bollards are design build. Confirm that they are design build.</p>						
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>						
	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Specification section 12 93 30/APA has been deleted. Content of specification section 12 93 30/APA has been consolidated into specification section 28 16 44/APA. Site bollards, as part of Perimeter Security Systems are performance based design/build.</p>						
	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 222 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0023	Operable Bollards at Natoma Pedestrian Area West, Location 12	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44/APA (SSI) 1.2.E Shows that there are operable bollards at Natoma Pedestrian Area West, location 12, which is at Natoma and 2nd Street. Provide location and details of HPU for this set of operable bollards. Confirm this is TJPA's property. There are no details for operable bollards at this location. Clarify that this is a requirement and if so provide details and confirm that the TJPA is allowed to install operable bollards at this location and that other businesses/buildings are not adversely impacted.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Refer to updated sheets A1-2302 and A1-2210, delivered with MEPTSc Addendum # 4, to be issued 06/20/2014. Location of Natoma Street West bollards has been revised per TJPA directive. 2. Locations of bollards and HPU is shown on the updated sheets A1-2302 and A1-2210. 3. Details of HPU's to be provided by the bollard manufacturer/fabricator. 4. Location of bollards identified in A1-2302 and A1-2210 is within TJPA property. 5. Perimeter protection is TJPA security requirement.		
P1-0024	Number of Wedge Barriers at Fremont	Closed	06/09/2014	06/09/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44/APA (SSI) 1.2.E - Shows only five wedge barriers at Fremont Street (Bus Plaza). The drawings show eight wedge barriers at Fremont Street (Bus Plaza) at GL 27. Revise and coordinate documents accordingly.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Description of work diagram identifies location of bollards and wedge barriers that are grouped together to operate in unison, irrespective of the number of the HPU's and controllers. No coordination action required.		
P1-0025	Wedge Barriers at Beale Street	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44/APA 1.2.E - Shows only two wedge barriers at Beale Street (Bus Plaza). The drawings show four wedge barriers at Beale Street (Bus Plaza) at GL 33. Revise and coordinate documents accordingly.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Description of work diagram identifies location of bollards and wedge barriers that are grouped together to operate in unison, irrespective of the number of the HPU's and controllers. No coordination action		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 223 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
P1-0026	Removable Bollards	Closed	required.					
			Please note, that this RFI's number is incorrectly labeled as #0002 on the PDF file "Attached_file__P1-0025_-_Wedge_Barriers_at_Beale_Street.					
			06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello						
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: 28 16 44/APA (SSI)				Refer to updated 28 16 44/APA delivered with VE Round 2, issued 06/18/2014.				
1.2.E - This does not show all Manually Removable Bollard locations that are indicated in the drawings, for example on L1-2302 GL 2-4 @ GL A. Remove from specification or provide all locations.								
P1-0027	Utility Vault Bollards	Closed	06/09/2014 06/19/2014 06/30/2014 Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>					
			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
			ANSWER:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
			Confirmed.					
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello						
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: L1-2305								
Confirm that B3 and not B3A is required at utility vaults between GL 20-22 at GL J. All other utility vaults have B3A bollards.								



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 224 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0028	Secondary Controllers	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44/APA (SSI) 1.3.A.2 - Locate all Secondary Controllers for all operable bollards and wedge barriers. They are not indicated in the drawings and quantities are not provided.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to 1.3.5 table in the updated section 28 16 44/APA, included with VE Round 2 deliverable, issued 06/18/2014.		
P1-0029	Card Readers for Operable Bollards and Wedge Barriers	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44/APA 3.5.G: Locate all Card Readers for all operable bollards and wedge barriers. They are not indicated in the drawings and quantities are not provided.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Locations for all required card readers are identified in updated sheets A1-2302, A1-2303, A1-7402 and A1-7418 included with MEPTSc Addendum # 4, to be issued 06/20/2014.		
P1-0029.1	Card Readers for Operable Bollards and Wedge Barriers	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44/APA 3.5.G: RFI Response P1-0029.1: Locations for all required card readers are identified in updated sheets A1-2302, A1-2303, A1-7402 and A1-7418 included with MEPTSc Addendum # 4, to be issued 06/20/2014. Original comment remains. Card Reader locations are not indicated.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches SKA-3979 and SKA-3980, where locations of card readers have been highlighted. Dimensions have been added to the drawing.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 226 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0032	Photoelectric Beam for Operable Barriers	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: 28 16 44 (SSI)			Equipment and detail to be provided by the Operable Barrier manufacturer/supplier. Locations for photoelectric beam pylons identified on updated sheets A1-2302, A1-2303, A1-7402 and A1-7418 included with MEPTSc Addendum # 4, to be issued 06/20/2014.				
1.2.I - Provide detail for the photoelectric beam required to detect people or vehicles on or near the operable barriers. Locate and dimension on drawings. They are not indicated in the drawings and quantities are not provided.							
P1-0032.1	Additional Information Photoelectric Beam for Operable Barriers	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: 28 16 44 (SSI), A1-2304, A1-2306, A1-2307, A1-2302, A1-2303, A1-7402, A1-7418 from ASI 118, A1-7418 (SKA-3526) issued in ASI 119			1. Location of photoelectric beams are not called out on sheets A1-2302, A1-2303 and A1-2304. However, location of indicator light pylons and/or knox box and key switch + indicator light is clearly shown, (see attached). Per section 28 16 44.2.7.C, Custom Pylons describe two configurations of the pylon matching the annotations on plans. Design of custom pylon, complete with photoelectric beams and other equipment shall be provided by the Bollard Manufacturer.				
RFI response P1-0032: "Equipment and detail to be provided by the Operable Barrier manufacturer/supplier. Locations for photoelectric beam pylons identified on updated sheets A1-2302, A1-2303, A1-7402 and A1-7418 included with MEPTSc Addendum # 4, to be issued 06/20/2014."			Additionally, photoelectric beams are not shown on sheets A1-2306 and A1-2307, which describe the wedge barriers at West and East ends of the MUNI Bus Plaza, because they are not required at those locations.				
- Locations of photoelectric beams are not called out on sheet A1-2302, A1-2303. Provide updated details. Also provide details for sheets A1-2304, A1-2306, A1-2307.			2. Photoelectric beam shown on sheet A1-7402 does not require full width coverage of the entire wedge because of the limited accessibility by the general public and saturated video area coverage.				
- Confirm that photoelectric beam on A1-7402 is wide enough to cover the entire wedge barrier if someone is standing on it.			3. Sheets included with this response include [A1-2302, A1-2303, A1-2304 from ASI 0119], [A1-3100, A1-3105 from ASI 0123], [A1-7402 and A1-7418 from ASI 0121].				



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0033	HPU Relocations and Cosntruction Scheduling	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44 1.2.J: "The contractor will be required to install the anti-ram barrier systems in phases to match the construction schedule of the project. The phasing includes the relocation of the hydraulic power units at a later date and re-installation of hydraulic hoses, fittings and valves based on the revised distance between the hydraulic power unit and the barriers it is controlling." Why are the HPU's being relocated? What is the phasing in the construction schedule that is being referred to here? How does is the relocation of the hydraulic lines, piping and drainage being accounted for in the drawings? Routing and all accommodations for temporary and permanent locations needs to be provided. Coordinate all drawings and specifications. Revise accordingly.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Phasing language deleted from specification.		
P1-0034	Vehicle Barrier Controller locations	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 28 16 44 (SSI) 2.1 - Locate and provide detail for all vehicle barrier controllers. They are not indicated in the drawings and quantities are not provided.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to updated specification section 28 16 44/APA - 1.3.A.5.		
P1-0035	Wedge Barrier CIP Locations	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44/APA 2.2 Coordinate and detail wedge barrier cast in place locations at the Bus Muni Plaza on Beale and Fremont Streets. These are not in the Structural drawings.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to response in RFI P1-0009.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 228 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0036	Road Loop Details	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: 28 16 44 (SSI)			Final location of road loops provided by the Barrier System manufacturer/fabricator. Locations of road loops currently shown on C1-7xxx series. Road loop locations for Howard Street Vehicle Ramp and West Natoma Street barrier to be provided in a future Civil package. Contractor shall obtain quantities from Contract Documents.				
2.2.H - Provide details and location of road loops. They are not indicated in the drawings. Provide quantities.							
P1-0036.1	Road loop Location	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: 28 16 44/APA (section 2.6.B),			Road loop sensors to be located at every operable barrier, both on the secure side and the non-secure side.				
RFI response P1-0036: "Final location of road loops provided by the Barrier System manufacturer/fabricator. Locations of road loops currently shown on C1-7xxx series. Road loop locations for Howard Street Vehicle Ramp and West Natoma Street barrier to be provided in a future Civil package. Contractor shall obtain quantities from Contract Documents."							
This states that loop detectors are located on both the secure and non-secure side of an operable barrier. The current Civil drawings do not show loops on both sides of the operable barriers, for example on sheet C1-7001. Clarify this requirement.							
P1-0037	Final Sequence of Operations	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	07/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Ray Quesada				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: 28 16 44/APA 3.5.A:			The contractor providing these items will be required to spend time coordinating with the Owner's security concept of operations and should include this time in				
Confirm that "The final sequence of operations will be							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	identified at a later time and will require coordination with the Owner's security concept of operations." does not require any work from the bidders.			their bid.			
P1-0038	Operable Bollards Finish Details	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference 28 16 44 (SSI)		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to response provided with RFI P1-0001		
2.3.C.2 - Provide finish and material for operable bollard decorative sleeve.							
P1-0039	Decorative Bollard Detail	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44 2.4.E		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to updated specification section 28 16 44 - 2.7 Custom Pylon. Custom pylon shall be designed and manufactured by the retractable bollard manufacturer.		
Provide details for decorative bollard for traffic light.							
P1-0040	Bollard Base Plate Detail	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-8676 A1-2502		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Base plate dimensions deleted from sheet A1-8676.		
Detail 1 - Based on the BOL-1 bollard steel base plate 4'-10" width and 4'-6" spacing indicated on A1-2502, the base plates are overlapping by 4". Confirm there is enough space in the slab to accommodate an overlap. Corner bollards are also setting on top of the neighboring bollard plate. Revise accordingly.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 230 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0041	Bollard Plate and Rebar Cover	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-8676 Confirm there is enough cover for the BOL-1 plate and rebar in topping slab. 4/S1-5003 Note #6 states that top and bottom rebar are required while 5/S1-5000 requires 1" clear. If there is not enough cover, revise accordingly.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The top rebar in the topping slab per note 6 on 4/S1-5003 shall be continued over the base plates. The bottom rebar shall be stopped short at the base plates.		
P1-0042	Topping slab Detail	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-8676 Detail 1 shows 6" for the topping slab, including waterproof membrane. Calculations from elevations and slab thicknesses for the Bus Deck equal 5.5". Correct this discrepancy.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 6" dimension in question identifies the total thickness of the build-up assembly on top of the structural concrete slab. The dimension is being revised to 5 3/4" and will be issued in a future ASI.		
P1-0043	Bollard Coordination Between L and A Drawings	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2302 through A1-2310, L1-2302 through L1-2310 Bollard locations and number are not coordinated in Landscape and Architectural drawings. For example B2 bollards on GL 5. Coordinate and revise accordingly.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. For location and type of all bollards with B** designation, Landscape Drawings shall govern. 2. For location and type of all bollards with BOL** designation, Architectural Drawings shall govern. 3. For location of retractable bollards and wedge barriers Architectural Drawings shall govern.		



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0044	Bollard 3	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
reference: 12 93 30 A1-3190				Section 12 93 30 has been consolidated into Section 28 16 44. Refer to 06/18/2014 Secondary Mitigation VE Round 2 package.			
Bollard 3 is not showing as removable on A1-3190 or in spec 05 50 00, where it is completely filled with concrete. Provide details for a removable concrete filled bollard or revise accordingly.							
<hr/>							
P1-0044.1	Conflicting Details Bollard 3	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: 12 93 30, A1-3190, 28 16 44				Bollard type BOL-3 is a design-build product. Sheet A1-3190 has been updated; refer to attached SKA-3912.			
RFI P1-0044 response: "Section 12 93 30 has been consolidated into Section 28 16 44. Refer to 06/18/2014 Secondary Mitigation VE Round 2 package."							
A1-3190 still refers to 05 50 00 in detail 7. Detail 2 and 4 are also in conflict with specification 28 16 44 regarding BOL-3 details. Detail 2 also refers to structural drawings, yet there are no structural drawings for any bollards. Clarify the conflicting details and requirements. Provide what the correct details and requirements are for BOL-3.							
<hr/>							
P1-0045	Slab Plate at Bollard	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: 05 50 00 2.5.F.1				Reference 05 50 00 / 2.5.F.1 has been deleted from specifications and incorporated into consolidated section 28 16 44 "Perimeter Security Systems" issued as an ASI with Secondary Mitigation VE Round 2 package.			
Through slab plate is not detailed in the drawings, but the specifications say that this is part of the bollard. Coordinate documents and revise accordingly.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 232 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0046	Bus Deck Bollard	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-2507, A1-2502, 05 50 00 Confirm that BOL-3 on the Bus Deck is a crash bollard. Is it strong enough, as designed, to withstand ramming from a vehicle?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> BOL-3 is a design/build bollard with required performance to comply with CFC 312 2007. It is not intended to stop head-on collisions with vehicles. Refer to 06/18/2014 Secondary Mitigation VE Round 2 package.		
P1-0047	Bollard Coordination Between Specifications	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 12 93 30, 05 50 00 Bollards in spec 12 93 30 and 05 50 00 do not match in regards to their parameters, ratings and requirements. Clarify why there are two incongruous lists of bollards that use three of the same numbers. Correct and revise accordingly.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Bollard specifications from Sections 12 93 30 and 05 50 00 have been consolidated into updated Section 28 16 44. Refer to 06/18/2014 Secondary Mitigation VE Round 2 package.		
P1-0048	Bollard Detail type	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: L1-7360 Landscape drawings do not detail each bollard type. Clarify which bollard type is on this sheet. Coordinate with Architectural and Structural drawings. Clarify if bus deck level BOL-1 and BOL-2, and loading dock BOL-3 are to be used for all areas? Provide details for all bollard types required.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Bollard manufacturer/fabricator shall design/build bollards of various types to suit identified conditions. Locations of individual types and conditions are clearly identified on drawings along with proximity to ramps, OCS poles, etc. 2. Bollards identified on Landscape drawings do not engage TTC Structure. 3. Bus Deck BOL-1, BOL-2, and Loading Dock BOL-3 are to be used only where identified on Architectural drawings. 4. Details to be provided by the bollard manufacturer/fabricator.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 233 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0049	Bollard Details	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 12 93 30 2.2 Provide details for bollards listed under section 2.2. Including but not limited to, details for removable bollards, stationary bollards, footings, special footings, anchorages, concrete fill level, concrete type, sleeves, etc.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Bollards specified in 12 93 30 have been consolidated into section 28 16 44. Bollards to be provided under 28 16 44 scope are performance design or design/build.		
P1-0050	Stationary Bollards	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: L1-2304, L1-2306 B1B is shown on L1-2304 and L1-2306 but is not specified in 12 93 30, for example at GL C between 17 and 18. Revise accordingly.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See L-0002 for description of bollard. Rating to match Bollard Type 1. Refer to updated consolidated specification section 28 16 44.		
P1-0050.1	Stationary Bollards	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: L1-2304, L1-2306, 28 16 44 RFI P1-0050 response: "See L-0002 for description of bollard. Rating to match Bollard Type 1. Refer to updated consolidated specification section 28 16 44." RFI original Question P1-0050: "B1B is shown on L1-2304 and L1-2306 but is not specified in 12 93 30, for example at GL C between 17 and 18. Revise accordingly." Original question remains. There is no listing for Bollard Type B1B in the consolidated 28 16 44.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Bollard type B1B is the equal to bollard type B1A. B1B is located at MUNI OCS pole locations. Design and coordination required is at MUNI OCS pole locations.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 234 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0051	Retractable Bollard Drain Detail	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: A1-8720 and A1-8721			1. Retractable bollard drains connect to plumbed drainage lines located under the structural slab. Refer to Plumbing drawings delivered with MEPTSc Addendum # 4, issued 06/20/2014.				
Provide detail for Retractable Bollard Drain, piping route and termination. Does the effluent need to be collected and treated as hazardous waste? Coordinate with Plumbing Drawings.			2. There is no special consideration required for the collected effluent.				
P1-0051.1	Stationary Bollards	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: A1-8720, A1-8721 P1-2252, and P1-2202			Arup believes the RFI incorrectly states Minna Street when the question was intended for the retractable bollards at Natoma Street.				
RFI P1-0051 response: "1. Retractable bollard drains connect to plumbed drainage lines located under the structural slab. Refer to Plumbing drawings delivered with MEPTSc Addendum # 4, issued 06/20/2014.			The retractable bollards that are located near grid line 1, and the retractable bollards that are located near grid line 10 which are outside the footprint of the trainbox, shall drain to a dry well as shown on the attached two sketches (SK-C-0001 and SK-C-0002).				
2. There is no special consideration required for the collected effluent."							
- Original question remains for retractable bollard locations at Minna Street on GL 1 and 10 where no drain lines are shown.							
- Confirm that both retractable bollard drain and pit drain connect to the single plumbing line as stated on P1-2202 "2" SAN/AD - UP (TYP 9) TO RETRACTABLE BOLLARDS CASING AND PIT".							
- P1-2252 states "2" UP TO RETRACTABLE BOLLARD DRAINS (TYP 6)". Please clarify if this drain line is meant to be for the retractable bollard drains and the pit drains.							
P1-0052	HPU detail	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 236 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0054.1	Details for Indicator Light Pylon	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 28 16 44 RFI P1-0054 response: "Mounting Details attached for specified poles" Confirm that these details are to be used for the indicator light pylon. They do not match the criteria in 28 16 44.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Details referenced in response to RFI P1-0054 are specific mounting details for traffic and MUNI OCS. Indicator light pylon is a design/build element by the operable barrier manufacturer. Foundation/mounting detail shall be provided by the operable barrier manufacturer.	
<hr/>							
P1-0055	Missing Note	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 3/L1-9636 Missing note. Please provide.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached SKLA-302.	
<hr/>							
P1-0056	Wedge Barriers on Civil Drawing	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: C1-2009 Civil Drawings do not indicate wedge barriers, but civil contractor will need to know where wedge barriers are located. Show wedge barriers on civil drawings.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Arup Response: Wedge barrier locations and pickup loops are shown for reference on C1-7006, Bus Plaza Signingand Striping. Detailed design is shown in architectural drawings.	
<hr/>							
P1-0057	Missing Bollard Locations	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: L1-2312A			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to sheet L1-2312 for bollard locations.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 237 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>Missing bollard locations. Clarify what the alternate is on this sheet.</div>							
P1-0058	Water tank Liners spec	Void	06/09/2014	06/19/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference 07 13 55 2.1		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
07 13 55 2.1 does not provide a specific manufacturer for thermoplastic water tank liners. Webcor intends to require all manufactures be approved via QBD prior to bid. If this is not acceptable, please provide specific manufacturers and products which are acceptable to use.							
P1-0059	Structural Details for 24" Curb at GL 1.4	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 2/A1-8157		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please provide structural details for 24" wide curb at GL 1.4, Second Level.			See attached sketch SKS-0359 for rebar details in the concrete curb at GL 1.4 on second floor.				
P1-0060	2/A1-8151	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 2/A1-8151		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please confirm that the future finish floors are not part of Phase 1 work.			Future finished floors are not part of Phase 1 Work. Floor Finishes in Retail Areas are part of Tenant improvement (TI).				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0061	Sheet Note on A1-3001 - Vertical Joints	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 1/A1-3001 A note on sheet A1-3001 to the right of detail 1 indicates "All Vertical Joints stop @ 30" above structural slab except the foundation wall," no joints appear to be required at this location. Please confirm no joints are required, or revise drawings to show joints.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For all Transformer Vault Rooms, the lower portion of the 12" thick concrete perimeter walls do not have vertical joints. The vertical joints in the walls start from 8" above the high point of the vault FFL datum. Refer to SKA-3569 to SKA-3575 which show updated notes, a typical vault schematic isometric drawing and tagged locations of CJs.		
P1-0062	GFRC Details	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 4/A1-8454 Per secondary mitigation meetings, stucco is to be used in lieu of GFRC. Please revise details.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The system will be changed to portland cement plaster. Details will be revised in a forthcoming ASI. See the work plan distributed to WOJV for the date of this ASI issue.		
P1-0062.1	Details for Portland Cement Plaster per RFI Response P1-0062	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0062 As stated in RFI Response P1-0062, "The system will be changed to portland cement plaster. Details will be revised in a forthcoming ASI. See the work plan distributed to WOJV for the date of this ASI issue." Per RFI Response P1-0062, revised details using cement plaster in lieu of GFRC are to be issued. No revised details have been received. Please provide the revised detail referenced in RFI Response P1-0062.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> System W-18 Portland Cement Plaster work and associated drawings will be issued in VE Round #4 August 18, 2014. WOJV helped determine when this package would be issued.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 239 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0063	Detail 2/A1-9228 Similar Condition	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 2/A1-9228 4/A-0026 is called out to be similar to the detail shown. 4/A-0026 does not appear to be a similar condition. Please provide detail reference for the condition shown.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 2/A1-9228 has been updated. Detail reference 4/A-0026 SIM has been removed. Refer to the attached SKA-3667.			
P1-0063.1	Details for Embedded Plate per Detail 2/A1-9228	Void	07/01/2014	07/11/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By:							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI P1-0063 Response, Detail 2/A1-9228, Sheet SKA-3667 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/2014) Per RFI P1-0063 response, "Detail 2/A1-9228 has been updated. Detail reference 4/A-0026 SIM has been removed. Refer to the attached SKA-3667." The revised detail shows an embedded plate at the B.O. Lower Concourse Deck. No information is provided for the embedded plate. Please provide information on embedded plate.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
P1-0064	Continuous Seal at Interior Side of Exterior Concrete Wall	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 4/A1-9211 Detail 4/A1-9211 shows a continuous seal between the structural steel, and the interior side of the exterior concrete wall. Is cont. seal required at the int. side of ext. wall? If so, please provide detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. On the exterior side of concrete wall/topping slab ¿ Separation is required between concrete wall and topping slab, which will consists of typical sealant/compressible material joint fill. 2. On the interior side of concrete wall/column base plate ¿ Physical Separation between column plate and concrete wall is still required, but sealant is not necessary.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0065	Steel Plate Supporting Concrete Topping Slab	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: 1/A1-3190			Detail have been revised to include all requested information. Refer to the attached SKA-3703.				
The contract documents show a metal plate supporting the topping slab, but does not provide structural details. Please provide detailing (size, thickness, attachment, waterproofing, etc) for steel plate supporting concrete topping.							
P1-0066	Escalator Pit at Shaw Alley	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: 4/A1-7550			The discrepancy has been clarified through an RFI. See response to RFI T-868.2.				
The detail shows a metal plate at the edge of the escalator pit, while S1-7301 and 4/S1-7660 shows a conc. wall on all sides of the pit. Please coordinate the drawings.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 241 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0067	Column Base Detail at Loading Dock	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 1/A1-3190 Curb is shown on Plan Detail 1, but not on the section detail (5/A1-3190). Please coordinate the drawings, and provide structural information.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The curb around the column noted in detail 1/A1-3190 has been revised. It is a architectural element that is part of the floor finish and not a structural element. Refer to the attached SKA-3703.		
P1-0068	Insulation at Detail 2/A1-8181	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 2/A1-8181 A note calls out for 2" rigid insulation, but points to concrete. Is rigid insulation required? If so, please revise drawing and specify which insulation is to be used.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The note is incorrect; no rigid insulation is required. In a future Addendum the Bus Deck Superintendent's Station will be revised to a pre-fabricated booth per VE mitigation meetings. The referenced sheet has been omitted in TG08.10. Documentation for pre-fabricated booths to be issued in a future package.		
P1-0068.1	Documentation for Concrete Platform at Bus Deck Superintendent Station	Void	07/01/2014	07/11/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI P1-0068 Response, Detail 2/A1-8181 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/2014) As stated in the RFI P1-0068 Response, "The note is incorrect; no rigid insulation is required. In a future Addendum the Bus Deck Superintendent's Station will be revised to a pre-fabricated booth per VE mitigation meetings. The referenced sheet has been omitted in TG08.10. Documentation for pre-fabricated booths to be issued in a future package." The concrete platform is to be furnished and installed as part of topping slab scope of work. Please provide documentation for concrete platform.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0069	Grout at Steel Beam	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 4/A1-9228 Detail 4/A1-9228 shows a fully grouted beam pocket, but does not show details on securing grout to the steel beam, or specify a grout to be used. Please provide details and specs.		SUGGESTION: Webcor recommends SAFP at the steel, cutting CMU around the beam and installation of a UL rated fireproofing assembly at the penetration		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail on 4/A1-9228 has been updated and will be issued in a future Addendum. The Lower Concourse Exit Passageway B1567 composite slab and CMU wall changed to concrete slab and RCW. Refer to the attached SKA-3368. Also, refer to previously issued S1-2252 and S1-3504. In addition, see the attached SKA-3669 for updated composite slab with steel beam, hangers and bracing interface with CMU Wall at the STAIR 502A.			
P1-0070	Steel Flashing at Column	Closed	06/09/2014	06/09/2014	06/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 3/A1-3190 Detail calls out for a 12 ga. steel flashing closure plate within the web of interior cruciform columns, but does not provide details for attachment, or where material is to flow from the flashing (there is a checker plate cap at the top of the column to deflect material from entering the enclosure). Is the 12 ga steel flashing required? If so, please provide details on attachment and draining. If not, please revise detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 12ga steel flashing is supported using metal Z-Grits. Please refer to detail 5/A1-3190 for a cross section through the flashing. Any water the gets past the flashing cap will drain down the flashing closure to the drainage layer beneath the floor finish topping. Refer to the attached SKA-3703.			
P1-0071	Layout for Guardrail	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 1/L1-9665 Provide layout for guardrail and associated stone header.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached SKLA-303.			
P1-0072	C-Channel Support in Mech Shaft 01424	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0073	From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference: 1/A1-7575 This C-channel support is not shown in plan view in the Architectural or Structural drawings. Please provide size and layout.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See structural documents including S1-5000 for slab edge support requirements at openings in the structural slabs.				
P1-0073	C-Channel Support in Mech Shaft 01242	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference: 7/A1-7579 This C-channel support is not shown in plan view in the Architectural or Structural drawings. Please provide size and layout.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See structural documents including S1-5000 for slab edge support requirements at openings in the structural slabs.				
P1-0074	Davit Arm Sockets	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference: 2/A1-3001 Detail calls out for davit arm sockets, but does not provide a detail or specification for the davit arm sockets. Please provide details and specs for the davit arms sockets.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Transformer vaults, davit arm sockets have been deleted at ground floor as requested by SFPUC on July 03, 2014. The drawings will be revised accordingly and issued in a forthcoming ASI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 244 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0075	Angle at Shaw Alley Bridge Topping Slab	Closed	06/11/2014	06/11/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 1/A1-8179 Detail shows an angle behind the deck closure plate (screenshot attached), but does not identify the function of the angle. Please provide the function, size and location of the angle.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See the note on detail 1/A1-8179 which says, "bridge guardrail and soffit assembly omitted for clarity". Refer to detail 3/A1-8156 for the guardrail/soffit assembly. Detail 3/A1-8156 shows the angle behind the deck closure plate supporting the guardrail. The size and location of the angle to be determined by the W-2 system design-build contractor.			
P1-0076	CMU Lateral Ties	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 1/A1-9207 Details call out for lateral ties to support CMU and directs to "ref. to structural." Structural does not appear to provide details for this work. Please provide structural detail for this work.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Lateral ties have been eliminated. Detail shall be updated in future ASI.			
P1-0076.1	Structural Details for Lateral Ties per Detail 1/A1-9207	Void	07/01/2014	07/11/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By:							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0076, Detail 1/A1-9207 Per RFI Response P1-0076, "Lateral ties have been eliminated. Detail shall be updated in future ASI." RFI Response P1-0076 refers to a revised detail to be issued in a future bid package. The detail is required to accurately bid TG07.4 - Concrete Masonry Unit. Please provide the revised detail referenced in RFI Response P1-0076.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
P1-0077	CMU Lateral Ties	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 245 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Scott Shope	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 5/A1-9206 Details call out for lateral ties to support CMU and directs to "ref. to structural." Structural does not appear to provide details for this work. Please provide structural detail for this work.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Lateral ties have been eliminated. Detail shall be updated in future ASI.			
P1-0077.1	Structural Details for Lateral Ties per Detail 5/A1-9206	Void	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>		
From: Webcor Construction LP	Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0077, Detail 5/A1-9206 Per RFI Response P1-0077, "Lateral ties have been eliminated. Detail shall be updated in future ASI." RFI Response P1-0077 refers to a revised detail to be issued in a future bid package. The detail is required to accurately bid TG07.4 - Concrete Masonry Unit. Please provide the revised detail referenced in RFI Response P1-0077.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
P1-0078	Flood Coat of Asphalt	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/21/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP	Scott Shope	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 3/A1-3191 Detail calls out for a "flood coat of asphalt" over foam glass insulation. Please provide the specification of the asphalt flood coat.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The "flood coat of asphalt" was a remnant of the original WPM-1A system build-up which is no longer applicable. Detail 3/A1-3191 has been updated to reflect current train box lid build-up (see attached sketch SKA-3805). Revised drawing A1-3191 will be issued as part of a future ASI.			
P1-0079	Topping Slab in Loading Dock Area	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP	Scott Shope	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 246 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 3/A1-3192 Detail calls out for a traffic topping at the loading dock area, but A1-9523 does not call out the topping slab as a traffic topping. Please confirm the topping slab requirement at this location.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 3/A1-3192 is for a rated assembly in a CMU wall. Floor finishes should not be inferred from this detail. Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.f "The TJPA will reject requests for interpretations or clarification of the Contract Document which can reasonably be derived from a review of the Contract Documents." Turner shall void this RFI and delete it.			
P1-0079.1	Topping Slab and Reinforcement Requirements for Loading Dock 01222	Closed	07/16/2014	07/26/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Sheet A1-9526 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Please confirm Loading Dock 01222 is to receive non-vehicular rated concrete topping slab and reinforcement as called out in Item 4.0 of the A1-9526 Notes.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Areas within the loading dock that have vehicular access will require reinforcement as call out in Item 3.0 BUS DECK LEVEL TOPPING AND CURB. All other areas will receive reinforcement as called out in Item 4.0. Refer to SKA-3895.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 247 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0080	Gantry Crane Support at Transformer Vaults	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 2/L1-7317					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Detail indicates that the architect and structural engineer are to confirm the detail. A1-8717 refers back to Landscape, and structural does not appear to address the issue. Please coordinate landscape, architectural and structural.					TT Response:		
					The gantry equipment is to be supported by concrete blocks over the concrete MFB beams. See attached sketch SKS-0360 for concrete block details at the gantry supports. These details will be added to the structural drawings in a future ASI.		
					PWP Response:		
					1. The concrete block (by structural) which is exposed to the sidewalk should be specified as integral color to match landscape cast in place concrete. Refer to attached SKLA-304.		
					2. TT's sketch SKS-0360 reflects a notch in the concrete block at manhole covers. It should be clarified that in order to avoid cracking and failure of the paving at the notch, that the notch in concrete to occur adjacent to metal lined frame of lift out lids. Metal frame and tray by others. Refer to attached SKLA-304.		
					AAI Response:		
					Gantry support concrete blocks are not a part of TG07.2 except for cast-in dowels as identified by structure. Refer to attached sketches SKA-3694, SKA-3700, SKA-3701 and SKA-3702.		
P1-0080.1	Concrete Block Placement for Gantry Crane Support at Transformer Vaults	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0080, Sketch SKA-0360, Sketch SKA-3694					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per RFI Response P1-0080, Sketch SKS-0360 shows the reinforced concrete block is to be placed directly on top of the structural MFB Beam.					The reinforced concrete block supporting the gantry rails shall be cast on top of the protection board. Refer to details 8 and 9 of A1-9255 issued with ASI-0121.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Per RFI Response P1-0080, Sketch SKA-3694, the reinforced concrete block is placed directly on top of all the following components: the drainage composite and protection board, WPM-1A flashing, and structural MFB.</p> <p>Please clarify if the reinforced concrete block is to be placed directly over the structucal MFB, or on top of drainage composite and protection board. Please revise details to match.</p>						
P1-0080.2	Concrete Mix for Concrete Block at Gantry Crane Support	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0080, Sketch SKS-0360				Confirmed.			
<p>Per RFI Response P1-0080, the gantry equipment is to be supported by a reinforced concrete block as detailed on Sketch SKS-0360, but does not call out the type of concrete mix to use.</p> <p>Specification Section 03 30 02 2.1 does not specifically note a mix for "Concrete Blocks".</p> <p>Please confirm the "All other concrete" mix called out in Specification Section 03 30 02 2.1 is to be used to furnish and install the concrete block referenced in RFI Response P1-0080.</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 249 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0081	Pour Stop at Column	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 1/A1-9211 Detail appears to show a break metal pour stop around the column. Please provide information (material, attachment, size, etc.) of the pour stop.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch SKA-3583 for clarification.		
P1-0082	Dimension of Seismic Joint	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 3/L1-7633 Dimension conflicts with Architectural - Conflicts with 2/A1-8897. Please coordinate landscape and architectural.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Architectural Dimensions generally will govern. Please ask specific questions on conflicts.		
P1-0082.1	Clarification of Siesmic Joints and Curb Dimensions on the Roof Park Level	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0082, Detail 3/L1-7633, Detail 2/A1-8897 RFI Response P1-0082 states, "Architectural Dimensions generally will govern. Please ask specific questions on conflicts." Per Detail 3/L1-7633, the park level seismic joints are 1'-10" and are flanked by 1'-6" curbs. Per Detail 2/A1-8897, the park level seismic joints at GL 10 and GL 20 are 2'-0" and are flanked by 8" curbs. Please confirm the roof park level seismic joint and associated curb dimensions, and coordinate the details.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Architectural Detail 2/A1-8897 governs.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0083	PVC Roofing Substrate Requirement	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Specification Section 07 54 19 3.2A 07 54 19 3.2A requires "the general contractor shall examine substrates, areas, and conditions" with the installer for compliance with the contract documents. Please remove the requirement for the general contractor to verify existing conditions with subcontractor. Subcontractor is solely responsible to verify and accept existing conditions prior to commencing work.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Contract Documents refer to the Contractor defined as the General Contractor/Construction Manager (CMGC) in the TJPA/CMGC Agreement for responsibility to complete the Work and for coordination of the Work, not to individual subcontractors that are contracted to the CMGC. The specification is correct.		
P1-0083.1	Additional Review of PVC Substrate Requirement	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	09/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Ray Quesada				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0083, Specification Section 07 54 19 3.2A As stated in RFI Response P1-0083, "The Contract Documents refer to the Contractor defined as the General Contractor/Construction Manager (CMGC) in the TJPA/CMGC Agreement for responsibility to complete the Work and for coordination of the Work, not to individual subcontractors that are contracted to the CMGC. The specification is correct." Per the contract, the CMGC verifies compliance of the work with the contract documents via the QA/QC process at the time of installation. Additional review of the work to reverify conformance with the contract documents as set forth in Specification Section 07 54 19 3.2A is an added service. Please confirm TJPA intends to have this added service to CM/GC's contract incorporated into the work.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The TJPA does not agree that what is required in this specification section is an added service. The CM/GC is ultimately responsible for the quality of the entire project. If the CM/GC wishes to assign or delegate any responsibility to a subcontractor related to quality control, that is your prerogative.		
P1-0084	Attachment Details for Linear Supply Air Diffuser	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	Reference: 5/A1-9040. Please provide attachment details for 2" linear supply air diffuser					The linear supply air diffuser shall be attached to the plenum above it, as per manufacturer's details and recommendations.	
P1-0085	Trench Drain Type 1	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 1/L1-7318 There does not appear to be a specification for the trench drain body, grate, or grate support. Please provide spec.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to specification section 05 60 00, 2.3 D and E.				
P1-0085.1	Specification for Continuous Metal Liner in Detail 1/L1-7318	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response 0085, Specification Section 05 60 00 2.3D & 2.3E, Detail 1/L1-7318 As stated in RFI Response 0085, "Refer to specification section 05 60 00, 2.3 D and E." Detail 1/L1-7318 calls out for a continuous metal liner. Specification Section 05 60 00 does not appear to provide a specification for this metal liner. Please provide a specification for the metal liner called out in Detail 1/L1-7318.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to specification section 05 60 00, 2.3 N.				
P1-0086	Trench Drain Type 2	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0086	Specification for Continuous Metal Liner in Detail 2/L1-7318	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>REQUEST: Reference: 2/L1-7318 There does not appear to be a specification for the trench drain body, grate, or grate support. Please provide spec.</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to specification section 05 60 00, 2.3 D and E.</p>							
P1-0086.1	Specification for Continuous Metal Liner in Detail 2/L1-7318	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0086, Specification Section 05 60 00, 2.3D & 2.3E, Detail 2/L1-7318 As stated in RFI Response P1-0086, "Refer to specification section 05 60 00, 2.3 D and E." Detail 2/L1-7318 calls out for a continuous metal liner. Specification Section 05 60 00 does not appear to provide a specification for this metal liner. Please provide a specification for the continuous metal liner called out in Detail 1/L1-7318.</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to specification section 05 60 00, 2.3 N.</p>							
P1-0087	Trench Drain at Property Line	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference: 3/L1-7318 There does not appear to be a specification for the trench drain body, grate, or grate support. Please provide spec.</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to specification section 05 60 00, 2.3 D and E.</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 253 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0087.1	Specification for Continuous Metal Liner in Detail 3/L1-7318	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0087, Specification Section 05 60 00, 2.3D & 2.3E, Detail 3/L1-7318					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
As stated in RFI Response P1-0087, "Refer to specification section 05 60 00, 2.3 D and E."					Refer to specification section 05 60 00, 2.3 N.		
Detail 3/L1-7318 calls out for a continuous metal liner. Specification Section 05 60 00 does not appear to provide a specification for this metal liner. Please provide a specification for the continuous metal liner called out in Detail 3/L1-7318.					Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.f "The TJPA will reject requests for interpretations or clarification of the Contract Document which can reasonably be derived from a review of the Contract Documents."		
					Turner shall void this RFI and delete it.		
P1-0088	CMU Support Wall at Seismic Joint	Closed	06/11/2014	06/11/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 1/L1-7613					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Detail does not agree with what is on 1/A1-8898. Please coordinate drawings (waterproofing, adj. wall/curb, topping slab, etc.)					See architectural drawings for seismic joint; insulation and waterproofing transitions and protection slab.		
					See structural drawings for structural wall, structural slab and concrete footing.		
					See attached SKLA-0310 landscape elements and SKA-310 for architectural elements.		
P1-0089	WPM-6	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 4/A1-7511.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Detail calls out WPM-6. No specification for WPM-6 has been provided. Please provide a specification for WPM-6.					Detail as been revised and waterproofing membrane has been removed. Refer to SKA-3718, SKA-3719, SKA-3720, SKA-3721.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 254 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0090	Waterproofing soffit	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 4/A1-7511 Detail shows waterproofing at the top of soffit below the stairs. The stair must be installed before soffit, which will prevent access to the top of soffit for waterproofing. Please revise design to allow installation of waterproofing (sheet metal)			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail as been revised and waterproofing membrane has been removed. Refer to SKA-3718, SKA-3719, SKA-3720, SKA-3721.		
P1-0091	Plywood Installed with Soil	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 2/L1-9665 Detail calls out for 3/4" plywood to be installed directly in contact with soil. Please provide specification for plywood.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 3/4" plywood is temporary protection. It is not necessary to be treated or finished surfaced.		
P1-0091.1	Specification for Plywood Installed with Soil per Detail 2/L1-9665	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0091, Detail 2/L1-9665 As stated in RFI Response P1-0091, "3/4" plywood is temporary protection. It is not necessary to be treated or finished surfaced." The response to RFI P1-0091 does not appear to provide the requested specification. Please provide a specification for the 3/4" plywood called out in Detail 2/L1-9665.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 3/4" Shop Grade Type 1 is the specification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 255 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0092	Rated Soffit	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: reference: 4/A1-7511 Detail calls out for a rated soffit below the stairs, but the top end of the soffit does not appear to be a rated condition. Please confirm the end of the soffit does not need to be rated.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> In the attached sketches the detail is revised. The soffit does not need to be a fire rated soffit. Refer to the attached SKA-3718, SKA-3719, SKA-3720, SKA-3721.				
P1-0093	Fire rated assembly	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: reference: 1/A1-7575 Is this a fire rated assembly? Code calls out for stl. to be independently rated, does TS meet this requirement?							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail has been revised. Refer to the attached SKA-3685.				
P1-0094	Elevator Deferral	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: reference: 1/A1-7589A The elevator in this detail has been deferred. Is the elevator call lantern on this deleted elevator to be roughed in as part of Phase 1? If so, please provide rough-in information. If not, please revise details.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The elevator will be roughed-in as part of Phase 1. Refer to sheet A1-7576 & A1-7577 for rough-in information.				
P1-0094.1	Additional Information For Elevator Deferral	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference: P1-0094, 1/A1-7589A							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See response to RFI P1-0095.1.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 256 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0094:	The elevator will be roughed-in as part of Phase 1. Refer to sheet A1-7576 & A1-7577 for rough-in information. RFI P1-0094 provides direction to rough-in the elevator call lanterns as part of Phase 1 work. The elevator contractor has not been selected for the deferred elevators, and there may be a conflict having the phase 1 elevator contractor provide rough-in if the deferred elevators are installed by a different future elevator contractor. Please confirm response to RFI P1-0094						
P1-0095	Elevator Deferral From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore Co-Author: REQUEST: 2/A1-7589A The elevator in this detail has been deferred. Is the elevator call lantern on this deleted elevator to be roughed in as part of Phase 1? If so, please provide rough-in information. If not, please revise details.	Closed To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				Yes, the elevator will be roughed-in as part of Phase 1. Refer to sheet A1-7576 & A1-7577 for rough-in information.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 257 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0095.1	Additional Information Elevator Deferral	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: P1-0095, 2/A1-7589A RFI P1-0095 Response: "Yes, the elevator will be roughed-in as part of Phase 1. Refer to sheet A1-7576 & A1-7577 for rough-in information." RFI P1-0095 provides direction to rough-in the elevator call lanterns as part of Phase 1 work. The elevator contractor has not been selected for the deferred elevators, and there may be a conflict having the phase 1 elevator contractor provide rough-in if the deferred elevators are installed by a different future elevator contractor. Please confirm response to RFI P1-0095.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, this is the direction from TJPA to the WOJV and PCPA teams.	
P1-0096	Framing Material	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 4/-A1-7823 Specs indicate that drawings will provide size and spacing of framing material, dwg does not show size or max spacing. Please provide size and spacing of Z girts.			SUGGESTION: Size of horizontal girts is shown on 4/A1-7823 as 2" depth. Vertical spacing of Z girts to match panelization pattern of W-5 cladding.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Size of horizontal girts is shown on 4/A1-7823 as 2" depth. Vertical spacing of Z girts to match panelization pattern of W-5 cladding.	
P1-0096.1	Information for Vertical Z Girts	Closed	07/09/2014	07/19/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0096 As stated in RFI Response P1-0096, "Size of horizontal girts is shown on 4/A1-7823 as 2" depth. Vertical spacing of Z girts to match panelization pattern of W-5 cladding." Please provide the information requested and referenced in RFI P1-0096 regarding vertical Z girt adjacent to door openings.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to sheets A1-7845 and A1-7846 issued as part of the Main Package IFC on 03/31/14.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 258 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0097	Bench Details	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 1/A1-9061 Detail calls out for benches, but does not provide installation details. Please provide bench details.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As per specification section 10 51 13, benches are manufactured product and need to be installed/anchored in accordance with manufacturer's standard details. There is a basis for design product in the specification. However, through the bidding process this may not be the product that is provided on the Project. The specification calls for the benches to be bolted to floor with galvanized expansion fasteners.		
P1-0097.1	Clarification for Choice in Bench Anchors	Closed	07/09/2014	07/19/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0097, Specification Section 10 51 13 As stated in RFI Response P1-0097, "As per specification section 10 51 13, benches are manufactured product and need to be installed/anchored in accordance with manufacturer's standard details. There is a basis for design product in the specification. However, through the bidding process this may not be the product that is provided on the Project. The specification calls for the benches to be bolted to floor with galvanized expansion fasteners." RFI Response P1-0097.1 indicates that the bench is to be anchored per the manufacturer's standard details, then goes on to require bolting to the floor with galvanized expansion fasteners. Please clarify whether the manufacturer's details are to be used or galvanized expansion anchors.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per Specification Section 10 51 13 / 2.5, benches shall be "bolted to the floor with galvanized expansion fasteners." However, if the manufacturer or Contractor recommend an alternate attachment detail, the CMGC shall submit an RFI with information on the alternate proposed fastening method for the TJPA Representative's review and comment. In addition, on the bench side of the bolt, the bench manufacturer shall provide for fastening of the bench to the floor.		
P1-0098	Locker Base Detail	Void	06/11/2014	06/21/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0099.2	Level 1 Paint Finish Requirements	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0099.1, GA-214-10 RFI Response P1-0099.1 confirms a Level 1 finish is to be furnished, installed and painted on the interior of the elevator shafts, however does not provide the requested paint finish requirements. Per industry standard (see attached GA-214-10), Level 1 finish includes embedment of tape in joint compound, but tape and fastener heads need not be covered with joint compound. Per 09 91 00 3.2 I, joints and screw heads are to be covered with joint compound and sanded smooth and flush with adjacent surfaces (i.e. a higher finish level than Level 1). Please provide the requested paint finish requirements referenced in RFI P1-0099.1.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Gypsum Board Finish ȷ In the elevator shafts, provide Level 3 finish. Paint Finish requirements shall be as specified in section 09 91 00 (Painting) item 3.2.I. Paint shall be per products specified in Paint Finish Schedule for exterior surfaces (for Portland Cement Plaster, . . .) 100 percent Acrylic Flat - Refer to section 09 91 00, item 3.7.A. Color to be selected in the future.				
P1-0099.3	VOID	Void	08/14/2014	08/24/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
P1-0100	Floor Misabeled	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: 3/A1-7513 Floor is mislabeled as "galv steel pour stop," Please revise note.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The note has been revised. Refer to the attached SKA-3686.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 261 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0101	Access Door	Void	06/11/2014	06/21/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: reference: A1-7427 Details 1 & 2 call out for an access door, but no door number, door material, or hardware information is provided. Please provide information on this access door.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
P1-0102	Door Callout	Void	06/11/2014	06/21/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: reference:1/A1-3001 Note calls out for a door, however no Door is shown should this just opening? Sim E/A1-9235							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
P1-0103	Decking Support Architectural vs Structural Coordination	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: reference: 2/A1-9229 Detail shows decking supported on a C-channel wedge anchored into the adjacent CMU. Structural shows decking penetrating CMU, please coordinate arch vs. structural.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For beam end connection at continuous CMU wall, where beam penetrates wall, refer to 12/S1-9001. Composite slab stops at face of continuous CMU wall, wall reinforcing is tied into slab and deck is supported by continuous angle, refer to attached SKS-0368. Architectural details on A1-9229 have been updated to correspond with structural details at CMU to composite slab connection. Refer to attached SKA-3752.			
P1-0104	Wide Flange assembly Details	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST:							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 262 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	1/A1-7550 Code requires structural steel members to be fire proofed independently of adj. walls. Is the top of wide flange in this detail a rated UL assembly?						
P1-0105	Plate over Wide Flange	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: reference: 1/A1-7550 Detail indicates the plate over the wide flange is identified on structural. Structural does not appear to call out this plate. Please provide information (size, attachment, etc.) for steel plate.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail as been revised. Refer to the attached SKA-3687.			
P1-0106	Conflicting Details	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: reference: 3/A1-9229 Detail appears to conflict with assembly shown on S1-2252, please coordinate arch and struct.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please resubmit the question with more specific comments. It is not apparent what you are referring to.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 263 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0106R	Composite Deck Type S1 Support	Closed	07/16/2014	07/26/2014	07/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Detail 1/S1-2252 (Attached), Detail 10/S1-9001, Details 2 & 3/A1-9229, Sheet A1-8662 Fire Protection Matrix & Schedule (All from IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				TT Response:			
Per Detail 1/S1-2252 (Attached), Composite Deck Type S1 extends through the face of the northerly CMU wall, and is supported by this wall (see attached). This condition is shown on Detail 10/S1-9001 (direction to this detail is given on 4/S1-5032).				For the exit passageway composite deck structural steel framing, refer to response to RFI P1-0103. Updated detail 10 of S1-9001 was issued with ASI-0121.			
Details 2 & 3/A1-9229 show this condition as being supported by structural steel framing which does not show on structural drawings and fireproofed which would not be required per Sheet A1-8662 Fire Protection Matrix and Schedule. Please coordinate architectural and structural drawings to match.				AAI Response:			
				Fireproofing is required for the exit passageway composite deck structural steel framing, beams, and hangers. Refer to attached SKA-3905. Refer also to A1-9229 and A1-9230 issued with ASI-0121.			
<hr/>							
P1-0107	Elevation coordination	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
reference: 1/SG1-6000 and 3/A1-8719				The sheet A1-8719, referenced in the RFI, details the waterproofing at signage pylon footings (detail 2) and monument boulder footings (detail 3).			
Elevations need to be coordinated with details on 3/A1-8719. Structural does not detail these footings. Architect to verify the elevation between top of structure and finish surface. This applies to interior and exterior signs				For the signage pylon and monument boulder footings sizes, elevations and locations please refer to the Ground Floor slab edge plan sheets (A1-2862 to A1-2867). The attached SKA-3700, SKA-3724 and SKA-3725, based on slab edge drawings, provide signage and monument boulder footing updates at Zones 2, 4 and 7 (at red clouds). Refer to Landscape drawings for general locations and details of signage pylons and monument boulders. For signage types, refer to Signage drawings			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0108	Waterproofing System Spec	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 07 54 19 2.2A 07 54 19 2.2A specifies only Sika Sarafil Waterproofing systems, or substitute products of another manufacturer for RF-1. Webcor intends to require all manufactures be approved via QBD prior to bid. If this is not acceptable, please provide specific manufacturers and products which are acceptable to use.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Request for Substitution process established by TJPA and WOJV as outlined in the General Conditions specification section 00 04 40 is the process to be utilized for Bidder proposed substitutions to the Basis of Design. In the Substitution Request, the bidder shall provide the information that outlines how the product is equivalent for the JPA representative's review. The QBD process is not the correct process, because it will leave the burden for researching how the product is equivalent on the TJPA team rather than the bidder and manufacture who are the experts on their proposed products.		
<hr/>							
P1-0108.1	Product/Manufacturer Substitution for PVC Roofing	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0108, Specification Section 00 04 40 RFI Response P1-0108 states, "The Request for Substitution process established by TJPA and WOJV as outlined in the General Conditions specification section 00 04 40 is the process to be utilized for Bidder proposed substitutions to the Basis of Design." Specification Section 00 04 40 states, "Contractor will be provided a period of 10 days after the date of each Trade Package award for submission of data substantiating a request for a substitution with an "or equal" item." The specification section referenced in RFI Response P1-0108 indicates that substitutions are addressed post-bid. Per the meeting between TJPA, PCPA, Turner, and Webcor-Obayashi on 7/17/14, the response to RFI P1-0108 is to be revised to state that the QBD process is to be used for suggested alternate materials/manufacturers pre-bid.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Your understanding is not correct. TJPA will alter Specification section 00 40 40 to adjust the current process.		
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 266 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0109.1	Product/Manufacturer Substitution for Site Dampproofing	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0109, Specification Section 00 04 40					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
RFI Response P1-0109 states, "The Request for Substitution process established by TJPA and WOJV as outlined in the General Conditions specification section 00 04 40 is the process to be utilized for Bidder proposed substitutions to the Basis of Design."					Your understanding is not correct. TJPA will alter Specification section 00 40 40 to adjust the current process.		
Specification Section 00 04 40 states, "Contractor will be provided a period of 10 days after the date of each Trade Package award for submission of data substantiating a request for a substitution with an "or equal" item."							
The specification section referenced in RFI Response P1-0109 indicates that substitutions are addressed post-bid.							
Per the meeting between TJPA, PCPA, Turner, and Webcor-Obayashi on 7/17/14, the response to RFI P1-0109 is to be revised to state that the QBD process is to be used for suggested alternate materials/manufacturers pre-bid.							
RFI Response P1-0109 has not been revised.							
Please confirm the QBD process is to be used to suggestion of alternate materials/manufacturers.							

P1-0110	Anchoring Details for Bicycle Sign	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 1/SG1-6202					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please provide anchoring details for the post mounted bicycle directional sign shown on detail 1 / SG1-6202					Please refer to SG1-6202, General Sheet Notes, Item 'D' - "SIGN SUB-CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE SIGN MOUNTING LOCATIONS/SURFACE CONDITION REQUIREMENTS AND METHOD OF ATTACHMENTS TO TJPA REPRESENTATIVE". Sub-Contractor's proposed anchoring details (proposed 'methods of attachment') are to be included as a component of the required signage submittal/shop drawing package.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0110.1	Signage Mounting Design Requirements	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0110, SG1 Drawings, Division 10 Specifications					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please refer to SG1-6202, "General Sheet Notes, Item 'D' - "SIGN SUB-CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE SIGN MOUNTING LOCATIONS/SURFACE CONDITION REQUIREMENTS AND METHOD OF ATTACHMENTS TO TJPA REPRESENTATIVE". Sub-Contractor's proposed anchoring details (proposed 'methods of attachment') are to be included as a component of the required signage submittal/shop drawing package."					Please reject and void this RFI as it is too vague and not possible to address.		
SG1 Drawings and Division 10 Specifications do not appear to provide mounting design requirements (i.e. allowable point loads, mounting into concrete over geosynthetic fill, mounting into waterproofing, etc.). Please provide design requirements for mounting all signage.					The previous response to P1-0110 makes it clear that mounting of the sign is the contractor's responsibility for this performance based item. In addition, the Contract Documents show signage mounting for many signs in various locations. If the contractor has a question about a particular location, the RFI should refer to a specific location and detail.		
P1-0111	Callout on L1-9612	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 3/L1-9612					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
"DECK BOARD TYP" is called out twice, one of which is pointing to a boulder. Please provide correct callout.					The callout pointing to the boulder should be labeled boulder. Refer to attached SKLA-305		
P1-0112	Concrete Cure	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 32 34 10 3.3 B3					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Requires that concrete cure for 28 days above 70 degrees Fahrenheit, which will require heating of the concrete for a month. Is this what TJPA wants to do?					Omit requirement 3.3 B3. Refer to curing requirements for concrete substrates as specified in other sections, as applicable.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0113	Incorrect Detail on A1-6014 and A1-6016	Closed	06/11/2014	06/11/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPAndrew KitchenTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: A1-6014 & A1-6016				Detail reference has been revised. Refer to the attached SKA-3689 & SKA-3690.			
A1-6014 and A1-6016 call out 7/A1-8717 at the detail at center of street. This appears to be the incorrect detail, and should be 5/A1-8717. Please revise.							
P1-0114	Steel Plate Coordination on Architectural Drawings	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPAndrew KitchenTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: A1-8881, A1-8717 & A1-8710				Protection slab sheets have been revised to match details. Note that the details are typical and the protection slab drawings show extents of steel plate at ground level. Refer to SKA-3699 for typical waterproofing note at roadway to train box lid and sketches SKA-3693, 3695, 3696, 3697, and 3698.			
2/A1-8710, 5/A1-8717 and 3/A1-8881 requires 1" steel plate under roadways and curbs below roadways. A1-2922 through A1-2927 omit a significant amount of plate shown on Beale, Fremont, First, Minna, and Natoma Streets by the details. Please revise the details or plan sheets to agree with each other.							
P1-0114.1	Metal Plate Omissions for Ground Level Protection Slab	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPTram NguyenTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0114 Sketch SKA-3693 Sketch SKA-3695 Sketch SKA-3696 Sketch SKA-3697 Sketch SKA-3698 Detail 2/SKA-3538 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14)				1) Correct, metal plates are not required at locations noted, only concrete protection slab as indicated on SKA-3693.			
Per RFI Response P1-0114: 1. Sketch SKA-3693 does not show metal plates at the following Gridlines: C/2 and G/4. 2. Sketch SKA-3695 does not show metal plates at the following Gridlines: G/9.9, G/10.1, G/12, and F/9.				2) Correct, metal plates are not required at locations noted, only concrete protection slab as indicated on SKA-3695.			
				3) Correct, metal plate is not required at locations noted, only concrete protection slab as indicated on SKA-3696.			
				4) Correct, metal plates are not required at locations noted - these are interior locations,			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 269 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>3. Sketch SKA-3696 does not show a metal plate at Gridline G/16</p> <p>4. Sketch SKA-3697 does not show metal plates at the following Gridlines: D/19.9, D/20.1, D/21, D22, D24, F/19.9, F/20.1, F/21, F/22, and F/24</p> <p>5. Sketch SKA-3698 does not show metal plates at any location.</p> <p>However, Sketches SKA-3693, SKA-3695, SKA-3696, and SKA-3697 show metal plates are to be installed at signigicant amounts of similar conditions.</p> <p>Please note Detail 2/SKA-3538 of ASI 119 shows metal plates at GL G/10.1 but steel plates are omitted on Sketch-3695 at this location</p> <p>Please confirm that only locations identified as having metal plates on Sketches SKA-3693, SKA-3695, SKA-3696, and SKA-3697 require metal plates.</p>						
P1-0115	Electrical Continuity and Grounding	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: 05 50 00				Grounding of metal fabrications is required for systems as follows:			
05 50 00 1.1 A4 indicates that electrical continuity and grounding for metal fabrications is included in 05 50 00, but give no further information on what is required. Please confirm no grounding of metal fabrications is required, or provide the grounding requirements.				1) System includes internal elements that require bonding (such as the dispenser bollards). Refer to product installation requirements.			
				2) System includes equipment which are called out to be bonded on the drawings (i.e. metal in the utility vaults). Refer to notes on the drawings.			
				3) Bonding is required by code to a specific application/use. Bond in accordance with applicable codes.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 270 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0116	Perm-A-Barrier VPS Contractors	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference: 07 13 14 2.3 B1				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
07 13 14 2.3 B1 specifies Grace "Perm-A-Barrier VPS" or approved equal for WPM-10A. In an attempt to prevent single sourcing, and assure bidders only bid approved materials, Webcor intends to require any alternate manufacture be approved via QBD prior to bid. If this is not acceptable, please provide alternate manufacturers/products which are acceptable to use.				The Request for Substitution process established by TJPA and WOJV as outlined in the General Conditions specification section 00 04 40 is the process to be utilized for Bidder proposed substitutions to the Basis of Design. In the Substitution Request, the bidder shall provide the information that outlines how the product is equivalent for the JPA representative's review. The QBD process is not the correct process, because it will leave the burden for researching how the product is equivalent on the TJPA team rather than the bidder and manufacture who are the experts on their proposed products.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 271 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0116.1	Product/Manufacturer Substitution for Self-Adhered Sheet Waterproofing	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0116, Specification Section 00 04 40					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
RFI Response P1-0116 states, "The Request for Substitution process established by TJPA and WOJV as outlined in the General Conditions specification section 00 04 40 is the process to be utilized for Bidder proposed substitutions to the Basis of Design."					Your understanding is not correct. TJPA will alter Specification section 00 40 40 to adjust the current process.		
Specification Section 00 04 40 states, "Contractor will be provided a period of 10 days after the date of each Trade Package award for submission of data substantiating a request for a substitution with an "or equal" item."							
The specification section referenced in RFI Response P1-0116 indicates that substitutions are addressed post-bid.							
Per the meeting between TJPA, PCPA, Turner, and Webcor-Obayashi on 7/17/14, the response to RFI P1-0116 is to be revised to state that the QBD process is to be used for suggested alternate materials/manufacturers pre-bid.							
RFI Response P1-0116 has not been revised.							
Please confirm the QBD process is to be used to suggestion of alternate materials/manufacturers.							
P1-0117	Waterproofing Systems	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 07 13 54 2.1 A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
07 13 54 2.1 A specifies Sika Sarnafil Waterproofing Systems, or other manufacturers that meet or exceed their physical property specifications for WPM-3. In an attempt to prevent single sourcing, and assure bidders only bid approved materials, Webcor intends to require any alternate manufactures be approved via QBD prior to bid. If this is not acceptable, please provide alternate					The Request for Substitution process established by TJPA and WOJV, as outlined in the General Conditions specification section 00 04 40 is the process to be utilized for Bidder proposed substitutions to the Basis of Design. In the Substitution Request, the bidder shall provide the information that outlines how the product is equivalent for the JPA representative's review. The QBD process is not the correct process, because it will leave the		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>manufacturers/products which are acceptable to use.</div> <div>burden for researching how the product is equivalent on the TJPA team rather than the bidder and manufacturer who are the experts on their proposed products.</div>							
P1-0117.1	Product/Manufacturer for PVC Waterproofing	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Co-Author:</div>			<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div>REQUEST: SUGGESTION:</div> <div>REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0117, Specification Section 00 04 40</div> <div>RFI Response P1-0117 states, "The Request for Substitution process established by TJPA and WOJV as outlined in the General Conditions specification section 00 04 40 is the process to be utilized for Bidder proposed substitutions to the Basis of Design."</div> <div>Specification Section 00 04 40 states, "Contractor will be provided a period of 10 days after the date of each Trade Package award for submission of data substantiating a request for a substitution with an "or equal" item."</div> <div>The specification section referenced in RFI Response P1-0117 indicates that substitutions are addressed post-bid.</div> <div>Per the meeting between TJPA, PCPA, Turner, and Webcor-Obayashi on 7/17/14, the response to RFI P1-0117 is to be revised to state that the QBD process is to be used for suggested alternate materials/manuffacturers pre-bid.</div> <div>RFI Response P1-0117 has not been revised.</div> <div>Please confirm the QBD process is to be used to suggestion of alternate materials/manufacturers.</div>			<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Your understanding is not correct. TJPA will alter Specification section 00 40 40 to adjust the current process.</div>				
P1-0118	Thermoplastic Water Tank Liner Manufacturer	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>			<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 273 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 07 13 55 2.1 07 13 55 2.1 does not provide a specific manufacturer for thermoplastic water tank liners. Webcor intends to require all manufactures be approved via QBD prior to bid. If this is not acceptable, please provide specific manufacturers and products which are acceptable to use.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Manufactures that meet the Performance requirements specified in the referenced specification section are acceptable. The successful bidder shall submit the product the meets the specification requirements as a shop drawing submission. The QBD process is not the correct process for determining quality of products. If WOJV wants to vet products during the bid process, than utilize the Request for Substitution process established by TJPA and WOJV as outlined in the General Conditions specification section 00 04 40.			
P1-0118.1	Product/Manufacturer for Thermoplastic Water Tank Liners	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0118, Specification Section 00 04 40 RFI Response P1-0118 states, "The Request for Substitution process established by TJPA and WOJV as outlined in the General Conditions specification section 00 04 40 is the process to be utilized for Bidder proposed substitutions to the Basis of Design." Specification Section 00 04 40 states, "Contractor will be provided a period of 10 days after the date of each Trade Package award for submission of data substantiating a request for a substitution with an "or equal" item." The specification section referenced in RFI Response P1-0118 indicates that substitutions are addressed post-bid. Per the meeting between TJPA, PCPA, Turner, and Webcor-Obayashi on 7/17/14, the response to RFI P1-0118 is to be revised to state that the QBD process is to be used for suggested alternate materials/manufacturers pre-bid.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Your understanding is not correct. TJPA will alter Specification section 00 40 40 to adjust the current process.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 274 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i><u>Number</u></i>	<i><u>Subject</u></i>	<i><u>Status</u></i>	<i><u>Date Created</u></i>	<i><u>Date Required</u></i>	<i><u>Date Answered</u></i>	<i><u>Cost Impact</u></i>	<i><u>Proceed</u></i>
<div>RFI Response P1-0118 has not been revised.</div> <div>Please confirm the QBD process is to be used to suggestion of alternate materials/manufacturers.</div>							
P1-0119	GFRC Shown at W-13	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 1/A1-8479 Is the future GFRC shown in 1/A1-8479 provided as part of phase 1? Will it remain GFRC or be changed to a different material?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The future GFRC cover panel shown on 1/A1-8479 is not part of Phase 1 work.			
P1-0120	Light Sculpture and Laminated Glass	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-9375 The W-13 glass light sculpture is shown on detail 1/A1-9375. Is this light sculpture to be deleted from the drawings or will it be part of our scope of work? Laminated glass is shown on detail 2/A1-9375. Is this laminated glass to be deleted from the drawings or will it be part of our scope of work?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The light sculpture and all of its component parts, as shown on A1-9375 and W-13 system drawings and specifications, have NOT been deleted and remain part of the work.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 275 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0121	Mock-up Locations in A Drawings	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference: 08 88 53 Provide location in Architectural drawings for extent of mock-ups. Section 1.9.O does not list a valid location for extent. Section 1.9.O shows 084426A references for mock-up extent.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For W-12 mock-up, see 2/A1-8451. For W-13 mock-up, see 1/A1-8476. The question is noted in the attachment, but not included above.				
P1-0122	Contractor's Proprietary System Language for Glass Floors	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference: 08 88 53 and 08 44 33 (TG08.2/TG08.10 - Design/Build Glazing Systems dated 5/16/2014) Add design build language similar to that of 08 44 33 Section 1.1.A.25 to allow for contractor's proprietary system.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Design Build language extracted from Spec Section 08 44 33 paragraph 1.1.A.25 has been added to Spec Section 08 88 53 paragraph 1.1.A.21 and will be issued in the forthcoming ASI for the VE round of Design Build package submission.				
P1-0123	Location of Bearing Supports	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference: 8/S1-6010, 1 and 2/S1-6020 Confirm location of the bearing supports. The table on 8/S1-6010 and details 1 and 2/S1-6020 do not match. Clarify.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The location of the bearing supports is clearly indicated on the drawings. We have updated the details 1 and 2 to add missing information. If there is any specific information missing, please let us know.				
P1-0123.1	Updated Detail for Bearing Plate	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference: RFI P1-0123, 8/S1-6010, 1, and 2/S1-6020							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Updated drawings will be submitted with ASI 0120				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 276 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>As stated in RFI Response P1-0123: "The location of the bearing supports is clearly indicated on the drawings. We have updated the details 1 and 2 to add missing information. If there is any specific information missing, please let us know."</p> <p>Please provide updated details to clearly show the size and dimensions of the bearing plate on 1 & 2/S1-6020.</p>						
P1-0124	Column Contact Point 7/S1-6010	Closed	06/11/2014	06/11/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	Reference: 7/S1-6010		Two contact points are required at each column in order to keep the collar framing around the light column from rotating. These details will be updated in a future Addendum.				
	Detail 7/S1-6010 shows 1 point of contact per column. Confirm the 1 contact point is sufficient to keep the collar framing around the light column from rotating.						
P1-0124.1	Column Contact Detail	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	Reference: RFI P1-0124, 7/S1-601		Updated drawings will be submitted with ASI 0120 dated July 11, 2014.				
	RFI P1-0124 Response: "Two contact points are required at each column in order to keep the collar framing around the light column from rotating. These details will be updated in a future Addendum."						
	Response to P1-0124 refers to a revised detail to be issued in a future bid package. The detail is required to accurately bid the associated trade package. Please provide the revised detail referenced in the RFI response.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 277 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0125	W-12 Anchoring	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: 4 and 6/S1-6034 and 4/A1-8454				Details 4 and 6 on S1-6034 are correct. Architectural details will be revised in a future package.			
Detail 4 and 6/S1-6034 show the W-12 bolting to the box beam while detail 4/A1-8454 show the glass floor attached to the box beam with an angle. Clarify W-12 connection to box beam.							
P1-0125.1	W-12 Anchoring Detail	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: RFI P1-0125, 4 and 6/S1-6034, and 4/A1-8454				See SKA-3823 attached. The revised sheet will be issued with the DB Glazing ASI 0120 dated July 11, 2014.			
RFI P1-0125 Response: "Details 4 and 6 on S1-6034 are correct. Architectural details will be revised in a future package."							
Response to P1-0124 refers to a revised detail to be issued in a future bid package. The detail is required to accurately bid the associated trade package. Please provide the revised detail referenced in the RFI response.							
P1-0126	Horizontal Life Line Stanchion	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: 1 and 2/WW1-5001 and 4/A1-8860				1. Detail 1/WW1-5001 shows the life line condition, detail 2 is for standalone point tie-back. Please note that the ends of the life line assembly are the same as the tie-back.			
Details 1 and 2/WW1-5001 shows typical details for a prefabricated horizontal life line support however Architectural floor plans refer to 4/A1-8860 for typical horizontal life line stanchion detail.				2. Refer to structural for structural connections, not architectural or façade maintenance, if an additional detail is required please indicate.			
1. Clarify which stanchion is to be used to support the horizontal life line system				3. Detail 4/A1-8860 indicates typical waterproofing.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 278 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>2. Clarify the means of connection to the WF beam. Detail 4/A1-8860 shows a bolted connection and 1/WW1-5001 calls for a welded connection.</div> <div>3. Provide waterproofing and flashing details for the stanchion.</div>						
P1-0126.1	Fall Arrest Stanchions.	Closed	08/05/2014	08/15/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 2/WW1-5001 and 4/A1-8860 Per response to RFI P1-0126 detail 4/A1-8860 is to be used for typical waterproofing. Detail 4 shows the fall arrest stanchion waterproofed on top and both sides with flashing. Should the fall arrest stanchion be completely flashed it may get damaged due to use of lanyard creating an entry point for water intrusion. Please confirm the fall arrest stanchions should have flashing on all sides		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, the fall arrest stanchions should have flashing on all sides.				
P1-0127	Davit Base Plate Connection	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 5/A1-8860 and 12/S1-7600 Detail 5/A1-8860 shows the davit base plate bolted to the WF however 12/S1-7600 shows the davit base plate welded to the WF. Please clarify method of attaching the davit base plate to the WF.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Follow Structural drawing, 12/S1-7600.				
P1-0128	Spec Section 11 24 23	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 11 24 23 For the referenced Specification Section, what does subsection 3.8 cover that subsection 3.6 does not?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The subsections are different. Upon further review it has been determined subsection 3.6 shall be deleted. Subsection 3.8 will remain with no changes.				
P1-0129	Seismic Joint Coordination Between A Drawings	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-8880, A1-2302, A1-7001 Per A1-8880, WJC8 and RJC1 are located between Stair 201 and the adjacent existing building. Per A1-2302 and A1-7001, there does not appear to be a seismic joint at this location. Please revise so that drawings match each other.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Expansion Joints have been deleted. See Attached Sketch SKA-3688.				
<hr/>							
P1-0130	Carboline Protective Coatings Primer	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 07 81 00 3.1.B, A1-8662, A1-8663 Per the attached letter, Skanska will furnish and install Carboline Protective Coatings Primer on all steel to receive Intumescent Fireproofing. Bidders will be directed to assume the steel will be received with this coating, and they will use compatible coatings, or perform all necessary surface prep to use a different system. Per 07 81 00 3.1 B fireproofing cannot begin prior to completion of roofing. This will not work with the construction schedule. Please confirm that FP-1 and RFLE do not exist, or provide spec and location (see A1-8662 & A1-8663)		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The construction schedule and sequence of construction is the responsibility of the CM/GC. FP-1 and RFLE-3 indicated in the fireproofing Schedule of Sheet A1-8662 are clearly indicated in the description column of the schedule. FP-1 is a fireproofing method covered in RFLE#3 document approved by SFFD/DBI . RFLE-3 is a method of calculation also covered in RFLE#3 document also approved by SFFD/DBI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 280 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0131	Fire Blankets Shown at Ceiling Locations	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-8890, 07 09 13 The contract documents show fire blankets within the ceiling space at several locations. Are these part of the rated seismic joint assemblies? The seismic joint assemblies note that the assembly must have a "fire barrier", but does not identify the barrier as a "fire blanket." If the "fire blanket" is the "fire barrier" identified in 07 09 13, please remove/revise the language on the drawings to match the specification. If this is an added material to be furnished and installed separately, please provide a spec., extent, and details for the fire blanket. This affects TG16.1 Framing/Drywall and/or TG07.8 Expansion Joints. Please provide the requested information so as not to impact the bidding schedule.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Fire Blanket is part of the seismic joint assembly. The annotation has been revised to match the Specification. Refer To SKA-3692.		
P1-0132	Installation Requirements for Insulation	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 09 80 00 1.9 A requires that all materials requiring "wetness, moisture or dampness" be completed prior to installation of insulation. This would mean that all drywall finish, thin set tile, and any other "wet applied" finishes be installed prior to acoustic insulation/sealant being installed within the wall cavities, or penetrations. Please rewrite this requirement to follow the manufacturer's written recommendations.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is a means and methods requirement that the CM/GC shall manage as stated in Division 01. Specification 09 80 00 sets forth the industry standard requirements for installation of the insulation materials an systems. Specification language does not change.		
P1-0132.1	Language Revision for Material Installation per Specification Section 09 80 00	Closed	07/09/2014	07/19/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0132, Specification			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification language on Section 09 80 00 / 1.9 A will		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 281 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Section 09 80 00 As stated in RFI Response P1-0132, "This is a means and methods requirement that the CM/GC shall manage as stated in Division 01. Specification 09 80 00 sets forth the industry standard requirements for installation of the insulation materials an systems. Specification language does not change." RFI Response 0132 requires that insulation not be installed unless no further installation of materials requiring wetness, moisture or dampness is contemplated. Drywall mud, thin set for tile, terrazzo, paint and other finish materials create wetness, moisture, and damp condition within the building. Please revise the language to mandate material specified within Specification Section 09 80 00 shall be installed per the manufactuer's written installation instructions.						be revised as recommended in this RFI. This revision will be included in ASI 127.
P1-0133	Relative Humidity Requirement	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 09 80 00 1.9 B requires that relative humidity in the area of work does not exceed 55% humidity for the duration of the project. The average relative humidity for San Francisco is above 55% for +80% of the year (and those days below 55% are intermixed between days above 55%). By this standard, we would need to scaffold, shrink wrap, rent air conditioners/dehumidifiers and run them for several years until substantial completion. Please rewrite this requirement to follow the manufacturer's written recommendations.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification Section 09 80 00 1.9 B shall be revised to state: "Ensure manufacturer's written installation requirements for ambient conditions are met."			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 282 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0134	Embeds for Superintendent Station	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: A1-8181			The embeds for the Bus Deck Superintendent's Station shown on sheet A1-8181 are not required. Sheet A1-8181 has been omitted in TG08.10. The Bus Deck Superintendent's Station will be a pre-fabricated booth per VE mitigation meetings. Documentation for pre-fabricated booths to be issued in a future package.				
Per A1-8181, there are embeds within the curbs at the Superintendent Station at the bus deck level. The design of these embeds is not indicated. Please provide the size, location (i.e. continuous, etc.), and method of embedment (1/2" welded studs at 24" o.c.). This will impact TG07.3. Please provide the requested information so as not to impact the bidding schedule.							
P1-0134.1	Required Detailing for Superintendent's Station Concrete Platform	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0134			This information will be provided with the ASI that will be issued on the schedule agreed to with WOJV and TGPA. Design of the concrete platform cannot be completed without completing the redesign of the Superintendent's Station per the TJPA directed design change.				
As stated in RFI Response P1-0134, "The embeds for the Bus Deck Superintendent's Station shown on sheet A1-8181 are not required. Sheet A1-8181 has been omitted in TG08.10. The Bus Deck Superintendent's Station will be a pre-fabricated booth per VE mitigation meetings. Documentation for pre-fabricated booths to be issued in a future package."							
Per RFI Response P1-0134, detailing for the Superintendent's Station will be provided in a future package. The information related to the concrete platform is required to acquire pricing for topping slabs. Please provide the detailing for the Superintendent's Station Concrete Platform.							
P1-0135	Below Grade Waterproofing	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
reference: 07 13 54			Product data is not attached as noted in the question.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>Per the contract documents, WPM-3 is to be used at the roof park level below grade. Per 07 13 54, WPM-3 is Sika Sarnafil Waterproofing System PVC G476-20. Per the product data for Sarnafil PVC G476 (see attached), WPM-3 can be exposed for a maximum of 3 months. Based upon this limitation Webcor will be requiring the waterproofing subcontractor to protect the waterproofing until permanent overburden (foam fill, soil, rock, etc.) can be installed. This may lead to substantial added cost to the project. Please confirm that this is acceptable, or revise the contract documents to a product which can be exposed for an extended duration.</p>				<p>See Application specification section 07 13 54 / 3.3 that states "The waterproofing sequence in general shall be as follows: install the first ply of the membrane to serve as temporary waterproofing until the building is ready to receive the overburden at Park level. Following installation of Additional protection in areas where construction will occur above the membrane will be installed and removed by other contractors."</p> <p>The Contractor is responsible for means and methods of construction and scheduling the interaction of trades to complete the work. The contractor shall determine the most cost effective means of water management during construction to reduce project costs. The suggested construction phase water management process outlined in specification section 07 13 54 can be altered as desired by the Contractor to reduce costs and coordinate with the Contractor's means and methods. The completed waterproofing system, testing, etc. shall comply with 07 13 54 and the drawings in the Contract Documents (e.g. waterproofing detail 7/A1-8851).</p>		
P1-0136	Roofing Spec	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:				The referenced specification section 07 13 54 / 1.8.A2 states "Be prepared to cover unfinished work with temporary covers in the event of an unexpected rainfall." The statement does not state that the entire area of the roof shall be covered every night. This is required to prevent damage to the incomplete ongoing waterproofing work, which might result from issues such as water entrapment within the system.			
reference: 07 13 54 1.8 A 2				Specification section 07 13 54 / 1.8 B will be revised in a future ASI to delete the requirement that "At the end of each day, leave the building in a completely watertight condition." WOJV has bid manual			
Per 07 13 54 1.8 A 2, the roofing subcontractor must be prepared to cover unfinished work with temporary covers in the event of an unexpected rainfall. Per 07 13 54 1.8 B, the roofing subcontractor must leave the building in a completely watertight condition at the end of each day, and make unfinished work watertight. Based upon these requirements, Webcor will be requiring the roofing subcontractor to protect the entire area of the roof until it is completely watertight. This may add substantial added costs to the project. Please confirm this is the desired requirements, or revise the contract documents.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 284 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
instructions that appropriately describe the CM/GC requirements on this issue.							
P1-0137	Waterproofing Membrane Curing time	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: 07 13 00 3.5 A		The language has been revised. Refer to attached SKLA-306.					
Spec Section 07 13 00 3.5 A 1 requires the waterproofing membrane to cure a minimum of 7 days at 70 degrees Fahrenheit. In San Francisco, the average daily high temperature does not get up to 70 degrees for 8 months out of the year, and the average low temperature is below 70 degrees year round. As such, acclimatization (scaffold, tenting, and heaters) will be required to maintain the 70 degrees the entire duration of the W/P activity. This may add substantial added costs to the project. Please confirm this is the desired requirements, or revise the contract documents.							
P1-0138	Unfinished work watertight spec	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
07 14 13 1.8 B		Spec Section 07 14 13 / 1.8 B shall be deleted.					
Spec Section 07 14 13 1.8 B requires "at the end of each day, leave the building in a completely watertight condition. Make unfinished work watertight." This requirement will require the tenting of the entire building in order to make the building and unfinished work "watertight." This may add substantial added costs to the project. Please confirm this is the desired requirements, or revise the contract documents.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 285 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0139	Unfinished work watertight spec	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
reference: 07 54 19 1.9 A 5					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Spec Section 07 54 19 1.9 A 5 requires "at the end of each day, leave the building in a completely watertight condition. Make unfinished work watertight." This requirement will require the tenting of the entire building in order to make the building and unfinished work "watertight." This may add substantial added costs to the project. Please confirm this is the desired requirements, or revise the contract documents.					The following sentence; "...at the end of each day, leave the building in a completely watertight condition. Make unfinished work watertight." Will be deleted from Spec Section 07 54 19 1.9 A 5. You are correct, construction phase weather protection is a means and methods issue.		
					WOJV shall review this changed specification in relation to the Bid Manual and adjust the Bid Manual as required. The Bid Manual previously stated: "It shall be the responsibility of the Trade Subcontractor to take all measures to protect Work from inclement weather, including that determined by WOJV, until completion of the work and acceptance by the Owner." and "In the event that the building requires weather protection and rain water control, Trade Subcontractor shall furnish and install all weather protection as required for Work to continue unabated and will be liable for damage to other Work or costs for weather protection installation due to Trade Subcontractor's failure to timely or properly install weather protection." We also don't believe your text is intended to require each individual trade subcontractor to fully tent the building each day or even on a rainy day.		
P1-0139.1	Direction For Revision of Specification Section 07 54 19 1.9 A 5	Void	07/03/2014	07/13/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-00139					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
As stated in RFI Response P1-00139, "The following sentence; "...at the end of each day, leave the building in a completely watertight condition. Make unfinished work watertight." Will be deleted from Spec Section 07 54 19 1.9 A 5. You are correct, construction phase weather protection is a means and methods issue.							
WOJV shall review this changed specification in relation to the Bid Manual and adjust the Bid Manual as required. The Bid Manual previously stated: "It shall be the							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 286 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>responsibility of the Trade Subcontractor to take all measures to protect Work from inclement weather, including that determined by WOJV, until completion of the work and acceptance by the Owner." and "In the event that the building requires weather protection and rain water control, Trade Subcontractor shall furnish and install all weather protection as required for Work to continue unabated and will be liable for damage to other Work or costs for weather protection installation due to Trade Subcontractor's failure to timely or properly install weather protection." We also don't believe your text is intended to require each individual trade subcontractor to fully tent the building each day or even on a rainy day."</p> <p>RFI Response P1-00139 indicates that Specification Section 07 54 19 1.9 A 5 will be changed. No specification or specific direction to delete the language was provided. Please provide the revised language or direct the language to be stricken for Specification Section 07 54 19 1.9 A 5.</p>						
P1-0140	Floor Coating Temperature Spec	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 07 18 14 1.8 B Spec Section 07 18 14 1.8 B indicates ¿ambient and surface temperatures shall be at least 60 degrees F for a minimum period of 48 hours before, during and after coating system application.¿ I would suggest language requiring environmental conditions be established as required by the product manufacturer. Otherwise, this may add substantial added costs to the project. Please confirm this is the desired requirements, or revise the contract documents.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The requirement of Spec Section 07 18 14 1.8 B shall be revised to: "Ambient and surface temperatures shall be maintained per manufacturer's requirements for the application of floor coatings."			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 287 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0141	Coating Requirements	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 07 18 14 3.6 A Spec Section 07 18 14 3.6 A indicates "Ambient and surface temperatures shall be at least 50 degrees F for a minimum period of 48 hours before, during and after coating system application." This conflicts with 07 18 14 1.8 B. In addition, I would suggest language requiring environmental conditions be established as required by the product manufacturer. This may reduce acclimatization, and conflicts with the manufacturer's installation instructions. Otherwise, this may add substantial added costs to the project. Please confirm this is the desired requirements, or revise the contract documents.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Ambient and surface temperatures shall be maintained per manufacturer's requirements for the application of floor coatings.			
P1-0142	Thermoplastic Water Tank Liners	Void	06/11/2014	06/21/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By:							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 07 13 55 2.1 07 13 55 2.1 does not provide a specific manufacturer for thermoplastic water tank liners. Webcor intends to require all manufactures be approved via QBD prior to bid. If this is not acceptable, please provide specific manufacturers and products which are acceptable to use.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
P1-0143	TG08.7 Glass Floor Corrosion Expert	Closed	06/12/2014	06/22/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 08 88 53 Specification section 1.9 G.1 requires that the design build contractor engage a California licensed Corrosion Engineer who is an expert in corrosion.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As discussed with TJPA & WOJV, specification 08 88 53 has been changed to delete the California Licensed Corrosion Engineer Requirement and the confirmation letter from the corrosion engineer. As agreed with the TJPA and WOJV in documentation			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 288 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0144	<p>It is further required that the design build contractor get a confirmation letter from the corrosion engineer as stated in section 2.11 B and that it must comply with the recommendations of a corrosion engineer approved by TJPA Representative.</p> <p>These requirements will increase bid substantially and may limit the bidding pool.</p> <p>Please confirm it is TJPA intent to leave these requirements in thereby increasing costs and potentially limiting the bidding pool.</p> <p>Maximum Pour Height for 10" Blocks</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST: Reference: 04 20 00 3.5 L 9</p> <p>04 20 00 3.5 L 9 Specifies maximum pour height for 8" and 12" blocks, but does not identify one for 10" (CMU Wall Types 9 and 11). Please provide information.</p>	Closed	06/12/2014	06/22/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The maximum pour height for 10 inch CMU block wall will be 14 feet. Specification section 04 20 00 3.5 L 9 shall be updated and issued in a future ASI.</p>				



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0144.1	Revision to Specification Section 04 20 00 3.5 L 9	Void	07/03/2014	07/13/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0144, As stated in RFI Response P1-0144, "The maximum pour height for 10 inch CMU block wall will be 14 feet. Specification section 04 20 00 3.5 L 9 shall be updated and issued in a future ASI." RFI Response P1-0144 references a specification to be issued. No revised specification was provided. Please provide the revised language associated with Specification Section 04 20 00 3.5 L 9.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
P1-0145	Masonry Tolerances	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 04 20 00 04 20 00 3.6 identifies tolerances which appear to differ from industry standard (ACI 530.1). This may cause the masonry pricing to increase. Please confirm it is TJPA's desire that the CMU tolerances differ from industry standard, or delete tolerances within spec and reference industry standards for CMU placement.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Language on Specification 04 20 00 3.6 stands. Specified masonry erection tolerances are generally similar to those in ACI 503.1. Whenever in conflict, Contractor is to meet the more restrictive tolerances.		
<hr/>							
P1-0146	CMU Concrete Base Aggregate Exposure	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 04 20 00 04 20 00 3.7 A requires that prior to placing CMU, the aggregate within the concrete base is to be exposed. This may expose rebar within slabs/concrete curbs, require touch-up of adj. surfaces, and require additional protection of adj. surfaces. Please confirm that concrete material is			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification 04 20 00 / 3.7A requires the contractor to clean the top of concrete, remove laitance and expose aggregate; not to expose the rebar. This is an industry standard for installing masonry and should not require additional protection on properly placed concrete elements.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 290 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>to be removed to expose aggregate within the concrete base below CMU walls.</div>							
P1-0147	Concrete Curbs at CMU Walls	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Scott Shope	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: 4/A1-0022				Not all CMU walls have concrete curbs. The CMU walls that have a concrete curb have annotation <i>CC</i> specified on their wall tag. These walls, with their wall tags, have been illustrated on the architectural zone plans.			
4/A1-0022 indicates that a "CC" accompanies the CMU wall symbol if a concrete curb is to be erected below the wall. 1/A-0025 indicates that typical CMU walls do not have curbs. 2/A-0025 indicates that if a CMU wall is on a sloped slab, a curb is typically required below the CMU wall. Enlarged floor plans in architectural plans do not typically show a concrete curb below CMU walls (i.e. no "CC" adj. to the symbol). Typical structural details (1 & 2/S1-9001) show concrete curbs at all CMU walls. Are all CMU walls supposed to receive concrete curbs or only the ones identified on architectural plans?				S1-9001 illustrates curbs for CMU walls, where they exist.			
P1-0148	CMU Rated Walls	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Scott Shope	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: 04 20 00				For fire rated CMU walls, use mineral wool, backer rod and fire / smoke stop, as has been illustrated on detail 3/ A1-0024. Specification section 04 20 00 2.2 F shall be revised to conform and shall be issued with a future ASI.			
Per 04 20 00 2.2 F, preformed rubber is to be used in masonry expansion joints. Per 3 & 4/A-0024, mineral wool, backer rod, and fire/smoke stopping is to be used at rated walls. Per A-0022, all CMU walls are rated. Please revise spec or drawing to agree.							
P1-0148.1	Revision for Specification Section 04 20 00	Void	07/03/2014	07/13/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 291 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0148, Specification Section 04 20 00 2.2 F RFI Response P1-0148 states, "For fire rated CMU walls, use mineral wool, backer rod and fire / smoke stop, as has been illustrated on detail 3/ A1-0024. Specification section 04 20 00 2.2 F shall be revised to conform and shall be issued with a future ASI. RFI Response P1-0148 refers to a future ASI to revise Specification Section 04 20 00. No revised specification has been received. Please provide the revision for Specification Section 04 20 00.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
P1-0149	Train Box Construction Joints	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 3 & 4/A-0024 Per 3 & 4/A-0024 within the train box there are 2 different wall joint details depending if the wall is running north and south, or east and west. The details go on to reference structural for wall control joint information in each direction. Per S1-9000 - S1-9003 (Typical CMU Details) there is one standard detail for all construction joints. Please confirm there is only one construction joint detail desired for walls running in any direction, and coordinate arch. drawings to match.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This question is vague and cannot be answered. Joint widths vary along the E/W length of the building as well as vertically by level. Contractor to provide information on the joints in question by both gridlines (N/S & E/W) as well as building level (Platform, Lower Concourse etc.).			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0149.1	Widths for Below Grade/Train Box CMU Control Joints	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0149, Details 3 & 4/A-0024, Details 7 & 10/S1-9000			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
As stated in RFI Response P1-0149, "This question is vague and cannot be answered. Joint widths vary along the E/W length of the building as well as vertically by level. Contractor to provide information on the joints in question by both gridlines (N/S & E/W) as well as building level (Platform, Lower Concourse etc.)"			Joints laid out in the architectural drawings reduce continuous wall lengths for the purpose of crack control and/or permit the seismic displacement of elements braced to the floor above relative to those elements that are permitted to slip relative the floor above.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Per Detail 3/A-0024 the train box CMU control joints running in an east to west direction appears to be the width of a standard grout joint.- Per Detail 4/A-0024 the train box CMU control joints running in a north to south direction are larger than the width of a standard grout joint.- Details 3 & 4/A-0024 indicate that structural drawings are to be referenced for control joint information.- Per Details 7 & 10/S1-9000 standard below grade CMU wall control joints are 3/8" regardless of orientation.			For joints oriented in the north-south direction, control and seismic functions are satisfied at a joint width of 3/8". This is due to the small magnitude of below grade seismic building drift in the east-west direction.				
Please confirm that all below grade/train box CMU wall control joints are to be 3/8" wide as required by structural, rather than differing widths based upon orientation as indicated on the architectural drawings.			Joints oriented in the east-west direction for the purpose of providing seismic separation under north-south building drift shall be sized per General Note CD-6 of S-0005, requiring Operational Performance under GSL-2 Earthquake. The GSL-2 story drifts that control the joint widths are tabulated on S-0006. For partition walls at the Train Platform Level, the Lower Concourse drift demands apply. For partition walls at the Lower Concourse, the Ground Level drift demands apply. Drift demands are converted to displacements (joint sizes) by multiplying the percentage drift by the story height.				
P1-0149.2	CMU Wall Layout Requirements	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	09/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0149.1			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
RFI Response P1-0149.1 does not provide specific sizes and layout requirements for CMU walls.			Dimensioned setting out for all concrete and CMU partition walls is referenced from the Architectural Zone Plans, located on related details and identified as CJs e.g. A1-3007 GL 7, E.6.				
Please provide specific sizes and layout requirements for CMU walls as Trade Package TG07.4 CMU is not design-build.			On the Architectural Zone Plans and details, the CMU wall tags refer to the Masonry Partition Schedule on Architectural drawing A-0022, which stipulates the CMU wall thicknesses and performance criteria.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 293 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
</							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 294 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0150.1	Penetration Firestopping Testing Clarification	Closed	07/07/2014	07/17/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0150, Specification Section 07 84 13 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
As stated in RFI Response P1-0150, "For applications, exceeding listed 3 ½ inches joint width, engineering judgment from the manufacturer (in this case Hilti) is required."					Yes, an engineering judgment that the manufacturer has obtained approval for by the AHJ, for penetration fire stopping exceeding 3 1/2", will be accepted from any listed manufacturer in lieu of providing a tested assembly.		
Per RFI Response P1-150 an engineering judgement from Hilti will be accepted. There are several other specified manufacturers for penetration fireproofing, 07 84 13 1.7 C requires that penetration firestopping be UL/Intertek/FM Global tested assemblies, and tested by a qualified testing agency acceptable to the AHJ. Please confirm that an engineered judgment for penetration firestopping from any listed manufacturer will be acceptable in lieu of providing a tested assembly.							
P1-0151	HD for CMU Wall Types	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 1/A1-3100					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1/A1-3100 shows CMU wall types with the symbol "HD". 4/A-0022 does not define what this symbol indicates. A-0015 defines "HD" as "heavy duty" or "hot dipped", neither of which appears to apply. Please provide information on CMU marked as "HD".					Detail 4 on drawing A1-0022 has been updated to reflect that $\bar{z}HD\bar{z}$ stands for additional reinforcing. Drawing A1-0022 shall be issued with a future ASI and shall reflect this change.		
P1-0151.1	Information for HD Designated CMU walls	Closed	07/08/2014	07/18/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 295 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0151 As stated in RFI Response P1-0151, "Detail 4 on drawing A1-0022 has been updated to reflect that "HD" stands for additional reinforcing. Drawing A1-0022 shall be issued with a future ASI and shall reflect this change." Per RFI Response P1-0151, the designation "HD" stands for "additional reinforcing". The response does not indicate what the additional reinforcement requirements are to be. Please provide the reinforcement requirements.					Refer to Structural drawing S1-9000 for reinforcement requirements.	
P1-0152	Concrete Curing	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 04 22 00 3.2.B.1 04 22 00 3.2 B 1 Requires that concrete cure for 28 days above 70 degrees Fahrenheit prior to installation of setting materials. This will require heating blankets be placed and maintained for 28 days prior to setting the block, adding cost to the topping slab. Please confirm this requirement is necessary, and the added costs acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Omit "...28 days at 70 degrees Fahrenheit (21 degrees Celsius)..." See attached SKLA-309.				
P1-0153	CMU Drawings Differing from Industry Standard	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 04 22 00 3.3.I.1 04 22 00 3.3.I.1 identifies tolerances which appear to differ from industry standard (ACI 530.1). This may cause the masonry pricing to increase. Please confirm it is TJPA's desire that the CMU tolerances differ from industry standard, or delete tolerances within spec and reference industry standards for CMU placement.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See response to RFI P1-0145.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 296 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0154	CMU at Roof Park	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 04 22 00 3.2 B 1, L1-7610 - L1-7613					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
04 22 00 3.2 B 1 and L1-7610 - L1-7613 indicates that CMU footings at the roof park are shown on the architectural drawings. The architectural drawings do not appear to layout the footings shown on L1-7610 - L1-7613. Please provide the layout for all CMU wall footings at the roof park level.					See architectural Roof Level Protection Slab Plans, Sheets A1-2913 through A1-2917.		
P1-0154.1	Footing Details per Sheets L1-7612 and L1-7613	Closed	07/22/2014	08/01/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0154 A1-2913 through A1-2917 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) L1-7612 and L1-7613 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
RFI Response P1-0154 references Sheets A1-2913 through A1-2917 for the location of CMU wall foundations.					Refer to attached sketches SKA-3910 and SKA-3911 noting footing layout along walls adjacent to the seismic joints and as coordinated with Landscape details.		
The CMU wall footings depicted on Sheets L1-7612 and L1-7613 (walls adjacent to seismic joints) are not depicted on Sheets A1-2913 through A1-2917.							
Please provide layout information for the footings shown on Sheets L1-7612 and L1-7613.							
P1-0155	Hardware for B1401B	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: A1-9703 and locate door B1401B					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					A1-9703 is the Ground Level Door Schedule yet the		

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 298 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0156	Openings around Ground Level Columns	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Zachary Moore</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
reference: A1-2104				The openings around the ground level columns, are block outs for the base plate. For locations and dimensions of these openings, refer to the architectural slab edge plans. Structural drawing A1-5052 illustrates the base plate detail and dimensions.			
Per the architectural slab plans (see below for example) there are openings around the ground level columns with galvanized steel plate supporting the slab above. Structural drawings (see below for example) does not show these openings. Are these openings required? Please revise the documents to conform with each other.							
P1-0157	Base Plate Detail at Ground Level	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Zachary Moore</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
reference: 2/A1-9311				The metal plate on the curbs, shall be 3/8 inches thick galvanized metal and shall be anchored to the curb with 3/8 inch diameter anchor's. Detail 3 on drawing "A1-9311" has been updated to reflect the same and shall be issued with a future ASI.			
Per architectural (see below) metal plates on curbs conceal the base plate for columns at transfer girders at ground level. The contract documents do not appear to detail the size or attachment of the metal plate or associated curb. Please provide detailing for the metal plate and associated curb.							
P1-0158	Tubular Lighting	Void	06/11/2014	06/21/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Zachary Moore</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
reference: 3/S1-2305							
Per the contract amendment for TG07.2, the tubular lighting devices have been deleted. However, the details for the tubular daylight devices still appear on the plans (see below for example). Please revise the contract documents to delete the associated detailing.							
P1-0159	Bus Bridge and Bus Deck	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 299 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: S-2063, S1-2502, A1-2502 Per the Bus Ramp Drawing S-2063, the elevation at T.O. AC is 56.10 (56' - 1-3/16") where the bridge connects to the transit center. Per S1-2502 T.O. Steel at H line (1' - 7" away from the bus bridge connection) is 56' - 4" (2-13/16" higher than the bus ramp AC). Per A1-2502, drive aisle high point along GL-H is 57' - 11-1/4" (1' - 10-1/16" higher than the T.O. Bus Bridge AC). Please review the grades at this location to confirm the bus bridge aligns with the top of bus deck.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per S1-2502, 56'-4" top of steel elevation at GL-H is correct. Per A1-2502, 57'-11 1/4" drive aisle high point along GL-H is correct.		
P1-0159.1	Revision to Detail 2/A1-8378 to Match RFI Responses	Closed	07/08/2014	07/18/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0159, RFI Response B-0008, Detail 2/A1-8378 As stated in RFI Response P1-0159, "Per S1-2502, 56'-4" top of steel elevation at GL-H is correct. Per A1-2502, 57'-11 1/4" drive aisle high point along GL-H is correct." Per RFI Response P1-0159, the Bus Deck Drive Aisle high point at the bus bridge is 57'-11 1/4". Per RFI Response B-0008, the top of bus bridge paving is 57'-11 3/4". Per Detail 2/A1-8378, the transition from the Bus Bridge to the Bus Deck Drive Aisle is at 57'-11 1/4". Please revise Detail 2/A1-8378 to reflect the elevations confirmed in RFI Responses P1-0159 and B-0008.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The response to RFI P1-0159 is correct. Arup will be revising their response to RFI B-0008 to conform to the information contained in RFI P1-0159.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 300 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0160	Structural Slab Detail	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: S1-2502, A1-2892, A1-9532 Per S1-2502 and A1-2892, the structural slab extends 1'-7" south past GL H to meet the bus bridge. Per A1-9532 the bus deck topping slab stops 3'-4" north of GL H. This will leave a 4'-11" area with no topping slab between the bus deck and bus bridge. Please revise the drawing to show the desired condition.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Topping extents revised per attached SKA-3723 based on sheet A1-9532. Refer also to details 2 & 3/A1-8378 previously issued, for extent of slab and bus bridge interface.			
P1-0161	Topping slab at bus deck	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: A1-6102 There does not appear to be a detail depicting the edge of topping slab and associated waterproofing where the bus deck meets the bus bridge. Per A1-6102 the connection between bus bridge is under study. Please provide the details for the connection between the bus bridge and bus deck. This will affect bid documents for TG07.6 Topping Slabs and TG13.2 Waterproofing.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For topping slab at Bus Deck to Bus Ramp, see detail 2 & 3 on A1-8378.			
P1-0162	Expansion Material	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: attached: S-6113 Per the bus bridge plans S-6113, a 24" wide piece of expansion material is to be inserted between the bus bridge and bus deck. This does not appear to be a waterproof assembly, and may leak onto the building/people below. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See detail 3 on A1-8378 for the waterproof joint assembly at the Bus Deck to Bus Ramp transition. Waterproofing details will typically be found in the architectural drawings and not on structural drawings.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 301 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0163	Expansion material Detail	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: S-6113, S1-5000 Per the bus bridge plans S-6113, there is a 2" wide piece of expansion material sitting on a ledge at the bus deck edge of deck. Per S1-5000, there is no ledge at the typical edge of structural slab detail. Please revise the details to match.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Architectural detail 3/A1-8378 has been revised. Refer to the attached SKA-3691. S1-5000 does not require any revision.			
P1-0164	Structural Slab notch	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: S1-2502, A1-2892 Per S1-2502 there is a notch at the structural slab at the cast node between the bus ramp ends. A1-2892 does not show this notch. Please revise plans to match.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Agreed, drawing A1-2892 will be updated to reflect notch in slab and issued as part of a future ASI.			
P1-0164.1	VOID	Void	07/08/2014	07/18/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By:							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
P1-0165	Bus Deck Rails	Closed	06/10/2014	06/10/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: A1-2502 The accessible path of travel to the Bus Deck Superintendent Station appears to be missing some ramp rails (I believe over 5% slope requires rails)		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Ramp rails information can be found on A1-8168 and A1-8169. However, sheets A1-8168 and A1-8169 have been omitted in TG08.10. Bus Deck Superintendent's Station will be a pre-fabricated booth per VE mitigation meetings. Documentation for pre-			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 302 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0165.1	Rail Requirements for the Path of Travel to the Superintendent Station	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:		REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0165, Sheet A1-8168, Sheet A1-8169, CBC Section 1003.5, CBC Section 1010.19					
As stated in RFI Response P1-0165, "Ramp rails information can be found on A1-8168 and A1-8169. However, sheets A1-8168 and A1-8169 have been omitted in TG08.10. Bus Deck Superintendent's Station will be a pre-fabricated booth per VE mitigation meetings. Documentation for pre-fabricated booths to be issued in a future package."		Refer to attached sketches SKA-4044, SKA-4046 and SKA-4047 for updated layout of ramps with required rails.					
A1-8168 and A1-8169 show rails for the ramp west of the superintendent station, but omits rails at the 8.1% ramp/curb cut south of the superintendent station and across the drive aisle from it.							
- Per CBC Section 1003.5, slopes along the path of egress which exceed 5% must comply with CBC Section 1010.							
- Per CBC Section 1010.9 requires ramps with a rise greater than 6" to have handrails on both sides.							
- Per CBC Section 1003.5 contrasting finish surfaces in lieu of handrails are only acceptable where the difference in elevation is 6" or less (in this case the vertical travel is approx. 9").							
Please confirm that portions of the path of travel to the Superintendent Station which exceed 5%, and have a vertical travel greater than 6" do not require rails.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 304 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0167.1	Revised Drawings for Concrete Work at Bus Deck Level	Closed	07/08/2014	07/18/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0167					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
As stated in RFI Response P1-0167, "Sheet A1-8168 has been omitted in TG08.10. Bus Deck Superintendent's Station will be a pre-fabricated booth per VE mitigation meetings. Documentation for pre-fabricated booths to be issued in a future package."					Refer to attached SKA-4044, SKA-4046 and SKA-4047 for updated information regarding slopes of the ramps adjacent to the Bus Deck Level Supervisor Booth.		
RFI Response P1-0167 indicates that documentation for pre-fabricated booths will be issued in a future package. The work around the pre-fabricated booths is not included in the same bid package as the pre-fabricated booth. Please provide the information regarding slopes at the ramps adjacent to the pre-fabricated booths.							
P1-0168	Stem Wall at Bus Deck Superintendent Station	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: A1-8168					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
A1-8168 shows concrete stem walls supporting the Bus Deck Superintendent Station and adjacent ramp. There do not appear to be details showing these walls (wall thickness, reinforcement, connection to superstructure, waterproofing, etc.). Please provide details for this area.					Sheet A1-8168 has been omitted in TG08.10. Bus Deck Superintendent's Station will be a pre-fabricated booth per VE mitigation meetings. Documentation for pre-fabricated booths to be issued in a future package.		
P1-0168.1	Revised Stem Wall Drawings for Concrete Work at Bus Deck Level	Closed	07/09/2014	07/19/2014	09/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0168					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
As stated in RFI Response P1-0168, "Sheet A1-8168 has been omitted in TG08.10. Bus Deck Superintendent's Station will be a pre-fabricated booth per VE mitigation meetings. Documentation for pre-fabricated booths to be					See attached sketches SKA-3902-R1 and SKS-0407 showing structural details at the base of the superintendent's pre-fab booth at bus deck level. SKA-3902-R1 shows the curbs that support the booth in plan and SKS-0407 shows rebar details in the curbs.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	issued in a future package."						
	RFI Response P1-0166 indicates that documentation for pre-fabricated booths will be issued in a future package. The work around the pre-fabricated booths is not included in the same bid package as the pre-fabricated booth. Please provide the information regarding structures supporting the pre-fabricated booths.						
P1-0169	Coating for Metal Surfaces	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: 05 15 21				Per specification section 09 97 16, part 1, 1.1, A.1; all AESS are to receive high performance coatings. Per specification section 05 10 00 part 2, 2.2, A and 2.2, C indicate all structural steel is to be either primed of galvanized; there is no exception for the cast steel items. Shop Primer is required as specified.			
Per 05 15 21 Steel Castings (see attached), steel castings (most notably the cast nodes) are to be furnished as bare metal. This was confirmed in the construction issues meeting held on 04/17/14 (see attached), with the indication that coating of the bare metal is to be included in TG16.5 Painting. 09 97 16 High Performance Coatings - Superstructure Package (see attached) identifies a coating system for exterior exposed factory-primed metal surfaces, and a coating system for galvanized steel, but not a coating system for exterior exposed unprimed/non-galvanized metal surfaces. Please provide the coating system for all unprimed/non-galvanized metal surfaces.				The specifications are intended to be read as a whole and as such, specification section 05 15 21 only speaks to the fabrication of steel castings, a sub-set of structural steel which is governed by section 05 10 00.			
Revised: IFC Set 09 97 15 2.5 B calls out for "Shop Primer" in the "Coating System for Exposed Unprimed and Non-Galvanized Steel Surfaces." Based on this information the painter (who in not under contract yet) would need to go to the steel erector's shop to prime the steel (which is currently in production) with the materials called out in 05 10 00 and 05 12 13. Based on the current schedule, the unprimed/non-galvanized steel will be erected before the painter is under contract. In addition, adding priming of these surfaces to the steel scope of work would negatively impact the delivery and erection schedule of steel. Please revise the spec to provide priming of unprimed and non-galvanized metal in the field,							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>or confirm that it is acceptable for steel erection to be delayed.</div>							
P1-0169.1	Clarification for the Preparation of Cast Nodes	Closed	07/08/2014	07/18/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: (All Attached)		WOJV, Turner, and TJPA shall address the questions related to scope of work in the current construction Contract.					
- RFI Response P1-0169							
- Specification Section 05 10 00 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
- Sheet S1-1023							
- Submittal TG0701-99C.1							
Per RFI Response P1-0169 (Attached), cast nodes are governed by Specification Section 05 10 00 (Attached), and shall be shop primed.							
- Per Specification Section 05 10 00 3.2 P 1 (See attached Specification Section 05 10 00), "Unless otherwise specified in Section 3.2.P.3, shop prime all structural steel..."							
- Per Specification Section 05 10 00 3.2 P 3 d (See attached Specification Section 05 10 00), "Surfaces requiring preheat are not to be primed until preheat has been performed."							
- Per structural drawings (Example Sheet S1-1023 attached) cast nodes are to be field welded to the adjacent tube columns.							
In order to weld the cast nodes to the adjacent tube columns, the cast node must be preheated as confirmed in the reviewed welding procedure from Submittal TG0701-99C.1 (Attached). Since surfaces to be preheated are not to be shop primed, base contract documents explicitly mandate that cast nodes are not to be primed until after welded in the field.							
Please confirm TJPA intends to add shop priming of cast							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 307 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>nodes (Note: Adding shop priming of cast nodes will negatively impact the budget and schedule). If the addition of shop priming is not desired, please provide a specification for the field priming of unprimed and non-galvanized metal as requested in RFI P1-0169 (See attached RFI Response P1-0169).</div>							
P1-0170	Bin Cart Lift Unit	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: reference: 11 13 00 1.1.A.7 & 2.2.G & 3.3 - Bin Cart Lift Unit - Is this something that is bid out, or is it obtained from Recology? If it needs to be bid out provide details for bin cart lifter and installation and operation requirements.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Bin Cart Lift Unit is an item that shall be bid. It has been specified, under specification section 11 13 00 2.2 G. The location of the bin cart unit in the loading dock area is shown on drawing A1-3100 IFC 2 Rev 0. The installation and operation of the unit shall be as per manufacturer's standard and manual.		

P1-0170.1	Additional Information For Bin Cart Lift Unit	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference: RFI Response P1-0070 spec 11 13 00 RFI Response: "The Bin Cart Lift Unit is an item that shall be bid. It has been specified, under specification section 11 13 00 2.2 G. The location of the bin cart unit in the loading dock area is shown on drawing A1-3100 IFC 'Rev 0'. The installation and operation of the unit shall be as per manufacturer's standard and manual." Provide details, including embeds and attachments, for Bin Cart Lifter and Bin Cart Lifter Control Box mounting			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is a performance specification and these items will be engineered by the trade subcontractor in the shop drawing phase. Similar to many trades on the project that WOJV coordinates with during the shop drawing phase and this requirement is clear in the specifications. Bin Cart Lift Unit is secured to floor through use of expansion anchors and bolted into place, no embeds are required. The Bin Cart Lift Control Box is directly mounted to the railing system that is part of the unit.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0171	Loading Dock Equipment Attachment	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 11 13 00 1.4.C - This states that the subcontractor is determining the method of attachment to the structure. Clarify the method of attachment to the structure. Are there any requirements from the Structural Engineer?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Seismic design criteria for non-structural components are provided in Specification 01 18 50. Also, as indicated in Specification 11 13 00 Section 1.4.C, the method of attachment to the structure shall be clearly indicated in the shop drawings.		
P1-0172	Repeated Statement	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 11 13 00 1.4.G.H - Remove 1.4.G. It is already stated in 1.4.H.2.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification statements referenced in the question in the Issued for Construction documents do not conflict with each other. The specification will not be altered and reissued.		
P1-0173	Quality Control Spec	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 11 13 00 1.6.C.1 - During the qualification process TJPA stated they would have this requirement changed. Anvil Builders is prequalified and has not been in business for five years. They were incorporated in 2011.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Regarding the item in this RFI, TJPA stated the specification requirement should not be changed.		
P1-0173.1	Minimum Experience Spec	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Transbay PMPC Elissa Flandro				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference:11 13 00			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Revise the spec to be a "minimum of 3 years' experience in application of products, systems and		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 309 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>RFI P1-0173 response: "Regarding the item in this RFI, TJPA stated the specification requirement should not be changed."</p> <p>1.6.C.1 states "Firm with minimum of 5 years" experience in application of products, systems and assemblies specified and with approval and training of product manufacturers." During the qualification process TJPA stated they would have this requirement changed. There is a prequalified bidder that cannot comply with this requirement.</p>						
P1-0174	Quality Control Spec	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
reference: 11 13 00				Regarding the item in this RFI, TJPA stated the specification requirement should not be changed.			
1.6.C.2 - During the qualification process TJPA stated they would have this requirement removed since two hours travel time from the building site limits the amount of firms able to qualify and bid on this package. Revise accordingly.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 310 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0174.1	Max Travel Distance Spec	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Elissa Flandro	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 11 13 00 RFI P1-0174 response: "Regarding the item in this RFI, TJPA stated the specification requirement should not be changed" 1.6.C.2 states "Firm shall be located no more than 2 hours normal travel time from building site" During the qualification process TJPA stated they would have this requirement removed since two hours travel time from the building site limits the amount of firms able to qualify and bid on this package. Revise accordingly.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Delete the "2 hours normal travel time" requirement from the spec.	
<hr/>							
P1-0175	Warranty Defects	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 11 13 00 1.8.C - Clarify why the warranty is expected to cover defects in design. Shouldn't this be covered under the design team? This is not a design build scope.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Specification Section 11 13 00 "Truck Dock Equipment" / 1.8.C is a warranty for the truck Dock Equipment. The "defects in design" statement is refering to the Truck Dock Equipment designed and manufactured by a company such as Advance Lifts noted under possible product manufacturers. No, the Truck Dock Equipment is not designed by the PCPA design team and should not be covered under the design team.	
<hr/>							
P1-0176	Recessed dock levelers	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference 11 13 00 2.2.B.2.a - Clarify how high is "sufficient height to enable lip to extend and clear truck bed before contact."			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The statement on specification section 11 13 00 2.2.B.a, on ¿sufficient height clearance¿ shall be edited and removed (see attached pdf of the updated specification). The dock leveler unit should have an	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0177	Bin Lifters	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			operational range of 12 inches and 12 inches below the dock platform.				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: A1-3100			The Bin Cart Lift Unit is an equipments that is to be bid. Please refer to the specification section 11 30 00 2.2 G, for model number, capacity and other specifications. The installation and operation of the unit shall be as per manufacturer's standard and manual.				
Provide details for Bin Lifters.			See RFI P1-170.				
P1-0177.1	Additional Information Bin Lifters	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			Attachment requirements (including embeds) will vary depending on the equipment that the CMGC purchases in the bidding process. The CMGC shall coordinate the requirements for the attachments between the trade subcontractors the CMGC hires and submit shop drawings for review.				
Reference: RFI P1-0177, A1-3100 RFI Response P1-0177: "The Bin Cart Lift Unit is an equipments that is to be bid. Please refer to the specification section 11 30 00 2.2 G, for model number, capacity and other specifications. The installation and operation of the unit shall be as per manufacturer's standard and manual. See RFI P1-170."							
Provide details, including embeds and attachments, for Bin Cart Lifter and Bin Cart Lifter Control Box mounting.							
P1-0178	Loading Dock Equipment	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>reference: 11 13 00</p> <p>Construction section 2.2.B.7 states "Fabricate dock-leveler frame from structural- and formed-steel shapes" while section 1.6.B states "Provide all assemblies as complete unit produced by a single manufacturer, including necessary accessories, fittings and anchorages." Clarify the intent of the construction section 2.2.B.7 and if the intent is to either fabricate pieces or to have all assemblies provided by a single producer. If the intent is to fabricate pieces provide all details and criteria for fabrication.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Paragraph 1.6.B instructs Bidder to provide a fully assembled dock leveler.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.2.B.7 instructs the manufacturer of the dock equipment to utilize certain types of materials to provide a fully assembled dock leveler.</p>			
P1-0179	Communication System Details	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>11 13 00</p> <p>2.2.C.6 - Provide details of all warning signs, signal lights, alarms.</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The warning signs, signal lights and alarms are all a part of the truck restrain system, specified under specification section 11 13 00 2.2 C. For details on installation and operation, please refer to manufacturer's manual.</p> <p>Additionally, details 4 and 6 on drawing A1-3191, IFC 'Rev 0'; illustrate the signage, signal lights and alarms required.</p>	<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>		
P1-0180	Dock Lights Detail	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>reference: 11 13 00</p> <p>2.2.E - Provide details for Cool Head Incandescent Dock Light - double arm light with min 60 inch reach.</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Detail 6 on drawing A1-3191 will be updated to illustrate the cool head incandescent dock light. This drawing will be issued with a future ASI and will reflect this change.</p>	<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 313 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0180.1	Dock Light Details	Closed	07/11/2014	07/21/2014	07/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference 11 13 00 2.2E, RFI P1-0180, A1-3191			Refer to detail 6 on sheet A1-3191 issued in ASI No.0121 package on 07/18/14.				
Response to RFI P1-0180 states: Detail 6 on drawing A1-3191 will be updated to illustrate the cool head incandescent dock light. This drawing will be issued with a future ASI and will reflect this change.							
Provide updated detail.							
P1-0181	Preset Anchor Bolts	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
reference: 11 13 00			This is a means and methods question. Specification 11 13 00 3.3.C gives the contractor options for anchoring and bolting the dock bumpers. Depending on the selected manufacturer and installer, shop drawings shall be prepared and the contractor shall coordinate installation.				
3.3.C - States "If preset anchor bolts, cast-in-place inserts, or threaded studs welded to embedded plates or angles are not provided, attach dock bumpers by drilling and anchoring with expansion anchors and bolts." Who would be providing preset anchor bolts? Where are these detailed?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 314 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0182	Self-Forming Pit	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 11 13 00 Provide details of Self-Forming pit system.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to A1-3191 for architectural details. Delete the words, "self-forming" from specification section 11 13 00 /3.3 D.2. Basis of Design is the Rite-Hite Corp. dock leveler as noted in specification section 11 13 00 / 2.1 and 2.2 B. Dock leveler pit system referred to in specification section 11 13 00 / 3.3 D.2 is described in the attached manufacturer's installation instructions and other manufacturer's materials.				
P1-0183	TG08.3 Skylight Fall Protection	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: WW1-1706 and A1-8401 Do the Skylights at GL 11 and GL 28 have fall protection integral to the frame work? WW1-1706 show safety tie-back around perimeter but A1-8401 does not show fall protection. Clarify extent of fall protection if any to be used at GL 11 and GL 28 Skylights.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No, tie-offs are to be integral to the skylight's perimeter railing (shown in landscape drawings). Cleaning of the skylights at grids 11 & 28 can be done from the ground adjacent the skylight.				
P1-0183.1	TG08.3 Skylight Fall Protection Tie-offs	Closed	07/07/2014	07/17/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: P1-0183, IFC Main Set WW1-1706 and addendum 11 A1-8401 The response to P1-0183 states that tie-offs are to be integral to the skylight's perimeter rail, and that cleaning of the skylights at grids 11 & 28 can be done from the ground adjacent the skylights. Please confirm that tie-offs are needed if the skylights can be cleaned from the ground. Additionally, Cal OSHA regulations for Personal Fall Arrest Systems states "Anchorages to which personal fall arrest			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The design team believes the tie-offs are required. The loading requirement for the fall arrest is required at the anchorage locations. The entire railing system does not need to meet the fall arrest anchorage load requirement. The fall protection applies only to the indicated single tie off anchor labeled on WW1-1703 & WW1-1706.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 315 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0183.2	Additional Information TG08.3 Skylight Fall Protection Tie offs	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference WW1-1703 and WW1-1706 Provide connection details and locations for each the tie-off anchor required for Skylights at GL 11 and 28. Coordinate Window Washing, Architectural and Structural drawings. Are the tie-off anchors around Skylights at GL 11 and 28 integral to the skylight or are they stand alone.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Tie-off anchors are NOT required for Skylights at Gridlines 11 and 28. Refer to attached sketches SKA-3908 and SKA-3909.				
P1-0184	TG08.7 Bearing Support for W-13 Glass Floor	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: S1-6010 and S1-6020 Bearing support shown in detail 8/S1-6010 is not the same as that shown in detail 1 and 2/S1-6020. Please clarify bearing support to be used.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 8/S1-6010 does not show a bearing support, the detail shows a cross section of the structural steel. The detail has been updated to add more dimension lines to clearly indicate that 8/S1-6010 does indeed match the details 1/S1-6020 and 2/S1/6020. This will be issued in a future Addendum. The bearing itself is described in great detail in the specification section on drawing S1-6020.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 316 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0184.1	TG08.7 Bearing Support for W-13 Glass Floor Detail	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: P1-0184, 8/S1-6010, and 1 and 2/S1-6020 RFI P1-0184 Response: "Detail 8/S1-6010 does not show a bearing support, the detail shows a cross section of the structural steel. The detail has been updated to add more dimension lines to clearly indicate that 8/S1-6010 does indeed match the details 1/S1-6020 and 2/S1/6020. This will be issued in a future Addendum. The bearing itself is described in great detail in the specification section on drawing S1-6020. " P1-0184.1: Response to P1-0184 refers to a revised detail to be issued in a future bid package. The detail is required to accurately bid the associated trade package. Please provide the revised detail referenced in the RFI response.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Updated drawings will be submitted with ASI 0120 dated July 11, 2014.		
P1-0185	TG08.7 Glass Floor Support	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference S1-6020 What is the round piece of steel sitting on top of the bearing support shown in detail 2/S1-6020? Provide dimension and clarify type 2 support.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to detail 1/S1-6020 and 3/S1-6020 for this information.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0186	TG08.7 SS Sliding Plate for W-13 Glass Floor	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 3/S1-6020 How does the Stainless Steel sliding plate attach to the structural steel sliding plate? Please clarify.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The sliding bearing is a design-build item. It can be welded, bolted, glued or any other form of attachment method. It will be up to the contractor to select a bearing and with that define a way to attached it to the supporting steel framing.		
P1-0187	TG08.7 W-13 Glass Floor Detail Reference	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 1/S1-6010, 2/S1-6010, and 2/S1-6020 Detail 1/S1-6010 references a 2/S1-6010 which does not exist. Should it refer to detail 2/S1-6020?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Correct, it should reference to 2/S1-6020. The detail will be updated to reflect the correct reference and issued in a future ASI		
P1-0188	Top Coat Material and Color	Closed	06/17/2014	06/27/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: IFC Set 07 81 23 2.4 C Per IFC Set 07 81 23 2.4 C, the decorative top coat for intumescent paint is as specified in 09 97 15, and the custom color is to be selected by TJPA. There does not appear to be a system for top coating intumescent paint specified in 09 97 15, nor a color shown for the finish. Please specify the top coat material, and color.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification 07 81 23 2.4 C is correct. The topcoat or finish coat of steel members fireproofed per 07 81 23 shall adhere to the paint systems specified on 09 97 15. The specified epoxy intumescent coating system is compatible with a wide variety of paint system top coats. Additionally, the contractor shall comply with 09 97 15 1.3 B and 2.3 A and 2.3 B. The colors will be indicated in the drawings in upcoming ASI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 318 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0188.1	Top Coat and Color for Intumescent Coated Steel	Closed	07/22/2014	08/01/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 07 81 23 2.4 C Specification Section 09 97 15 Specification Section 07 81 23 2.4 C indicates that the top coat is to be an aliphatic urethane as specified in Specification Section 09 97 15. Specification Section 09 97 15 does not have a coating system for steel coated in intumescent fireproofing. Please provide the requested top coat and color.					Specification section 07 81 23 1.1 C.2 states that the finish coat is to comply with division 09 for the decorative top coat. Specification section 09 97 16 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 provides the top/finish coat; this is the same coating system for steel elements coated in intumescent fireproofing. Please refer the enclosed sketches for colors.		
P1-0189	Paint Finish Schedule	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
reference: 09 91 00 2.4 A, 2.4 B and A1-9601 - A1-9606 09 91 00 2.4 A indicates that paint colors are indicated on the finish and material schedule. 09 91 00 2.4 B indicates that the number of colors to be used will be determined by the TJPA Representative. Room finish schedules (A1-9601 - A1-9606), nor the paint finish schedule (09 91 00 3.7) appear to provide the paint colors. There does not appear to be a specification or drawings titled "Finish and Material Schedule". Please provide the paint colors and layout.					Both specification statements are correct: Paint colors are indicated on the finish and material schedule - this is found on Sheets A1-9191 to A1-9606; The number of colors has been selected by the TJPA Representative and it is indicated in the Materials Legend on Sheet A1-9606, which includes the rooms where colors occur. There is no need for paint layout. The paint finish schedule on 09 91 00 3.7 indicates the paint system according to the surface or substrate.		
P1-0190	Intumescent Paint	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
- 09 91 00 3.7 indicates there is an intumescent paint for					Reference to painting of plywood backing panels has		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 319 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	plywood backing panels. Architectural, electrical, and telecommunication drawings call out for ¾" pressure treated, fire retardant plywood backing. Finish schedules show the interior walls of electrical and low voltage rooms are to be painted. Specified coatings may not be compatible with the pressure treated, fire retardant plywood. Please confirm intumescent paint is required on the pressure treated, fire retardant plywood backing. If intumescent paint is required, please confirm the pressure treated, fire retardant plywood is compatible with the specified intumescent coatings. NOTE: This may be a good VE item.					been deleted from Section 09 90 00. Updated specification shall be delivered with subsequent ASI.	
P1-0191	Plywood installation	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
reference: contract documents and 06 10 53 The contract documents call out for call out for plate steel to be installed over concrete or CMU walls (2/A1-9144 for example). The finish schedule, electrical, and telecom drawings call out for ¾" plywood to be installed over the walls in these locations. 06 10 53 does not provide information on fasteners/ spacing of fasteners, and there do not appear to be details for fastening plywood through steel plated concrete/CMU walls. Please provide information on installation of plywood panels to steel plated conc./CMU walls.				See specification section 06 10 53 / 3.3.			
				Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.f "The TJPA will reject requests for interpretations or clarification of the Contract Document which can reasonably be derived from a review of the Contract Documents."			
				Turner shall void this RFI and delete it.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 320 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0192	Required Mockups	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: A1-8164 addendum 11 IFC main set Indicate on the drawing what is intended to be mocked up now that the redline drawings (issued on May 16, 2014) have deleted the chamber mockups.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Addendum #11 is not the latest documents for W-2 System, please refer to ASI-120. Lab mockup on Sheet A1-8164 has been deleted and factory visual mockup is indicated in Sheet A1-8152 and revised Specifications.		
P1-0193	LEED Requirements Specific to Glazing	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 08 71 13 Please confirm that this specification does not have any LEED requirements. Additionally 08 71 13 was specific to TG08.1 Design Build Glazing however that trade package has been deleted, if it is needed for TG08.10 revise title accordingly.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification Section 08 71 13 does not have any LEED requirements. To reflect WOJV's revised bidding plan, in a future ASI the title in footer and header for Specification Section 08 71 13 shall be revised to delete the WOJV TG08.1 package number.		
P1-0194	Glass Type	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: A/A1-8166 Please clarify the type of glass above the sill as indicated in this detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> evised sheet A1-8166 and Glass Types Specification 08 80 03 to be issued in future TG08.10 ASI.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0194.1	Glass Type Detail	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: RFI P1-0194, A/A1-8166 RFI P1-0194 Response: "Revised sheet A1-8166 and Glass Types Specification 08 80 03 to be issued in future TG08.10 ASI." P1-0194.1: Response to P1-0194 refers to revised details to be issued in a future bid package. The details are required to accurately bid the associated trade package. Please provide the revised details referenced in the RFI response		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFI P1-0194 Response is correct - as stated, Sheet A1-8166 and Specification Section 08 80 03 were included in ASI 0120 issued July 11, 2014, so there is absolutely no issue on this regard with the Bidding documentation. This RFI (RFI P1-0194.1) is not valid, as the CM/GC has the current schedule of submission of packages. Turner should void and delete this RFI.			
P1-0195	Glass Type	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: C/A1-8166 Please clarify the type of glass above the sill as indicated in this detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Revised sheet A1-8166 and Glass Types Specification 08 80 03 to be issued in future TG08.10 ASI.			
P1-0195.1	Glass Type	Closed	07/07/2014	07/17/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: RFI P1-0195, TG08.2/TG08.10 - Design/Build Glazing Systems addendum #11 C/A1-8166 Response to P1-0195 refers to revised details to be issued in a future bid package. The details are required to accurately bid the associated trade package. Please provide the revised details referenced in the RFI response.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As WOJV was previously informed and as WOJV agreed to, the DB Glazing ASI 0120 is being issued July 11, 2014 to respond to review comments and RFI's for packages TG08.3 (W-10), TG08.7 (W-12, W-13) and TG08.10 (W-2, W-3, W-4, W-6 & W-8).			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0196	Door Schedule	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Zachary Moore</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
reference: A1-9711				See specification section 08 33 23 / 2.5.D for performance requirements for motor size. Motor size shall be determined by the equipment manufacturer.			
Please complete the door schedule to include motor sizes to power the overhead coiling doors.							
P1-0197	W-6 at Superintendents Station	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Zachary Moore</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: 08 44 25 3.10 H Please confirm that the W-6 Sliding Windows At Bus Deck Superintendents Station is no longer required as part of the W-6.				The Bus Deck Superintendent's Station will be a pre-fabricated booth per VE mitigation meetings. Documentation for pre-fabricated booths to be issued in a future package.			
P1-0198	Operator Booths	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Zachary Moore</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
reference: A1-8275, Detail 6				Confirmed. The Muni Bus Plaza GGT Supervisor Booth and SFMTA Booth will be pre-fabricated booths per VE mitigation meetings. Documentation for pre-fabricated booths to be issued in a future package.			
Please clarify that the two operator booths are no longer part of W-6.							
P1-0199	Details for Pop out framed within W-2	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	07/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Zachary Moore</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
reference: A1-8174 and detail 1 Please provide details for pop outs framed with the standard W-2 aluminum mullion system.				Per June 10 and 11, 2014 TG08.10 drawing markup review meetings with WOJV and TJPA, as noted on sheets A1-8174 and A1-8189, revised W-2 pop-out framing to be provided according to typical details on A1-8170, A1-8171, A1-8175 and A1-8185. Revised A1-8174 and A1-8189 sheets are to be issued in			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 323 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
upcoming TG08.10 Issue for Bid Package.							
P1-0200	PVC Detail	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Reference: 5/A1-8883 Per 5/A1-8883 2 ea. 2" dia. PVC pipes penetrate the train box wall for draining FJC2 at ground level. Per 5/A1-8883, concrete is to be poured tight to the PVC pipe, and no sealant/link seal/waterproofing is shown around the pipes within the wall. This may lead to the PVC pipe breaking at the wall if the concrete shifts, and a point for water intrusion at the train box wall. Please confirm this is the desired detail at this location.				The PVC pipes are provided with flexible couplers that are attached to flexible membrane and SS secondary gutters to allow both the gutter and PVC drains to move if the concrete shifts. Refer to annotations on details 4 and 5 of A1-8883 issued with the Main Package IFC dated March 31, 2014. These PVC drain pipes receive 2 plies WPM-1A spiral wrap on the outside face of the foundation and SJ concrete end wall to prevent water intrusion. Refer to annotations on details 4 and 5 of A1-8883 issued with the Main Package IFC dated March 31, 2014. WOJV shall review the details that interface with the Trainbox waterproofing with the WOJV waterproofing system subcontractor/designer (Best/Grace) and submit shop drawings for each waterproofing condition.			
<hr/>							
P1-0201	Bus Crash Rail CIP detail	Closed	06/19/2014	06/29/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: It has been indicated that the bus crash rail is to be changed to CIP concrete. The bus crash rails pass across seismic joints within the building. Please provide the seismic joint specification and details for this work.				Refer to details 1, 2 & 3 on attached sketch SKA-3860 for seismic joint cover plate detailing.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 324 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0201.1	Fastening Requirements for 1/8" Thick SS Bent Metal Plates	Closed	07/23/2014	08/02/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Sketch SKA-3680 of RFI Response P1-0201 Per Sketch SKA-3680 provided in RFI Response P1-0201, 1/8" thick SS bent metal plates are to be installed at the Bus Deck Level Crashrail. Design requirements for attaching the SS bent metal plates referenced in SKA-3680 are not provided. Please provide fastening requirements (anchor size & spacing, or engineering requirements) for 1/8" thick SS bent metal plates fastened on one side to be installed at the bus crash rail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide ½" dia. stainless steel drop in anchors with cap nut at 6" o.c.		
P1-0202	Call outs Marked "FUTURE"	Closed	06/19/2014	06/29/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Details 1,2,3,4, 5 of sheet A1-7589A. Multiple call outs are marked "(FUTURE)". Please confirm there is no scope of work related to these call-outs for Phase 1 work.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		
P1-0203	Terrazo marked "FUTURE"	Closed	06/19/2014	06/29/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Detail 4 of sheet A1-7589A. Detail 4 calls out to "INFILL FRAME WITH TERRAZZO FINISH (FUTURE)". Please confirm that this infill of terrazzo will not be part of phase 1.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0204	Future Loading of W-5 Cladding	Closed	06/19/2014	06/29/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Detail 1 / A1-7844. Detail 1 shows a future W5 Wall Cladding (as part of Phase 2) which will be attached to a train platform partition (partition type 31 as part of Phase 1). Specification 09 22 19 requires that the metal framing of the partition be designed by the Trade Contractor. Is the trade contractor to include the loading of the future W-5 cladding in his design calculations for the metal framing? If so please provide the loading of the future W-5 cladding to be used in the design calculations.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					1. The trade contractor is responsible to include the loading of the future W-5 cladding in his design for the metal framing.		
					2. For loading requirements of the future W-5 cladding system to be used in the design calculations for metal framing, refer to specification section 08 44 39 under 2.3 Design Criteria.		
P1-0205	FJC3A spec and Drawing information	Closed	06/19/2014	06/29/2014	07/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Per 1/A1-8894 FJC3A is to be installed at the bus deck level guardrail, and to refer to specification. 07 09 15 indicates that FJC3A is specified in 07 09 13. 07 09 13 does not indicate the manufacturer, type, gutter, or integration into FJC3. There does not appear to be details showing extent of FJC3A, or tie-in to adjacent expansion joints. Please provide omitted specification and drawing information.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					See specification section 07 09 13 / 3.4 C & D: "Moisture Barrier: Manufacturer's standard modified as shown on drawings."		
P1-0206	Galv. Metal Plate at Fireproofed Beam	Closed	06/20/2014	06/30/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 3/A1-8894 and 3/A1-8897					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per 3/A1-8894 dated 03/31/14 and 3/A1-8897 dated 03/31/14, galv. metal plate is covering a fireproofed beam is to be furnished and installed at the edge of the bus deck and roof park levels. Structural does not appear to show these plates. Please provide size, location, attachment requirements, and fireproofing details for these plates.					Refer to attached sketch SKA-3860. Detail 4 has been added to clarify FJC3A seismic joint assembly and components.		
					Note: there is no galv. metal plate noted nor required for the seismic joint assembly at Roof Park Level (3/A1-8897).		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 326 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0206.1	Design Requirements for Galvanized Metal Plate per Detail 3/A1-8897	Closed	07/23/2014	08/02/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0206, Detail 3/A1-8897 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Per RFI Response P1-0206, there is no galv. metal plate noted nor required for the seismic joint assembly at Roof Park Level (3/A1-8897). Per Detail 3/A1-8897 (see attached) there is a "galv. metal plate covering fireproofed structural beam" which is not detailed within the documents (it is unknown if it is required for a seismic joint assembly). Please provide the design requirements (size, extent, attachment, fireproofing, etc.) for the galvanized metal plate covering fireproofed structural beam depicted on Detail 3/A1-8897.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The response to previous RFI (P1-0206) is correct, there is no galv metal plate required at the fireproofed structural beams. Per VE Item #36, the GFRC system will be eliminated. Please see enclosed SKA-3818R1 and ASK-3963 with revised Roof Park and Bus Deck level fascia drawings, including the seismic joint details.		
P1-0207	Bus Crash Rail Leave Out Areas	Closed	06/20/2014	06/30/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: SKS-358 (S1-8000) Per SKS-358 (S1-8000) dated 06/18/14, the continuous bus crash rail is to have #5 rebar stubbed out of the structural slab. Areas of the bus crash rail are to be left out in order to accommodate material landing areas. Please confirm it is acceptable to use form savers at the leave out areas of the bus crash rails.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		
P1-0208	Alum. Checker Plate	Closed	06/20/2014	06/30/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Scott Shope To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-7504, A1-7506, A1-7507 Per the VE, Alternate Second Mitigation issued on 5/16/14			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Checker plate has been removed from all Stairwells. Refer to SKA-3726, 3727, & 3728.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
P1-0209	Topping Slab Reinforcement	Closed	06/20/2014	06/30/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Scott Shope	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference: A1-9520								Provide rebar in the architectural topping slab around openings, column block-outs and at construction joints per attached sketch SKS-0370. For pipe and conduit penetrations through the topping slab, detail 4/S1-3500 shall apply.
Per the topping slab notes (A1-9520 for instance), reinforcement is called out. No details are referenced for special requirements within the slab (penetrations, column leave outs, construction joints, etc.). Please confirm no additional reinforcement (trimmers at openings, keyways at construction joints, expansion joints at walls, etc.) is needed within the topping slabs other than what is required by the topping slab notes.								

P1-0210	Galvanized Plate Detail	Closed	06/23/2014	07/03/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Zachary Moore	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
reference: A & B/A1-8890								Refer to attached sketch SKA-3885 for corrected annotation related to sheet A1-8890. Also refer to response for RFI P1-206 for requested detailing related to FJC3A seismic joint assembly.
A & B/A1-8890 note "Extent of Galvanized Plate" along GL 10 and 20 between GL H to GL F, and GL D to GL B. The plans, section, and details of these areas do not appear to show galvanized steel plate in these locations. Please provide plans, sections, and details for the referenced galvanized steel plates, or remove the notes if they are not applicable.								



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0211	IFRM Layout	Closed	06/23/2014	07/03/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: Per A/A1-8662 Per A/A1-8662, IFRM-2 is located on the tubular portion of the light column, stopping below the cast node. Per E/A1-8662, IFRM-1 is to be applied to the tubular portion of the light column below the cast node, and IFRM-2 is to be applied to the cast node. Please revise the details to match the desired IFRM layout.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail E/A1-8662 has been revised per the attached SKA-3795 to conform with detail A/A1-8662			
P1-0212	Hot dipped galvanized Plates	Closed	06/23/2014	07/03/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per 1/A1-8894 Per 1/A1-8894 there are hot dipped galvanized plates below the Bus Deck expansion joints (see below), and to refer to structural. Per 1/S1-5005 (see below) these plates are not shown. Please provide the size, dimensions, and attachment for these plates.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to response for RFI P1-0206.			
P1-0213	Clarification on Recoating of Damaged Surfaces	Closed	06/25/2014	07/05/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Specification 07 81 23 3.7 B (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Per Specification 07 81 23 3.7 B, the subcontractor is to "repair areas cut-out or damaged as result of testing. Make repair area invisible under normal lighting conditions at the site from a distance of 2 feet." This requirement may exceed industry standard and result in recoating the entire surface in order to make the required repairs. Please confirm TJPA intends to have surfaces damaged due to testing entirely recoated to meet the invisibility at 2		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Follow the Contract Document specification.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 329 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0214	Request for FJC2 Joint Specification at Ground Level	Closed	06/25/2014	07/05/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Drawing A1-8880, Specification 07 09 13 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Per drawing A1-8880, there are 2 ea. FJC2 expansion joints. One of the FJC2 joints is located at the W-12 exterior glass system (GL 20), and one on the Ground Level adjacent to Beale Street (GL 35). FJC2 as specified in 07 09 13 appears to be for the W-12 system, and 07 09 15 does not appear to specify a seismic joint for FJC2. Please provide a specification for the FJC2 joint located at the Ground Level.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The enclosed SKA-3735, SKA-3736 Drawings and Specification pages with 07 09 13 markup clarify seismic joint assemblies FJC1 and FJC2 accordingly. Revised construction documents will be submitted in forthcoming ASI.				
P1-0215	Panel Noise and Vibration	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 2014/06/16 W-1 Re-issued for Bid 08 44 27 2.2N Noise and/or vibration due to wind are listed as an unacceptable conditions. There is the possibility that wind will create noise and/or vibration in properly installed panels because of factors such as (but not limited to) perforations and gaps between panels. If provisions remains in the specifications, they may result in additional cost in the bids and/or limit the bidding pool. Confirm that noise and/or vibration caused by wind within properly installed panels will be acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> JV, TJPA, PMPC, and the design team discussed this extensively. The specification as written is the agreed upon Contract Document. Noise and/or vibration caused by wind are not acceptable and are assumed, until determined otherwise, to be an indication that the panels are not installed properly.				

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0215.1	Exterior Awning Noise Due to Wind	Void	08/13/2014	08/23/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 08 44 27 Section 2.2N (TG08.2 Issued for Rebid Documents) Please confirm that noise due to wind moving through the patterns cut out in the Aluminum Panels of the Exterior Awning and through the gaps between the panels Exterior Awing and noise due to wind moving above and below the entire system is not to be considered an unacceptable condition. The contractor is providing the pattern per the contract documents and they will have no control over any noise due to wind moving through the predetermined pattern, gaps between each panel and wind moving above and below the entire system. The contractor should only be responsible for noise due to vibration caused by poor workmanship and should not be responsible for any noise due to the inherent design of the W-1 Exterior Awning.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<hr/>							
P1-0216	Touch up Specification	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 08 44 27 3.10 F.1.b Specification Section 08 44 27 calls for touchup so that repair is invisible from a distance of 2 ft. According to PDCA P1-04 TOUCH-UP PAINTING AND DAMAGE REPAIR (see attached), Section 2.3 states: "...In order to determine whether a surface has been "properly painted" it shall be examined without magnification at a distance of thirty-nine (39) inches or one (1) meter, or more, under finished lighting conditions and from a normal viewing position." Based on PDCA recommendations, anything less than 39" may result an unnecessary increase in cost to the bids. Additionally, the nearest normal viewing position of the final constructed awning will be several meters. Please confirm that the 2 ft. requirement is to remain.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, follow the Contract Documents.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 331 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0217	Multiple Seismic Joint Assembly Manufacturers per Specification Section 07 09 13 Closed		07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Ray Quesada				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 09 13 2.2 A 1 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Specification Section 07 09 13 2.2 A 1, Construction Specialties, Inc. is the basis of design for the seismic joint assemblies. As such, the details associated with the seismic joints which were bid out to Shimmick and Skanska were based upon Construction Specialties, Inc. Specification 07 09 13 2.2 A goes on to list another 3 manufacturers which can be used. Since each manufacturer may require different block-outs, embeds, attachment to structure, etc., there could be some added unforeseen costs if a bidder uses a product which is not the basis of design.					Let the bidders know that Construction Specialties is the basis of design and that the bidder will need to cover any costs associated with using one of the other listed manufacturers.		
Would TJPA like us to direct the bidders to cover any costs associated with any changes required due to the use of a product which is not the basis of design, or would TJPA like to carry the risk/costs associated with this?							
P1-0218	Inconsistent Specification and Drawing References for Joint Sizes and Movement Closed		07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 09 13 2.4 B, Detail 2/A-8880, Detail 1/A1-8880 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Specification Section 07 09 13 2.4 B, there is a chart indicating joint sizes and movement requirements on Detail 2/A-8880. The chart is on Detail 1/A1-8880. Please revise the specification section to agree with the drawing.					Specification Section 07 09 13 2.4 B has been revised to state:		
					"B. Refer to Drawing 1/A-8880 for chart indicating joint sizes and movement requirements."		
P1-0219	Seismic Joint Type FJC1 Within the Roof Park Landscaping/Paving Closed		07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 332 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REFERENCE: Sheet A1-8880 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Per Sheet A1-8880, Seismic Joint Type FJC1 is located within the roof park landscape/paving. Is Seismic Joint Type FJC1 to be deferred with the rest of the roof park?						
P1-0220	Park Deferral Waterproofing	Closed	07/02/2014	07/02/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author:		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: Reference: Addendum #11 Dated 05-16-14 A1-8404 detail 1 Due to the deferral of the roof park landscaping items that would have been covered, the waterproofing and drainage gutter assembly for the W-10 Skylight, be exposed to UV and weather for a prolonged period of time. Please provide any provisions necessary to mitigate this changed condition.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
			This RFI refers to a question previously answered in RFI P1-135. The components of detail 1/A1-8404 are not impacted by the issues on RFI P1-0135.				
P1-0221	Inconsistent Drawing and Specification Titles for Expansion/Seismic Joints	Closed	07/02/2014	07/02/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author:		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: REFERENCE: Sheet A1-8880 , Specification Section 07 09 13 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Sheet A1-8880 is titled "Expansion Joint Schedule". Specification Section 07 09 13 is titled "Seismic Joint Assemblies". Please change one of the titles to match the other.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
			Sheet A1-8880 is titled "Expansion Joint Schedule", because it provides in a listing form graphical aspects of all expansion joints; it includes other expansion joints not found on Specification Section 07 09 13. Specification Section 07 09 13 is titled "Seismic Joint Assemblies" and puts forth the technical specification of seismic joint assemblies. The two documents do not provide the same information, thus titles are not the same.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0222	Revision to Adjoining Material for Joint Types CJC1 and CJC2	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-8880 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Sheet A1-8880, the adjoining material for Joint Type CJC1 and Joint Type CJC3 is GFRC. Please revise the table to reflect the actual adjacent material to be used.					See attached SKA-3736.1 with revised adjoining material for Joint Type CJC1 and Joint Type CJC3. Sheet A1-8880 will be issued in a future ASI.		
P1-0223	Finish Clarification for Joint Type FJC6	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-8880 , Specification Section 07 09 13 3.4 G (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Sheet A1-8880, the finish for Joint Type FJC6 and adjacent materials are to be selected by Tennant, while Specification Section 07 09 13 3.4 G indicates it is to be recessed to receive terrazzo. Please provide the desired finish.					See attached SKA-3736.2 and Spec Section markup with revised infill material for seismic joint cover FJC6.		
P1-0224	Absence of Joint Type FJC7 at Bus Ramp Per Sheet A1-8880	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-8880 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Sheet A1-8880, Joint Type FJC7 is located where the bus ramp abuts the building. Sheet A1-8880 does not appear to show an expansion joint at this location. Please revise Sheet A1-8880 to show the location of Joint Type FJC7 or provide details on the location of Joint Type FJC7.					Sheet A1-8880 is correct. FJC7 is detailed on sheet A1-8378.		
					Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.f "The TJPA will reject requests for interpretations or clarification of the Contract Document which can reasonably be derived from a review of the Contract Documents."		
					Turner shall void this RFI and delete it.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 334 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0225	Joint Type CJC4 Locations per Sheet A1-8880 on the Ground Level and Second Le Closed		07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-8880, Sheet A1-4303, Sheet A1-4403 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Sheet A1-8880, Joint Type CJC4 is within GWB ceilings at GL 10 on the Ground Level and the Second Level. Sheet A1-4303 at GL 10 on the Ground Level shows W-16A, but does not call out a seismic joint or details. Sheet A1-4403 at GL 10 on the Second Level does not call out a seismic joint or details. Please revise the drawings and schedule to match.					Please refer to following Sketches: SKA-3736.3, SKA-3820, SKA-3821 & SKA-3822 that clarify seismic joint cover CJC4 to be issued a subsequent ASI.		
P1-0226	Materials for Seismic Joint Assemblies per Specification Section 07 09 13 Closed		07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 09 13 2.5 Specification Section 07 09 13 2.6 Specification Section 07 09 13 2.7 Specification Section 07 09 15					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Spec Section 07 09 13 2.5 indicates the materials and coatings to be used. Spec Section 07 09 13 2.6 indicates that the joint assembly design to be based upon the design shown. Spec Section 07 09 13 2.7, indicates that an engineer is to design the materials for use in the seismic joints. Are the subcontractors to follow Spec Section 07 09 13 2.5 as per Spec Section 07 09 13 2.6, or redesign the materials per Spec Section 07 09 13 2.7? This is similar to Spec Section 07 09 15.					Specification Section 07 09 13 / 2.5 and 07 09 13 / 2.6 are correct as stated. At the request of the CM/GC in different review meetings, the TJPA directed the Design Team to delete the requirement for a Corrosion Engineer in all the Glazing and Cladding specifications.		
					Specification Section 07 09 13 /2.7 is not incorrect as currently issued. However, to further reduce costs on the Project, Specification Section 07 09 13 / 2.7. will also be revised to deleted the requirement of a Corrosion Engineer and will state the following:		
					"Conduct a component-by-component analysis of potential corrosion resulting from galvanic action between materials, for components of the work of this section and provide report."		
					This revision will also be applied to specification Section 07 09 15. These two Specifications will be re-issued in subsequent ASI.		
P1-0227	Omitted Information for Joint Type FJC8	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0230	Information for Specification Section 03 30 03 per Sheet A1-9522	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-9522 (Attached), Specification Section 03 30 03 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per the notes on Sheet A1-9522, the concrete topping slab in the following locations are to be provided with the required thickness and as described by the structural engineer in Specification Section 03 30 03:					The notes on the drawings have been revised from "section 03 30 03" to read "section 03 30 02". Refer to the attached SKA-3750 which reflects updated Trainbox topping slab notes. This amendment is applicable to drawing sheets# A1-9520, A1-9521, and A1-9523 to A1-9537.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Train Platform & Lower Concourse Level- Vehicle and Bicycle Ramp- Bus Deck Level Topping & Curbs- All Other Concrete Toppings							
No documentation is provided for Specification Section 03 30 03. Please provide the specifications for section 03 30 03.							
P1-0230.1	Details and Specifications for Concrete Sloping to Zero Thickness	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0230					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per RFI Response P1-0230, topping slab concrete is to be as specified in Specification Section 03 30 02. Per Specification Section 03 30 02, all concrete mixes, excluding the concrete fill at basket columns, have a 3/4" aggregate.					For typical detail for concrete at the small ramps, refer to Structural detail 5/S1-5003.		
In several locations (Train Platform Level GL 2 - 4 and GL A - F for example) show the topping slabs sloping to zero thickness. This condition will not allow the use of aggregate or reinforcing as noted on the revised sheets in the response to RFI Response P1-0230.							
Please provide details and specifications for sloping of concrete to zero thickness.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 337 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0230.2	Concrete Ramp Details for Structural Slabs Poured per Slab Plans	Closed	07/22/2014	08/01/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0230.1, Detail 5/S1-5003 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					The referenced structural detail calls for saw cut and roughening of the slab to ¼" amplitude. The architectural slab edge drawings are not intended to show areas of slab roughening.		
RFI Response P1-0230.1 references Detail 5/S1-5003 for the installation of small ramps. Per Detail 5/S1-5003, there is a minimum slab thickness of 2" at the ramp, to saw cut the concrete at the nose of the ramp, and to roughen the surface of the structural slab to receive the ramp.					The small ramps have been shown on the architectural zone plans and on the structural details since well before the Below Grade Package TG07 Issue for Construction. Execution of this a contractors means and methods item and the drawings do not need to be revised as requested in this RFI.		
Architectural slab edge plans do not show depressions within the structural slabs where these ramps exist (topping slab ramps or housekeeping pad/mechanical pad ramps). As such, a 2"x40" swath of concrete would need to be removed where concrete has been poured per the slab plans (note - mat slab rebar is 1.5" clr. from the t.o. slab, 1 way slab and composite deck rebar is 3/4" clr. from the t.o. slab).							
Please provide revised concrete ramp details where structural slabs have been poured per the slab plans.							
P1-0230.3	Rebar Depressions and Fixes at 2" Depressions	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: Detail 5/S1-5003 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					It is not necessary to provide depressions in the slab for the small concrete ramps. As suggested in the RFI, a different material can be provide the taper of the small ramps.		
Detail 5/S1-5003 requires a minimum 2" thickness of concrete for the ramp. In order to maintain a minimum 2" thickness, a depression in the slab will need to be provided at the ramps. Depressions are shown on the slab edge plans.					Specification section 09 30 00 to be revised as follows:		
Train platform, lower concourse decks, and associated reinforcement are part of TG06, not TG07.2.					09 30 00 2.7.H Leveling Topping: One of the following or equal.		
Please revise the plans to show depressions and fixes for rebar at the 2" depressions, or provide a different material					1. Mapei "Planicrete 50" (basis of design)		
					2. Mapei "Mapecem"		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 338 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0231	Details for Embedded Plate per Detail 2/A1-9228	Closed	07/08/2014	07/18/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
REFERENCE: RFI P1-0063 Response, Detail 2/A1-9228, Sheet SKA-3667 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/2014)			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Per RFI P1-0063 response, "Detail 2/A1-9228 has been updated. Detail reference 4/A-0026 SIM has been removed. Refer to the attached SKA-3667."			AAI Response: For updated 2/A1-9228, refer to updated SKA-3667R1				
The revised detail shows an embedded plate at the B.O. Lower Concourse Deck. No information is provided for the embeded plate. Please provide information on embedded plate.			TT Response: See detail 5/S1-9001 for top of CMU wall brace detail. Note, detail 5 allows for cast-in-place and post-installed options. Both are acceptable.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 339 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0232	Details for Expansion Joint Located at the Bus Bridge, Bus Deck, and Building Co	Closed	07/11/2014	07/21/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Details 2 & 3/A1-8378 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14), Detail 4/SKA-3609 (ASI 119 dated 6/18/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Details 2 & 3/ A1-8378 depict an expansion joint to be placed where the bus bridge conjoins with the bus deck. The same expansion joint is not shown in Detail 4/SKA-3609 at the same location.					Expansion joint has been added to sketch SKA-3609_R1, see attached.		
Please provide details and specifications showing how the expansion joint interacts with the bus deck, building, and both sides of the new concrete bus crash rail.					Details 2 and 3 on A1-8378 have been revised in SKA-3661_R1, to clarify the interaction of the building elements at Bus Ramp expansion joint FJC7.		
					Joint WJC9 added to clarify the interaction of W-9 panels at the bottom and sides of the Bus Ramp expansion joint. This joint is also included in revised seismic joint specification 07 09 13 and schedule on A1-8880 per attached. Both of these documents are being issued as part of ASI 0123 but have been included for clarification in this response.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 341 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: L-0006 and L-0007 While sizing the maximum load for the rooftop cranes it was communicated by PWP and TT that the maximum tree size will be no greater than 25,000 lbs and that the roof is designed for a maximum of 26,000 lbs. Confirm that the structure will be able to accommodate the additional tree weight which will incur over the years as the trees grow.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TT Response: The roof structure was designed for the tree weights given to us by PWP during the course of the design. It was noted that the tree weights are the "average" weight of the mature tree. For seismic design, the "average" tree weight was used, because the floor slab diaphragm will distribute the weight of all trees to the seismic force-resisting system. For gravity design of steel beams carrying the tree, a factor of safety of 2 is applied to the "average" weight to account for the situation when a specific tree outgrows the "average" weight. The tree weight for the seismic design and gravity design is tabulated in the contract document Detail 2/S-1013. PWP Response: The "average" size of tree materials was determined by species and available soil volume (growing medium).			
P1-0236	Details for Expansion Joint Covers in Concrete Barrier	Void	07/11/2014	07/21/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 1/SKA-3616 (ASI 119 dated 6/18/2014) Detail 1/SKA-3616 calls for a expansion joint cover within the new concrete barrier. There are no details, specifications, or information on this expansion joint cover. Please provide the details and specifications for the referenced expansion joint cover.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to response for RFI P1-0201 for seismic joint cover plate detailing. Refer also to Specification section 4.05 75 00 4 Architectural Metal Fabrications, Item 1.1.D.1.			

Page: 342 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>specifications outlined by the Narrative. Based on the description, 12 93 30 and 12 93 30/APA have been fully consolidated into 28 16 44 and 28 16 44/APA. They should show as being deleted or revised if they are still meant to be included. At the moment there is conflicting information without this update. The TOC does not reflect the date of the most current marked up specs either. Provide clarification and an updated TOC.</p>							
P1-0240	Incorrect Specification Reference	Void	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: ASI 119 and 00 50 00 00 50 00 markup dated 06/18/2014 - Section 2.5.H needs to refer to section 28 16 44, not 12 93 30. Please correct or provide clarification as to what they need to refer to in 12 93 30.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Turner shall void this RFI. Specification section 00 50 00 does not exist. See the attached specification index issued with ASI 119.			
P1-0241	Blockout or Sleeve Locations	Closed	07/14/2014	07/14/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: ASI 119 and A1-3100 Routing for lines from HPU to Pull Box are indicated. Clarify if blockouts or sleeves are being added for TG07.2 to accommodate this, as discussed at RFI meeting on 05/23/2014. If so, provide for every location. It is not clear on these drawings.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Edge of Slab sheets in ASI-0121 issued on 07/18/2014. Design Team does not assign scope for Trade Groups.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0241.1	Blockout or Sleeve Locations	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
reference : ASI 121: A1-2870, A1-2862, A1-2864, A1-2866, and A1-2867				Refer to sheets A1-2852, A1-2862, A1-2864, A1-2866 and A1-2867 issued with ASI# 0123 on 08/06/2014. Also refer to attached SKA-3432 (based on sheet A1-2870).			
RFI P1-0241 response: "Refer to Edge of Slab sheets in ASI-0121 issued on 07/18/2014. Design Team does not assign scope for Trade Groups."							
Edge of Slab sheets do not show block outs for bollard and barrier hydraulic and electrical lines to each of the HPUs as was discussed in RFI meeting on 05/23/2014.							
- A1-2870 - Provide sleeves or blockouts for retractable bollards and barriers in the shoring wall area at vehicle ramp so that hydraulic and electrical lines may reach the HPU.							
- A1-2862 - Provide sleeves or blockouts for retractable bollards and barriers at GL 1 and Natoma St. so that hydraulic and electrical lines may reach the HPU.							
- A1-2864 - Provide blockout and/or sleeves for Natoma loading dock area so that hydraulic and electrical lines may reach the HPU.							
- A1-2866 and A1-2867 - Confirm that 4"" SL's on GL 27 and 343.5 are for the wedge barrier hydraulic and electrical lines to reach the HPU below. If not, provide sleeves or blockouts so that hydraulic and electrical lines may connect to the HPU.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 345 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0243	Blockout or Sleeve Locations	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: ASI 119 and SKA-3584 (A1-3105) Routing for lines from HPU to Pull Box are indicated. Clarify if blockouts or sleeves are being added for TG07.2 to accommodate this, as discussed at RFI meeting on 05/23/2014. If so, provide for every location. It is not clear on these drawings.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to response provided to RFI P1-0241.			
P1-0244	HPU Routing Detail	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	07/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: ASI 119 and SKA-3584 (A1-3105) Routing for lines from HPU to Pull Box and Retractable Bollards are drawn as red and blue. Define the difference between the red and blue lines. They are not labeled.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The routing of power and hydraulic lines is part of Retractable Bollard fabricator/bidder's scope. SKA-3584 (A1-3105) assumes one of many possible solutions to be provided by the Retractable Bollard fabricator/bidder. In SKA-3584 blue lines assume electrical conduits, while red lines assume hydraulic feed conduits.			
P1-0245	Information on Steel Plates for Utility Pads	Closed	07/14/2014	07/14/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Sheet A1-3002 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) As shown on Sheet A1-3002, steel plates have been added to the utility pads. No information is provided regarding the thickness of the steel plates, attachment details, or grounding details. Please provide the thickness, attachment, and grounding details for the steel plates referenced on Sheet A1-3002.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI Response: For Steel plates thickness and size refer to SFPUC drawing sheets# ES-2213 to ES-2215. TT Response: Steel plates shall be embedded in the concrete pads with shear studs welded to the bottom of the plates as shown in detail 5/S1-3002. WSP Response: Typical for each steel plate at the SFPUC			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

transformers: Contractor to tap the grounding electrode conductor embedded in the vault slab. Extend tap conductor in the slab and bond to the steel plate. Additionally, contractor to bond the metal ladders in the vaults and sumps pits. Bond to building steel. See attached sketch SKE-036 and apply required scope revision for each vault.

P1-0246	ASI 118 and 119 Discrepancy	Closed	07/14/2014	07/14/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

reference: ASI 118, 119 and A1-7416 (SK-3524)
There are discrepancies between ASI 118 (Addendum #4) and ASI 119 for this sheet. ASI 118 and 119 are both dated 06/20/2014. Confirm that ASI 119 is meant to take precedence. It does not appear to be the most current version.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: ☐

Per request of WOJV and PMPC, all VE items issued in ASI 0118 (MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid Addendum 4) which were not related to MEP package were provided in ASI 0119. ASI 0119 is a combination of "VE Round 2" and "MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid - Addendum #4". This sheet - A1-7416 (SKA-3524) is the same sheet in each package. This is noted on the revision narrative provided with ASI 0119.

Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.d "RFIs shall not be used for the following: the TJPA will not reply and will reject the RFI: d. Questions on contract administration procedural matters, unless they required interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents." This questions relates to a contract administration procedural matter that WOJV jointly determine and assisted in providing direction on how the documents were to be issued and labeled. WOJV has not coordinated knowledge of this matter between the internal parties. WOJV shall void this RFI and Turner shall reject the RFI.

P1-0247	ASI 118 and 119 Discrepancy	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 347 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: ASI 118, 119 and A1-7418 (SKA-3526) There are discrepancies between ASI 118 (Addendum #4) and ASI 119 for this sheet. ASI 118 and 119 are both dated 06/20/2014. Confirm that ASI 119 is meant to take precedence. It does not appear to be the most current version.			Per request of WOJV and PMPC, all VE items issued in ASI 0118 (MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid Addendum 4) which were not related to MEP package were provided in ASI 0119. ASI 0119 is a combination of "VE Round 2" and "MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid - Addendum #4". This sheet - A1-7418 (SKA-3526) is the same sheet in each package. This is noted on the revision narrative provided with ASI 0119. Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.d "RFIs shall not be used for the following: the TJPAs will not reply and will reject the RFI: d. Questions on contract administration procedural matters, unless they required interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents." This questions relates to a contract administration procedural matter that WOJV jointly determine and assisted in providing direction on how the documents were to be issued and labeled. WOJV has not coordinated knowledge of this matter between the internal parties. WOJV shall void this RFI and Turner shall reject the RFI.				
P1-0248	Information on Checker Plate on Loading Dock CMU Walls	Closed	07/14/2014	07/14/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Detail B/A1-3101 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail B/A1-3101 calls for checker plates to be fastened to the CMU walls in Loading Dock 01224. No details or design requirements have been provided for the attachment of the checker plates to the CMU Walls referenced on Detail B/A1-3101. Please provide the details and design requirements for the depicted checker plates.			For design requirement of checker plate to CMU wall: ¿Attach, per CID A-A-1922A, 400 series stainless steel recessed fasteners through to stainless steel expanding sleeve in CMU wall. Flush countersunk fasteners maximum 2¿-0¿ o.c.¿. This requirement to be included in specification section ¿05 50 00 ¿ Metal Fabrications, item 2.5.N¿ in a future ASI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 348 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0249	ASI 118 and 119 Discrepancy	Closed	07/14/2014	07/14/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: ASI 118, 119 and A1-7419 (SKA-3527) There are discrepancies between ASI 118 (Addendum #4) and ASI 119 for this sheet. ASI 118 and 119 are both dated 06/20/2014. Confirm that ASI 119 is meant to take precedence. It does not appear to be the most current version.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Per request of WOJV and PMPC, all VE items issued in ASI 0118 (MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid Addendum 4) which were not related to MEP package were provided in ASI 0119. ASI 0119 is a combination of "VE Round 2" and "MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid - Addendum #4". This sheet - A1-7419 (SKA-3527) is the same sheet in each package. This is noted on the revision narrative provided with ASI 0119.		
					Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.d "RFIs shall not be used for the following: the TJPA will not reply and will reject the RFI: d. Questions on contract administration procedural matters, unless they required interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents." This questions relates to a contract administration procedural matter that WOJV jointly determine and assisted in providing direction on how the documents were to be issued and labeled. WOJV has not coordinated knowledge of this matter between the internal parties. WOJV shall void this RFI and Turner shall reject the RFI.		
P1-0250	Reference for Corner Guards	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-3105 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Confirmed, corner guards are referenced in Specification Section 05 50 00 ¿ Metal Fabrications.		
The "Corner Guards by Misc Metals" called out on Sheet A1-3105 are referencing Specification Section 05 51 00. Specification Section 05 51 00 is for Steel Stairs and Railing.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm that the "Corner Guards by Misc Metals" should be referencing Specification Section 05 50 00 for Metal Fabrications.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 349 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0251	ASI 118 and 119 Discrepancy sheet A1-7420 (SKA-3528)	Closed	07/14/2014	07/14/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: ASI 118, 119 and A1-7420 (SKA-3528) There are discrepancies between ASI 118 (Addendum #4) and ASI 119 for this sheet. ASI 118 and 119 are both dated 06/20/2014. Confirm that ASI 119 is meant to take precedence. It does not appear to be the most current version.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per request of WOJV and PMPC, all VE items issued in ASI 0118 (MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid Addendum 4) which were not related to MEP package were provided in ASI 0119. ASI 0119 is a combination of "VE Round 2" and "MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid - Addendum #4". This sheet - A1-7420 (SKA-3528) is the same sheet in each package. This is noted on the revision narrative provided with ASI 0119. Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.d "RFIs shall not be used for the following: the TJPAs will not reply and will reject the RFI: d. Questions on contract administration procedural matters, unless they required interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents." This questions relates to a contract administration procedural matter that WOJV jointly determine and assisted in providing direction on how the documents were to be issued and labeled. WOJV has not coordinated knowledge of this matter between the internal parties. WOJV shall void this RFI and Turner shall reject the RFI.		
<hr/>							
P1-0252	Indicator Light Pylons and Photo Electric Beam Pylons	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: ASI 118 and 119 - A1-7420 (Detail C), A1-7420 Detail C - Indicator light pylons and photo electric beam pylons are missing from either side of the retractable bollard sets based on A1-7418 and 28 16 44. Confirm that indicator light pylons and photo electric beam pylons are intended to be included in this detail and provide an updated detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, indicator light and photo electric beam pylons are included. Refer to the attached sketches SKA-3903 and SKA-3904 showing indicator light pylons and photo electric beam sensors.		
<hr/>							
P1-0253	ASI 118 and 119 Discrepancy sheet A1-7421 (SKA-3529)	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference: A1-7421 (SKA-3529) There are discrepancies between ASI 118 (Addendum #4) and ASI 119 for this sheet. ASI 118 and 119 are both dated 06/20/2014. Confirm that ASI 119 is meant to take precedence. It does not appear to be the most current version.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Per request of WOJV and PMPC, all VE items issued in ASI 0118 (MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid Addendum 4) which were not related to MEP package were provided in ASI 0119. ASI 0119 is a combination of "VE Round 2" and "MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid - Addendum #4". This sheet - A1-7421 (SKA-3529) is the same sheet in each package. This is noted on the revision narrative provided with ASI 0119.</p> <p>Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.d "RFIs shall not be used for the following: the TJPA will not reply and will reject the RFI: d. Questions on contract administration procedural matters, unless they required interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents." This questions relates to a contract administration procedural matter that WOJV jointly determine and assisted in providing direction on how the documents were to be issued and labeled. WOJV has not coordinated knowledge of this matter between the internal parties. WOJV shall void this RFI and Turner shall reject the RFI.</p>		
P1-0254	Corner Guard Specification Details	Closed			07/14/2014 07/24/2014 08/05/2014 Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>		
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Specification Section 05 50 00 2.5M (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</p> <p>Specification Section 05 50 00 2.5M states: "M. Corner Guards For Concrete Columns/Concrete Block Walls: as detailed, 4' x 4" x ½" fabricated aluminum angles, 4'-0" high minimum and as shown on drawings with anchor straps at 12" o.c."</p> <p>The referenced details do not appear to be provided. Please provide the details called out in Specification Section 05 50 00 2.5M.</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The corner guards are indicated in the Ground Floor Loading docks, refer to drawings A1-3100 and A1-3105 and at the B1 Level Oversized Equipment Storage Overhead Door, refer to drawings A1-7426 and A1-7427.</p> <p>Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.f "The TJPA will reject requests for interpretations or clarification of the Contract Document which can reasonably be derived from a review of the Contract Documents."</p> <p>Turner shall void this RFI and delete it.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 352 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0257	ASI 118 and 119 Discrepancy sheet A1-7424 (SKA-3532)	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
reference: ASI 118, 119 and A1-7424 (SKA-3532)			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
There are discrepancies between ASI 118 (Addendum #4) and ASI 119 for this sheet. ASI 118 and 119 are both dated 06/20/2014. Confirm that ASI 119 is meant to take precedence. It does not appear to be the most current version.			Per request of WOJV and PMPC, all VE items issued in ASI 0118 (MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid Addendum 4) which were not related to MEP package were provided in ASI 0119. ASI 0119 is a combination of "VE Round 2" and "MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid - Addendum #4". This sheet - A1-7424 (SKA-3535) is the same sheet in each package.				
SUGGESTION:			Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.d "RFIs shall not be used for the following: the TJPA will not reply and will reject the RFI: d. Questions on contract administration procedural matters, unless they required interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents." This questions relates to a contract administration procedural matter that WOJV jointly determine and assisted in providing direction on how the documents were to be issued and labeled. WOJV has not coordinated knowledge of this matter between				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 353 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0258	Manufacturers On-site for Bollard/Barrier Installation	Closed	07/14/2014	07/14/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 28 16 44 1.2.A ASI 119					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1.2.A states that "Contractor is responsible for having the manufacturer of the product on site during the installation process to monitor the work associated with their product." Clarify how many hours the manufacturer needs to be on site. Is the Contractor required to have the manufacturer on site full time?					The Manufacturer shall be the entity that determines how much time they require for their representative to review the work to certify the installation.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0259	ASI 118 and 119 Discrepancy sheet A1-8720 (SKA-3542)	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: ASI 118, 119 and A1-8720 (SKA-3542)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
There are discrepancies between ASI 118 (Addendum #4) and ASI 119 for this sheet. ASI 118 and 119 are both dated 06/20/2014. Confirm that ASI 119 is meant to take precedence. It appears that neither ASI on its own is the most current for this sheet. Provide a revised sheet incorporating the most current information.					Per request of W/O and PMPC, all VE items issued in ASI 0118 (MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid Addendum 4) which were not related to MEP package were provided in ASI 0119. ASI 0119 is a combination of "VE Round 2" and "MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid - Addendum #4". This sheet - A1-8720 (SKA-3542) is the same sheet in each package. This is noted on the revision narrative provided with ASI 0119.		
					Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.d "RFIs shall not be used for the following: the TJPA will not reply and will reject the RFI: d. Questions on contract administration procedural matters, unless they required interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents." This questions relates to a contract administration procedural matter that WOJV jointly determine and assisted in providing direction on how the documents were to be issued and labeled. WOJV has not coordinated knowledge of this matter between the internal parties. WOJV shall void this RFI and Turner shall reject the RFI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 355 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0260	ASI 118 and 119 Discrepancy sheet	A1-8721 (SKA-3543)	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: ASI 118, 119 and A1-8721 (SKA-3543) There are discrepancies between ASI 118 (Addendum #4) and ASI 119 for this sheet. ASI 118 and 119 are both dated 06/20/2014. Confirm that ASI 119 is meant to take precedence. It appears that neither ASI on its own is the most current for this sheet. Provide a revised sheet incorporating the most current information.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per request of WOJV and PMPC, all VE items issued in ASI 0118 (MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid Addendum 4) which were not related to MEP package were provided in ASI 0119. ASI 0119 is a combination of "VE Round 2" and "MEP/TE/SE/VT Issued for Bid - Addendum #4". This sheet - A1-8721 (SKA-3543) is the same sheet in each package. Per specification section 01 10 40 / 1.6 C.2.d "RFIs shall not be used for the following: the TJPA will not reply and will reject the RFI: d. Questions on contract administration procedural matters, unless they required interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents." This questions relates to a contract administration procedural matter that WOJV jointly determine and assisted in providing direction on how the documents were to be issued and labeled. WOJV has not coordinated knowledge of this matter between the internal parties. WOJV shall void this RFI and Turner shall reject the RFI.		
<hr/>							
P1-0261	Difference Between Bollards	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 28 16 44 section 2.2 -Clarify the difference between Bollard Type 1 and Bollard Type 1A. They have the exact same requirements. -Clarify the difference between Bollard Types 2, 2A, 2B and 2C. They have the exact same requirements. -Clarify the difference between Bollard Types 3 and 3A. They have the exact same requirements. -Clarify the difference between Bollard Type BOL-1 and BOL-2. They have the exact same requirements.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. For difference between bollard Type 1 and Type 1A refer to 28 16 44 2.2.B.3. 2. For difference between bollard Types 2, 2A, 2B and 2C refer to 28 16 44 2.2.D.3 / E.3 / F.3. Also refer to drawings for context and adjacencies. 3. For difference between bollard Type 3 and Type 3A refer to 28 16 44 2.2.G.3. 4. For difference between bollard Type BOL-1 and Type BOL-2 refer to drawings for context and adjacencies.		
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 356 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0262	Blockout or Sleeve Detail	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: ASI 118 drawings A1-2206, A1-2203, A1-2207, and A1-2210				Refer to Edge of Slab sheets issued with ASI-0123, dated 08/06/2014.			
-Clarify if blockouts or sleeves are being added for TG07.2 to accommodate the HPU locations on the lower concourse, as discussed at RFI meeting on 05/23/2014. If so, provide for every location. It is not clear on these drawings.							
P1-0263	Blockout or Sleeve Detail	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By:							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: ASI 118 and A1-2203							
Clarify if blockouts or sleeves are being added for TG07.2 to accommodate the HPU locations on the lower concourse, as discussed at RFI meeting on 05/23/2014. If so, provide for every location. It is not clear on these drawings.							
P1-0264	Difference between Type 2 Bollards	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By:							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: 28 16 44 Section 2.2.C, 2.2.D, 2.2.E and 2.2.F:							
Clarify the difference between Bollard Types 2, 2A, 2B and 2C. They have the exact same requirements.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0265	Difference between Bollards Type 3	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By:</div> <div>Co-Author:</div> <div>REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Reference: 28 16 44 Section 2.2.G and 2.2.H</div> <div>Clarify the difference between Bollard Types 3 and 3A. They have the exact same requirements.</div>							
P1-0266	Blockout or Sleeve Detail	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By:</div> <div>Co-Author:</div> <div>REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Reference: ASI 118 and A1-2207 Clarify if blockouts or sleeves are being added for TG07.2 to accommodate the HPU locations on the lower concourse, as discussed at RFI meeting on 05/23/2014. If so, provide for every location. It is not clear on these drawings.</div>							
P1-0267	Blockout or Sleeve Detail	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By:</div> <div>Co-Author:</div> <div>REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Reference: ASI 118 and A1-2210 Clarify if blockouts or sleeves are being added for TG07.2 to accommodate the HPU locations on the lower concourse, as discussed at RFI meeting on 05/23/2014. If so, provide for every location. It is not clear on these drawings.</div>							
P1-0268	Difference between BOL-1 and BOL-2	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By:</div> <div>Co-Author:</div> <div>REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Reference: 28 16 44 2.2.J and 2.2.K ASI 119</div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 358 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Clarify the difference between Bollard Type BOL-1 and BOL-2. They have the exact same requirements.							
P1-0269	Vehicle Pulse	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Reference: ASI 119 and 28 16 44 2.6.B.3 - Clarify how "b. Pulse on vehicle arrival" and "c. Pulse on vehicle departure" are different from "d. Pulse on arrival and departure."				"Pulse on arrival" and "pulse on departure" differs from "pulse on arrival and departure" because "pulse on arrival" and "pulse on departure" and distinct single event actions and is common associated with a single vehicle. "Pulse on arrival and departure" refers to two events occurring near simultaneously by two vehicles (e.g. one car departing the road loop while a second car enters its detection field).			
P1-0270	API or SDK Interface	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44 2.8.B.4 ASI 119 2.8.B.4 states that "Any features not available through the API or SDK interface shall be described as an exception by the Contractor as a part of the Contractor's bid." Since exceptions are not allowed in any bids for this project and would render the bid invalid, the statement needs to be removed.				The last sentence in Specification Section 28 16 44, paragraph 2.8.B.4 the reads: "Any features not available through the API or SDK interface shall be described as an exception by the Contractor as part of the Contractor's bid." shall be deleted. A revised specification section will be issued in ASI 127.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 359 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0271	Bid Exceptions	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Ray Quesada	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: ASI 119 and 28 16 44				The last sentence in Specification Section 28 16 44, paragraph 2.8.B.4 the reads: "Any features not available through the API or SDK interface shall be described as an exception by the Contractor as part of the Contractor's bid." shall be deleted.			
2.8.D.2 states "Any features not able to operate in a virtualized server environment shall be described as an exception by the Contractor as a part of the Contractor's bid." Since exceptions are not allowed in any bids for this project and would render the bid invalid, the statement needs to be removed.				A revised specification section will be issued in ASI 127.			
<hr/>							
P1-0272	Construction Manager	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: 28 16 44 2.8.B.6 ASI 119				The term "Construction Manager" shall be revised to "TJPA Representative."			
2.8.B.6 states that "The Contractor shall furnish the API or SDK to the Construction Manager at the time of system procurement. Any updates to the API or SDK shall be provided to the Construction manager at the time of release throughout the lifecycle of the project." "Construction Manager" needs to be replaced by "TJPA".							
<hr/>							
P1-0273	Secondary Controllers	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: ASI 119 and 28 16 44/APA				1. A secondary controller is required for Minna Loading [01364]			
1.3.A.5 - Confirm that Secondary Controllers are not required at the Minna Loading, Natoma Loading, Natoma Pedestrian Area East and Natoma Pedestrian Area West based on the table provided. Without Secondary Controllers these areas are unable to comply with section 3.5.G Single Layer Anti-Ram Barrier Entry Sequence and				2. A secondary controller is required for Natoma Loading [01480]			
				3. A secondary controller is not required for Natoma Pedestrian Area East and Natoma Pedestrian Area			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 360 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	3.5.H. Single Layer Anti-Ram Barrier Exit Sequence.						West. These two locations will require local control via a key switch, where the key switch is located adjacent to the operable bollards on a custom pylon and the key is secured within a knox box.
P1-0274	Sally Port Exit Sequence	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 28 16 44/APA 3.5.E.5 ASI 119 Sally Port Configuration Exit Sequence: Vehicle Operator Initiated via Sensors (Howard Street Exit Only) - Confirm that a card reader is not required upon exit of the Sally Port, as it is upon entry, and that the barrier opens automatically upon exit of any vehicle as outlined in this sequence.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Sally Port Configuration Exit Sequence: Vehicle Operator Initiated via Sensors (Howard Street Exit Only) does not require the use of a card reader for exiting. The barriers are to operate automatically, initiated by the detection of an exiting vehicle through the use of a road loop sensor.			
<hr/>							
P1-0275	Anti Ram Barrier Card Reader	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: ASI 119 and 28 16 44/APA 3.5.G and 3.5.H - Based on the sequence of operations outlined for single layer anti-ram barriers in section 3.5.G and 3.5.H confirm that card readers are not required for any of the single layer anti-ram barriers upon entry or exit and that they will all be controlled manually by an operator.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. The card readers are not required for any of the single layer anti-ram barriers upon entry/exit. They will be controlled by an operator.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0276	Sequence of Operation Anti-Ram Barriers	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 28 16 44/APA ASI 119					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Provide sequence of operation for Bus Plaza Anti-Ram Barriers and their integration with the traffic control system, including but not limited to, types of output required (when does the traffic light change color, which traffic light changes color for each barrier, what stage of barrier operation aligns with each output) and extent of interaction with traffic lights. For example, do lights at Howard and Mission street change color depending on status of lights at the Bus Plaza Anti-Ram Barriers?					1. Control system to provide an output to the traffic control system in Section 34 41 13 to indicate barrier deployment.		
					2. The barrier control system will trigger a relay associated with the specific lane/barrier that the operator is controlling for an outbound bus.		
					3. The traffic lights controlling the flow of traffic on the public street is to begin their sequence to stop traffic (e.g. turn red).		
					4. After the traffic light has indicated vehicles on the public street are to stop, the light associated with the lane of the exiting bus shall change state to indicate to the bus operator that they can proceed.		
					5. After the bus clears the barrier, the barrier operator will trigger the system via the control to change the bus exit light to red.		
					6. Once the exit light is red, the barrier is to rise to the secure position and the traffic light associated with the vehicles traveling on the public roadway is to reset to indicate that vehicles can proceed.		
					7. Final sequence operations to be coordinated with the Owner's security concept of operations and with the traffic light control system contractor.		
P1-0277	Vehicle Barrier Timing	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: ASI 119 and 28 16 44/APA					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
3.5.L. - Provide time period required before vehicle barrier should automatically rise.					A vehicle barrier shall automatically raise if the barrier up loop has not been activated within fifteen (15) seconds. This shall be a base design parameter and is to be field coordinated during operational testing.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 362 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0278	Specifications for Stone Threshold References	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Details 2 & 5/A1-9001, Details 2 & 5/A1-9002 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Details throughout the plans (for example, Details 2 & 5/A1-9001 and Details 2 & 5/A1-9001) call for "Stone Thresholds" to be used. The specifications do not reference "Stone Thresholds". Please confirm that thresholds called out to be "Stone Thresholds" are to be furnished and installed as specified in Specification Section 09 30 00 2.5 "Marble Thresholds".			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Note: Stone thresholds are identified as included in this section in item 1.1.A of the specification.		
P1-0279	Details for Threaded Insert Drainage	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 6/A1-9321 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 6/A1-9321 references drain holes at the bottom of the threaded insert, but does not depict the relationship of the drain hole to the substrate. Please provide details for draining of the threaded insert.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Drain hole in threaded insert to be ½" dia to allow for natural drainage through substrate below.		
P1-0280	Confirmation for Corrosion Expert Requirement	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 09 15 1.6 H (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 07 09 15 2.8 C (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 07 09 15 1.6 H states, "Engage a California-licensed Corrosion Engineer who is an expert in			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 363 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>corrosion, to conduct a component-by-component analysis of potential corrosion resulting from galvanic action between materials, for components of curtain wall and aluminum panels and provide report."</p> <p>Specification Section 07 09 15 2.8 C states, "Comply with recommendations of the corrosion engineer approved by the TPJA Representative, as specified above."</p> <p>As agreed upon between TJPA, PMPC, and Webcor-Obayashi, the language "Conduct a component-by-component analysis of potential corrosion resulting from galvanic action between materials, for components of the work of this section and provide report" will be used in lieu of the language in Specification Sections 07 09 15 1.6 H and 07 09 15 2.8 C</p> <p>Please confirm that the language, "Conduct a component-by-component analysis of potential corrosion resulting from galvanic action between materials, for components of the work of this section and provide report." is to be used in lieu of the language currently required by 07 09 15 1.6 H and 07 09 15 2.8 C.</p>						
P1-0281	Specification for Joint Type FJC8 at Vehicle/Bike Ramp	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0227, Sketch SKA-3736.4, Detail 2/A1-8885 (ASI 118 dated 6/20/2014)		Seismic joint type FJC8 at the Vehicle Ramp has been renamed FJC9, see enclosed SKA-3926. Joint Schedule in A1-8880 and Specification 07 09 13 seismic joint assemblies will reflect the added joint type. This will be issued in ASI 127.					
Per RFI Response P1-0227 received on 07/10/14, FJC8 is to be furnished and installed between the W-13 and terrazzo flooring at Ground Level GL 23 (see SKA-3736.4).							
Per ASI 118, Detail 2/A1-8885 received 07/07/14, FJC8 is located at the vehicle/bicycle ramp.							
Please clarify the type and specification of FJC8 located at the vehicle/bicycle ramp.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
P1-0282	1" Moving Joint at Vehicular & Bicycle Ramp	Closed	07/16/2014	07/26/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-7402 (ASI 117 dated 4/23/14)			The 1" movement joints at the top of the vehicle and bicycle ramps were updated from 1" to 2" thru-out. Refer to SKA-3925. Floor joint cover designation was updated from FJC8 to FJC9. The Floor Joint Cover detail is typical/similar to what is shown on SKA-3926.					
Per Sheet A1-7402 of ASI 117, there is a 1/2" movement joint at the top of the vehicular and bicycle ramps, but no details or specifications are provided showing the construction of this joint.								
Please provide details and specifications for the 1/2" movement joint at the vehicle and bicycle ramps.								
<hr/>								
P1-0283	R1 Requirements for Wall Type 3	Closed	07/16/2014	07/26/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
REFERENCE: Detail 11/A1-9208 (ASI 118 dated 6/20/14), A-0024 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			Please refer to SKA-3913 and SKA-3914 for the R1 (modifier) requirement of Wall type 3.					
Per Detail 11/A1-9208 of ASI 118, and associated zone plans, concrete columns are to be framed in with wall type 3-R1. Per Sheet A-0024, there is no Comment R1 for Wall Type 3.								
Please provide the R1 requirements for Wall Type 3.								
<hr/>								
P1-0284	Category 3 Stairs, Platforms, and Rails for Phase 1	Closed	07/16/2014	07/16/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
REFERENCE: Sheet SKA-3076 (dated 3/13/14)			Confirmed.					
TJPA did not accept TG07.5R Bid Additive Alternate No. 01 to furnish and install Category 3 stairs, platforms, and rails as shown on SKA-3076 (Attached).								
Category 3 metal stairs, platforms, and rails still show on the contract documents, however TJPA has indicated they do not intend for the Category 3 metal stairs, platforms,								



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>and rails to be installed as shown.</p> <p>Please confirm stairs, platforms, and rails are not to be provided as part of Phase 1 at Category 3 locations, or provide direction for the desired access at these locations.</p>							
P1-0285	Concrete Curbs at Lower Concourse, Zone 4	Closed	07/16/2014	07/26/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Sheet A1-2207 (ASI 118 dated 6/20/14)</p> <p>Sheet A1-2224 of ASI 118 calls out concrete curb types at the following locations:</p> <p>GL 14/G, GL 19/C, GL 24/H, GL 31/F.7, GL 32/C, and GL 32/G</p> <p>The concrete curbs at the above locations are depicted with dashed lines. Are concrete curbs called out but shown dashed to be furnished and installed as part of Phase 1?</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The concrete curbs at locations mentioned and depicted with dashed lines are furnished and installed in Phase 2. These dashed lines are for setting out of splice couplers for future phase 2 washrooms walls with concrete curbs.</p>				
<hr/>							
P1-0286	Specification for Chain Linked Fences	Closed	07/16/2014	07/26/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: A1-2104 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14)</p> <p>ASI 119 calls out for a chain link fence at several locations (A1-2104 for instance), but no chain link fence specification exists.</p> <p>Please provide a specification for chain link fences.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Jeff Heath, WOJV indicate they do not require a specification for Chain Linked Fences as requested by this RFI. Therefore this RFI should be withdrawn.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 366 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0287	Directional Notes for Changes on Sheets A1-2202 Through A1-2207 of ASI 119	Closed	07/16/2014	07/26/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Sheets A1-2202 through A1-2207 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14)				All lower concourse floor openings are provided with guardrails (see typical details on A1-7027). All guardrails are to be removed and replaced with chain link fence as outlined in VE item ID_44 and attached ASI-119 Revision narratives			
Sheets A1-2202 through A1-2207 of ASI 119 show clouds around openings, however notes outlining the changes are not provided (see attached A1-2205 for example).							
Please provide information for clouded openings with no directional notes.							
P1-0288	Facade Access Equipment Exhibit A	Closed	07/16/2014	07/26/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Zachary Moore</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please confirm per the attached email correspondence with Ed Sum that Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture is to direct bidders to ignore specification 11 24 23 section 3.8.b in the Exhibit A of the TG15.2 Façade Access Equipment scope of work. Language will remain in the specification but is not a requirement of the TG15.2 subcontractor.							
P1-0289	1-3/4" Step in Loading Dock 01222	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-2302, Sheet A1-6012 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				Provide 4"x 4"x 3/8" continuous cast in HD galvanized steel angle to topping slab along slab edge step (approximately grid 5 and grid 6).			
Per Sheet A1-2302 and Sheet A1-6012, there is a 1-3/4" step in the loading dock topping slab, 1'-10" east of GL 5 between GL C and GL D.				Refer to sheet A1-3100 for slab elevations. The steps in the slab noted, along approximately grids 5 and 6, actually vary due to the slope in the Lower Loading Dock slab.			
This step is in the drive area of the loading dock, and may be a long term maintenance item (spalling concrete due to trucks and dumpsters rolling over the step).							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 367 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
					</		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 368 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0291	Engineering Requirements for Spray On Fireproofing per Specification Section 01	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)

Specification Section 01 80 50 1.1 B

Specification Section 01 80 50 1.2 A

Specification Section 07 81 00

Specification Section 07 81 23

Per Specification Section 01 80 50 1.1 B, "the requirements of this Section apply when to all non-structural components, unless otherwise noted."

Per Specification Section 01 80 50 1.2 A:

"Non-structural building components are components that are not part of the building structural system whether inside or outside the building enclosure, above and below grade. Nonstructural components of the Transbay Transit Center include, but not necessarily limited, to the following:

1. Ceilings, glazing, awnings, and similar components and assemblies.
2. Electrical: Power and lighting components and systems; substations; switchgear and switchboards; auxiliary engine-generator sets; transfer switches; motor control centers; motor generators; selector and controller panels; fire protection and alarm components and systems; and telephone and communication components and systems.
3. Mechanical: Heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning components and systems; plumbing components and systems; fire sprinkler components and systems.
4. Vertical Transportation: Mechanical, electrical and supporting elements for transport systems, including elevators and escalators. "

Specification Section 07 81 00 Sprayed Fire Resistive Material and Specification Section 07 81 23 Intumescent Fire Resistive Material do not include items specifically noted in the non-structural list, however, Specification Section 01 80 50 1.2 A explicitly states the list is not all inclusive. In addition, 07 81 00 and 07 81 23 do not specifically exclude the requirements associated with 01 80 50.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

The work of Specification Section 07 81 00 Sprayed Fire Resistive Material and Specification Section 07 81 23 Intumescent Fire Resistive Material do not have seismic requirements.

Specification Section 01 80 50 will be revised to list applicable Specification Sections and Specification Sections requiring seismic criteria will reference Section 01 80 50.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 369 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please confirm material furnished and installed under Specification Sections 07 81 00 and 07 81 23 are not required to have engineering as required by Specification Section 01 80 50. If engineering is required for items furnished and installed under Specification Sections 07 81 00 and 07 81 23, please specifically identify which elements are to be engineered.</p>							
P1-0292	Grout Placement Beneath Drain Hole at Rail Embed	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
REFERENCE: Detail 6/A1-9306 (ASI 119 dated 6/18/14)				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per Detail 6/A1-9306, the HD galvanized rail embed shows a drain hole in the bottom of the embed. The detail goes on to show the bottom of the embed seated in grout which will prevent water from draining out of the drain hole.				Provide ½" diameter drain hole in embed; drill 3/8" diameter hole through mortar to allow for drainage down to substrate.			
Please confirm plugging the rail embed drain hole as shown in 6/A1-9306 is acceptable.							
P1-0293	Bus Bridge Crash Rail Material Confirmation	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
REFERENCE: Detail 2/A1-8378 (ASI 119 dated 6/18/14)				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per the current Bus Bridge Contract Documents, the Bus Bridge Crash Rail is metal as it approaches the Bus Deck.				Confirmed. The Bus Bridge crash rail is metal per the Bus Bridge contract documents. Per VE item # 32, the Transit Center Building crash rail at the Bus Deck level is concrete. Locations of the respective crash rails at the Bridge/Building joint have been coordinated in the attached sketch, SKA-3661-R2.			
Per Detail 2/A1-8378 of ASI 119, the Bus Bridge Crash							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Rail is changing to match the concrete crash rail of the Bus Deck.</p> <p>Please confirm the Bus Bridge Crash Rail design, and coordinate drawings to match.</p>						
P1-0294	Method of Construction for Concrete Column Steel Jacket Base	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 1/A1-9208 (ASI 118 dated 6/20/14), Detail 6/S1-3503 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Per Detail 1/A1-9208 of ASI 118, the concrete column steel jacket base are welded studs/post installed expansion anchors, and to refer to structural for sizing. Per Detail 6/S1-3503, welded studs are to be used at the lower concourse, post-installed anchors are to be used at the mat slab (train box), and jacket base plate is poured integrally to the slab whether welded studs or post-installed anchors are used. Based upon the current construction and bid schedules, steel jackets will not be procured prior to pouring mat slab and lower concourse deck. Please confirm post applied anchors can be furnished and installed at all locations column steel jacketing is required, and that the jacket base plate can be placed on top of the slab/deck where the slab/deck has been poured prior to column steel jacket installation.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Arup response: Confirmed that post-installed expansion anchors at mat-slab(train platform level) and lower concourse level can be furnished and the jacket base plate can be placed on top of slab where the slab has been poured prior to column steel jacket installation. TT response: Drilling of the holes for the post-installed expansion anchors shall not damage the slab reinforcement rebars. Fabrication of the base plate shall be done based on the field locations of the anchors				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 371 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0295	Thickness of AESS Closure Elements	Closed	07/21/2014	07/31/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Sheet A1-8690 Sheets A1-8692 through A1-8695 Sheet A1-8690 and Sheets A1-8692 through A1-8695 call out for AESS closure elements to be welded per structural, and finished per the AESS specification. However, the details for the AESS closure elements do not call out the thickness of the material. Please provide the thickness of the AESS closure element material.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The plate thickness is 3/8" thick, per drawings: 8/S1-4351, S1-4350, S1-4352 and S1-4353. Also, RFI T-1517 acknowledged 3/8" thick plate.				
P1-0296	Utilization of Sheet A1-8378 for Joint Type FJC7	Closed	07/23/2014	08/02/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0224, Sheet A1-8378 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Per RFI Response P1-0224, details for FJC7 are located on Sheet A1-8378 2 Formed Aluminum Panel System (W-9) Sheet Typical Details. The answer to RFI P1-224 was then voided. The plans do not provide a path to direct expansion joint bidders to this sheet (no detail references are given on the plan sheets, and FJC7 is not part of the W-9 system). Please confirm details on Sheet A1-8378 are to be used in relation to bidding, furnishing, and installing FJC7.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The work of seismic joint cover FJC7 is documented in Sheet A1-8378 and Specification Section 07 09 13 Seismic Joint Assemblies. Note that several other RFI's that have been responded to, covered this subject also.				
P1-0297	Liquidated Damages	Closed	07/23/2014	08/02/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 372 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	REQUEST: Reference: Specification 34 41 13 Paragraph 3.9.E Liquidated Damages are mentioned within Specification 34 41 13 para. 3.9.E. and should be deleted. If LD's are to be incurred they should be addressed within the contract terms under Division 00/01 specifications. Please advise.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached specification section 34 41 13 revised as requested.		
P1-0298	Corrosion Engineer	Closed	07/23/2014	08/02/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference: Specification 05 12 13 1.7 I (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification 05 12 13 2.4 C (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 05 12 13 1.7 I states, "Engage a California-licensed Corrosion Engineer who is an expert in corrosion, to conduct a component-by-component analysis of potential corrosion resulting from galvanic action between materials, for components of curtain wall and aluminum panels and provide report." Specification Section 05 12 13 2.4 C states, "Comply with recommendations of the corrosion engineer approved by the TPJA Representative, as specified above." As agreed upon between TJPA, PMPC, and Webcor-Obayashi, the language "Conduct a component-by-component analysis of potential corrosion resulting from galvanic action between materials, for components of the work of this section and provide report" will be used in lieu of the language in Specification Sections 05 12 13 1.7 I and 05 12 13 2.4 C Please confirm that the language, "Conduct a component-by-component analysis of potential corrosion resulting from galvanic action between materials, for components of	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 373 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0299	Waterproofing at Escalator Closure per Detail 3/A1-7552	Closed	07/23/2014	08/02/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Detail 3/A1-7552 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14), RFI Response P1-0089					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Detail 3/A1-7552, WPM-6 is to be installed at the escalator closure at the glass guardrail.					WPM-10 has replaced WPM-6 at referenced Detail 3/A1-7552.		
- Per RFI Response P1-0089, WPM-6 has been removed - The area between the sheathing and escalator as depicted in Detail 3/A1-7522 is inaccessible for waterproofing							
Please confirm that WPM-6 will be removed from the location referenced in Detail 3/A1-7552.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 374 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0300	Design Requirements for Galvanized Metal Plate per Detail 3/A1-8894	Closed	07/23/2014	07/23/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 3/A1-8894 (ASI 119 dated 6/18/14) Per Detail 3/A1-8894 of ASI 119 there is a "galv. metal plate covering fireproofed beam" which is not detailed within the documents (it is unknown if it is required for a seismic joint assembly). Please provide the design requirements (size, extent, attachment, fireproofing, etc.) for the galvanized metal plate covering fireproofed structural beam depicted on Detail 3/A1-8894.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no galvanized metal plate required at the fireproofed structural beams. Per VE Item #36, the GFRC system was eliminated and this detail revised. See attached SKA-3616-R1 (A1-8894).		
P1-0301	BOL-3 Conflict with spec	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: ASI 119-A1-7027 (SKA-3495), 28 16 44 Detail 6, 7 and 8 indicate that BOL-3 is ""6"" o x 1/4"" THK HD GALV STL CONC FILLED PIPE TYP"". This is in conflict with what is specified for BOL-3 in 28 16 44. Clarify which is meant to be correct.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to RFI P1-0044.1 response, along with sketch SKA-3912.		
P1-0302	Conflicting Detail with Description	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: ASI 119 and IFC L1-7360 and 28 16 44 Details on L1-7360 are in conflict with the outlined bollard descriptions, including but not limited to, presence of sleeve, diameter of sleeve, diameter of bollard. Clarify which is meant to be correct.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached SKLA-317.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 375 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0303	Bollard Type Depicted	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: ASI 119 and IFC - L1-7360 Clarify which bollard type is depicted in the details on L1-7360. There is no type indicated.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached SKLA-316.		
P1-0304	Leed Requirments	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 28 16 44 Confirm there are no LEED requirements for 28 16 44, such as VOC requirements for example.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> firmed, there are no LEED requirements for Specification 28 16 44.		
P1-0305	Bollard "Special Footing"	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: L-0002, 28 16 44, 28 16 44/APA On Legend L-0002 a ""Special Footing"" is called out for Bollard types 1A, 1B, 1C, 2A, 2B, 2C, and 3A. Please provide specifications and details as for each ""special footing"" required on each bollard type. No detail about ""special footing"" is provided in spec 28 16 44 or 28 16 44/APA.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Special footing is described as item 3 of bollard descriptions in 28 16 44.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 376 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0306	Maintenance Requirement	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 28 16 44 Section 3.7 - Confirm TJPA wants 5 years of maintenance included in the bid for TG07.9 Bollards and Barriers.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> WOJV to exclude maintenance scope in their Exhibit A document.		
P1-0307	Seismic Design Criteria For Bollards	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 01 80 50 Confirm that spec section 01 80 50 Seismic Design Criteria for Nonstructural Components does not apply to TG07.9 Bollards and Barriers since it is not referenced in 28 16 44.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification 01 80 50 Seismic Design Criteria for Nonstructural Components does not apply to TG07.9 Bollards and Barriers.		
P1-0308	Bollard Pull Box's	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: ASI 119 - A1-2302 through A1-2310, A1-3100, A1-3105 (SKA-3584) Pull Boxes are located at each of the operable barriers, for example at gridline 5. Provide requirements and details for all pull boxes related to the operable barriers. How are they covered? How do they lock? What type of security do they require? How will the security of the pull boxes be integrated into the overall building security?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The pull boxes, should they be utilized, shall be provided by the Bollard manufacturer/installer as part of their system design. Pull boxes shall be rated for outdoor use and the covers of the pull boxes shall be mechanically fastened with a tamper resistant security lock intended for securing covers of pull boxes		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 377 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0309	Knox Box	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
ASI 119 A1-2303, A1-2302, 28 16 44 There is one Knox box located on each of the referenced drawings. Confirm these are the only two Knox boxes for the entire project and none are located in the building. Confirm that these have been coordinated with the Fire Marshal and Security. Confirm these Knox boxes are key control only and that no other requirements are needed.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					1. Correct, there is only one knox box located on each of the referenced drawings.		
					2. Confirmed, these are the only two knox boxes.		
					3. Not an RFI issue and the question should be withdrawn.		
					4. Refer to specification 28 16 44 / 2.8 for knox box requirements.		
P1-0310	Bollard and Wedge Barrier Finish Requirements	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
reference: 28 16 44 Provide finish requirements for the bollards and wedge barriers. For example, provide finish type, paint color, and any other requirements. They are not included.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Barriers should be painted. Color to match Extrusion White 85±5 by TIGER Drylac 38/10090.		
P1-0311	Probe Detector Locations	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
reference: 28 16 44 - section 2.6.C Clarify and provide details for location of Probe Detectors. Clarify if the probe detectors are for the wedge barriers or retractable bollards. Provide details, specifications, operation and output requirements for the probe detectors.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Road loop detectors are to be used for all the barriers. Probe detectors can be used as an alternative, which the contractor can propose if deemed a value engineering item to be considered.		
P1-0312	System integration Requirements	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: 28 16 44 - section 3.8.D ""All software and IP devices of this system shall be integrated as a part of and shall be fully compatible with operating in the Converged IP-based Network to be installed at the Transbay Transit Center."" Confirm that all requirements to comply with the future system integration are stated in this section.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor will be required to coordinate with the network designer of the converged IP-based network.			
P1-0313	ASI 118 and 119 Discrepancies	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Transbay PMPC Ray Quesada							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached sheets, A1-7416, A1-7416 (SKA-3524), A1-7418, A1-7418 (SKA-3526), A1-7419, A1-7419 (SKA-3527), A1-7420, A1-7420 (SKA-3528), A1-7421, A1-7421 (SKA-3529), A1-7422, A1-7422 (SKA-3530), A1-7423, A1-7423 (SKA-3531), A1-7424, A1-7424 (SKA-3532), A1-8720, A1-8720 (SKA-3542), A1-8721, A1-8721 (SKA-3543). There are discrepancies between ASI 118 (Addendum #4) and ASI 119 for these sheets. ASI 118 and 119 are both dated 06/20/2014. Confirm that ASI 119 is meant to take precedence. It does not appear to be the most current version.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ASI #119 was issued to relay specific scopes of work that are either deleted or modified to reflect scope reduction. Be advised that the backgrounds and dates in the revision box of ASI #119 documents are older versions of sheet issuances and do not reflect the most updated backgrounds or revision dates. These documents are only to be used to determine whether items identified with edit clouds and included in the Narrative, provided with ASI #119, are either scope reductions or deletions.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 379 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0314	Lithocrete Sole Source	Closed	07/28/2014	07/28/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 03 33 13 1.1 A Specification section 03 33 13 1.1 A - requires the contractor to sole source Lithocrete a product that is protected by various US Patents a. Provide performance criteria for the design basis along with acceptable alternatives			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached SKLA-318.		
<hr/>							
P1-0315	Structural Information on OCS Trough Support	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 3/A1-8551 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 3/A1-8551 indicates that information on the OCS Trough Support is located on structural drawings. S1-9010 does not provide information on this member. Please provide structural information on the OCS Trough Support.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The structural drawings provide information for the OCS HSS vertical supports. Detail 3/A1-8551 shows a suggested field method of fastening the OCS assembly to the vertical HSS structural supports by way of an HSS sleeve. Contractor may modify this detail as they see fit to install OCS assembly with coordination with SFMTA. Moreover, RFI T-1417.3 response has already recommended the CM/GC schedule a meeting with all the stake holders to resolve all OCS questions.		
<hr/>							
P1-0315.1	Design Requirements for OCS Trough Support	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI Response P1-0315 Per RFI Response P1-0315, "The structural drawings provide information for the OCS HSS vertical supports. Detail 3/A1-8551 shows a suggested field method of fastening the OCS assembly to the vertical HSS structural supports by way of an HSS sleeve. Contractor may			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the updated information in the enclosed SKA-3949R for the OCS trough support details.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 380 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>modify this detail as they see fit to install OCS assembly with coordination with SFMTA. Moreover, RFI T-1417.3 response has already recommended the CM/GC schedule a meeting with all the stake holders to resolve all OCS questions."</p> <p>The above response does not provide design requirements for the OCS Trough Support.</p> <p>Please provide the design requirements for the OCS Trough Support to be administered to the Bidders.</p>						
P1-0316	SFMTA Design & Construction Documents for Muni Bus Plaza Ceiling & OCS Syst	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	09/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Description 3 A of Muni Bus Plaza Ceiling and OCS System Description/A1-8551 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Muni Bus Plaza Ceiling and OCS System Description 3 A on Sheet A1-8551 states, "Refer to SFMTA design and construction documents for work all OCS assembly components and installation."					The SFMTA documents were issued in a transmittal on September 10, 2014.		
No SFMTA design and construction documents have been provided.							
Please provide the referenced SFMTA design and construction documents.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 381 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0317	OV Series Sheets for OCS System	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	09/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Elissa Flandro				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Sheets A1-8550 through A1-8552 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			The OV drawings were issued to W/O on 9/11/2014 as Field Order T-00033 for TG12.2 OCS.				
Sheets A1-8550 through A1-8552 indicate that coordination of the OCS system must be performed with the ¿OV Series¿ sheets (see 4/A1-8551 for an example).							
OV sheets have not been issued.							
Please provide the OV sheets.							
P1-0318	Part B Documentation per Specification Section 07 81 00	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 81 00 1.1 B (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			Specification Section 07 81 00 paragraph 1.1 B will be deleted. There are no Part B documents.				
Specification Section 07 81 00 1.1 B states, "Refer to Part B Documents applicable to the Section."							
Part B Documents are not included in this specification section.							
Please provide the "Part B Documents" referenced in Specification Section 07 81 00 1.1 B.							
P1-0319	AESS Category for Light Columns	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: AESS Matrix/A1-8660, Detail E/A1-8660 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			Please refer to revised architectural Sheet A1-8660 showing the revised AESS zones to match the Matrix submitted in ASI-0123.				
The AESS Matrix on Sheet A1-8660 calls for AESS Category 1 finish on the light column.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 382 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>However, Detail E/A1-8660 calls for AESS Category 2 finish on the upper portion of the light column.</div> <div>Please confirm the desired AESS Category requirements for the light column.</div>							
P1-0320	Lithocrete Alternatives	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specification section 03 33 13 1.2 (4) - lists US Patents that must be complied with that are restricted to installation of the Lithocrete. a. Provide performance criteria that will be acceptable along with a listing of alternatives to the US Patents		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See response to P1-0314.			
<hr/>							
P1-0321	Testing Requirments	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specification Section 03 33 13 1.3 C Testing: a. Confirm that Trade Group will provide all on-site testing, method of procedure for testing submittals, and all reports		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI is administrative and should be rejected.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 383 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0322	Acceptable Manufactures	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Specification section 03 33 13 1.5 - Manufactures, Suppliers, and Sub-Contractors					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
a. Provide a list of acceptable suppliers to Lithocrete Quarried Stone					See response to P1-0314.		
b. Provide a list of acceptable alternative project references that are not limited to Lithocrete Quarried Stone							
c. Provide a list of acceptable components that are not limited to Lithocrete Quarried Stone							
P1-0323	Quality Control	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Specification Section 03 33 13 1.6 - Quality Control					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
a. Provide a list of acceptable performance criteria to Lithocrete Quarried Stone					See response to P1-0314.		
b. Provide a list of acceptable alternative project personnel experiences that are not limited to Lithocrete Quarried Stone							
P1-0324	Material Sourced within 500-miles	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Specification Section 03 33 13 2.1 - LEED Requirements					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
a. Provide an acceptable criteria, or listing of materials that can be sourced within the 500-mile radius as specified: Lithocrete does not meet this credit requirement					The specification has been modified. See attached SKLA-318.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 384 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0325	Lithocrete Surface Seeded Aggregate	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 03 33 13 2.5 C Lithocrete Surface Seeded Aggregate			See response to P1-0314.				
a. Provide the Artist's sample # 07-133J for Trade Group to match							
b. Provide an acceptable list of samples and/or alternative to Lithocrete samples							
<hr/>							
P1-0326	Integral concrete coloring	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 03 33 13 2.7 A Integral Concrete Coloring			See response to P1-0314.				
a. Provide color that is referenced - drawings do not contain a specified color callout for Shaw Alley							
<hr/>							
P1-0327	Lithocrete Surface Seeded Aggregate Alternatives	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 03 33 13 3.4 Lithocrete Surface Seeded Aggregate Installation			See response to P1-0314.				
a. Provide a list of acceptable alternatives that are not single source protected by US Patents							
b. Provide a list of acceptable manufactures that are not single source protected by US Patents							
c. Provide a list of acceptable products that are not single source protected by US Patents							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 386 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0331	Door Type Clarification	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-3100 & A1-3100 (SKA-3670) in ASI 119 Both A1-3100 and A1-3100 (SKA-3670) were issued in ASI 119. A1-3100 (SKA-3670) shows a W-2 overhead coiling door while A1-3100 shows a prefinished aluminum overhead coiling door on Grid Line C between 5 and 6. Please clarify what type of door is to be furnish and installed at this location.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the door type at this location refer to Overhead Door Schedule A1-9711(SKA-3859) issued as part of ASI 0120. Reference Door number 01224B.		
P1-0332	Prefinished Aluminum Overhead Door Detail	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-3100, A1-8153 & A1-8180 in ASI 119 A1-3100 calls for a prefinished aluminum overhead coiling door, and refers to 3/A1-8153 for details. Detail 3/A1-8153 references A1-8180, which shows an overhead glass folding door. Please revise details to show requirements for the prefinished aluminum overhead coiling door.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Revised sheets A1-8153 (SKA-3827) and A1-8180 were issued with ASI 120 on 7/11/2014.		
P1-0333	AS-Built	Closed	07/29/2014	07/29/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 08 44 33 Section 1.1 24.j calls to strike requirement for AS-Built drawings. However section 1.14 states that this specification is to comply with Article 3.09 of the General Conditions and Sections 01 17 20 apply to this section. Confirm whether AS-Built drawings are required for this specification.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As-Built are required; Section 01 17 20 governs.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 387 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0334	Installer Experience	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 08 44 33 Section 1.09 F 4 and 5 references installers experience. Confirm "companies" will be used in lieu of "installers" agreed upon between TJPA, PMPC, and Webcor-Obayashi.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
P1-0335	Confirmation for Corrosion Expert Requirement	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 08 44 23 Specification Section 08 44 23 2.11 C states, "Comply with recommendations of the corrosion engineer approved by the TPJA Representative, as specified above." As agreed upon between TJPA, PMPC, and Webcor-Obayashi, the language "Conduct a component-by-component analysis of potential corrosion resulting from galvanic action between materials, for components of the work of this section and provide report" will be used in lieu of the language in Specification Sections 08 44 23 2.11 C Please confirm that the language, "Conduct a component-by-component analysis of potential corrosion resulting from galvanic action between materials, for components of the work of this section and provide report." is to be used in lieu of the language currently required by 08 44 23 2.11 C.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Specification Section 08 44 23 paragraph 2.11 C has been replaced with "Conduct a component-by-component analysis of potential corrosion resulting from galvanic action between materials, for components of the work of this section and provide report". See enclosed markup of specification.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
P1-0336	Detail Reference per Detail 9/A1-9580	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 9/A1-9580, Detail 7/A1-9321 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: The correct callout is 8/A1-9585, for detail 9/A1-9580.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 388 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Detail 9/A1-9580 calls out Detail 7/A1-9321.</p> <p>Detail 7/A1-9321 is not shown on Sheet A1-9321.</p> <p>Please provide the correct call out for the on Detail 9/A1-9580.</p>						
P1-0337	Detail Reference for Typical Driveway Aisle Assembly	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
REFERENCE: Detail 8/A1-9585, Detail 1/A1-9585 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Detail 8/A1-9585 references Detail 1/A1-9585 for the typical driveway aisle assembly.				The correct call out for the bus deck driveway aisle assembly on Detail 8/A1-9585 is 1/A1-8675.			
Detail 1/A1-9585 is a section at terrazzo floor with radiant heating (Grand Hall).							
Please provide the correct call out for the driveway aisle assembly on Detail 8/A1-9585.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 389 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0338	Roof Park Building Protection Slab and Waterproofing Details	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	09/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Transbay PMPC Ray Quesada				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: A1-2603 (ASI 122 dated 7/23/14)				Provide waterproofing in this area that can be exposed.			
Sheet A1-2603 shows a Roof Park Building located at GL 6 between GL D and GL G.							
Sheet A1-2913 shows no protection slab in this area and details for waterproofing are not provided for this area.							
Please confirm this area is not to receive a protection slab and provide the waterproofing details for this area.							
P1-0339	Base Bid Item Confirmation for Alternate No. 27 - Delete Roof Park Level Café	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Specification Section 01 10 30 APE E.1.15, Sheet A1-2605 (ASI 122 dated 7/23/14)				No, it has not yet been confirmed by TJPA that item E.1.15 ¿ Alternate No. 27 of Specification Section 01 10 30APE has been accepted as a base bid item.			
Specification Section 01 10 30APE E.1.15 - Alternate No. 27 states, "Provide lid over structural foundation complete with waterproof membrane." then references Sheet A1-2605.				We suggest that WOJV discuss scope of work to be bid and status of TJPA direction on these items directly with TJPA when possible.			
Sheet A1-2605 of ASI 122 notes, "Defer W-20 glass cafe. Retain circular foundation wall with topping slab. All utilities should be stubbed up below the topping slab."							
In accordance with Sheet A1-2605 of ASI 112, please confirm that Specification Section 01 10 30APE E.1.15 - Alternate No. 27 is accepted as a base bid item.							
P1-0340	Waterproofing Membrane for Roof Park Level per Alternate No. 27	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Specification Section 01 10 30 APE E.1.15				See A1-8630A and L1-2633A that describe Alternate 27. As noted in your question, if the Alternate to			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 390 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Specification Section 01 10 30APE E.1.15 - Alternate No. 27 states, "Provide lid over structural foundation complete with waterproof membrane. Extend main plaza paving system over café foundation with required substrate as indicated on Landscape drawings."</p> <p>Should Alternate No. 27 be accepted as a base bid item for the Roof Park Level, the waterproofing membrane specified (Sika Sarnafil PVC G476-20) is not UV rated and per the manufacturer cannot be exposed for more than 3 months.</p> <p>Please confirm that the waterproofing membrane specified above is to be used at the Roof Park Level per Alternate No. 27.</p>						
P1-0341	Manhole Access Openings in Future Café PK560	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	09/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: <p>REFERENCE: Details 1 and A/A1-8630A (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</p> <p>Detail 1/A1-2605 depicts two 30" diameter manhole access openings with steel plate covers to be installed in Future Café PK560. The manhole access openings will create access points for water to enter the crawl space depicted in Detail A/A1-2605.</p> <p>The crawl space beneath Future Cafe PK560 illustrated in Detail A/A1-2605 is not equipped with drainage or waterproofing to combat water entry.</p> <p>Please confirm that this is acceptable or provide waterproofing details for the crawl space beneath Future Cafe PK560.</p>	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
						<p>The two 30" access manholes shown on A1-8630A are deleted. Refer to attached SKS-0395 and SKA-4076 for area where slab may be saw-cut in the future to access crawl space.</p> <p>Run waterproofing system as shown continuously above the structure over the crawl space and over the future saw-cut access opening.</p> <p>Waterproofing is not required in the crawl space beneath Future Cafe PK560.</p>	
P1-0342	Concrete Slab and Adjacent Wall Connection Details	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 391 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail A/A1-8630A, Detail 1/S1-3281A (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail A/A1-8630A depicts the concrete slab in Future Café PK560 to be level with the top of the adjacent concrete wall. Detail 1/S1-3281A depicts the concrete slab meeting below the top of the adjacent concrete wall. Please coordinate the details for the connection of the concrete slab and adjacent concrete wall to match.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Structural drawing has been revised to match Architectural. See attached sketch SKS-0394.				
P1-0343	Deferral of Pylon Footings per ASI 122	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: ASI 122 dated 7/23/14, Detail 4/S1-3281A (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Per ASI 122 sheet notes, all pylons are deferred. If pylon footings are to be deferred, the anchor bolts will also be deferred. This will prevent footings from being installed as currently designed in Detail 4/S1-3281A. Note that pylon footing is currently included in the Trade Package TG07.2 contract. Please provide revised footing details, or designate the anchorbolts to be used.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The pylon footings are not deferred, per ASI 122 A1-2602 (SKA-3704) as well as other roof park zone plans, and are to be constructed as per detail 4/S1-3281A.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 392 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0344	Access Opening Details per Detail A/A1-8630A	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	09/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail A/A1-8630A, Detail 1/S1-2650A (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail A/A1-8630A calls for an access opening in wall. Detail 1/S1-2650A does not illustrate an access opening in wall at the same location. Please coordinate the details for an access opening in wall to match.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to response to RFI P1-0341 for revised wall access openings. The Structural drawing has been revised to match Architectural drawings.		
P1-0345	W10X54 Beam Connections to Adjacent Concrete Walls and Piers	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 1/S1-2650A, Detail 5/S1-3281A (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 1/S1-2650A depicts W10X54 members connecting to adjacent concrete walls and piers, referring to Detail 5/S1-3281A for exterior pier details. Detail 5/S1-3281A does not show the connection details for the W10X54 beams to the adjacent concrete walls and piers. Please provide details and specifications for the connection of the W10X54 beams to the adjacent concrete walls and piers.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The W10 beam connections to the concrete walls and piers shall be per 7/S1-7630. Detail 7/S1-7630 is called out on 1/S1-2650A.		
P1-0346	Topping Slab for Loading Dock 01461	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Sheet A1-9527, L1-2304 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to SKA-3894 for Areas within the Loading Dock 01461 that will have reinforcement as call out in Item 3.0 BUS DECK LEVEL TOPPING AND CURB. All		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 393 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Sheet A1-9527 shows a non-traffic rated topping slab at Loading Dock 01461.			other areas will receive reinforcement as called out in Item 4.0.			
	Sheet L1-2304 shows a non-traffic rated approach to Loading Dock 01461.			Refer to sketch SKLA-313 for extent of approach topping for Loading Dock 01461.			
	Please confirm Loading Dock 01461 and the approach to it are not to have traffic rated topping slabs/paving.						
P1-0347	Bollards on Curb Cuts	Closed	07/31/2014	07/31/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: L1-2304 through L1-2304 Sheets L1-2304 through L1-2307, for example at gridline 17-19, have multiple curb cuts with bollards located in the center of them. Please confirm spacing between all bollards meets ADA standards at all curb cuts.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed.	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
P1-0348	Concrete Pylon Deferral	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: ASI 122 - A1-2602 (SKA-3704) through A1-2607 (SKA-3710) Note says "Defer all pylons; associated lighting; security cameras and signs. Retain the concrete footing for the pylon." Provide requirements for pylon footings in this deferred state, including but not limited to, conduit tie in requirements, future use requirements, embed or drill and epoxy requirements.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Refer to response to RFI P1-0343.	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0349	Phasing Requirements	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	09/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Ray Quesada				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: ASI 122 - A1-2602 (SKA-3704) Note says "Defer the interiors of public restrooms and janitor's closet. Provide plumbing stub out within phased temporary building limit or within the bus deck ceiling." Provide phasing of the rooftop restaurant, including any temporary conditions that need to be accommodated for. Provide specifications and details for all phasing requirements.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Roof Park Restaurant area is being evaluated by TJPA and the design team as to how much to build and when. A decision is probably a few weeks away and phasing details will provided at that time.		
P1-0350	Traffic Coating at Bus Deck Level	Closed	08/04/2014	08/14/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Sheets A1-9532 through A1-9534 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Per Sheets A1-9532 through A1-9534, the topping slab is to receive a scratch coat. The scratch coat may have too high of an amplitude to receive traffic coating. In addition, the contract documents do not require a traffic coating at the drive aisle. Per the email from Mark O'Dell sent on 7/29/14, traffic coating will be added to the Bus Deck Level. Details and specifications have not been provided for the traffic coating at the Bus Deck Level. Please confirm that the topping slab is to receive a scratch coat and provide the traffic coating details and specifications per prior discussions.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Correction, the topping slab referenced is required to receive a scratch finish, not a scratch coat; this is confirmed. Specification section 07 18 14 Floor Coatings (FC-1, FC-2) is currently being updated to document the traffic coating to be added to the Bus Deck Level traffic/topping slab. This will be issued in an upcoming ASI.		
P1-0351	MRc5 requirement	Closed	08/07/2014	08/17/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: 32 14 41, 2.2.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Connecticut phone number specified is the		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>							
P1-0352	Materials are specified in specification 32 14 41 section 2.2 that are from Connecticut, without an equal stipulated. Since the requirements of these materials is to be 100% regionally sourced per section 2.1, provide an equal that is closer to the job site or revise the MRc5 required percentage so that the specifications are coordinated and bidders may be able to comply with this requirement.	Closed	08/07/2014	08/07/2014	09/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>							
	From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore													
	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello													
	Co-Author:													
	REQUEST: reference: 32 18 16 Specification 32 18 16 LEED requirements are not in alignment between part 1 and part 2. LEED submittal requirements listed in section 1.4.B need to align with LEED product requirements listed in section 2.1. Additionally, MRc5 option 2 language needs to be added to both part 1 and part 2 LEED requirements. Revise accordingly.							SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: See attached SKLA-324. Jenny Sasson / PWP	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
P1-0353	Specification for Planting Materials	Closed	08/07/2014	08/17/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>							
	From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore													
	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello													
	Co-Author:													
	REQUEST: reference: 32 93 00 Specification 32 93 00, 2.1.A states to provide 50% of concrete mixes within a total travel distance of 500 miles of the project site. This Specification is for Planting Materials, not Concrete Mixes. Please update this section so that it accurately describes the intent of this LEED Credit.							SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Revised "concrete mix" to "planting material". See attached SKLA-314.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0354	Dimensional Layouts for Chairs and Benches	Closed	08/07/2014	08/17/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: L1-2612 through L1-2617 No dimensional layouts are provided for chairs or benches on the referenced drawings. Please provide dimensional layouts for all chairs and benches. For example, refer to L1-2614 GL 16/C where the typical spacing is indicated but the first and last chair or bench is not dimensioned.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached SKLA-322.		
P1-0355	Wood Decking Dimensional Layout	Closed	08/07/2014	08/17/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: L1-2606 and L1-9607 L1-2606 shows wood decking at GL 29. 2/L1-9607 shows the detail for this deck, but neither provide a dimensional layout. Please provide the dimensional layout for this deck.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> L1-2606 is the Materials Plan; refer to L1-2616 for layout.		
P1-0355.1	Dimensional Layouts for Deck on L1-9607	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference P1-0355, L1-2616, L1-9607 IFC Main Set There is no detail for the deck dimensions on L1-2616. Provide dimensions for L1-9607.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Width of deck is identified on L1-2616. Refer to 9/8622 for alignment to determine length.		
P1-0356	General Note 19 Tree Grow Period	Closed	08/07/2014	08/17/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: reference: L-0001, L-0006, L-0007			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per agreement with the TJPA and Webcor, PWP will		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	General Note 19 states that there will be a contract grow period of three years. Based on the current schedule where the earliest contract award date is June 2014 and installation of large trees begin December 2016, this time period is not possible. Please revise accordingly.						be modifying the contract grow period to two years; revised drawings / specifications will be issued as part of the scheduled submittal on 09/09/2014.
P1-0357	Dimensions for curvature	Closed	08/07/2014	08/17/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: reference: L1-2612 through L1-2617 There are several sections of the referenced drawings that have curvature which is not dimensioned, i.e. the curvature referenced on the attached mark-up of GL 12 on L1-2613 at C.3 and G. Please provide radii for all curves shown on Park Level Zone Layout Plans L1-2612 through L1-2617.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		See attached SKLA-322.
P1-0358	Drain Connection Detail	Closed	08/07/2014	08/17/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: L1-3202 & L1-3203 between GL J & K refer to Civil drawings for location of the connection to the drainage ¿ please provide this detail of the connection in the Civil drawings.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		Plumbing to tie plumbing drains into (E) catch basin and (E) manhole as shown on the attached sketch.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 398 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0359	Missing Detail 9/L1-7304	Closed	08/13/2014	08/23/2014	12/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
Reference L1-7302 and 9/L1-7304 (IFC Main Set 03/31/2014):			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
L1-7302 calls for "Plant Rootball Typ" to be installed in the planters, and refers to 9/L1-7304 for details. 9/L1-7304 does not exist. Please provide the type of plants to be installed within the planters shown in L1-7302.			The detail call out should be 4/L1-7304. See attached sketch.				
			The type of plant shall be Woodwardia fimbriata - 15 gallon specimens.				
P1-0360	Testing and Reporting Requirements for Shaw Alley Art Installation	Closed	08/13/2014	08/23/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
Reference Specification Section 12 93 40 (IFC Main Set 03/31/2014):			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Specification Section 12 93 40 includes design requirements and detailed information for the illuminated pavers and benches; please indicate if UL and/or NEMA testing and reporting is required, including the testing and rating requirements if needed.			he luminaire identified in the specification is E.T.L. listing. The E. T. L listing complies with UL standard 676 and is IP 68 Rated.				
P1-0361	Liquidated Damages	Closed	08/13/2014	08/23/2014	08/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
Reference Specification Section 34 41 13 (IFC Main Set 03/31/14)			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Specification Section 34 41 13 Traffic Signals, Controller and Cabinet 3.9 & 3.10 includes language that assesses Liquidated Damages to the contractor; these should be deleted and addressed within the contract terms Div 00/01. Please delete and address within the Division 00/01 Specifications.			This RFI is a duplicate of RFI P1-0297. Refer to response to RFI P1-0297 for revised specification section 34 41 13.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0362	Waterproofing at Concrete Bus Crash Rail	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	09/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: A1-8675 (ASI 119 dated 6/18/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The details on Sheet A1-8675 of ASI 119 call for WPM-2 waterproofing to be installed at the bus deck crash rail.					See attached drawing A1-8675 for clarification of WP membrane at Bus Deck Level slab to concrete guard rail.		
There are no details depicting the relationship of the waterproofing from the bus deck level slab to the concrete bus crash rail.							
Please provide the details for waterproofing at this location.							
P1-0363	Walk-Off Mats at Ground Level	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Detail 1 & 2/A1-8214D (ASI 120 dated 7/11/14), Sheet A1-2305 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Detail 1 & 2/ A1-8214D of ASI 120 depicts walk-off mats located at W-3 sliding doors.					Confirmed. Walk-off mats are deleted per A1-2305.		
Per Sheet A1-2305 of ASI 119, walk-off mats at the ground level are to be deleted.							
Please confirm that walk-off mats are to be installed at W-3 sliding doors per ASI 120 or coordinate the drawings and details to match.							
P1-0364	One Story Building Reference Per Specification Section 07 54 19 1.1 A 2	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 54 19 1.1 A 2 b (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 07 54 19 1.1 A 2 b states, "Roofing					In specification section 07 54 19, delete item 1.1.A.2b referencing one story structure east of Beale Street. No such building exists under this contract.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 400 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>low slope roofs on one story structure east of Beale Street with a one-ply PVC membrane, fully adhered to a cover board and insulation."</p> <p>The contract documents do not give any information on a one story structure east of Beale St.</p> <p>Please provide information on the referenced one story structure.</p>						
P1-0365	Fireproofing at Park Level W-4 Steel Ring Beam	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Detail 2/A1-8237D (ASI 120 dated 7/11/14)							
Detail 2/A1-8237D of ASI 120 calls for fireproofing at the steel ring beam.		Sheets A1-8662 and A1-8663 indicate the scope and application of steel fireproofing requirements for the project. Details graphically show the fireproofing in the vicinity of the specific condition drawn, if the steel element is being cut, the fireproofing is shown in section, if the element is not cut (it is in the background) typically the fireproofing is not shown-- this is standard graphic convention. For the extent of all fireproofing of ALL structural steel, please refer to Fire Protection Matrix and Schedule in sheets A1-8662 and A1-8663.					
No fireproofing is shown at the column supporting the steel ring beam.							
Please confirm that fireproofing is not required at the column shown in Detail 2/A1-8237D. If fireproofing is required at the column supporting the steel ring beam, please provide the details and type for the required fireproofing.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 401 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0366	Top of Step Elevation for Stair 601	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet L1-3606 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14),					This RFI is incorrect. Drawings A1-8651 and A1-8652 (ASI 122 date 7/23/14) clearly show the top of step elevation above the Park Level elevation of 86'-9".		
Details 1 & 2/A1-8651 (ASI 122 dated 7/23/14)					See notes on 2/A1-8651 and 3/A1-8652, which refer to Landscape drawings for stair elevations. The Architectural and Landscape drawings are coordinated.		
Detail 3/A1-8652 (ASI 122 dated 7/23/14)							
Sheet L1-3606 shows a top of step elevation of 86.90 at Stair 601.							
Details 1 & 2/A1-8651 shows a top of step elevation of 86'-9" at Stair 601 then refers to Detail 3/A1-8652.							
Detail 3/A1-8652 also shows a top of step elevation of 86'-9".							
Please confirm the correct elevation and coordinate the plans and details to match.							
P1-0367	Deferral of Expansion Joint Covers per ASI 122	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: ASI 122 - VE Round 3 dated 7/23/14					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per ASI 122 dated 7/23/14, the Roof Park expansion joints have not been deferred, but their covers have been deferred.					The decision to defer the grade level seismic joint covers, as noted on SKA-3706, SKA-3708 and SKA-3819 issued as part of ASI 122, is rescinded. Covers are to be provided as part of the complete seismic joint assembly. If the Roof Park is still being deferred at time of installation then an alternate pan infill material will be proposed at that time.		
Expansion joints and all associated components are sold as a unit. This will affect the warranty (depending if the park is built out) and result in added cost with little benefit.							
Please confirm TJPA wants W/O to contract out the entire roof top park expansion joint assembly at grid lines 10 and 20 except the cover.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0368	Dampproofing Requirements at Trench and Slot Drain Channels	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 11 16 1.1 A 4, Sheet L1-7318, Sheet L1-7381 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				Slot drains are no longer used. Dampproofing not required at metal lined trench drains.			
Specification Section 07 11 16 1.1 A 4 calls out for site dampproofing at trench and slot drain channels.							
Trench drain details do not show dampproofing at these locations. (See Sheet L1-7318 and Sheet L1-7381 for examples.)							
Please provide the details and locations requiring dampproofing that the trench and slot drain channels.							
P1-0369	Waterproofing at Walk-Off Mat per Detail 6/A1-9307	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Detail 6/A1-9307 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				Refer to attached sketch SKA-4005 for revised detail and wpm clarification.			
Detail 6/A1-9307 calls out for continuous WPM, but does not identify what type of waterproofing to install.							
Please provide the type of waterproofing to be installed at the condition called out on Detail 6/A1-9307.							
P1-0370	Protection Board and Waterproofing Membrane Details at Public Restroom	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Detail 5/A1-9041, Detail 10/A1-9042 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				Waterproofing is required under all porcelain tiled floor and behind the wall tiles, in the public restrooms. The waterproofing membrane is WPM-12, refer to specification section 09 30 00 / 3.2.			
Detail 5/A1-9041 calls out for "protection board over waterproof membrane" directly below the topping slab.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 403 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0371	<p>Detail 10/A1-9042 calls out for "protection board and waterproofing where required" directly under topping slab.</p> <p>A1-9041 & A1-9042 are public restroom typical detail sheets.</p> <p>Please identify where waterproofing is required within the public restrooms, and what type of waterproofing is to be used.</p> <p>WPM-5 Crystalline Waterproofing at Escalator Pit per Detail 4/A1-7550</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Detail 4/A1-7550 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</p> <p>Detail 4/A1-7550 calls out for WPM-5 (crystalline waterproofing) over plate steel. WPM-5 crystalline waterproofing is specifically intended for sealing of concrete, and will not work on steel.</p> <p>Please provide direction to the type of waterproofing to be used at this condition, and associated waterproofing details.</p>	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The membrane over the plate steel has been changed to WPM-10. Refer to SKA-3870 for revised detail 4 on A1-7550.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 404 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0372	WPM -2 Call Out at Muni Bus Plaza	Closed	08/14/2014	08/14/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Detail 2/A1-7822 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Detail 2/A1-7822 calls out for WPM-2 at the Muni Bus Plaza. Typically WPM-1A is used at exterior Ground Level.					Waterproof membrane on Detail 2/A1-7822 has been corrected to WPM-1A, see attached sketch SKA-4001.		
Please confirm the WPM-2 as shown on Detail 2/A1-7822 is to be revised to WPM-1A. If not, please provide the extents of WPM-2 at Ground Level.							
P1-0373	Concrete Paving Specification Clarification	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 19 25, Specification Section 07 19 23					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 07 19 25 and Specification Section 07 19 23 both indicate they are to be used for concrete paving.					1. Section 07 19 23 - Site Repellents issued by PWP (Landscape Architects) shall be used with Landscape Concrete sections such as 03 33 12 - Landscape Cast-in Place Concrete, 03 33 13 - Shaw Alley Art Installation Paving, and 03 45 00 - Site Precast Concrete Elements.		
Please clarify which specification section is to be used for concrete paving.					2. Section 07 19 25 - Water Repellent Coatings (WPM-9) issued by AAI, shall be used with Non-Landscape concrete sections.		
P1-0374	Details for Site Fluid-Applied Waterproofing (WPM-4)	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 13 00					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 07 13 00 Site Fluid-Applied Waterproofing (WPM-4) appears to be related to roof park elements only.					See section 1.1.A for summary of locations. Omit item 1.1.A.3 ¿Walls.¿ See section 3.3 for application.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 405 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Does this occur anywhere else? No details for WPM-4 appear in architectural or landscape drawings.</p> <p>Please provide details for WPM-4 site fluid-applied waterproofing.</p>						
P1-0375	Sloped Topping Specifications	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Detail 4/A1-7552, Detail 8/A1-7552 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				For sloped topping products refer to response for RFI P1-0230.3; as noted, specification section 09 30 00 to be revised to include products as noted.			
Several locations show a "sloped topping" which is ¼" thick or less (see 4/A1-7552 & 8/A1-7552) for creating positive slope at waterproofing.							
No product is specified for the "sloped topping". Please provide a product that will allow for slopping from less than 2" to 0" thickness (including from 1/2" to 0").							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 406 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0376	Exterior Awning Noise Due to Wind	Closed	08/14/2014	08/14/2014	09/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 08 44 27 (W-2 Reissued for Bid Set) Please confirm that noise due to wind moving through the patterns cut out in the Aluminum Panels of the Exterior Awning and through the gaps between the panels Exterior Awing and noise due to wind moving above and below the entire system is not to be considered an unacceptable condition. The contractor is providing the pattern per the contract documents and they will have no control over any noise due to wind moving through the predetermined pattern, gaps between each panel and wind moving above and below the entire system. The contractor should only be responsible for noise due to vibration caused by poor workmanship and should not be responsible for any noise due to the inherent design of the W-1 Exterior Awning.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Specification Section 08 44 27 paragraph 2.2 N will be revised to state: "Unacceptable Conditions: "Vibration harmonics, noise or vibrations created by loosening, weakening or failure of fasteners, attachments or other components".		
P1-0377	WPM-5 Crystalline Waterproofing at Escalator Pit per Detail 4/A1-7552	Closed	08/14/2014	08/14/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 4/A1-7552 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 4/A1-7552 shows WPM-5 crystalline waterproofing extending into a drain body within an escalator pit. Crystalline waterproofing is a trowelled on waterproofing which seals concrete, and is not a membrane which can be lapped into a drain body. Please revise the detail to show the extent of WPM-5 crystalline waterproofing to be used at the drain.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The detail has been revised so that the membrane does not lap onto the drain body. Sheet will be issued in ASI 127.		
P1-0378	WPM-9 Call Outs at Elevator Pits	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 407 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Detail 3/A1-7576, Detail 2/A1-7577, Detail 3/A1-7577, Specification Section 07 19 25 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</p> <p>Detail 3/A1-7576, Detail 2/A1-7577, and Detail 3/A1-7577 call out for WPM-9 over drywall cant strips within elevator pits.</p> <p>Per Specification Section 07 19 25, WPM-9 is for concrete surfaces only.</p> <p>Please confirm WPM-9 is to be used over drywall where shown on the contract documents or provide the correct WPM system for the drywall.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The details have been revised to note WPM-10 over drywall cant strips. Sheet will be issued with ASI 127.</p>		
P1-0379	Slab Sloping Details at Roof Park Level	Void	08/14/2014	08/24/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Details 1 & 2/A1-8646 (ASI 122 dated 07/23/14)</p> <p>Details 1 & 2/A1-8646 of ASI 122 show a slab sloping in an east-west direction, above the structural slab below waterproofing.</p> <p>Slab plans do not identify these slabs.</p> <p>Please provide information on slabs sloping east-west on the Roof Park Level.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 408 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0380	WPM-5 Crystalline Waterproofing at Lover Concourse Level Telecom Service Vault	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Detail 1/A1-9250, Detail 3/A1-9251, Detail 4/A1-9251 (ASI 118 dated 6/20/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Detail 1/A1-9250 of ASI 118 shows WPM-5 crystalline waterproofing being applied to the bottom of metal deck and the bent plate at the edge of deck.					For the updated WPM-5 waterproofing details at the Telecom Service Vaults, refer to SKA-4015.		
Details 3 & 4/A1-9251 of ASI 118 shows WPM-5 crystalline waterproofing going over a metal sleeve.							
Crystalline waterproofing is not compatible with metal.							
Please revise waterproofing detail where WPM-5 crystalline waterproofing is shown over metal deck, bent plate, and metal sleeve.							
P1-0381	W-2 Schedule of Unit Prices	Closed	08/20/2014	08/30/2014	09/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference 08 44 25 (ASI 120 and Div. 00/01 Specifications)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 08 44 25 subsection 1.3 calls for a unit price for Temporary Retail Façade and Glass Retail Façade for 2, 3 and 4 bay modules. There is not a Schedule of unit prices specification for the W-2 system in the Div. 00/01 dated August 11, 2014. If a unit price is required for the Temporary Retail Façade it needs to be included in the Div. 00/01. Currently the only unit price specifications listed are 01 10 20/APA for TG03, 10 10 20/APB for TG04.5.1, 01 10 20/APC for TG04.3, 01 10 20/APD for TG04.4, 01 10 20/APE for TG04.1, 01 10 20/APF for TG04.2, 01 10 20/APG for TG04.6, 01 10 20/API for TG06.0, and 01 10 20/APJ for TG18.1. If unit pricing for Temporary and Glass Retail Façade is desired, provide unit price specification, otherwise revise specification to not include unit pricing language.					The unit price requirement for the temporary retail facade change to a glazed facade will be changed to an additive alternate, to be priced below the line. Please refer to attached marked up specification sections 01 10 30/APA and 08 44 25, and to attached sketches A1-8189 (SKA-3851-R2) and A1-8190 (SKA-3852-R2).		



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0382	Glazing Schedule of Alternates	Closed	08/20/2014	08/30/2014	09/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 01 10 30/APE (Div. 00/01 Specifications 08/11) The schedule of alternates for the design build glazing systems was not included in the August 11, 2014 issuance of the Div. 00/01 specifications. Any alternates that are desired for the TG08.10 Glass Curtain Wall (W-2, 3, 4, 6, and 8) need to be included in the Div. 00/01 specifications. Currently the only alternates that affect the TG08.10 package are alternate # 4 which deletes the Beale Street Lobby and #31 which changes the W-2 glass from low iron glass to standard clear. If any other alternates are desired, provide them in the 01 10 30/APE specification.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached markup of the revised Specification Section 01 10 30/APE: Delete paragraph E.1.19 Alternate No, 31: Change specified glass substrate for W-2 glass type from Low Iron glass to Standard clear Glass. Refer to the following Contract Documents: Specification Section: 08 80 03 Glass Types. Refer to attached markup of the revised Specification Section 01 10 30/APA: Delete paragraph A.1.3 Alternate No. 3: For W-4 Aluminum-Framed Curtain Wall System, provide an alternate to add reinforcement to vertical and horizontal mullions; add electrical pull string for future wiring; add any required prep for fastening the LED Art wall panels in the future; Details per sheet A1-8247 extent shown in sheets A1-8230 to A1-8232. Add paragraph A.1.4 Alternate No, 4: Change specified substrate for all W-2 and W-6 glass types from Low Iron Glass to Standard Clear Glass. Refer to Specification Section: 08 80 03 Glass Types.				
P1-0383	Ballistic Resistant Window in Room B1269	Closed	08/20/2014	08/30/2014	08/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference A1-9855 Detail 2 (IFC Main Set) Provide specification for the glass type for the ballistic resistant window, window frame and pass thru drawer required for the reception window in room B1269. In addition provide details of how the frame attaches to the pass thru drawer mounted on the bottom of the window.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The specification for the glass type for the ballistic resistant window, window frame and pass thru drawer for the reception window in room B1269 have been provided in Specification Sections 10 99 00 Building Specialties and 10 99 00/APA Building Specialties SSI. Frame attaches to the pass thru drawer as stipulated in the manufacturer's documentation.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 410 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0384	Planting Strip at Exhaust Ventilation Strap	Closed	08/20/2014	08/30/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: 3/A1-8176 IFC Main Set			The exhaust shaft planting strip, sidewalk area (NIC-Landscape) associated build up, and W-17 modular trellis system will be part of future scope and installation. The detail annotations have been modified accordingly. Refer to SKA-4041 and SKA-4042.				
Detail 3/A1-8716 shows a planting strip at the exhaust ventilation shaft near the bus ramps; Landscaping drawings do not provide any information regarding this area. Please confirm that planting strip is desired, and detail reference in landscaping for types of plants if any.							
P1-0385	Access Panels at Stair 201	Closed	08/21/2014	08/31/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-2302 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14) Detail 1/A1-7001 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail A/A1-7850 (ASI 122 dated 7/23/14) Detail B/A1-5102 (ASI 122 dated 7/23/14)			Access panel/fence will be added to details A/A1-7850 & B/A1-5102 for record in a future drawing issue.				
Sheet A1-2302 (ASI 119) and Detail 1/A1-7001 (IFC) both depict an access panel at the Stair 201B on the Ground Level and references Detail A/A1-7850 (ASI 122) and Detail B/A1-5102 (ASI 122).			For details of access panel/fence shown on drawing A1-2302 and 1/A1-7001 refer to attached sketch SKA-4055.				
- Detail A/A1-7850 (ASI 122) does not show an access panel/wall/fence at the same location depicted in Sheet A1-2302 and Detail 1/A1-7001.							
- Detail B/A1-5102 (ASI 122) does not show an access panel/wall/fence at the same location depicted in Sheet A1-2302 and Detail 1/A1-7001.							
Please provide details for the access panel/wall/fence called out on Sheet A1-2302 and Detail 1/A1-7001.							
P1-0386	WPM-5 Called out in Detail 6/A1-7554 at Second Level W-2 Escalator Pit	Closed	08/21/2014	08/31/2014	08/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 411 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Detail 6/A1-7554 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</p> <p>Detail 6/A1-7554 calls for WPM-5 crystalline waterproofing to cover insulation and a steel mullion at the second level of the W-2 escalator pit.</p> <p>WPM-5 crystalline waterproofing is specifically intended for sealing of concrete, and will not work on steel.</p> <p>Please provide direction to the type of waterproofing to be used at this condition, and associated waterproofing details.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Correction, the detail does not call for the WPM-5 waterproofing to cover insulation and steel mullion. The detail calls out for a "AIR/VAPOUR BARRIER LAPPED TO WPM-5 AND SEALED". Refer to W-2 specification 08 44 25 for Air/Vapour type.</p>		
P1-0387	Corner Guards Dimension Details per ASI 123	Closed	08/21/2014	08/31/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Specification Section 05 50 00 2.5 M 1 & 2 (ASI 123 dated 8/6/14)</p> <p>Specification Section 05 50 00 2.5 M 1 & 2 of ASI 123 states,</p> <p>"1. For Concrete Columns/Concrete Block Walls: as detailed, 8' x 4" x 1/2" fabricated aluminum angles, 8'-0" high typical or as shown on drawings with anchor straps at 12' o.c.</p> <p>2. For Gypsum Board Walls: as detailed, 8' x 4" x 1/2" fabricated aluminum angles, 8'-0" high typical or as shown on drawings. Flush countersunk fasteners"</p> <p>A standard size for corner guards are 4" x 4" x 1/2". Please confirm that corner guards are required to be the dimensions referenced in Specification Section 05 50 00 2.5 M 1 & 2.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>"M. Corner Guards:</p> <p>1. For Concrete Columns/Concrete Block Walls: as detailed, 4" x 4 1/2 x 1/2 fabricated aluminum angles, 8'-0" high typical, or as shown on drawings with anchor straps at 12' o.c.</p> <p>2. For Gypsum Board Wall: as detailed, 4" x 4 1/2 x 1/2 fabricated aluminum angles, 8'-0" high typical, or as shown on drawings. Flush countersunk fasteners."</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 412 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0388	Metal Framing Design-Build Compliance with Specification Section 08 05 13	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 05 41 00 1.6 G Specification Section 09 22 19 1.6 K Specidication Specification 08 05 13 Sheet A-0023 Specification Section 05 41 00 1.6 G and Specification Section 09 22 19 1.6 K require design-build work complying with Specification Section 08 05 13 "where shown on drawings and on Partition Schedule drawing A-0023." Sheet A-0023 does not indicate any wall type needing to meet the design requirements of Specification Section 08 05 13. Please confirm that none of the wall types identified on Sheet A-0023 are required meet the design requirements of Specification Section 08 05 13.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The response to this question is available only to bidders who have been granted access to the TJPAs secure website.		

P1-0389	CJC4 Expansion Joint at Second Level GL 10	Closed	08/21/2014	08/31/2014	09/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-8880 (ASI 123 dated 8/6/14) Sheet A1-9604 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Sheet A1-8880 of ASI 123 directs for the installation of a CJC4 expansion joint within the gypsum board ceiling at GL 10 on the Second Level. Per Sheet A1-9604 of IFC Main Package, the ceiling for Room 02320 is exposed to structure, not a gypsum board ceiling. Please confirm no ceiling expansion joint is to be installed at Second Level GL10.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, ceiling expansion joint type CJC4 is not to be installed in Room 02320.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 413 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0390	WJC4 Adjoining Materials	Closed	08/21/2014	08/31/2014	09/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet A1-8880 (ASI 123 dated 8/6/14)					Refer to enclosed revised detail 2 on SKA-4079 (A1-8178) for material clarification.		
Detail 2/A1-8178 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
Sheet A1-8880 of ASI 123 calls out for WJC4 to have adjoining materials of gypsum board.					Refer to enclosed revised Expansion Joint Schedule in SKA-4080 (A1-8178) to clarify that WJC4 occurs in the interior side and WJC3 occurs in the exterior side. The adjoining and infill material columns of Seismic Joint Schedule are revised to match Specification and details.		
Detail 2/A1-8178 of IFC Main Package does not show gypsum board in the plain of the wall joint.							
Please confirm no gypsum board is required in plain of WJC4.					Enclosed page 13 of Specification 07 09 13 3.4 Paragraphs L and M are revised to match A1-8880.		
P1-0391	Insulated Soffit References per A1-9603	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-9603 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet A1-9603 references insulated soffits at Rooms 01361, 01381, 01425, 01426, 01441, 01483, 01603.					References to insulated soffits have been removed from the Room Finish Schedules. Refer to attached sketches SKA-4154 AND SKA-4155 for clarification.		
Insulated soffits are not shown on RCP or sections.							
Please confirm that insulated soffits are not required at the referenced locations.							
P1-0392	Ceiling Type for Room 01603	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-9603 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14), Detail 3/A1-4306 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet A1-9603 references a gypsum board ceiling at					Room finish schedule on A1-9603 for Room 01603 is correct.		
					Sheet A1-4306 & Detail 3/A1-8511 refer to soffit on underside of stair 603, refer to A1-7022 to confirm		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 414 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Room 01603.						
	ceiling type for room 01603.						
	Sheet A1-4306 and Detail 3/A1-8511 call for a metal ceiling at this location.						
	Please confirm ceiling type.						
P1-0393	Insulation Beneath the Radiant Floor Heating System	Void	08/22/2014	09/01/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 21 00 1.1 2, Specification Section 07 21 00 3.2 B, Sheet A1-2982 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 07 21 00 1.1 2 and Specification Section 07 21 00 3.2 B indicate insulation is to be furnished and installed beneath the radiant floor heating system. Per Specification Section 07 21 00 2.3 R INS-16 is to be used in radiant terrazzo floor areas. Sheet A1-2982 shows INS 13 at the radiant flooring.							
Per Specification Section 01 10 30/APE E.1.7 Alternate 15, the deletion of radiant flooring is to be priced.							
Please confirm insulation requirements are not to change as part of Alternate 15.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 415 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0394	Insulation Specification for Parapets	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	09/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 21 00 1.1 1 d, Specification Section 07 21 00 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			Refer to attached sketch SKA-4056 for insulation type within parapet and to Specification Section 07 21 00 / 2.3 C for INS-3 description.				
Specification Section 07 21 00 1.1 1 d indicates Specification Section 07 21 00 does not apply to parapets.			Specification Section 07 21 00 / 1.1 A is being revised as follows:				
Several details (for example, Details 1 & 2/A1-7870) show insulation within parapets.			¿A. Section includes thermal insulation to limit thermal gains and losses at the following locations:				
Please provide a specification for insulation shown within parapets.			1. Building envelope, excluding the following locations:				
			a. Roof insulation specified elsewhere.				
			b. Doors.				
			c. Glazed assemblies. DELETED				
			d. Parapets. . DELETED				
			e. Louvers, except where blank-off panels occur.				
			f. Flexible Head and edge of Wall firestopping sealants and membrane.				
			g. Fire safing and smoke seals at slab edges. DELETED.				
			2. Beneath the suspended concrete floor slabs where indicated, including beneath the radiant floor heating system.				
			3. Elsewhere as indicated. DELETED¿				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 416 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0395	Request for Specification Section 07 12 11 Cellular Foamed Glass Insulation	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 21 00, Specification Section 07 12 11 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 07 21 00 references Specification Section 07 12 11 for Cellular Foamed Glass Insulation.					Cellular Foamed Glass Insulation does not apply. Specification Section 07 21 00 paragraph 1.1 G is deleted.		
Specification Section 07 12 11 has not been issued.							
Please provide the referenced spec.							
P1-0396	Request for Specification Section 07 27 00	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	09/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 21 00 3.2 D, Specification Section 07 27 00 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 07 21 00 3.2 D references Specification Section 07 27 00.					Specification Section 07 27 00 was deleted previously and replaced with the work of specification 07 13 14 "Sheet waterproofing and Miscellaneous Flashings." Specification Section 07 21 00 paragraph 3.2 D is revised to replace Section 07 27 00 with Section 07 13 14.		
Specification Section 07 27 00 has not been issued.							
Please provide the referenced specification.							
P1-0397	Design-Build Requirement for Roof Hatches	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	10/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 07 72 33 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 07 72 33 requires design-build requirements for roof hatches.					Design Build requirements are deleted from Specification 07 72 33 Roof Hatch.		
Roof hatches is not typically a D-B scope of work.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 417 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm TJPA desires engineering for roof hatches.							
P1-0398	Tubular H.O.G. Protective Enclosure and Stainless Steel Surface Collar Details	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 08 62 50 3.5 Sheet A1-8877 Specification Section 08 62 50 3.5 A 2 Specification Section 08 62 50 3.5 Tubular Daylighting Devices references Tubular H.O.G Protective Enclosure and Stainless Steel Surface Collar. Sheet A1-8877 does not identify these pieces. In addition, Specification Section 08 62 50 3.5 A 2 references seismic angle braces and Structural drawings. Structural drawings do not identify these pieces. Please provide details and structural information on Tubular H.O.G Protective Enclosures and Stainless Steel Surface Collars referenced in Specification Section 08 62 50 3.5.				All these questions no longer apply, as the work of Specification Section 08 62 50 Tubular Daylighting Devices is hereby deleted.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 418 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0399	Revision of Referenced Specificaton Section 09 90 00	Closed	08/22/2014	08/22/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 21 16 1.6 E, Specification Section 09 90 00 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 21 16 1.6 E references Specification Section 09 90 00.					Specification Section 09 21 16 1.6 E is revised to reference Section 09 91 00 in lieu of Section 09 90 00, which does not apply.		
Specification 09 90 00 is not part of the contract documents.							
Please revise the referenced specification number.							
P1-0400	Portable Lighting Requirement per Specification Section 09 21 16 1.6 E	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 21 16 1.6 E 3, Specification Section 09 21 16 1.6 E 5 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 21 16 1.6 E 3 requires the trade subcontractor to provide portable lighting for the review of mock-ups under various light conditions for defects and improperly finished joints, trim, and screw heads.					No portable lighting is required for the punchlist review prior to final acceptance by TJPA, unless the punchlist review is required prior to the time permanent building lighting is in place and operational.		
Specification Section 09 21 16 1.6 E 5 indicates that the mock-ups will be used as a standard for the gypsum board work with the same finish for the Project.							
No requirement is given elsewhere that portable lighting is required for providing various lighting conditions for inspection/punch prior to final acceptance by TJPA.							
Please confirm no lighting for inspection/punch prior to final acceptance is required beyond the ambient lighting found in the area under review.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 419 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0401	Utilization of Level 4 Finish	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 21 16 3.7 F 5 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 21 16 3.7 F 5 indicates a Level 5 finish is to be installed at surfaces to be painted, which are not Finish Levels 1 - 4.					Level 4 finish is to be provided where a flat paint, light texture or lightweight wall covering is specified.		
Level 4 finish level is to be used "for all other areas".							
There does not appear to be any areas not covered by Levels 1 - 3 and 5. Please confirm Finish Levels 4 finish is not used on the project.							
P1-0402	Revision of Referenced Specifcation Section 09 31 00	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 25 50 3.2 A 4, Specification Section 09 31 00 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 25 50 3.2 A 4 references Specification Section 09 31 00.					Specification Section 09 25 50 3.2 A 4 is revised to reference Section 09 30 00 in lieu of Section 09 31 00, which does not apply.		
Specification Section 09 31 00 is not part of the contract documents.							
Please revise the referenced specification number.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0403	Acclimization Requirements for ACT Installation	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 51 00 1.9 A, Specification Section 09 51 00 3.2 A (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 51 00 1.9 A requires temperatures be not less than 70 degrees F at least 3 days prior to and 3 days after installation of ACT.					Specification Section 09 51 00 paragraphs 1.9 A and 3.2 A are revised to state: "provide and maintain environmental conditions and ambient acclimatization requirements per manufacturer's written requirements.		
Specification Section 09 51 00 3.2 A requires temperatures of at least 72 degrees F 3 days prior and after installation of ACT.							
Please clarify acclimatization requirement. (NOTE: changing the requirement to maintaining minimum requirements of the product manufacturer may reduce acclimatization costs).							
P1-0404	Clarification for Work Supported from ACT System	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 51 00 1.7 C, Specification Section 09 51 00 3.2 M (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 51 00 1.7 C requires that light fixtures, air supply diffusers, boots, fire alarm grills and exhaust and return air grilles are not supported from the ACT system.					Item 3.2.M of Specification Section 09 51 00 will be deleted. Only elements as defined in drawing 5/A-0034 are permitted.		
Specification Section 09 51 00 3.2 M requires that upon request, written confirmation be provided that the work of Divisions 21, 22, 23, 26, 27 and 28 can be supported by the ACT system. Per Typical Suspended Panel Ceiling Note 11/A-0034, light fixtures and air terminals weighing less than 56 pounds may be supported directly on the heavy duty ACT system.							
Please clarify what elements of Divisions 21, 22, 23, 26, 27 and 28 are to be supported by the ACT system.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 421 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0405	Acclimization Requirements for Access Flooring	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 69 00 1.8 A, Specification Section 09 69 00 1.9 A (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 69 00 1.8 A requires that ambient temperature to be between 40-90 degrees F and relative humidity is not more than 70 percent at the time of installation.					Specification Section 09 69 00 paragraphs 1.8 A and 09 69 00 1.9 A are revised to state: "Provide and maintain environmental conditions and ambient acclimatization requirements per manufacturer's written requirements for the application of Access flooring."		
Specification Section 09 69 00 1.9 A requires that ambient temperature to be between 50-85 degrees F and relative humidity is between 20-80 percent.							
The above referenced Specification Sections do not match. Please clarify what acclimatization requirement is to be used. (NOTE: changing the requirement to maintaining minimum requirements of the product manufacturer may reduce acclimatization costs).							
P1-0406	Correction of Fahrenheit to Celsius Calculation	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 69 00 1.9 A (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 69 00 1.9 A requires an ambient temperature between 50-85 degrees F (100-290 degrees C).					See response as for RFI #P1-0405 - question in this RFI is no longer applicable.		
The Fahrenheit to Celsius calculation is incorrect. Please revise the requirement.							
P1-0407	Information on Fire Extinguisher Cabinets	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
			C. COLUMN COVER CABINETS:				
			Basis of Design inside box dimensions for fire extinguisher: 24" height x 11" width x 8" depth, coordinate with specification section 10 44 16.				
			Cabinet Box: Steel cabinet, white baked enamel box Trim and Door Material: Aluminum door and handle with full panel clear acrylic glazing; aluminum trim (as indicated on drawings) Larsen's Manufacturing Co. model number: AL 2712-RK, AL 2712-RT				
			Specification Section 10 44 16 2.1 B				
			FIRE EXTINGUISHERS 10 44 16				
			PART 2 - PRODUCTS				
			2.1 FIRE EXTINGUISHERS				
			Is revised as follows:				
			Delete: B				
			Add:				
			B. Fire Extinguisher Types				
			Type A: Fire Extinguisher UL 20A-120 B:C 1. Dry Chemical Type Fire Extinguisher: Steel tank with pressure gage 2. Class: ABC 3. Valve: Chrome plated brass 4. Extinguishing Agent Weight: 20 pounds 5. Finish: Baked polyester powder coat, red color				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 424 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0408	Interior Bird Deterrent Systems Specifications	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 81 13 1.1 a (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 81 13 1.1 a indicates that Specification Section 10 81 13 specifies bird deterrent systems at the exterior of the building only.					Specification Section 10 81 13 1.1 A.1 is revised to include the building interiors.		
Sheet A1-8251 indicates that bird control is to be installed within the Grand Hall.							
Please provide the specification for interior bird deterrent systems.							

Type B: Fire Extinguisher UL 10-B:C

1. Carbon Dioxide Fire Extinguisher: Steel tank with pressure gage 2. Class: BC 3. Valve: Chrome plated brass 4. Extinguishing Agent Weight: 20 pounds 5. Finish: Baked polyester powder coat, red color



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 425 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0409	Drill Holes for the Birdwire System	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	09/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 81 13 3.2 C 2 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				Install system using mechanical fastening methods only, without the use of adhesives. Use aluminum or stainless steel clamps, brackets, clips and fasteners for installation as shown in the Contract Document details. Use stainless steel hose clamp with attached post when attaching to pipe or round structural sections where diameter allows (e.g. light poles). The mechanical fastening method shall not penetrate the substrate in a manner that creates water intrusion or voids the warranty of the substrate.			
Specification Section 10 81 13 3.2 C 2 indicates that the installer of the Birdwire System is to drill ¼" holes in the substrate for mounting.							
These holes may void the warranty of the substrate, and create a possible point of water intrusion.							
Please confirm this is acceptable, or revise specification to allow for installation with adhesive only.							
P1-0410	Painting of ACT-1 Ceiling for B1268	Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	09/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-9602 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14)				Confirmed. The ACT-1 ceiling within Room B1268 is not to be painted, refer to attached SKA-4066.			
Sheet A1-9602 of ASI 119 dictates that ACT-1 ceiling within Room B1268 is to be painted.							
No other ACT-1 ceilings are scheduled to be painted.							
Please confirm the ACT-1 ceiling within Room B1268 is not to be painted.							
P1-0411	ACT Ceiling Type for Room 01223	Closed	08/22/2014	08/22/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-9603 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14)				Confirmed, all ceilings noted as ACT on schedule are ceiling type ACT-1.			
Sheet A1-9603 of ASI 119 calls out the ceiling finish of Room 01223 as "ACT".				See attached sketch.			



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 427 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0414	REQUEST: REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 26 00 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 10 26 00 is for Wall Protection Systems. The documents do not identify locations for these products. Please confirm that no products listed within Specification Section 10 26 00 are to be furnished or installed on Phase 1.	SUGGESTION:					
Structural Information for HSS Post and Column Baseplate		Closed	08/22/2014	09/01/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 1/A1-9858 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) A.) Detail 1/A1-9858 calls out for: - HSS Post - Column Baseplate secured to Structural Slab Detail 1/A1-9858 indicates the structural information is located on the structural plans. Structural plans do not show this steel. B.) Detail 3/A1-9858 calls for: - Structural Lintel Beam - Shear Plate welded to HSS and bolted to Lintel Beam - Double Steel Angle spaced at every 3'-0" alternating sides Detail 3/A1-9858 indicates the structural information is located on the structural plans. Structural plans do not show these elements. Please provide the referenced structural information for steel members and attachment.	SUGGESTION:					
		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>					
		Confirmed, specification section 10 26 00 is not related to any work furnished or installed in Phase 1. This section will be deleted from TOC in upcoming ASI 0127.					
		For both A) and B) the Structural Drawings do show the requested information. Please refer to 4/S1-9100 issued with IFC Set dated 03/31/14.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 428 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0415	Pricing Coordination with PG&E	Void	08/26/2014	09/05/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference Note #8 C1-8001 - C1-8005 ASI 123 Note #8 on Civil drawing(s) 8001 - 8005 contains the following: "Contractor shall coordinate with PG&E via TJPA for service connection work prior to start of construction. Location of PG&E service point is undermined and subject to change." Please provide clarity for the Trade Group bidders on how TJPA would like them to provide pricing, for this unknown element with an undetermined location and/or duration of time necessary for coordination.							
SUGGESTION:							
ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>							
P1-0416	Finish Details for Landscape Drawings	Closed	08/26/2014	08/26/2014	09/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference A1-2870, S1-2310 and S1-3201 (IFC Main set) Architectural drawing A1-2870 directs the contractor to the Structural drawings for information regarding the concrete finish elevations; Structural drawings S1-2310 & S1-3201 provide elevation for top of concrete at the train box only; landscaping drawings do not provide any finish information ¿ (see highlighted section) as this is not included in the landscaping. Please provide information regarding the highlighted section on the attached drawing L1-2330 and/or drawing number wherein concrete sectional details can be found, including topping slab to concrete on grade. Provide details for elevations, expansion joints, contraction joints, landscaping if any, civil site work if any.							
SUGGESTION:							
ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>							
The area referred to and highlighted in this RFI is Parcel F. There is no Landscape or Civil Site Work scope in this area, as the finishing of this area is future work not within the current scope of the Transbay Transit Center project. Note: A1-2870 does not direct the contractor to the Structural drawings for concrete finish elevations. S1-2310 has a few elevations, but that is a structural convention to illustrate a step in the slab. All elevations for the top of concrete Ground Floor level slab are derived from the Architectural slab edge drawings. S1-3201 is a section, not a plan and there are no elevations shown on this drawing.							
P1-0417	VE Item 4a	Closed	08/26/2014	09/05/2014	09/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>





Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 430 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0419	Application of Specification Section 01 80 50	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	09/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Specification Section 01 80 50 1.1 B (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			Specification Section 01 80 50 is revised to include this statement in the Summary:				
Specification Section 01 80 50 1.1 B states, "The requirements of this Section apply to all non-structural components, unless otherwise noted."			"B. The requirements of this Section apply when adopted by reference by other Sections of the Specifications."				
Per previous meetings with PMPC, 01 80 50 is to be specifically referenced in each specification to which it applies.			The Specification Sections listed below include nonstructural components requiring seismic criteria in their work, thus they will contain a reference to Section 01 80 50 Seismic design Criteria for Nonstructural Components.				
Please provide the areas and specification sections to which Specification Section 01 50 80 Seismic Design Criteria for Nonstructural Components applies.			- 07 09 13 - Seismic Joint Assemblies				
			- 07 09 15 - Vehicular Seismic Joint Assemblies				
			- 09 22 19 - non structural metal framing				
			- 09 24 00 - Portland Cement Plastering (W-18)				
			- 09 51 00 - Acoustic ceiling tiles				
			- 09 69 00 - Access Flooring				
			- 10 14 19 - Dimensional Lettering				
			- 10 14 26 - Pylon Signage				
			- 10 14 33 - Illuminated Panel Signage				
			- 10 14 36 - Non-Illuminated Panel Signage				
			- 10 14 66 - Floating Signage				
			- 10 14 83 - Interpretive Graphics				
			- 10 18 00 - Informational Kiosks				
			- 10 21 13 - Toilet partitions and screens				
			- 10 22 39 - Operable Partition				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 431 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
				- 10 44 00 - Automatic smoke and fire curtains - 10 51 13 - Metal lockers			
				- 12 93 10 - Lighting and Security Pylon - 12 93 40 - Shaw Alley Site Art Installation			
				- 23 34 00 - Fans - 21 05 48 - Vibration isolation and seismic restraints - 22 05 48 - Vibration isolation and seismic restraints - 23 05 48 - Vibration isolation and seismic restraints - 26 05 48 - Vibration isolation and seismic restraints			
				- Division 27 - Communications			
P1-0420	Framing Details for Access Panels Within Gypsum Board Ceilings	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	09/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Access panels will be required within gypsum board ceilings.				Refer to drawing A1-9042 for detailing of ceiling access panel within a gypsum board ceiling.			
Typical access panel ceiling framing has not been provided.							
Please provide the desired framing detail for access panels within gypsum board ceilings.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 432 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0421	VOID	Void	08/28/2014	09/07/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<hr/>							
P1-0422	Fire Extinguisher Locations per Specification Section 10 44 13 1.3 C 2 c	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 44 13 1.3 C 2 c (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			For Fire Extinguisher and Fire Extinguisher Cabinet locations at all levels, Fire Extinguisher legend and Fire Extinguisher Details refer to the attached Architectural Sketches SKAs: 4115 - 4118; 4120 - 4125; 4133 - 4137; 4181 - 4182; 4184; 4193 - 4198, 4202; 4206 - 4230 & 4244 - 4258.				
Specification Section 10 44 13 1.3 C 2 c states, " Where extinguishers are not indicated, assume cabinet and extinguishers will be located within 75 feet of any point in the building, or at a rate of one for each 3,000 square feet of building area..."							
No fire extinguishers are located on the plans. Please provide fire extinguisher locations.							
<hr/>							
P1-0423	Painted Cement Board for SFPD Restrooms	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	09/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
REFERENCE: Details 4-8/A1-9060 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			For the restrooms, cement board is used as a substrate for the tile finish. The wall area between the top of the tile and the ceiling is painted gypsum board. The annotation on the Lower Concourse Restroom elevations and the wall assembly annotation on the Partition Schedule have been updated accordingly. Please refer to the attached SKA-4070 to SKA-4074.				
Details 4 - 8/A1-9060 indicate that the exposed wall space area above tile within the SFPD Restrooms are to be painted cement board.							
Painting of exposed cement board is not a typical application.							
Please confirm painted cement plaster board is desired where indicated in the contract documents, and provide finish/appearance required for the painted cement board.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0424	Installation of Electrical Components per Specification Section 09 24 00 1.1 C 2	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	09/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 24 00 1.1 C 2 (ASI 124 dated 8/18/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Specification Section 09 24 00 1.1 C 2 of ASI 124, the raceways, wiring, and pathways needed for concealed electrical systems i.e., lighting fixtures, exit lighting, power, way finding, automatic door power, along with low voltage wires (concealed or exposed as indicated in drawings are to be furnished by others, but installed by the Portland Cement Plaster Trade Package.					Paragraph 1.1 C.2 of Specification Section 09 24 00 issued on ASI-0127 is deleted, work is defined under TG10.4.		
TG10.4 - Electrical, Communications, Security, and Integrated Networks, is to furnish and install all electrical work unless specifically referenced in other trade packages (for example, some low voltage is in the Doors and Hardware Trade Package).							
Please remove installation of electrical out of the specification for Specification Section 09 24 00.							
P1-0425	Test Methods per Specification Section 09 24 00 1.7 G 2	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	09/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 24 00 1.7 G 2 (ASI 124 dated 8/18/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 24 00 1.7 G 2 a indicates that TJPA's Inspection Agent will conduct testing of exterior enclosure welds, "utilizing one of the following test methods."					Specification Section paragraph 09 24 00 1.7 G.2 has been deleted, thus no test method is necessary. See revised specification attached to RFI P1-0428.		
No test methods are listed.							
Please provide the referenced testing methods.							
P1-0426	Confirm the Use of Scanning and Other Means to Locate Reinforcing Bars	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	09/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:**REQUEST:**

REFERENCE: Note PA-1/S-0008, Note PA-3/S-0008 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)

Note PA-1/S-0008 defines a powder actuated fastener as a post installed anchor.

Note PA-3/S-0008 states to use scanning equipment or other means to locate and avoid cutting or damaging reinforcing bars.

Based upon these requirements, scanning for rebar will be required prior to the installation of any powder actuated fasteners (metal framing top and bottom tracks, ceiling wires, etc.).

This could significantly increase the cost and duration of the work. Please confirm scanning or other methods for locating rebar is required prior to the installation of powder actuated fasteners.

SUGGESTION:**ANSWER:****Accept Suggestion:** ☐

If powder actuated fasteners are long enough to cause damage to rebar, then scanning per PA-3 is required. If the powder actuated fasteners are short enough not being able to hit or damage rebar, then section PA-3 is not invoked hence scanning is not required.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 435 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0427	Drawings for Portland Cement Plaster	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	09/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 24 00 1.1 A 8 (ASI 124 dated 8/18/14)			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Specification Section 09 24 00 1.1 A 8 a indicates architectural drawings are to be used for to determine design intent for Portland cement plaster.			The design intent and scope of the work of the Portland Cement Plastering is clearly included in the following drawings:				
No details or other drawings have been provided for the Portland cement plaster scope of work.			1. A1-5612D, A1-5613D, A1-5615D, A1-56152D from the ASI -0120 issued 7/11/2014.				
Please provide the referenced drawings.			2. A1-8229D, A1-8230D, A1-8231D, A1-8232D, A1-8233D, A1-8234D, A1-8237D, A1-8238D, A1-8239D, A1-8240D, A1-8241D, A1-8242D, A1-8245D, A1-8402D, A1-8403D, A1-8404D & A1-8454 from the ASI -0120 issued 7/11/2014.				
			3. A1-8614 (SKA-3964) and A1-8615 (SKA-3965) of VE Round 4 (ASI-0124) issued 8/18/2014				
			No other 'details or other drawings' are required.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0428	Portland Cement Plaster Color	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	09/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 24 00					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 24 00 2.7 B indicates that the cement plaster color is to be Gray. No other integral colors are noted.					Specification Section 09 24 00 paragraph 2.7 B has been revised. Please refer to attached markup of this section for revised plaster system and materials.		
If the cement plaster requires paint, the plaster will need to cure for an extended duration before paint is applied. This will impact the duration the scaffold is in place.					Issues related to curing times per specification are determined by the plaster system manufacturer's recommendations.		
Please note that TG16.1 Drywall/Framing is currently scoped to leave the scaffold in place if the cement plaster requires painting.					Please refer to paragraph 2.5 in the attached revised plaster Section. The color is integral to the pre-mixed exterior finish coat, which is applied over the plaster mesh over the brown coat. The basis of design specified is Parex "Image Smooth Finish" with a custom color - The color is BM 1548 classic gray to match TJPA's Representative sample.		
Please confirm that the gray cement plaster is to remain exposed and does not require paint.					The duration of the scaffold in place is a Means and Methods decision to be determined by the Contractor.		
P1-0429	Doors 01901A and 01920A per Sheet A1-9703	Closed	09/03/2014	09/13/2014	09/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Sheet A1-9703 (ASI 124 dated 8/18/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet A1-9703 of ASI 124 calls out Doors 01901A and 01920A.					Both doors are located in at the Ground Floor Zone 10 SW area in the vicinity of the Vehicle and Bicycle Ramp. Door 01901A is the exterior exit door from Stair 901 and Door 01920A is the door for the Communication Vault to the south and west of the stair exit door.		
The plans do not show these doors.							
Please provide a plan showing Doors 01901A and 01920A.					Please see attached SKA-4077 for the location and SKA-4078 for the updated Door Schedule showing these two doors.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 437 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0430	Wall Type Clarification at Stair 601A	Closed	09/03/2014	09/13/2014	09/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet A1-2306 (ASI 124 dated 8/18/14)					Wall type 61 will be used at this location.		
Detail 1/A1-7020, Details 2 & 4/A1-7702 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
Sheet A1-2306 and Detail 1/A1-7020 call out for Wall Type 61 to be used at Stair 601A.							
Details 2 & 4/A1-7702 calls out for these walls to be Wall Type 10.							
Please clarify the wall type to be used at this location.							
P1-0431	Locations Where Wall Type 30 and 61 Support W-5 System	Closed	09/03/2014	09/13/2014	09/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet A1-0023					Wall types 30 & 61 are specific to supporting the W-5 System and at locations where noted on the drawings.		
Detail 1/A1-7020					The W-5 System may also be supported by HSS posts, these locations are also appropriately referenced and detailed on the drawings.		
Sheet A1-0023 describe Wall Types 30 and 61 as supporting the Colored Glass Cladding System (W-5).							
Details (Detail 1/A1-7020, for instance) show the Colored Glass Cladding System (W-5) as being supported separately from Wall Types 30 and 61.							
Please confirm Wall Types 30 and 61 are only supporting the W-5 where the W-5 system is specifically shown to hang from Wall Types 30 and 61 on the drawings.							
P1-0432	POR-1 Finish Conflict	Closed	09/05/2014	09/15/2014	09/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 438 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Reference A1-9606 (SKA-3884) ASI 122 (07/23/2014) and Specification 09 30 00 Section 3.9 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)						
	A1-9606 calls out POR-1 finish as Polished (POR-2A) and Matte (POR-2B). Specification 09 30 00 3.9 calls out the finish for POR-1 as Polished (POR-1A) and Matte (POR-1B). These are in conflict. Please revise so that the drawing and the Specification are not in conflict.						
P1-0433	POR-3 Base Conflict	Closed	09/05/2014	09/15/2014	09/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference A1-9606 (SKA-3884) ASI 122 (07/23/2014) and Specification 09 30 00 Section 3.9 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)				Tiling specification Section 09 30 00 items 3.9.C is revised to match base height shown on drawing A1-9606. Refer to attached PDF of page 11 for updated information.			
A1-9606 calls out POR-3 base to be '3 1/2 high x 12 1/2 bullnose'. Specification 09 30 00 3.9 calls out the size as '4 1/2 x 12 1/2 bullnose'. These are in conflict. Please revise so that the drawing and the Specification are not in conflict.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 439 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0434	POR-4 Base Conflict	Closed	09/05/2014	09/15/2014	09/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference A1-9606 (SKA-3884) ASI 122 (07/23/2014) and Specification 09 30 00 Section 3.9 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)				The tiling specification Section 09 30 00 items 3.9.D is revised to match base height shown on drawing A1-9606. Refer to attached revisions to this specification section for updated information.			
A1-9606 calls out POR-4 base to be '3½ high x 12½ bullnose'. Specification 09 30 00 3.9 calls out the size as '4½ high bullnose'. These are in conflict. Please revise so that the drawing and the Specification are not in conflict.							
P1-0435	CET-3	Closed	09/05/2014	09/15/2014	09/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference A1-9606 (SKA-3884) ASI 122 (07/23/2014) and Specification 09 30 00 Section 3.9 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)				Drawing number A1-9606 is revised to show CET-1 (there is no CET-3) to match specification section 09 30 00 item 3.9.E. Refer to attached sketch # SKA-4155 Rev.1 for updated information.			
A1-9606 Identifies CET-3, but Specification 09 30 00 3.9 does not show CET-3. Please provide specification for CET-3.							
P1-0436	CET-1	Closed	09/05/2014	09/15/2014	09/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference A1-9606 (SKA-3884) ASI 122 (07/23/2014) and Specification 09 30 00 Section 3.9 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)				Drawing number A1-9606 is revised to change CET-3 into CET-1 to match specification section 09 30 00 item 3.9.E. Refer to attached sketch # SKA-4155 Rev.1 for updated information.			
Specification 09 30 00 3.9 specifies CET-1, but A1-9606 does not identify CET-1. Please update A1-9606 to include CET-1.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 440 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0437	Floor Finish CT	Closed	09/05/2014	09/05/2014	09/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference A1-9603 (SKA-3428) ASI 119 (06/20/2014) and A1-9606 (SKA-3884) ASI 122 (07/23/2014) A1-9603 calls out floor finish ¿CT¿ in several locations. ¿CT¿ is not defined in the room finish schedule abbreviations, or the A1-9606 Materials Legend. Please provide a definition for ¿CT¿ on the finish schedule.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing number A1-9603 is revised to call for SC instead of CT. Refer to sketch # SKA-4154 for updated information, copy attached.		
P1-0438	Environmental Requirements for Tile Carpeting	Closed	09/05/2014	09/15/2014	09/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification 09 68 13 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) 09 68 13 1.7 E and 09 68 13 1.8 A dictate specific environmental requirements for installation of tile carpeting. These requirements may differ from the manufacturer¿s written installation requirements. Please confirm the specified environmental conditions are to be provided in lieu of the requirements established within manufacturer¿s written installation instructions, or revise specification to require environmental conditions to meet the manufacturer¿s written installation instructions.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental conditions for Tile Carpeting are to be as per Manufacturer's written instructions.		
P1-0439	Automatic Smoke and Fire Curtains at Elevator Doors	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 10 44 00 ASI 121 (07/18/2014) Specification 10 44 00 section 1.1 A states that automatic smoke and fire curtains are at all elevator doors. The architectural and electrical drawings do not indicate that			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No, not all elevators require Smoke and Fire Curtains at all levels. Refer to SKA-4107 for Elevator Matrix (matrix will be included in referenced specification in next ASI issue). 2. See below for specific Elevator Detail correction:		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>automatic smoke and fire curtains exist at all elevator doors. Please confirm if all elevator doors receive automatic smoke and fire curtains.</p> <p>If yes, please revise: 1) the architectural elevator jamb/head details and/or detail callouts and, 2) coordinate revisions with the electrical drawings.</p> <p>If no, please provide: 1) a matrix of the elevators that require automatic smoke and fire curtains and 2) revise architectural details and/or detail callouts. 3) coordinate revisions with the electrical drawings.</p> <p>Please note the following coordination conflicts currently exist between the architectural and electrical drawings and should be addressed in the answers above: -E1-2204 shows power for smoke curtains at elevators PE403 and PE404 but the architectural detail for the elevator does not show an automatic smoke and fire curtain at the door head/jamb. Coordinate and revise accordingly.</p> <p>-The electrical drawings show power for smoke and fire curtains for Lower Concourse Passenger Elevators 301,302, 502, 503, 704 and 705 but the architectural detail for the elevator does not show an automatic smoke and fire curtain at the door head/jamb. In addition the door head/jamb details are for service instead of passenger elevators. Coordinate and revise accordingly.</p> <p>-Electrical drawings show power for automatic smoke and fire curtains for PE202 on the ground level. Provide elevator door jamb detail for PE202 on the ground level that includes automatic smoke and fire curtain.</p> <p>-PE403, PE404, PE502, PE503, PE704 and PE705 all have details that show a smoke and fire curtain on the ground level. Electrical drawings do not have power for smoke and fire curtains at these locations on the ground level. Coordinate and revise accordingly.</p> <p>-PE403 and PE404 electrical drawings show power for automatic smoke and fire curtains on the second level however there is not a detail for the elevator jamb/head condition that shows the automatic smoke and fire curtain.</p>						
					a) E1-2204 shows power for Smoke curtains at Elevators PE403 & PE404 at Lower Concourse Level, refer details 1 & 3 in SKA-4110.		
					b) For smoke and fire curtains for Lower Concourse Elevators 301, 302, 502, 503, 704 & 705, refer details 1 & 3 in SKA-4110.		
					c) For smoke and fire curtains for PE202 at Ground level, refer detail 2 & 4 in SKA-4110.		
					d) Smoke and Fire curtains removed at PE403, PE404, PE502, PE503, PE704 & PE705 at Ground level, refer detail 2 & 4 in SKA-4108 and 3 in SKA-4109.		
					e) Refer to sheet A1-7832 - Addendum # 4 06/20/14, for smoke & fire curtains at PE403 & PE404 at second floor.		
					f) Reference on 3/A1-7204, revised to 4/A1-7832, refer to SKA-4111.		
					g) Refer to sheet A1-7840 - Addendum # 4 06/20/14, for smoke & fire curtains at PE302, PE303, PE502 & PE503 at Bus deck.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 442 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Coordinate and revise accordingly.</p> <p>-PE704 and PE705 3/A1-7204 references 4/A1-7830 which is regarding stair 501 and not PE704 and PE705. Revise callout for the elevator jamb/head condition for the second level.</p> <p>-PE302, PE303, PE502, and PE503 provide detail of elevator jamb/head condition, electrical drawings show an automatic smoke and fire curtain on the bus deck level for these elevators however there are not details for that.</p>							
P1-0440	Access Hatch per Detail 4/A1-9220	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:		Specification Section 08 31 20 Floor Doors are to be used for all single leaf floor doors at the water tanks. For updated drawing annotations for the water tank floor doors, refer to SKA-4095 and SKA-4096.					
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 08 31 20 1.1 A Detail 4/A1-9220							
Specification Section 08 31 20 1.1 A Floor Doors references "single-leaf floor doors at water tanks."							
Detail 4/A1-9220 illustrates a single-leaf door to be installed at the Train Platform Level Water Storage Tank but calls out "Access Hatch". There are no specifications for Access Hatches.							
Please confirm Specification Section 08 31 20 Floor Doors is to be used for all single-leaf doors/access hatches/openings at water tanks or provide an Access Hatch specification.							
<hr/>							
P1-0441	Single Colored Polished Concrete at Bus Deck	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 443 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Specification Section 01 10 30/APE E.1.12 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Sheets A1-9562 through A1-9567 (ASI 119 dated 6/18/14)</p> <p>Per the Deduct Alternates meeting between TJPA, AAI, WOJV, and PCMP on 8/20/14, Alternate No. 24 (Specification Section 01 10 30/APE E.1.12) to substitute Terrazzo floor with Single Color Polished Concrete was accepted.</p> <p>Sheets A1-9562 through A1-9567 currently call for Terrazzo flooring at the Bus Deck Level.</p> <p>Please provide drawings and specifications that reflect the Single Color Polished Concrete to be installed at the Bus Deck Level.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Per agreement with TJPA/PMPC, WOJV and the Design Team, a conformed set incorporating all approved Alternates is being scheduled for delivery in December 2014. Documentation containing drawings and specifications for the Single Color Polished Concrete shall be provided at that time.</p>		
P1-0442	Single Colored Polished Concrete at Beale St. Lobby	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Specification Section 01 10 30/APE E.1.13 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Sheet A1-9540 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14)</p> <p>Per the Deduct Alternates meeting between TJPA, AAI, WOJV, and PCMP on 8/20/14, Alternate No. 25 (Specification Section 01 10 30/APE E.1.13) to substitute Terrazzo floor with Single Color Polished Concrete was accepted.</p> <p>Sheets A1-9540 currently call for Terrazzo flooring at the Beale Street Lobby.</p> <p>Please provide drawings and specifications that reflect the Single Color Polished Concrete to be installed at the Beale Street Lobby.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Per agreement with TJPA/PMPC, WOJV and the Design Team, a conformed set incorporating all approved Alternates is being scheduled for delivery in December 2014. Documentation containing drawings and specifications for the Single Color Polished Concrete shall be provided at that time.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 444 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0443	Verification of Performance Requirements by Door Designer/Subcontractor	Closed	09/08/2014	09/08/2014	09/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 08 11 13 Specification Section 08 11 15 Specification Section 08 11 16 Specification Section 08 34 54 Specification Section 08 71 10 Specification Section 08 78 10 Specification Section 08 11 13 Steel Doors and Frames, Specification Section 08 11 15 Commercial Security Steel Doors and Frames, Specification Section 08 11 16 Flush Stainless Steel Doors and Frames, and Specification Section 08 34 54 Ballistic Doors and Frames have Design Criteria and Performance Requirements/Design-Build requirements. Specification Section 08 71 10 Base Building Hardware and Specification Section 08 78 10 Main Package Special Function Hardware do not have Design Criteria and Performance Requirements/Design-Build requirements. Please confirm the door designer/subcontractor is not responsible to verify the capabilities of the specified door hardware are not exceeded by the Design Criteria and Performance Requirements/Design-Build requirements of the doors, and make hardware changes as part of the base bid work.					Door designer/subcontractor is responsible for verification of capabilities of specified door hardware, and will be required to coordinate, and if necessary make hardware changes as part of the base work.		
P1-0444	Precast Terrazzo Sills	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Specification Section 09 66 41 1.1 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Specification Section 09 66 14 1.1 indicates that this Spec applies to precast epoxy terrazzo stair treads and sills. There are no precast terrazzo sill locations in the plans. Please confirm there are no precast terrazzo sills.					Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 445 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0445	Rope	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 9/A1-9042 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) 9/A1-9042 indicates ¿rope and sealant¿ are to be installed at inside corners. There is no specification for "rope". Please provide a specification for ¿rope¿.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Term has been corrected on the drawing from ¿rope¿ to ¿backer rod¿, see attached sketch SKA-4088.		
P1-0446	Terrazzo Control Sample	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 09 66 23 2.3.B.5.a.1.b and 09 66 23 2.5.A IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) 09 66 23 2.3.B.5.a.1.b and 09 66 23 2.5.A direct bidders to match TJPA¿s and the Artist¿s control sample. No control sample has been provided. Please provide the referenced control sample.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The bidder awarded the contract will be provided with Terrazzo Control Sample by the Artist after award.		
P1-0447	Custom Color Recipes for Terrazzo	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 09 66 23 2.3.B.5.b IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) 09 66 23 2.3.B.5.b directs bidders to budget for up to 20 different custom colors and metallic infill. No final color recipes have been provided. This will not allow for consistent bid inclusions, and may lead to increased cost of the bids. Please provide specific recipes for all of the desired terrazzo colors.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Bidder shall continue to budget for up to 20 custom colors and metallic fill as noted in the RFI question referenced specification section. For approximate anticipated recipes of 16 out of 20 custom colors refer to attached "JC Color Specification Key (11Sep14).pdf", provided with this response.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 446 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0448	Bronze Floor Inserts	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 09 66 23 2.3.C IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) 09 66 23 2.3.C indicates that 56 bronze floor inserts are to be furnished and installed as part of the terrazzo work. Please see the following and provide responses accordingly: 1) No drawings or specifications (grade of bronze, required finish, patina, etc.) have been provided showing the bronze floor inserts. Please provide these drawings/specifications. 2) 09 66 23 2.3.C states that there are 6 different designs of bronze inserts, but the list below only shows 5. Please revise so these are no longer in conflict. 3) 09 66 23 2.3.C.5 shows "12 inch TBD". Please provide the missing information that is currently shown as "TBD".			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Specification for the bronze inserts (grade of bronze, required finish, patina, etc.) shall be provided by the Artist. 2. 6 Designs is correct. Artist shall provide the design and description of the 6th element. For the remaining 5 elements refer to attached "20142703_JC Bronze Inset Sketch 1.pdf", and "20132212_JC Bronze Inset Sketch 2.pdf". 3. Refer to the attached " 20132212_JC Bronze Inset Sketch 2.pdf" for illustration of "12 inch TBD".				
P1-0449	Terrazzo Anchoring Devices	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 09 66 23 2.4.F IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) 09 66 23 2.4.F indicates that anchoring devices are as indicated on the drawings. No anchoring devices are shown on the drawings. Please provide anchoring device information.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Anchoring devices are not shown on the drawings. Anchoring devices are to be provided by the contractor if and where required.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0450	Environmental Conditions for Epoxy Terrazzo Flooring	Closed	09/11/2014	09/21/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 09 66 23 1.9.A IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
09 66 23 1.9.A states ¿ The minimum slab temperature shall be 60 degrees F before commencing installation, during installation, and for at least 72 hours after installation is complete. The substrate temperature must be at least 5 degrees F above the dew point during installation.¿ The Manufacturer's written installation instructions state "Throughout the application process, substrate temperature should be 60°F ¿ 90°F. Substrate temperature must be at least 5°F above the dew point. Applications on concrete substrate should occur while temperature is falling to lessen offgassing. The material should not be applied in direct sunlight, if possible. Protect material from freezing prior to installation.." The specifications do not match manufacturer¿s written installation instructions. Please confirm the environmental conditions required within 09 66 22 shall override the manufacturer¿s written installation instructions.					Environmental conditions for Terrazzo are to be as per Manufacturer's written instructions.		

P1-0451	Environmental Conditions for Terrazzo Epoxy Crack Suppression System	Closed	09/11/2014	09/21/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 09 66 22 1.8.A IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
09 66 22 1.8.A states ¿ The minimum slab temperature shall be 60 degrees F before commencing installation, during installation, and for at least 72 hours after installation is complete. The substrate temperature must be at least 5 degrees F above the dew point during installation.¿ The Manufacturer's written installation instructions state "During installation and initial cure cycle substrate and ambient air temperature must be at a minimum of 60°F (16°C). Substrate temperature must be at least 5°F (3°C) above the dew point. The specifications do not match manufacturer¿s written installation instructions. Please confirm the environmental conditions					Environmental conditions for Terrazzo Epoxy Crack Suppression System are to be as per Manufacturer's written instructions.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 449 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 09 66 23 1.3.E.1 and 1.4.D.1 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) 09 66 23 1.3.E.1 and 09 66 23 1.4.D.1 mention color schemes/ terrazzo color identification. No color schemes/ terrazzo color identification has been provided. Please provide color schemes/ Terrazzo color identification so that the terrazzo can be accurately priced.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached " 20140908_JC GRAND HALL (Color Specification)_AAI Clean.pdf" file for Grand Hall Terrazzo Color Scheme. Please note that the Final Artwork is subject to change.		
P1-0455	Unit Price for Epoxy Flooring	Closed	09/11/2014	09/21/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Andrew Kitchen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 09 66 23 1.4.C.1 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) and 01 10 20 Div. 00/01 (08/11/2014) 09 66 23 1.4.C.1 states to provide a unit price per 2 (two) samples of 6 inch square epoxy flooring in excess of 20 colors. 01 10 20 (and its appendices) do not call out this unit price. Please revise these specifications to match.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Delete the following text from 09 66 23 / 1.4.C.1 "Provide unit price per 2 (two) samples in excess of 20 colors".		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 450 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0456	LEED Credit MR5 for Terrazzo	Closed	09/11/2014	09/11/2014	09/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 09 66 23 1.5.C IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
09 66 23 1.5.C calls out for LEED Credit MR 5, which requests information on the terrazzo's materials extraction, processing and location of manufacture. No specific aggregates have been specified for this scope of work. Please confirm there is no minimum amount of material for 09 66 23 which must be extracted, processed and manufactured within the straight-line total travel distance described in 09 66 23 1.5.C.					LEED requirements are a goal, which cannot be confirmed until the final colors have been approved by the Artist in collaboration with TJPA and the Awarded Subcontractor.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 451 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0457	FI Requirements for Terrazzo	Closed	09/12/2014	09/22/2014	11/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 03 30 02, 09 66 22, 09 66 23 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) 03 30 02 3.6.A.2 states to comply with dimensional tolerance limitations given by ACI 117 for Concrete Finishes, and 03 30 02 3.6.A.4.c states "FI numbers shall not apply to unshored slabs or shored slabs with camber." ACI 117 4.4.1 states that slabs on structural steel or precast concrete have no deviation from elevation requirement. However, 09 66 22 3.2.B states that the Terrazzo Trade Subcontractor must level the floor to a specific FI, and 09 66 23 3.3.F refers to 09 66 22 3.2.B for FI requirements for Epoxy Terrazzo Flooring. As such, the concrete filled metal pan deck and topping slabs have a FI requirement which conflicts with the allowable FI referenced in 09 66 22 and 09 66 23. In addition, the concrete substrate may continue to move after installation of terrazzo. Please provide direction on installation of terrazzo epoxy crack suppression and epoxy terrazzo flooring where their FI requirements conflict with the FI requirements of the concrete substrate.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification Section 09 66 22, 3.2 B: Reference to tolerances is to be removed from this section. Specification Section 09 66 22, 3.2 C to be revised as follows: Before installation of the moisture control system, engage a California licensed surveyor or civil engineer to make a survey of the floor to confirm the flatness SOF of 50 and elevations as indicated on drawings using a self propelled profilometer or a similar instrument that will give an accurate measurement downloadable to a computer in the form of a floor survey. Report any deviations from the floor flatness criteria or floor level to General Contractor for correction. Specification section 03 30 02, 3.6 G: Revise section to add 3. Finish surface of topping slab to SOF of 50. Elevation of topping slab to be as shown on drawings. To facilitate installation of reinforcing in topping slab at Grand Hall and to mitigate conflict with Hydronics Piping substitute #4 bar with WWR 6x6x4.5/4.5 on bolsters. WWR to be flat sheet.				
P1-0458	Overhead Coiling Doors and Grilles Interface Cabinet Location	Closed	09/12/2014	09/22/2014	09/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specification 08 33 23 2.3.B and 08 33 16 Section 2.3.B IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Specifications state ¿TJPA Representative prior to installation shall approve the exact style and finish of each cabinet.¿ Please provide the exact style and finish for the interface cabinet required for the overhead coiling doors and grills so that the bidders will know what to price.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide recessed NEMA 1, steel 6" x 6" x 4" (nominal) Interface Cabinet enclosure with Stainless Steel locking cover.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 452 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0459	Aluminum Enclosures at Jambs	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specification 08 33 16 and 08 33 23 2.6.H IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) This section is specific to Aluminum Enclosures at Jambs for the overhead coiling doors and grilles. Detail 2/A1-8153 and 2/A1-8154 show aluminum head conditions for the overhead doors and grilles. Please confirm the aluminum finish at the jamb is the same as the finish for the aluminum head closures. If not provide finish for aluminum head closures.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		
<hr/>							
P1-0460	Missing Callout on Bathroom Elevation Drawings	Closed	09/16/2014	09/26/2014	09/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference A1-9060 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Details 4-8 on A1-9060 show bathroom elevation drawings. There is no detail showing the transition from wall tile to painted GWB (This is shown as 2 black lines, see red mark-ups on the attached drawing for clarification). Please provide details for the transition from wall tile to painted GWB.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Trim detail was shown on detail 5/A1-9040 with Main Package IFC, March 31, 2014. Section references have been added on A1-9060 for the transition detail from wall tile to painted GWB in washrooms, refer to SKA-4225. Refer also to SKA-4227 for updated A1-9040.		
<hr/>							
P1-0461	Structural Details for Protection Slab	Closed	09/17/2014	09/27/2014	09/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Sheets A1-2912 through A1-2917 Sheets A1-2922 through A1-2922 Sheets A1-2912 through A1-2917 and Sheets A1-2922 through A1-2922 call for protection slabs.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The protection slab at the Roof Park Level shall have #4 @16" O.C. each way centered in the slab; this information is provided in sheets A1-9535 to A1-9537 issued in ASI-0127 issued 09/12/2014. The concrete mix designs are provided in the specification 03 30 02. Additionally, please refer to SKS-0370 submitted with RFI P1-0209 response for rebar details around		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 453 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>No structural information is provided on the protection slabs (i.e. reinforcement, concrete mix, details at openings and joints, finish, etc.).</p> <p>Please provide structural information for all protection slabs.</p>			<p>openings and at construction joints in topping and protection slabs.</p> <p>Sheets A1-2912 through A1-2917 and Sheets A1-2922 through A1-2922 provide the extent of protection slabs at Ground Level and Roof Park Level.</p>			
P1-0462	<p>Thickness Requirement for Insulation or Topping Slab</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Sheet A1-2980 Detail 2/A1-2982 Specification Section 07 21 00 2.3 B Details 4 & 5/A1-9321 (ASI 123 dated 3/31/14)</p> <p>1.) Expanded Polystyrene Insulation (INS-2) is called for on Sheet A1-2980 at the Lower Concourse Level and Detail 2/A1-2982 at the Grand Hall. The sheet notes refer to Specification Section 07 21 00 for additional information on insulation types. Specification Section 07 21 00 2.3 B states "thickness as indicated".</p> <p>2.) Details 4 & 5/A1-9321 call for insulation at the Bus Deck Level.</p> <p>Plans and sections do not show the thickness of the the slab or insulation at the Lower Concourse Level, Grand Hall, or Bus Deck Level.</p> <p>Please provide the thickness required for the insulation or topping slab to be installed at the Lower Concourse Level, Grand Hall, and Bus Deck Level.</p>	Closed	09/17/2014	09/27/2014	09/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1. Insulation thickness is 1" at lower concourse level and is located below concrete topping. Refer to SKA-4143 (based on A1-2980).</p> <p>2. Plans and sections show extent of insulation and tag insulation types. For Grand Hall and Bus Deck levels refer to SKA-4174 (based on A1-9585) for concrete topping thicknesses and insulation thicknesses. As the Bus Deck insulation thickness varies, also refer to Slab Edge Plans for elevations of sloped built-up and sloped structural slab to calculate insulation thickness at various locations.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 454 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0463	Topping Slab Requirements for Rooms B1365, B1387, B1390	Closed	09/17/2014	09/27/2014	09/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: (ASI 121 dated 7/18/14)		The structural engineer has confirmed that the topping slab assembly in rooms B1365 (Oversized Equipment Storage), B1387 (Maintenance Equipment Repair Shop), and 1390 (Maintenance Workshop), described on A1-9523 (Note# 1), is sufficient to receive the anticipated the loads of the equipment traffic.					
Sheet A1-2203							
Sheet A1-9523							
Sheet A1-2203 refers to Sheet A1-9523 for Slab Topping Details for rooms B1365 (Oversized Equipment Storage), B1387 (Maintenance Equipment Repair Shop), and B1390 (Maintenance Workshop).							
Sheet A1-9523 does not require traffic rated topping slabs for rooms B1365, B1387, or B1390. However, these rooms are indicated for the use of oversized equipment storage and maintenance.							
Please confirm rooms B1365 (Oversized Equipment Storage), B1387 (Maintenance Equipment Repair Shop), and B1390 (Maintenance Workshop) are not to receive traffic rated topping slabs.							
<hr/>							
P1-0464	Overhead Door at SE201	Closed	09/17/2014	09/27/2014	09/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference A1-2202 ASI 121 (07/18/2014)		Elevator SE201 is deferred, however the Overhead Door B1237G, for this elevator, is not deferred and is to be installed.					
Service Elevator SE201 has been deferred. Please provide direction as to whether or not the rated overhead door on the lower concourse for SE 201 should be installed at this time.							
<hr/>							
P1-0465	Smoke Curtains at PE203	Closed	09/17/2014	10/11/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference A1-2302 (ASI 119 06/20/2014)		Confirmed. The smoke curtains for elevator PE203 are also to be deferred.					
<hr/>							



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 456 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0467	Metal Ceiling Connection to W-2	Closed	09/19/2014	09/29/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 2/A1-7513 ASI 127 2/A1-7513 shows a closure piece that is not fastened or sealed to the W-2 support. Please confirm if a fastener and/or sealant is provided at this locations. If yes, please provide details to fill void between closure piece and W-2 support.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> All W-14 perimeter has a continuous aluminum 'Z' closure at all transitions to vertical surfaces. There are no voids, please see enclosed SKA-4262.			
P1-0468	Metal Ceiling Field Modifications	Closed	09/19/2014	09/29/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 09 51 23 2.9.A.8 ASI 127 09 51 23 23 2.9.A.8 discusses creating penetrations in metal ceiling panels and prohibits any field modifications. Please confirm if this language applies only to penetrations or if it applies to modifying panels at edge condition as well. Where the panels meet finishes installed by others and the structural steel superstructure it's likely that field modifications will be required to accommodate as-built conditions. Please confirm that this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please see enclosed revised Specification Section 09 51 23 Paragraph 2.9 A.8.			
P1-0469	Power Bollards	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 12 93 00 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) The above referenced specification includes Power Bollards. No Power Bollards are shown on the drawings. Please provide locations for Power Bollards, and all details or remove from specification.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to L1-2605. "Utility bollard" equals power bollard.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 457 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
P1-0470	Cafe Chairs and Tables	Void	09/23/2014	10/03/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					
Co-Author:			Answered By:					
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference Specification Section 12 93 00 1.1.A.6 and 1.1.A.7 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)								
The above referenced specification shows Café Chairs and Café Tables. Clarify if these are meant to be purchased with the TG13.1 Rooftop Landscaping package or if the TJPA wants to procure them at a later time once plans for the rooftop cafe are finalized. At the moment the rooftop cafe is a deductive alternate with a temporary lid over the stem walls.								
P1-0471	Power Bollard Locations	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					
Co-Author:			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference Specification Section 12 93 00 1.4.C.1 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)			1) Yes.					
Clarify that the reference to bollards in this statement refers only to power bollards and not to any other types of bollards. Clarify where the power bollards are located.			2) See plans for locations.					
P1-0472	Rope Net Structure on Play Structure	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					
Co-Author:			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference Specification Section 12 93 20 2.3.A IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)			A. Yes					
Specification Section 12 93 20 2.3.A.1 for the Play Structure states "2500: CUSTOM ROPE NET STRUCTURE 'Transbay Transit Center' (2550S)" and Specification Section 12 93 20 2.3.A.2 states "Or Equal."			B. The alternate suppliers will need to match the specified product.					
a. Has the design team set this up with the manufacturers specifically for this project?								
b. If so, how does the Trade Subcontractor produce an								



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 458 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	equal product?						
P1-0473	Color and Finish Details for Steel Posts	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Specification Section 12 93 20 2.4.I IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)			Refer to specification section 09 97 13 3.6.D.				
Specification calls for custom color on the steel posts, but doesn't provide any details. Please provide custom color and finish details.							
P1-0474	Labor by Building Contractor Statement	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Specification Section 12 93 20 3.3.A.2 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)			Spec language revised in attached SKLA-330.				
Specification states "In any case two assistants for the project-related installation time approx. 1-1/2 day (0.25 hours per clamp) and uncovered foundations have to be provided by the building contractor." This sentence does not make sense. Additionally, TG13.1 will furnish and install the playground structure, including all connections to the playground structure and the labor required for this work. Labor will not be furnished by another trade subcontractor or the CM/GC. Please remove this sentence.							
P1-0475	Deductive Bid Alternate	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 459 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<hr/>							
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 32 14 41 2.2.D.2 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Section 32 14 41 2.2.D.2 lists a Deduct Bid Alternate. Deduct Alternates should not be in the technical specifications, but instead placed in the Alternate Specification. Remove from this specification section and place in the Alternate specification.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
			This bid alternate is listed in specification SCHEDULE OF ALTERNATES FOR MAIN PACKAGE 01 10 30/APE .				
			Refer to Specification Section 32 14 41 2.2.D.2 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) for technical requirements of alternate.				
P1-0476	Color Selection	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 32 14 41 2.3.M.1, 2.3.N.1, 2.3.O.1 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Referenced Specification Sections state that "Color" will be selected by TJPA Representative. Please define "Color" so that Bidders may provide a price.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
			Color will be to match stone.				
<hr/>							
P1-0477	Sand Layer	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 32 15 10 1.3G, 32 14 40 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Specification states "Sand Layer: refer to 32 14 40". Specification 32 14 40 does not mention anything about a Sand Layer. Please define Sand Layer.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
			Omit reference to sand layer. Refer to attached SKLA-329.				
<hr/>							
P1-0478	RPM Color	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 460 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 32 15 10 2.2.B IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Specification states that the RPM color is to be selected by TJPA Representative. Please define the color and finish of the RPM.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				Color shall be Fresco. Fresco is the color and finish.			
P1-0479	Humidity or Fog Limitations for RPM	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 32 15 10 3.4.A IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Specification references the weather limitations for RPM, but does not mention any humidity or fog limitations. Are there any humidity or fog limitations? If so, please provide.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				No.			
P1-0480	Missing Sections in 32 15 10	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 32 15 10 3.12.A.2 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Specification references Section 3.11.A.1 and 3.11.A.3. These sections do not exist in Specification 32 15 10. Please revise section 3.12.A.2 to reference the correct sections.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				See attached SKLA-328.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 461 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0481	Incorrect Reference in 32 15 10	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 32 15 10 3.12.B.2 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Specification references Section 3.11.B.1. This is an incorrect reference. Please revise section 3.12.B.2 to reference the correct section.							
			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached SKLA-328.		
P1-0482	Geotextile Fabric Source	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 32 11 24 2.1.A, 2.2.A IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Specification says that 100% of materials are to be sourced regionally. The Geotextile Fabric manufacturer listed in this Specification is from Georgia, which would cause great difficulty in achieving this credit. Please revise the Specification so that the LEED credit is achievable with the given manufacturers.							
			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The manufacturers global headquarters is in Georgia. Contact manufacturer to confirm local fabrication plant.		
P1-0483	Recycled Content Requirements	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 32 11 24 2.1.A IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) Recycled content submittal requirements are included in Part 1. Since there is no LEED MRc4 requirement listed in section 2.1, confirm that there are no recycled content requirements.							
			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No minimum recycled content is required for the subject specification. Only a LEED data submittal is required.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 462 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0484	MRC5 Option 2 Language	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	12/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 32 01 90 1.5.B and 2.1.A IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
In Specification 32 01 90 1.5B and 2.1.A, MRc5 Option 2 is not listed. The LEED language in this Specification needs to match Specification 01 81 13. Please revise 32 01 90 to add MRc5 Option 2.					Language has been changed to option 2 in both 1.5.B and 2.1.A. See attached SKLA-332.		
P1-0485	2 Year Maintenance Period After Final Completion	Void	09/23/2014	10/03/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 32 01 90 3.2.A IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification states "Continuously maintain plants, planted areas, and irrigation system during progress of Work, and for a minimum period of 2 years after date of Final Completion and until the TJPA accepts maintenance responsibility." Confirm that TJPA wants to bid the 2 year maintenance period after Final Completion.							
P1-0486	Maintenance Fertilization Program	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 32 01 90 2.2.C IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Clarify where the details of "the maintenance fertilization program accepted by the TJPA Representative" may be found. Please provide all details of the "maintenance fertilization program."					The "maintenance fertilization program" will be established based on the existing site conditions at the beginning of the maintenance period and be determined based on the informational submittals as identified in 32 01 90 1.4.		
					Existing site conditions will be based on the approved and installed soil blends, additives, fertilizers, amendments, etc. though the construction period.		
					The informational submittals shall be provided to the		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 463 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TJPA representative for review and comment. Based on these submittals the "maintenance fertilization program" will become established though the Maintenance Period.							
P1-0487	Maintenance Period Charges	Void	09/23/2014	10/03/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Specification Section 32 01 90 3.9.B.2 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)							
Specification states "Continue maintenance of landscape Work until the date that the TJPA accepts maintenance responsibility." Confirm that for pricing, the trade subcontractor should include two years worth of maintenance and then a monthly fee will be charged for any time period extending beyond the two years. Confirm if the acceptance of TJPA maintenance responsibility will be in writing.							
P1-0488	MRc5 Option 2 Language	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	11/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Specification Section 32 91 20 1.2.A.2 and 2.1.A IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)							
In Specification 32 91 20 1.2.A.2 and 2.1.A, MRc5 Option 2 is not listed. The LEED language in this Specification needs to match Specification 01 81 13. Please revise 32 91 20 to add MRc5 Option 2.						Language has been changed to option 2 in 1.2.A.2 and 2.1.A. See attached SKLA-333.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 464 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0489	Pesticides and Herbicides on Greywater Treatment Wetland	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 32 91 20 2.2.E IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
This states that "The use of pesticides and herbicides is forbidden." Confirm that this applies only to the Greywater Treatment Wetland and not to any other portion of the roof.					Specification section "32 91 20 Wetland Planting Medium" applies to wetland planting medium only.		
P1-0490	Bid Alternates in Technical Specifications	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 32 91 20 2.2.F IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Section 32 91 20 2.2.F lists a Bid Alternate. Bid Alternates should not be in the technical specifications, but instead placed in the Alternate Specification. Remove from this specification section and place in the Alternate specification.					Omit reference to alternate. Refer to attached SKLA-331.		
P1-0491	Geosynthetic Fill Requirements	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 32 34 10 3.3.B IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Confirm that these requirements are in alignment with and do not conflict with any concrete specifications.					See RFI P1-0112 dated 6/25/14.		
P1-0492	Bid Alternates in Technical Specifications	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Specification Section 32 14 40 2.2.A.2, 2.3.A.2, 2.3.B.2 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)</p> <p>Section 32 14 40 2.2.A.2 lists a Bid Alternate. Bid Alternates should not be in the technical specifications, but instead placed in the Alternate Specification. Remove from this specification section and place in the Alternate specification.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Refer to Specification Section 32 14 40 2.2.A.2, 2.3.A.2, 2.3.B.2 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014) for technical requirements of alternate.</p>		
P1-0493	Sand Stop Fabric	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Specification Section 32 14 40 3.3.A.1 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)</p> <p>This section states to "install sand-stop fabric as indicated on the Drawings." Please clarify where this is located in the drawings.</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Revise spec to be: "install sand stop fabric at all construction joint and at all weeps." See attached SKLA-327.</p>	<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 466 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0494	Details for Concrete Walls at the Roof Park Level	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	10/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Sheet A1-2970 Sheet S1-2603			George Metzger: Sheet S1-2701 was issued as part of Roof Park Restaurant package, dated 05/30/2014. Contact TJPA regarding the status of this and the TJPA direction on the Restaurant.				
Sheet A1-2970 of ASI 127 calls for a 10" concrete knee wall, thicker concrete walls at the elevator core, refers to structural drawings, and do not show the walls as deferred at the Roof Park Level.			Ray Quesada: Roof Park Restaurant IFC set, dated 5/30/2014, will be issued to W/O with the conformed IFC set to be issued in December, 2014.				
Sheet S1-2603 of ASI 127 does not identify the type of wall to be built, but references Sheet S1-2701. Sheet S1-2701 has not been issued.							
Please provide Sheet S1-2701 and details on the concrete walls to be built at the Roof Park Level.							
P1-0495	Unit Pricing	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	12/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Specification Section 32 91 30 3.6.A.1 IFC Main Set (03/31/2014)			Omit Section 3.6 of specification 32 91 30. See attached SKLA-326.				
This section states to "Provide allowance for 15 eight-hour days of adjustment grading work with a work crew of six using rakes and shovels to smooth and shape the planting area surfaces. Provide unit cost per day." If a unit price is desired, it needs to be part of the Unit Price Specification. Unit Prices should not be in the technical specifications. Please remove and place in the Unit Price Specification.							
P1-0496	Landscape Drawing Table of Contents	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference L-000 ASI 127			The Park is no longer deferred. A conform set of				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 467 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0497	<p>L-0000 shows the table of contents with dates clouded and sheet names restored. In ASI 119 all sheets above ground level were deleted per the park deferral. Confirm whether the sheet deletions from ASI 119 are meant to remain deleted or if they are reinstated as is shown in ASI 127.</p> <p>Updated Tree Planting Sheets</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference L-0006 and L-0007 ASI 127</p> <p>The tree schedule has been updated in ASI 127, but new Tree Planting sheets have not been issued with these revisions. For example, LA36 has been added while AC 36 and DD 48 are missing from the Tree Planting Schedule. When will updated Tree Planting sheets be issued?</p>	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	09/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
P1-0498	<p>Benches on Bus Deck Level</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference A1-2502, A1-2502A (ASI 127), A1-2503-2504 (ASI 119), A1-2505 (ASI 123), A1-2506 (ASI 119), A1-2507 (ASI 123)</p> <p>There are what appear to be benches on the Bus Deck, see attached markups in blue on A1-2506 (SKA-3634), but there are no call outs identifying exactly what they are. Confirm if these are benches. If they are not benches clarify what they are meant to be. Provide details, dimensions and specifications.</p>	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>

contract documents is scheduled for issue in December 2014 that will show the Park back in the scope of the Project.

Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger

ANSWER: **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The revision in ASI 127 were corrections to the Legend only. There were no revisions to the plans.

ANSWER: **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

1. Confirmed, these are benches.

2. The benches shall be "Tecno RS Seating System" by Forms + Surfaces, or equal. Refer to attached "Transit Area Bench-131101 Rev.pdf" Cut Sheet for specific details. Locations and specifications shall be provided in ASI 0128.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 468 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0499	8/A1-8532	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	10/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LPAndrew KitchenTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference 6/A1-8532 (IFC Main Set)				See enclosed SKA-8532 revised with the correct detail references. The details are located in the same sheet.			
6/A1-8532 references detail 8/A1-8532. Detail 8/A1-8532 does not exist. Please provide this detail.							
P1-0500	Ceiling Type 2	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LPAndrew KitchenTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference 9/A1-8511 and 9/A1-8530 (IFC Main Set) and 09 51 23 (ASI 124)				All Ceiling Type 1 and Type 2 panel designations are deleted. There is only one W-14 ceiling system, as put forth on Specification Section 09 51 23.			
9/A1-8511 and 9/A1-8530 call for Ceiling Type 2. According to Specification Section 09 51 23 2.5.A, Ceiling Type 2 was deleted. Please delete all callouts for Ceiling Type 2 in the drawings.							
P1-0501	Reveal Between W-14 and Cast Nodes	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LPAndrew KitchenTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference A1-8520 (ASI 124)				The aluminum ceiling portion of this project is treated as Design/Build; the design intent is shown and profiles are diagrammatic in nature, thus not all conditions are detailed; additionally, the ceiling reveals illustrated in details 1, 2 & 4 on A1-8520 occur at angled pipe columns, not at cast nodes.			
Details 1, 2, and 4/A1-8520 show the connection of the W-14 ceilings and the cast nodes. There is no detail or information provided for the reveal between the W-14 and the cast nodes. Please provide a cut that shows this reveal detail.				As noted in the W-14 System Description on A1-8500, dimensional control for the joints between W-14 ceilings and adjacent systems shall be derived from the 3D model. Refer to the W-14 3D model listed on sheet A1-0009.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0502	Sheet A1-8504	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Detail 2/A1-8531 ASI 124				Detail 2/A1-8531 is revised. The note calls out the ceiling suspension system. There is not a "Secondary Structure" and sheet A1-8504 has been deleted, as it is not required.			
Detail 2/A1-8531 calls out "Secondary Structure See A1-8504." A1-8504 was not issued in the IFC Main Set or any subsequent ASIs. Please provide sheet A1-8504.							
P1-0503	Rigid Insulation Above W-14	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference ASI 124 Drawings				a) Acoustical insulation is required at all corrugated ceiling panels to mee the criteria in Specification 09 51 23 2.4 Q. Acoustical insulation is required at horizontal, sloped or vertical soffits to meet said criteria.			
The following sheets show a new W-14 Metal Ceiling location, without deleting the old rigid insulation location: 2/A1-8501, 3/A1-8510, 1/A1-8511, 1/A1-8530, 4/A1-8530, 5/A1-8530, 9/A1-8530, 4/A1-8531, 3/A1-8532, 5/A1-8532, 7/A1-8532. Additionally, the following sheets do not show rigid insulation redrawn with the new redline markups: 2/A1-8501, 5/A1-8510, 1/A1-8511, 1/A1-8521. It seems that there was no intent to place rigid insulation above horizontal or diagonal soffit locations.				b) Per TJPA's direction, all of the Conformed IFC Documents with the revised construction documentation will be issued in the Conformed Set of December 2014.			
a) Please confirm there is no rigid insulation located above horizontal or diagonal soffits.							
b) Please revise these drawings so that the rigid insulation is properly located, and so that all old rigid insulation locations are deleted.							
P1-0504	W-14 Connection to Large Fan Sleeve	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference A1-8531 ASI 124				The aluminum panel does no need to be supported at the steel sleeve fan support - the round shape ceiling and soffit panels have their own framing support. The aluminum grommet is intended to have a gasket			
Detail 3/A1-8531 (ASI 124) shows the W-14 Metal Ceiling angle abutted to the Large Fan Sleeve but does not							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 470 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0505	Reveal Between W-14 and OCS Switch Shield	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	10/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference A1-8552 (ASI 124) Detail 2/A1-8552 shows no connection detail where the Fiberglass OCS Switch Shield and the W-14 Ceiling come together. Please provide a cut detail that shows the connection between the Fiberglass OCS Switch Shield and the W-14 Ceiling.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See enclosed A1-8551 with detail clarifying the transition of W-14 ceiling panel to OCS Switch shield.				
P1-0506	Fiberglass OCS Switch Shield	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference A1-8552 (ASI 124) Detail 2/A1-8552 shows a Fiberglass OCS Switch Shield. There is no specification for the Fiberglass OCS Switch Shield in the Contract Documents. Please provide specification for the Fiberglass OCS Switch Shield.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to Specification Section 05 50 00 Metal Fabrications paragraph 2.5 U.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 471 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0507	Concrete Lid Details for Stair 501A and 502A	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
(ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Sheet A1-2305, Detail 8/A1-7010					Please refer to Architectural Edge of slab drawing A1-2885 for location and structural sheet for S1-9001 for typical structural details for the concrete lid at stair 501A & 502A. The lid slab is Type S13 and this information will be added to the structural drawings in a future ASI.		
(ASI 123 dated 8/6/14) Detail 1/A1-7009							
(ASI 119 dated 6/18/14) Detail A/A1-7110							
(ASI 118 dated 6/20/14) Detail A/A1-3021							
(IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail A/A1-7803, Detail E/A1-7803, Detail 2/A1-7830							
Sheet A1-2305 of ASI 127 shows Stair 501A and 502A at the Ground Level.							
- Stair 501A references Detail 8/A1-7010 and Detail A/A1-7110 for details. Detail A/A1-7110 depicts a concrete lid at Stair 501A.							
- Stair 502A references Detail 1/A1-7009 and Detail A/A1-3021 for details. Detail A/A1-3021 depicts a concrete lid at Stair 502A.							
- Details A & E/A1-7803 reference Detail 2/A1-7830. Detail 2/A1-7830 also depicts a concrete lid.							
Structural does not call for concrete lids at Stair 501A and 502A. Please identify and provide details for the structural slab required at Stair 501A and Stair 502A.							
P1-0508	CET-1 Size	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: P1-0434, P1-0435					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					SKA-4155 has been corrected to show the size for CET-1 tile (the tile for back splash) as 6" x 6" to match		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 472 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>The sketch attached to RFI P1-0435 (A1-9606) shows the size of CET-1 as 6' x 6'. The attached Specification 09 30 00 for RFI P1-0434 shows the size of CET-1 as 6" x 6". Please revise so that the drawing and the specification match for CET-1.</p>			<p>specifications - Refer to SKA-4155 Rev.2 attached.</p>				
P1-0509	Concrete Mix for Bus Crash Rail	Closed	10/03/2014	10/13/2014	10/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 03 30 02				Confirmed.			
Specification Section 03 30 02 Cast-In-Place Concrete does not provide information on the concrete mix required for the Bus Crash Rails.							
Please confirm the concrete mix to be used is "All other concrete" or provide the specifications for the concrete mix to be used at the Bus Crash Rails.							
P1-0510	Clarification on Special Hardware Sets	Closed	10/08/2014	10/18/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
This question contains Sensitive Security Information and is available only to individuals who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question.				The response to this question contains Sensitive Security Information and is available only to individuals who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0511	Worker Employment Requirements for Division 10 Signage	Closed	10/08/2014	10/18/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)

Specification Section 10 14 16
Specification Section 10 14 19
Specification Section 10 14 26
Specification Section 10 14 33
Specification Section 10 14 36
Specification Section 10 14 63
Specification Section 10 14 66
Specification Section 10 14 73
Specification Section 10 14 83
Specification Section 10 18 00

The following Specification Sections require bidders to "employ workers that will be employed during the construction at the Project.":

- Specification Section 10 14 16 1.3 E 3 Cast and Etched Graphics
- Specification Section 10 14 19 1.3 E 3 Dimensional Lettering
- Specification Section 10 14 26 G 3 Pylon Signage
- Specification Section 10 14 33 1.3 F 3 Illuminated Panel Signage
- Specification Section 10 14 36 1.3 E 3 Non-Illuminated Panel Signage
- Specification Section 10 14 63 1.4 J 3 Electronic Panel Signage
- Specification Section 10 14 66 1.4 G 3 Floating Signage
- Specification Section 10 14 73 1.3 F 3 Glass Signage
- Specification Section 10 14 83 1.4 E 3 Interpretive Graphics
- Specification Section 10 18 00 1.4 H 3 Informational Kiosks

Subcontractors will not be able to guaranty employment of specific workers producing material. Please confirm it is acceptable that personnel may change throughout the project.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

· Specification Section 10 14 16 1.3 E 3 Cast and Etched Graphics: Delete in its entirety, sentence 10 14 16 1.3 E 3, ¿Employ supervisory personnel who will oversee sample construction. Employ workers that will be employed during the construction at the Project.¿ See attached.

· Specification Section 10 14 19 1.3 E 3 Dimensional Lettering: Delete in its entirety, sentence 10 14 19 1.3 E 3, ¿Employ supervisory personnel who will oversee sample construction. Employ workers that will be employed during the construction at the Project.¿ See attached.


· Specification Section 10 14 26 1.4 G 3 Pylon Signage: Delete in its entirety, sentence 10 14 26 1.4 G 3, ¿Employ supervisory personnel who will oversee sample construction. Employ workers that will be employed during the construction at the Project.¿ See attached.

· Specification Section 10 14 33 1.3 F 3 Illuminated Panel Signage: Delete in its entirety, sentence 10 14 33 1.3 F 3, ¿Employ supervisory personnel who will oversee sample construction. Employ workers that will be employed during the construction at the Project.¿ See attached.

· Specification Section 10 14 36 1.3 E 3 Non-Illuminated Panel Signage: Delete in its entirety, sentence 10 14 36 1.3 E 3, ¿Employ supervisory personnel who will oversee sample construction. Employ workers that will be employed during the construction at the Project.¿ See attached.

· Specification Section 10 14 63 1.4 J 3 Electronic Panel Signage: Delete in its entirety, sentence 10 14 63 1.4 J 3, ¿Employ supervisory personnel who will oversee sample construction. Employ workers that will be employed during the construction at the Project.¿ See attached.

· Specification Section 10 14 66 1.4 G 3 Floating Signage: Delete in its entirety, sentence 10 14 66 1.4



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
G 3,	Employ supervisory personnel who will oversee sample construction. Employ workers that will be employed during the construction at the Project.	See attached.					
.	Specification Section 10 14 73 1.3 F 3 Glass Signage: Delete in its entirety, sentence 10 14 73 1.3 F 3,	Employ supervisory personnel who will oversee sample construction. Employ workers that will be employed during the construction at the Project.	See attached.				
.	Specification Section 10 14 83 1.4 E 3 Interpretive Graphics: Delete in its entirety, sentence 10 14 83 1.4 E 3,	Employ supervisory personnel who will oversee sample construction. Employ workers that will be employed during the construction at the Project.	See attached.				
.	Specification Section 10 18 00 1.4 H 3 Informational Kiosks: Delete in its entirety, sentence 10 18 00 1.4 H 3,	Employ supervisory personnel who will oversee sample construction. Employ workers that will be employed during the construction at the Project.	See attached.				




Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0512	Warranty Period Requirement per Specification Section 10 14 16 Cast and Etched	Closed	10/08/2014	10/18/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Specification Section 10 14 16			· Specification Section 10 14 16 1.6 A 2 Cast and Etched Graphics: Change current ¿ Warranty Period: Sign Subcontractor to provide information determined from date of Substantial Completion. Period subject to final approval by ArchitectTJPA representative.¿ to ¿ Warranty Period: Ten (10) years from date of substantial completion unless otherwise specified. ¿ See attached.				
Specification Section 10 14 16 1.6 A 2 Cast and Etched Graphics indicates the warranty period is subject to final approval by TJPA representative.			· Specification Section 10 14 19 1.6 A 2 Dimensional Lettering: Change current ¿ Warranty Period: Sign Subcontractor to provide information determined from date of Substantial Completion. Period subject to final approval by ArchitectTJPA representative.¿ to ¿ Warranty Period: Ten (10) years from date of substantial completion unless otherwise specified.¿ See attached.				
This requirement may impact pricing of the bid.			· Specification Section 10 14 26 1.7 A 2 Pylon Signage: Change current ¿ Warranty Period: Sign Subcontractor to provide information determined from date of Substantial Completion. Period subject to final approval by ArchitectTJPA representative.¿ to ¿ Warranty Period: Ten (10) years from date of substantial completion unless otherwise specified. ¿ See attached.				
Please provide a specific time period for the warranty.			· Specification Section 10 14 33 1.6 A 2 Illuminated Panel Signage: Change current ¿ Warranty Period: Sign Subcontractor to provide information determined from date of Substantial Completion. Period subject to final approval by ArchitectTJPA representative.¿ to ¿ Warranty Period: Ten (10) years from date of substantial completion unless otherwise specified. ¿ See attached.				
			· Specification Section 10 14 36 1.6 A 2 Non-Illuminated Panel Signage: Change current ¿ Warranty Period: Sign Subcontractor to provide information determined from date of Substantial Completion. Period subject to final approval by ArchitectTJPA representative.¿ to ¿ Warranty Period: Ten (10) years from date of substantial completion unless otherwise specified. ¿ See attached.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specification Section 10 14 63 1.7 A 2 Electronic Panel Signage: Change current ¿ Warranty Period: Sign Subcontractor to provide information determined from date of Substantial Completion. Period subject to final approval by TJPA representative¿ to ¿ Warranty Period: Ten (10) years from date of substantial completion unless otherwise specified. ¿ See attached. Specification Section 10 14 66 1.7 A 2 Floating Signage: Change current ¿ Warranty Period: Sign Subcontractor to provide information determined from date of Substantial Completion. Period subject to final approval by ArchitectTJPA representative.¿ to ¿ Warranty Period: Ten (10) years from date of substantial completion unless otherwise specified. ¿ See attached. Specification Section 10 14 73 1.6 A 2 Glass Signage: Change current ¿ Warranty Period: Sign Subcontractor to provide information determined from date of Substantial Completion. Period subject to final approval by ArchitectTJPA representative.¿ to ¿ Warranty Period: Ten (10) years from date of substantial completion unless otherwise specified. ¿ See attached. Specification Section 10 14 83 1.8 A 2 Interpretive Graphics: Change current ¿ Warranty Period: 10 years from date of Substantial Completion.¿ to ¿ Warranty Period: Ten (10) years from date of substantial completion unless otherwise specified.¿ See attached. Specification Section 10 18 00 1.7 A 2 Informational Kiosks: Change current ¿ Warranty Period: Sign Subcontractor to provide information determined from date of Substantial Completion. Period subject to final approval by TJPA representative¿ to ¿ Warranty Period: Ten (10) years from date of substantial completion unless otherwise specified. ¿ See attached. 						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 477 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0513	Incorrect Specification Reference for Stone Boulders with Inset Metal Letterforms	Closed	10/08/2014	10/18/2014	10/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 10 14 16 Specification Section 32 14 41 Specification Section 10 14 16 2.1 A Cast and Etched Graphics states, "Stone boulders with inset metal letterforms. Refer to Section 32 14 41.2.1 for 'stone' selection and specifications." The referenced specification is the LEED Requirements for Mortar-Set Stone Paving. Please revise the referenced specification to the correct specification section.			Change sentence from "Refer to Section 32 14 41.2.1 for stone selection and specifications." to "Refer to Landscape drawings and specifications for stone selection and specifications."				
P1-0514	LEED Credits MR 5.1 & MR 5.2 Requirement per Specification Section 10 14 16	Closed	10/08/2014	10/18/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 10 14 16 Specification Section 10 14 16 1.2 B 2 Cast and Etched Graphics indicates that information to receive LEED Credits MR 5.1 and MR 5.2 (regional materials) is required. No minimum requirement for regional materials is given. In addition, Specification Section 10 14 16 2.3 Cast and Etched Graphics lists Metal Arts (Mandan, ND), Matthews International (Pittsburgh, PA) and Gemini Signs (Marlborough, MA). The listed manufacturers will not qualify for LEED Credits MR 5.1 and MR. 5.2 . Please confirm that it is acceptable for none of the cast and etched graphics specified in Specification Section 10 14 16 are required to be extracted or manufactured within the limits called out in LEED Credits MR 5.1 and/or MR 5.2.			Confirmed that it is acceptable that none of the cast and etched graphics specified in Specification Section 10 14 16 are required to be extracted or manufactured within the limits called out in LEED Credits MR 5.1 and/or MR 5.2.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 478 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0515	Use of Lead Expansion-Bolt Devices for Drilled in Place Anchors	Closed	10/08/2014	10/08/2014	10/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 10 14 16 Specification Section 10 14 19 Specification Section 10 14 66 Specification Section 10 14 16 2.6 A Cast and Etched Graphics, Specification Section 10 14 19 2.3 A Dimensional Lettering, and Specification Section 10 14 66 2.3 A Floating Signage, call out for the use of "lead expansion-bolt devices". The use of lead expansion-bolt devices could cause lead residue within the building, and dramatically increase the health and safety costs associated with construction as required by Specification Section 00 08 14 Health and Safety Criteria. Please revise Specification Section 10 14 16, Specification Section 10 14 19, and Specification Section 10 14 66 to remove the use of lead expansion-bolt devices.					Specification Section 10 14 16 2.6 A: Change second sentence from ¿Use toothed steel or lead expansion bolt devices for drilled-in-place anchors.¿ to ¿Use toothed steel expansion bolt devices for drilled-in-place anchors.¿ Specification Section 10 14 19 2.3 A: Change second sentence from ¿Use toothed steel or lead expansion bolt devices for drilled-in-place anchors.¿ to ¿Use toothed steel expansion bolt devices for drilled-in-place anchors.¿		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 479 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0516	Quality Requirements in the IFB Process for TG17.1 Signage/Graphics/Directory Signage	Closed	10/08/2014	10/18/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 10 14 19 Specification Section 10 14 26 Specification Section 10 14 33 Specification Section 10 14 36 Specification Section 10 14 66 Specification Section 10 14 73 Specification Section 10 14 83 Specification Section 10 14 19 2.2 A Dimensional Lettering, Specification Section 10 14 26 2.2 C Pylon Signage, Specification Section 10 14 33 2.2 A Illuminated Panel Signage, Specification Section 10 14 36 2.2 A Non-Illuminated Panel Signage, Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 A Floating Signage, Specification Section 10 14 73 2.2 A Glass Signage, and Specification Section 10 14 83 2.1 B Interpretive Graphics state, "Subject to Open Bid process per General Contractor project requirements. Fabrication company (Sign Subcontractor) shall provide samples and documentation of project experience to indicate level of competency and performance per Bid Instructions. Quality and finish of fabricated graphics elements shall match or exceed those fabricated and produced by sign companies as listed here." Quality requirements are not typically provided in the IFB process. Please confirm no quality requirements are to be added to the IFB for the Specification Sections above, or provide the desired bid instructions.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> · Dimensional Lettering, Specification Section 10 14 19 2.2 A: Delete in its entirety. See attached. · Illuminated Panel Signage, Specification Section 10 14 33 2.2 A: Delete in its entirety. See attached. · Non-Illuminated Panel Signage, Specification Section 10 14 36 2.2 A: Delete in its entirety. See attached. · Interpretive Graphics, Specification Section 10 14 83 2.1 B: Delete in its entirety. See attached.		
P1-0517	Clarification on Requirements for Electrical Power to Signage	Closed	10/08/2014	10/18/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 10 14 19 Specification Section 10 14 19 3.1 B Dimensional Lettering indicates that electrical power is to be sized to					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Regarding Specifications Section 10 14 19 3.1 B, Dimensional Lettering, delete in its entirety the sentence "Verify that items, including anchor inserts, and electrical power are sized and located to accommodate signs." And replace with the following:		

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>accommodate the building.</p> <p>Per the response to Constructability Comment 7907, the specification requirement was to be changed to mandate signage be designed to accommodate the existing power allotments.</p> <p>Please revise specification as indicated in Constructability Comment 7907.</p>						
P1-0518	<p>Sign Type RS2 Exterior Vertical Flag Tenant ID per Specification</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 10 14 33</p> <p>Specification Section 10 14 33 2.2 D 1 Illuminated Panel Signage identifies Sign Type RS2 Exterior Vertical Flag Tenant ID.</p> <p>Sheet SG-0010, Sheet SG-001, and the Sign Message Schedule do not identify Sign Type RS2. In addition, the plan sheets do not identify RS2 signs.</p> <p>Please confirm there are no RS2 signs required for Phase 1.</p>	Closed	10/08/2014	10/18/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
						<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>See the attached response.</p>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 481 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0519	Messages for Signage Type RS4 Exterior Square Flag Tenant ID	Closed	10/08/2014	10/18/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 10 14 33					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 14 33 2.2 D 2 Illuminated Panel Signage provide specifications for Sign Type RS4 Exterior Square Flag Tenant ID.					Tenants for the retail spaces have not yet been identified, consequently, final messages (logos) for Sign Type RS4 are not available. Because this sign type is internally illuminated and will require electrical power, the signs are to remain in the Phase 1 work and not deferred.), Sign Subcontractor to fabricate and install a ¿Blank¿ sign (sign meeting all criteria described in drawings and specifications but without tenant logo). Regarding Specification Section 10 14 33 2.2 D 2 h, Illuminated Panel Signage, delete in its entirety the sentence, ¿Required conduit and electrical wiring is to be concealed until such time as specific tenant is identified and the corresponding Sign Type RS4 is fabricated and installed.¿ See attached, including SKSG #2029.		
Per the Sign Message Schedule, all of the messages for Sign Type RS4 are shown as (TENANT LOGO TBD).							
Please provide the messages for Signage Type RS4, or confirm Sign Type RS4 is not to be provided as part of Phase 1 work.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 482 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0520	Review and Finalize Construction Schedule Subcontractor Requirement	Closed	10/08/2014	10/18/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)

Specification Section 10 14 16
Specification Section 10 14 19
Specification Section 10 14 26
Specification Section 10 14 33
Specification Section 10 14 36
Specification Section 10 14 63
Specification Section 10 14 66
Specification Section 10 14 73
Specification Section 10 14 83
Specification Section 10 18 00

The following Specification Sections requires the sign subcontractor to review and finalize the construction schedule:

- Specification Section 10 14 16 1.3 F 1 Cast and Etched Graphics
- Specification Section 10 14 19 1.3 F1 Dimensional Lettering
- Specification Section 10 14 26 H 1 Pylon Signage
- Specification Section 10 14 33 1.3 G 1 Illuminated Panel Signage
- Specification Section 10 14 36 1.3 F 1 Non-Illuminated Panel Signage
- Specification Section 10 14 63 1.4 K 1 Electronic Panel Signage
- Specification Section 10 14 66 1.4 H 1 Floating Signage
- Specification Section 10 14 73 1.3 G 1 Glass Signage
- Specification Section 10 18 00 1.4 I 1 Informational Kiosks

Subcontractors are not responsible to establish the construction schedule. Please remove the requirement for the signage contractor to review and finalize the construction schedule.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

· Cast and Etched Graphics, Specification Section 10 14 16 1.3 F 1: There is no 10 14 16 1.3 F 1 in this Section.

· Dimensional Lettering, Specification Section 10 14 19 1.3 F 1: Delete in its entirety the sentence 10 14 19 1.3 F 1: Sign Subcontractor to review and finalize construction schedule and verify availability of materials, Installer's personnel, equipment, and facilities needed to make progress and avoid delays. See attached.

· Pylon Signage, Specification Section 10 14 26 1.4 H 1: Delete in its entirety the sentence 10 14 26 1.4 H 1: Sign Subcontractor to review and finalize construction schedule and verify availability of materials, Sign Subcontractor's personnel, equipment, and facilities needed to make progress and avoid delays. See attached.

· Illuminated Panel Signage, Specification Section 10 14 33 1.3 G 1: Delete in its entirety the sentence 10 14 33 1.3 G 1: Sign Subcontractor to review and finalize construction schedule and verify availability of materials, Sign Subcontractor's personnel, equipment, and facilities needed to make progress and avoid delays. See attached.

· Non-Illuminated Panel Signage, Specification Section 10 14 36 1.3 F 1: Delete in its entirety the sentence 10 14 36 1.3 F 1: Sign Subcontractor to review and finalize construction schedule and verify availability of materials, Sign Subcontractor's personnel, equipment, and facilities needed to make progress and avoid delays. See attached.

· Electronic Panel Signage, Specification Section 10 14 63 1.4 K 1: Delete in its entirety the sentence 10 14 63 1.4 K 1: Sign Subcontractor to review and finalize construction schedule and verify availability of materials, Sign Subcontractor's personnel, equipment, and facilities needed to make progress and avoid delays. See attached.

· Floating Signage, Specification Section 10 14 66 1.4 H 1: Delete in its entirety the sentence 10 14 66 1.4 H 1: Sign



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
				Subcontractor to review and finalize construction schedule and verify availability of materials, Sign Subcontractor's personnel, equipment, and facilities needed to make progress and avoid delays.¿ See attached.			
				· Glass Signage, Specification Section 10 14 73 1.3 G 1: Delete in its entirety the sentence ¿Sign Subcontractor to review and finalize construction schedule and verify availability of materials, Sign Subcontractor's personnel, equipment, and facilities needed to make progress and avoid delays.¿ See attached.			
				· Informational Kiosks, Specification Section 10 18 00 1.4 I 1: Delete in its entirety the sentence ¿Sign Subcontractor to review and finalize construction schedule and verify availability of materials, Sign Subcontractor's personnel, equipment, and facilities needed to make progress and avoid delays.¿ See attached.			
P1-0521	Torsion Hinges and Locking Fasteners for Aluminum Ceilings	Closed	10/09/2014	10/19/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Specification Section 09 51 23			Specification 09 51 23 paragraph 2.9 A.10 is deleted.				
09 51 23 2.9.A.10 states ¿Torsion Hinges and Locking Fasteners: Provide the following on each aluminum ceiling punched panel.¿ The redline mark-up version of 09 51 23 from ASI 124 shows ¿Torsion Hinges and Locking Fasteners: Provide the following on each aluminum ceiling punched panel¿ as deleted. Please confirm that the sentence from 2.9.A.10 is to be removed from ASI 127.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0522	Perforations in Aluminum Panels	Closed	10/09/2014	10/19/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference 09 51 23 ASI 127			The aluminum panel perforation pattern shall meet the acoustic requirements on Specification Section 09 51 23 paragraph 2.4 Q and paragraph 2.5 B.10. Please see enclosed SKA-3934R for added detail notes.				
09 51 23 2.5.B.10.A, among other sections in this specification, discusses providing perforation holes in the aluminum ceiling panels. The perforation holes are visible on some of the drawings for the aluminum ceiling, but there are no callouts, and there is no specified hole pattern shown. Please confirm there are to be perforation holes in the aluminum panels, and if so, please provide pattern and any other specifications needed.							
P1-0523	Sign Message Schedule Reference Revision	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Specification Section 00 03 50 1.1 A 4 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			Refer to the attached "00 03 50 Available Project Information-Design Reports.pdf" for the specification revision mark-up to be issued with ASI 0128.				
Specification Section 00 03 50 1.1 A 4 Available Project Information references the Sign Message Schedule, dated March 31, 2014.							
A revised Sign Message Schedule dated September 12, 2014 was issued with ASI 127.							
Please revise Specification Section 00 03 50 to reflect the new Sign Message Schedule.							
P1-0524	Incorrect Sign Message Schedule Location Associations	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Sheet SG1-2102 (ASI 124 dated 8/18/2014)			The sign types, locations on SG1-2102, and the Message Schedule have been revised. See attached, SKSG-2003_SG1-2102 and updated Message				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 485 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0525	Final Artwork for Sign KM1 Static Map and Digital Display	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
REFERENCE:				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Detail 2/SG1-6023 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				The detailed configuration of the Transit Center is specific to all interior spaces and uses -- has not yet been finalized. Consequently, artwork for the final graphic for the static map is not yet available. Pricing can be based on the assumption that the final static map will be a large format digital print map of the Transit Facility, fabricated and installed as per the current drawings and specifications. There is no 3D Dimensional Lettering as a component of this sign type.			
Key Note 9 on Detail 2/SG1-6023 indicates that the final artwork for Sign KM1 Static Map and Digital Display is to be supplied by owner.							
Please provide the final artwork, information on amount of letters to be priced, or allowance amount to be used.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 486 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0526	Graphic Requirements for Sign AC1 per Detail 6/SG1-6201	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:		The rectangular space indicated on Detail 6/SG1-6201 is reserved for an illustration of the future artwork that the plaque will identify (to be reversed etched as with the rest of plaque). Final illustration is available at a future date is to be provided by artist through Sign Subcontractor, and approved by TJPA. For pricing purposes, bidder should assume rectangular space will be filled with reverse etched illustration.					
Detail 6/SG1-6201 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
Detail 6/SG1-6201 shows a blank rectangle at the top of Sign AC1 Art Commission Plaque. No information has been given as to inserting a graphic in the rectangular space.							
Please confirm no graphic is to be provided within the blank rectangular space at the top of Sign AC1, or provide the required graphic.							
P1-0527	Egress Information for Sign Types EP1 and EP2	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:		We are confirming that the egress information as shown on Sheet A-1360 through Sheet A-1365 is to be used to develop the exiting signage (sign types EP1 and EP2). Also refer to appropriate drawings for final locations of Alarm Pull Stations, Fire Extinguishers, and other items required under the 2010 SF Fire Department Bulletin, 2.11 submittal Guidelines for Emergency Evacuation Signs.					
Detail 2/SG1-6201 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
Key Note 1 of Detail 2/SG1-6201 indicates that the signage contractor is to develop exiting signage for Sign Type EP1 Evacuation Plan Stair Mount and EP2 Evacuation Plan Elevator Mount.							
Please confirm the egress information as shown on Sheet A-1360 through Sheet A-1365 is to be used to develop the exiting signage.							
P1-0528	Locations for Pylon Signage	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)		Refer to the Landscape Layout Plans for layout of landscape elements and signage. Exact locations of signage pylons can be identified by the footings					
Detail 2/SG1-6000							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 487 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Detail 4/SG1-6001 Detail 2/SG1-6002 Detail 3/SG1-6003</p> <p>The following details show General Note A indicating the exact location of pylons is as shown on Landscape Drawings:</p> <p>Detail 2/SG1-6000 Detail 4/SG1-6001 Detail 2/SG1-6002 Detail 3/SG1-6003</p> <p>Landscape Drawings do not dimension the location of the pylons. Please provide the exact locations of the pylon signage.</p>						
P1-0529	"End of Section" Correction to Specification Section 10 14 26	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 14 26 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)			Change "End of Section" notation from "End of Section 10 14 19" to "End of Section 10 14 26".				
Specification Section 10 14 26 Pylon Signage Page 14 calls out "End of Section 10 14 19". Please revise the "End of Section" specification reference number to 10 14 26.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0530	Pylon Signage Electrical Power Requirements per Specifications and Constructabi	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 14 26 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Details 6 & 7/SG1-6001 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					As per the RFI and Constructability Comments 7909, 7910, and 7911, Specification Section 10 14 26 3.1 B, Pylon Signage, has been modified as follows: Delete the sentence ¿Verify that items, including anchor inserts, and electrical power are sized and located to accommodate signs.¿ in its entirety and replace with the sentences, ¿Verify that anchor and anchor inserts are sized and located properly to accommodate installation of Pylon signage. Sign Subcontractor to design signs to conform to electrical circuiting power allotments existing in the current design and if necessary, include additional electrical circuits in pricing if additional power is determined to be required.¿ See attached.		
Specification Section 10 14 26 3.1 Pylon Signage directs that the signage subcontractor is to verify that electrical power is sized and located to accommodate signs. In addition, Details 6 & 7/SG1-6001 indicate that the signage contractor is to provide power requirements to the TJPA representative.							
Per Constructability Comments 7909, 7910, and 7911, the signage specification are to be revised to require the signage contractor to design the signs within the electrical circuiting power allotments in the current design, and include additional electrical circuits in their signage bid if additional power is determined to be required.							
Please revise Specification 10 14 26 as indicated in the response to Constructability Comments 7909, 7910, and 7911.							
P1-0531	Warranty Period Requirement per Specification Section 10 14 26 Pylon Signage	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 14 26 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Specification Section 10 14 26 1.7 A 2 Pylon Signage, delete sentence ¿ Warranty Period: sign subcontractor to provide information determined from date of Substantial Completion. Period subject to approval by TJPA representative.¿ And replace with the sentence ¿Warranty Period: Ten (10) years from date of substantial completion unless otherwise specified.¿		
Specification Section 10 14 26 1.7 A 2 Pylon Signage indicates that the warranty period is subject to final approval by TJPA. Please provide warranty period.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0532	Revision of Specification Section 10 14 26 2.1 B 4 r to Match Provided Information	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:		In the now correctly referenced Specification Section 10 14 26 2.1 B 4 r, Pylon Signage, delete the sentence, ¿TBD Refer to telecommunication sheets for specifications.¿ in its entirety. See attached.					
Specification Section 10 14 26 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
Specification Section 10 14 26 2.1 B 4 r Pylon Signage indicates that the integrated speaker is "TBD Refer to telecommunication sheets for specifications."							
Specification Section 10 14 26 2.1 B 4 r 1 - 6 go on to specify a product.							
Please revise 10 14 26 2.1 B 4 r to agree with the provided information.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 490 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0533	GFIC Outlet Requirement for Sign Types PD1 and PD2	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	11/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
REFERENCE:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Detail 3/SG1-6003 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			WSP Response:				
Per Key Note 9 on Detail 3/SG1-6003, Sign Type PD1 Bus Deck Dock Identification and Sign Type PD2 Muni Plaza Identification are to be provided with a GFIC duplex outlet.			15A convenience outlets will be added within signage pylons for the following sign types:				
			PS1				
			PS2				
			PS4				
			PS5				
			PS6				
			PD1				
			PD2				
Sheet E1-2306 and Sheet E1-2502 through Sheet E1-2507 do not show outlets or circuiting for outlets at these locations.			These convenience outlets will be connected to existing spare 20A circuit within nearby LP panel, no more than 8 outlets per circuit. Outlets are being provided by signage contractor. Refer to future ASI 0128 drawings for circuiting info.				
Please confirm no outlets are required at these locations, or provide circuiting information.			WRNS Response:				
			We have confirmed that outlets are required as indicated for Sign Types PD1 and PD2. See associated, revised Electrical Drawings for outlets and circuiting.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 491 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0534	Verbiage for Sign Type R1 Roof Access Marker	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:		At this time, TJPA has not finalized the name of the Park. Consequently, we cannot provide the exact number of characters (letters) that will ultimately be required. For pricing purposes, assume thirty (30) characters.					
Detail 2/SG1-6060 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
Key Note 2 on Detail 2/SG1-6060 indicates that the final name for park to be provided by TJPA representative to establish the verbiage on Sign Type R1 Roof Access Marker. This is not biddable with the current information.							
Please provide the verbiage for Sign R1, information on amount of letters to be priced, or allowance amount to be used.							
P1-0535	Incomplete Key Note 2 on Detail 3/SG1-6050	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:		Note 2 shall read ¿ILLUMINATION: LED, WHITE. SIGN SUB-CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING SEGMENTING/STRIP LAYOUT OF LED MODULES TO PROVIDE EVEN ILLUMINATION WITHOUT HOTSPOTS. POWER SUPPLY TO BE LOCATED INTERNALLY FOR ILLUMINATION. INTERIOR SURFACES OF LED MOUNTING SURFACE TO BE PAINTED WITH LIGHT ENHANCING PAINT.¿					
Detail 3/SG1-6050 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
Key Note 2 on Detail 3/SG1-6050 is incomplete. Please provide the remaining verbiage.							
P1-0536	Switchable Lighting Circuit Requirement for Pylon Signage per Specification Secti	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	11/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:		WSP Response:					
Specification Section 10 14 26 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
The following Specification Sections for Pylon Signage call out for pylon sign lighting to be on a switchable lighting		All circuits serving sign types PS1, PS2, and PS4 shall be via normal power LRC located in same electrical room as power panel serving sign. Connect to existing					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
	<div><div>circuit:</div><div>10 14 26 2.1 B 1 q 10 14 26 2.1 B 2 q 10 14 26 2.1 B 3 q 10 14 26 2.1 B 4 s 10 14 26 2.1 B 5 s 10 14 26 2.1 C 1 y 4 10 14 26 2.1 C 2 z 4</div><div>The electrical plans do not show the pylons as being on a switchable lighting circuit. Please revise the Electrical Drawings/Pylon Signage Specifications to agree with each other.</div></div>			<div>available relay. Otherwise, provide matching relay, quantity as required.</div> <div>All circuits serving sign types PS5, PS6, PD1, and PD2 shall be via new emergency power LRC to be located in same electrical room as power panel serving sign. Provide separate cabinet and quantity of relays to match quantity of circuits served.</div> <div>The lighting circuits to these signs will be controlled through the LRC¿s (lighting relay cabinets). They are not controlled by the BMS. Electrical drawings will be revised in ASI-128 to reflect this.</div> <div>WSP/ELW 10/23/14</div> <div>WRNS Response:</div> <div>Sign Types (Pylons) PS1, PS2, PS4, PS5, PS6, PD1, and PD2 ¿ as called out in the specifications ¿ will be on ¿switchable lighting circuits¿.</div>				
P1-0537	Usage of Sign Type E3 Exit in Phase 1	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:								
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>REFERENCE:</div> <div>Specification Section 10 14 36 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Sheet SG1-6200 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Signage Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Signage Plan Sheets</div> <div>Specification Section 10 14 36 2.2 J 2 Non-Illuminated Panel Signage identifies Sign Type E3 Exit and Sheet SG1-6200 identifies signage information for Sign Type E3 Exit.</div> <div>The Sign Message Schedule and Signage Plan Sheets do</div>			<div>SUGGESTION:</div> <div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>We have revised the sign Location Plan (SG1-2304) and the Message Schedule as per the issue identified in RFI P1-0537. See attached, including SKSG-2001.</div>					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 493 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0538	Designation for Sign Type EP1 per Specification Section 10 14 26	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 14 36 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Sheet SG1-6201 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 10 14 36 2.2 J 7 Non-Illuminated Panel Signage identifies Sign Type EP1 as both Evacuation Plan at Stair and Evacuation Plan at Elevator. Sheet SG1-6201 calls out Sign Type EP1 Evacuation Plan Stair Mount and Stair Type EP2 Evacuation Plan Elevator Mount. Please revise Specification Section 10 14 36 and drawings to match.				Specification Section 10 14 36 2.2 J 7, Non-Illuminated Panel Signage: Delete the nomenclature ¿EP1¿ and replace with ¿EP2¿. See attached.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0539	Temperature Range for Thermal Movement Design Requirements Clarification	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 14 63 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					In Specification Section 10 14 63 1.2 A 3 a, Electronic Panel Signage, delete the sentence ¿Temperature Change (Range): 120 deg F (67 deg C), ambient: 180 deg F (100 deg C), material surfaces.¿ and replace with the sentence ¿Temperature Change (Range): 120 deg F (48.8 deg C), ambient: 180 deg F (82.2 deg C), material surfaces.¿ See attached.		
Specification Section 10 14 63 1.2 A 3 a Electronic Panel Signage indicates that the temperature range for thermal movement design requirements are 120 deg. F (67 deg. C), ambient: 180 deg. F (100 deg. C), material surfaces.							
67 deg. C = 152.6 deg. F, 100 deg. C = 212 deg. F.							
Please provide the correct temperature range to be used for thermal movement design requirements.							
P1-0540	Warranty Period Requirement for Electronic Panel Signage	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Ray Quesada				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 14 63 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Refer to Specification Section 01 17 40 for specified warranty period of 24 months.		
Specification Section 10 14 63 1.7 A 2 Electronic Panel Signage indicates that the warranty period is subject to final approval by TJP A representative.							
Please provide the desired warranty period.							
P1-0541	Door Hardware for Prefabricated Buildings	Closed	10/13/2014	10/13/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference 13 34 24 2.3.L ASI 127					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification states that Door hardware shall be supplied by the hardware contractor. The Prefabricated Buildings Subcontractor's scope includes the furnish and install of the door hardware. Please revise this specification so that the Prefabricated Buildings Trade Subcontractor supplies					Specification section 13 34 24 2.3.L will not be revised to suit Subcontractor's scope. Scope of work for bid packages is GC's responsibility. Design Teams does not assign scope.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Reference 13 34 24 1.5.B & 2.2.H ASI 124 Specification 1.5.B states "Color swatches demonstrating available colors and patterns for specified finishes shall be supplied for final approval." Additionally Specification 2.2.H states that paint color shall be selected by TJPA Representative. Please define the colors and patterns before bid so that this package can be accurately priced.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Final color selection shall be made from the Booth Manufacturer's standard range of colors at the time of the submittal.		
P1-0544	Signage Details and Types Required for Add Alternate 18	Closed	10/13/2014	10/13/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: REQUEST: REFERENCE: Specification Section 01 10 30 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 10 14 63 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 01 10 30/APE E.1.9 Schedule of Alternates for Main Package and Specification Section 10 14 63 2.2 G Electronic Panel Signage describe Add Alternate 18 in which the signage contractor is to provide pricing to incorporate LED screens into the W-5 Wall System of the Beale Street Lobby. Signage details and types are not given to establish the basis of pricing the alternate. Please provide the signage details and types to be used in pricing Add Alternate 18.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Alternate # 18, shall be removed from Section 01 10 30/APE in Phase 1.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 497 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0545	Wall Wainscoting in Booth 2 Restrooms	Closed	10/13/2014	10/13/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference 13 34 24 2.4.B.3 ASI 127			a. Five (5) feet is the correct height.				
Specification calls out Wall Wainscoting in the Restrooms of Booth Type 2 as "Stainless Steel panel four (5) feet in height above wall base.¿			b. Stainless steel Type 316, 16 Gage, No 4 satin finish, mechanically fastened using countersunk stainless steel screws/fasteners tamper resistant.				
a) Is the correct height 4 ft or 5 ft?							
b) Please define the stainless steel type, thickness, finish, and the method of fastening to the substrate.							
P1-0546	Power Requirements for Floating Signage per Specification Section 10 14 66	Closed	10/13/2014	10/13/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE:			Specifications Section 10 14 66 3.1 B, Floating Signage, delete in its entirety the sentence ¿Verify that items, including anchor inserts, and electrical power are sized and located to accommodate signs.¿ And replace with the following sentences: ¿Verify that anchor and anchor inserts are sized and located properly to accommodate installation of Pylon Signage. Sign Subcontractor to design signs to conform to electrical circuiting power allotments existing in the current design and if necessary, include additional electrical circuits in pricing if additional power is determined to be required.¿ See attached.				
Specification Section 10 14 66 Floating Signage indicates that the signage contractor is to provide power requirements to TJPA/verify electrical power is sized to accommodate Sign Types BS1 Wall Mounted Blade Sign, BS3 4-Icon Overhead Directional, BS4 6-Icon Overhead Directional, SD1 Zone 2 Post-Mounted Bicycle Directional Sign, and SD5 Zone 2 Wall-Mounted Vehicular Directional Warning Sign in the following subsections:							
- 10 14 66 2.2 C 1 p (Sign Type BS1)							
- 10 14 66 2.2 C 2 n (Sign Type BS3)							
- 10 14 66 2.2 C 3 o (Sign Type BS4)							
- 10 14 66 2.2 C 4 m (Sign Type SD1)							
- 10 14 66 2.2 C 6 m (Sign Type SD5)							
- 10 14 66 3.1 B							
In addition, General Sheet Note H on Detail 2/SG1-6202 and General Sheet Note H on Detail 3/SG1-6030 requires the sign subcontractor to provide power requirements to TJPA representative.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Per the response to Constructability Comments 7924 the signage specifications will be revised to require the design-build signage contractor to design the signs within the electrical circuiting power allotments in the current design, and to include additional electrical circuits in their signage bid if additional power is determined to be required.

Please revise the specifications and general notes to agree with the response to Constructability Comments 7924.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 499 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0547	Exterior Window Dimensions for Prefabricated Buildings	Closed	10/13/2014	10/13/2014	11/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference 13 34 24 (ASI 127)			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The Contract Documents do not dimension the exterior window glazing for the Prefabricated Guard Booths. Please dimension the exterior window glazing before bid so that this package can be accurately priced.			Prefabricated booths are design-build elements. To realize the maximum design-build value, Design Team will rely on the booth manufacturer's standard fabrication modules.				
			Specification section 13 34 24, 2.3.H, shall be modified as follows:				
			2.3.H.				
			1. Maximize window size for all non-restroom spaces within manufacturer's standard module/panel size.				
			2. Window sill shall clear built-in work counter height, and be located between 2'-8" and 3'-0" above finished floor.				
			3. Window head height shall not exceed booth ceiling height.				
			4. Minimum window height shall not be less than 3'-6", and width of window is to suite manufacturer's building module.				
			5. Window framing system shall consist of continuous galvanized steel interior and exterior retainer along window perimeter used to secure window glazing.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0548	W-2 Shown for Prefabricated Guard Booths	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference A1-2502 ASI 127 A1-2502 shows that the Bus Deck Superintendent Station contains W-2. The Bus Deck Superintendent Station does not contain any W-2. Please remove the callout for W-2.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the attached SKA-4275 with the W-2 tag removed and prefabricated booth is now noted. Refer also to A1-2502 (SKA-3459) issued with MEP Add 4 as a markup.		
<hr/>							
P1-0549	Incorrect Reference on A1-7418	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: A1-7418 ASI 127 Detail 1 calls out "For Guardhouse detail plans ref to dwg sheet A1-7423." A1-7423 was deleted in ASI 127. Please revise this detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail call-out on sheet A1-7418 shall be revised for ASI 0128. For instruction of providing Prefabricated Booth refer to SKA-3526 and section 13 34 24.		
<hr/>							
P1-0550	Room 01642 Callout	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference A1-9703 ASI 124 Detail 1 shows Room 01642 and Door 01642A as the GGT Supervisor Booth. A1-2306 shows Room 01642 as SFMTA. Please revise A1-9703 so that Room 01642 and Door 01642A correspond to the SFMTA Booth.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing A1-9703 is revised to call out room 01642 with door 01642A as SFMTA to correspond to A1-2306. The drawing will be issued as part of ASI 0128.		
<hr/>							
P1-0551	Missing Details for Hardware Sets	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 501 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0552	SFMTA Booth Restroom Doors Reference A1-9703 and A1-9705 ASI 124, 08 78 10 IFC Main Set The redline markups on these sheets show hardware Set SH-35 and SH-36 for the Prefabricated Guard Booth doors. There are no details for these hardware sets in the Specification. Please provide specifications for SH-35 and SH-36. From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference A1-9703 ASI 124 Detail 1 shows the SFMTA Supervisor Booth restroom doors (01640A and 01641A) as Door Type A with a SS/GL Finish. Door Type A is a Hollow Metal Door with no glass. Please confirm whether the door finish is HM or SS/GL and update the door schedule accordingly.	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We confirm that SFMTA Supervisor Booth restroom doors (01640A and 01641A) are hollow metal doors type A with no glass. The door finish schedule (A1-9703) is revised accordingly and will be issued as part of ASI 0128.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 502 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0553	Lights L182A and L183	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference 13 34 24 2.3.O (ASI 127), E1-4310 (ASI 124), 26 51 00/APA (ASI 118)				Specification section 13 34 24 - 2.3.O shall be updated as follows:			
13 34 24 2.3.O states lighting equipment and devices for the Guard Booth be provided per lighting specifications and drawing E1-4310. E1-4310 shows that the guard booth contains lighting types L182A and L183. L182A and L183 were removed from the L Series Light Types in 26 51 00/APA with ASI 118. Please revise the documents so that the lights shown for the Guard Booth are in the specifications.				[1] Replace 13 34 24 - 2.3.O.1 paragraph: 1. Booth shall be delivered assembled complete with prewired luminaires, sensors, controls, and other devices ready for site power connections by the booth contractor. Lighting shall be recessed in aluminum metal panel ceiling system as required. Provide required lighting equipment and devices per lighting specifications and as shown on the following drawings: with paragraph: 1. Booth shall be delivered assembled complete with prewired luminaires, sensors, controls, and other devices ready for site power connections by the booth contractor. Lighting shall be recessed in aluminum metal panel ceiling system as required. Provide required lighting equipment and devices per lighting specifications: [2] Replace 13 34 24 - 2.3.O.1.a paragraph: a. Booth Type 1: Refer to drawing E1-4310. with paragraph: a. Booth Type 1: Luminaire Type F16. [3] Replace 13 34 24 - 2.3.O.1.b paragraph: b. Booth Type 2: Refer to drawing E1-4306. with paragraph: b. Booth Type 2: Luminaire Type F16. [4] Replace 13 34 24 - 2.3.O.1.c paragraph:			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 503 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
				c. Booth Type 3: Refer to drawing E1-4502. with paragraph: c. Booth Type 3: Luminaire Type F16. [5] Add the following paragraph to 13 34 24 - 2.3.O: 2. Office light level at desk height shall be maintained average value of 30fc or higher. Light shall be dimmable to 10% of full light output or lower. [6] Add the following paragraph to 13 34 24 - 2.3.O: 3. Restroom light level at lavatory height shall be maintained average value of 30fc or higher.			
P1-0554	Verbiage for Sign Type SS1	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) The Sign Message Schedule indicates that Sign Type SS1, Message A, will be determined. Per 10 14 63 2.2 G, Sign SS1 is to be an LED screen. Please confirm lettering is to be added to the LED screen, and provide the verbiage for Sign Type SS1, amount of letters to be priced, or allowance amount to be used.			Confirmed that Sign Type SS1 will not include any message or dimensional letters. All messages to be displayed electronically via display Screens.				
P1-0555	Screen Type for Sign Type SS1	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 504 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 14 63 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Detail 4/SG1-6010 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</p> <p>Specification Section 10 14 63 2.2 G Electronic Panel Signage calls for LED screens per Add Alternate No. 18.</p> <p>Detail 4/SG1-6010 depicts an LCD screen to be installed.</p> <p>Please provide the screen type required for Sign Type SS1 and revise the plans and specifications to match.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					
			<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>10 14 63 2.2 G, Electronic Panel Signage, delete the word ¿LED¿ and replace with the word, ¿LCD¿. See attached.</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			
P1-0556	Display Type for Sign Type SS1	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
<p>Co-Author:</p>							
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 14 63 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Detail 4/SG1-6010 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</p> <p>Specification Section 10 14 63 2.2 G Electronic Panel Signage calls for LED screens per Add Alternate No. 18.</p> <p>Detail 4/SG1-6010 depicts an LCD screen to be installed.</p> <p>Please clarify if Sign Type SS1 is to be an LED or LCD screen and revise the plans and specifications to match.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					
			<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>10 14 63 2.2 G, Electronic Panel Signage, delete the word ¿LED¿ and replace with the word, ¿LCD¿. See attached.</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 505 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0557	Verbiage for Message A of Sign Type CT1 Clipper Tag on Elevator	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: Detail 2/SG1-6190 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Signage Plan Sheets (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Signage Plan Sheets call out Sign Type CT1 at multiple locations. Detail 2/SG1-6190 calls for Sign Type CT1 Clipper Tag on Elevator. The Sign Message Schedule indicates that Message A for Sign Type CT1 is to be determined. This is not biddable with the current information. Please provide the verbiage for Sign Type CT1 at all locations shown on the Signage Plan Sheets, information on amount of letters to be priced, or allowance amount to be used.					The message for Sign Type CT1 is integrated with the ¿Clipper Tagging¿ device and is part of the vendor-supplied system to be bought-out separately by TJPA. The Sign Subcontractor would be responsible only for its installation and integration within the pylons and wall surfaces in which the devices are designated to be installed. See attached revised Signage Message Schedule.		
P1-0558	Contractor Verification Prior to Fabrication per Sign Message Schedule	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	11/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) The Sign Message Schedule states the following for Sign Type ST1 Floor Level ID: "Verify stair information with contractor prior to fabrication" For examples, see the following pages in the Sign Message Schedule: Pg. 1: Sign ST1-T-02-007 Pg. 5: Sign ST1-L-02-0214 Pg. 11: Sign ST1-G-02-005 Pg. 28: Sign ST1-G-10-002 Please provide the omitted information to be "verified".					Specific to Sign Type ST1, please see revised Sign Message Schedule, attached. The specific text for the messages on each of the referenced "Sign Type ST1" cannot be finalized until each individual exit stair function and operation is also finalized, as information for each stair and floor level will vary (e.g., levels accessed/not accessed, re-entry information, etc.). Pricing can be based on the General Sheet Notes, Key Notes, and the example of text/graphics indicated on Detail 3/SG-6200 text example, as well as on the associated specifications.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 506 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0559	Message Designation for Signage per Sign Message Schedule	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)			Refer to revised, attached Sign Message Schedule for all Sign Types BS1 and BS4.				
The Sign Message Schedule designates messages at location A, B, C, and D. However, the designations on the Sign Message Schedule do not match what is called out on the Sign Plan Sheets.							
Some examples are on page 44 of the Sign Message Schedule. Message A and Message C are provided for the following signs: Sign BS4-B-03-002 Sign BS1-B-03-003 Sign BS1-B-03-004							
Per Sheet SG1-4503, the messages for Signs BS4-B-03-002, BS1-B-03-003, and BS1-B-03-004 are designated at locations B and D.							
Please revise the Sign Message Schedule and plans to match.							
<hr/>							
P1-0560	Sheet SG1-2702 per Signage Message Schedule	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Ray Quesada				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)			The Roof Park Restaurant IFC set, dated 5/30/14, and issued with Field Order 34 will be issued for bidding purposes with the consolidated IFC set scheduled to be issued in December 2014.				
The Sign Message Schedule references Sheet SG1-2702 on page 44.							
Sheet SG1-2702 has not been issued for bidding purposes per the transmittal for Field Order 34 Roof Top Park.							
Please provide Sheet SG1-2702 as referenced in the Sign Message Schedule.							
<hr/>							
P1-0561	Verbiage and Locations for Sign Type BS3 4-Icon Overhead Directional	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 508 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0563	Power Requirements for Sign Type SD5 Vehicular Direction Warning Sign	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 14 66 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					· Confirmed that as per Specification Section 10		
Sheet E1-2203 (ASI 118 dated 6/20/14)					14 66 2.2 C 6 m, Floating Signage, Sign Type SD5		
Sheet E1-4203 (ASI 118 dated 6/20/14)					Vehicular Direction Warning Sign is to have power.		
Per Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 C 6 m Floating Signage, Sign Type SD5 Vehicular Direction Warning Sign is to have power, but Sheets E1-2203 and E1-4203 do not show power for Sign Type SD5 at the vehicular ramp.					· Confirmed that as per Specification Section 10		
Per Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 C 4 m Floating Signage, Sign Type SD1 Post-Mounted Bicycle Directional Sign is to have power, but Sheet E1-2310 does not show power to the SD1 signs.					14 66 2.2 C 4 m Floating Signage, Sign Type SD1		
Please provide electrical information for all floating signage.					Post-Mounted Bicycle Directional Sign is to have power.		
					WSP Response:		
					Refer to the following sketches for revised signage circuiting:		
					SKE-RFI-P1-0563-1		
					SKE-RFI-P1-0563-2		
					SKE-RFI-P1-0563-3		
P1-0564	Warranty Period Requirement for Floating Signage	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Ray Quesada				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 14 66 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Refer to Specification Section 01 17 40 for specified warranty period of 24 months.		
Per Specification Section 10 14 66 1.7 A 2 Floating Signage, the warranty period is subject to final approval by the TJPA representative.							
Please provide the desire warranty period.							
P1-0565	Mounting Height for Sign Types BS1, BS3, and BS4	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 14 66 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Sheet SG1-6030 (ASI 124 dated 8/18/14)</p> <p>Per Specification Section 10 14 66 Floating Signage subsections 2.2 C 1 i, 2.2 C 2 i, and 2.2 C 3 n, the mounting height above grade for Sign Types BS1 Wall-Mounted Blade Sign, BS3 4-Icon Overhead Directional, and BS4 6-Icon Overhead Directional is 9'-0".</p> <p>Per SG1-6030, the min. mounting height for Sign Types BS1, BS3, and BS4 9'-2" AFF.</p> <p>Please revise the drawings and specifications to agree with each other.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Confirmed that as per SG1-6030, the min. mounting height for Sign Types BS1, and BS4 is 9'-2" AFF. Note that Sign Type BS3 has been eliminated as per RFI #P1-0561. The following specification revisions have also been made:</p> <p>· Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 C 1 i , Floating Signage, delete the second sentence, ¿9¿-0¿ mounting height above grade.¿ and replace with the sentence, ¿See Signage Drawings for mounting height.¿ See attached.</p> <p>· Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 C 2 i , Floating Signage, Sign Type BS3 has been eliminated as per RFI #P1-0561. See attached.</p> <p>· Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 C 3 n , Floating Signage, delete the second sentence, ¿9¿-0¿ mounting height above grade.¿ and replace with the sentence, ¿See Signage Drawings for mounting height.¿ See attached.</p>		
P1-0566	Mounting Height for Sign Type SD5	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP	Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 14 66 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Detail 4/SG1-6202 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</p> <p>Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 C 6 i Floating Signage Indicates that the mounting height for Sign Type SD5 Vehicular Direction Warning Sign is as indicated on the Construction Intent Drawings.</p> <p>Detail 4/SG1-6202 does not provide the mounting height for Sign Type SD5.</p> <p>Please provide the mounting height for Sign Type SD5.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 C 6 i, Floating Signage, delete the words ¿Construction Intent¿ and replace with ¿Signage¿. Revised Detail 4/SG1-6202 now indicates mounting height. See attached, including SKSG #2004.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 510 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0567	Warranty Period Requirement for Specification Section 10 14 73 Glass Signage	Closed	10/16/2014	10/26/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Transbay PMPC Ray Quesada				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE:			Refer to Specification Section 01 17 40 for specified warranty period of 24 months.				
Specification Section 10 14 73 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
Per Specification Section 10 14 73 1.6 A 2 Glass Signage the warranty period is subject to final approval by the TIPA representative.							
Please provide the desire warranty period.							
<hr/>							
P1-0568	Electrical Power Requirement for Sign Type BG1	Closed	10/16/2014	10/26/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE:			Confirmed that electrical power is not required to supply sign Type BG1. Specification Section 10 14 73 3.1 B, Glass Signage, delete in its entirety the sentence, ¿Verify that items, including anchor inserts, and electrical power are sized and located to accommodate signs.¿ and replace with the sentence, ¿Verify that anchor and anchor inserts are sized and located properly to accommodate installation of Glass Signage.¿ See attached.				
Specification Section 10 14 73 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
Specification Section 10 14 73 1.3 E and Specification Section 10 14 73 3.1 B Glass Signage indicate that Sign Type BG1 Applied Message Band on Glass is powered. Specification Section 10 14 73 2.2 and Sheet SG1-6191 do not show electrical components associated with Sign Type BG1.							
In addition, the response to Constructability Comment 7927 states "The signage specifications will be revised to require the design-build signage contractor to design the signs within the electrical circuiting power allotments in the current design, and to include additional electrical circuits in their signage bid if additional power is determined to be required."							
Please confirm electrical power is not required to be supplied to Sign Type BG1 and delete the electrical references, or revise the contract documents to reflect the response to Constructability Comment 7927.							
<hr/>							
P1-0569	Scheduling Language per Specification Section 10 14 83 Interpretive Graphics	Closed	10/16/2014	10/26/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 511 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 14 83 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 10 14 83 2.4 G Interpretive Graphics states that signage development is independent of schedule, and to allow adequate time for development of product. The signage subcontractor will be required to complete the work as required by the construction schedule. Please remove the schedule language associated with 10 14 83 2.4 G.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification Section 10 14 83 2.4 G, Interpretive Graphics, delete in its entirety the sentences ¿ Signage development is independent of schedule. Allow adequate time for development of product.¿ See attached.				
P1-0570	Drawings for Interpretive Graphics	Closed	10/16/2014	10/26/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 14 83 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 10 14 83 3.3 A Interpretive Graphics directs that the signage subcontractor is to locate signs and accessories where indicated. No drawing has been provided locating the interpretive graphics. Please provide a document laying out the interpretive graphics.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Roof Park Garden layout ¿ where the Interpretive Graphics elements will be installed ¿ has not yet been finalized. Consequently, final locations for these elements cannot be identified at this time. Pricing should be based on the information contained in the Signage Drawings and associated specifications (e.g., nature of construction/fabrication, quantities, installation methodologies, etc.). Regarding Specification Section 10 14 83 3.3 A, Interpretive Graphics, delete in its entirety the sentence ¿Locate signs and accessories where indicated, using mounting methods of types described and complying with manufacturer's written instructions.¿ and replace with the sentence ¿Signs and accessories to be installed using mounting methods of types described and complying with manufacturer's written instructions.¿ See attached.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0571	Aluminum Thickness for Interpretive Graphic Signage	Closed	10/16/2014	10/26/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 14 83 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Specification Section 10 14 83 has been modified to remove the term "Construction Intent" (as in "construction Intent Drawings"), which has been replaced with the term "Signage" (as in "Signage Drawings"). See attached.		
Specification Section 10 14 83 2.1 A 1 a Interpretive Graphics states that the thickness of aluminum for interpretive graphic signage is per the construction intent drawings.					Specific to Specification Section 10 14 83 2.1 A 1 a, Interpretive Graphics, the thickness of aluminum for the Interpretive Graphic Signage is 1/4", as indicated on Key Note #1, Sheet SG1-6080.		
The construction intent drawings do not show a thickness. Please provide the thickness of aluminum for the interpretive graphic signage.							
P1-0572	Correction of Fahrenheit to Celsius Calculation in Specification Section 10 18 00	Closed	10/17/2014	10/27/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Specification Section 10 18 00 1.2 A 3 a Informational Kiosks, delete the sentence "Temperature Change (Range): 120 deg F (67 deg C), ambient: 180 deg F (100 deg C), material surfaces." and replace with the sentence "Temperature Change (Range): 120 deg F (48.8 deg C), ambient: 180 deg F (82.2 deg C), material surfaces." See attached.		
Specification Section 10 18 00 1.2 A 3 a Informational Kiosks states,							
"Temperature change (Range): 120 deg F (67 deg C), ambient: 180 deg F (100 deg C), material surfaces."							
The Fahrenheit to Celsius conversions are incorrect. Please revise the requirement.							
P1-0573	Qualification Data Requirements for Informational Kiosks	Closed	10/17/2014	10/27/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Specification Section 10 18 00 1.3 G Informational Kiosks states, delete sentence "Qualification Data: To be determined after Display Units' review." In its entirety. See attached.		
Specification Section 10 18 00 1.3 G Informational Kiosks states, "Qualification Data: To be determined after Display							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 513 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0574	Warranty Period Requirement for Specification Section 10 14 73 Glass Signage	Closed	10/17/2014	10/27/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Refer to Specification Section 01 17 40 for specified warranty period of 24 months.		
Specification Section 10 18 00 1.7 A 2 Informational Kiosks indicates that the warranty period for informational kiosks is subject to final approval by TJPA.							
Please provide the desired warranty duration to be bid.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0575	Electrical Power Requirements for Informational Kiosks	Closed	10/17/2014	10/27/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					As per RFI and Constructability Comments 7932, 7934, 7938 and 7939, Specification Section 10 18 00		
Detail 2/SG1-6020 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					3.1 B Informational Kiosks has been modified as follows: Delete the sentence Verify that items, including anchor inserts, and electrical power are sized and located to accommodate signs. In its entirety and replace with the sentences Verify that anchor and anchor inserts are sized and located properly to accommodate installation of Electronic Panel Signage. Sign Subcontractor to design signs to conform to electrical circuiting power allotments existing in the current design and if necessary, include additional electrical circuits in pricing if additional power is determined to be required. See attached.		
Detail 3/SG1-6021 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
Detail 2/SG1-6022 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
Specification Section 10 18 00 3.1 B Informational Kiosks indicates that the subcontractor is to verify that electrical power is sized to accommodate the informational kiosks. General Note I on Detail 2/SG1-6020, General Note H on Detail 3/SG1-6021, and General Note H on Detail 2/SG1-6022 indicate that the sign subcontractor is to provide power requirements to TJPA.							
Per the response to Constructability Comments 7932 7934, 7938 and 7939 state that the signage specifications will be revised to require the design-build signage contractor to design the signs within the electrical circuiting power allotments in the current design, and to include additional electrical circuits in their signage bid if additional power is determined to be required.							
Pleaser revise the plans and specifications to agree with the response to the associated constructability comments.							

P1-0576	Electrical Power Requirements for Informational Kiosks	Closed	10/17/2014	10/27/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Specification Section 10 18 00 has been modified to remove the term Construction Intent Drawings , which has been replaced with the term Signage Drawings . See attached.		
Specification Section 10 18 00 refers to the Construction Intent Drawings throughout the specification (ex. 10 18 00 1.3 F).							
Please confirm that Construction Intent Drawings is to be revised to Signage Drawings , or provide the							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

referenced construction intent drawings.

P1-0577	Message & Graphic Requirements for Sign Type KC1	Closed	10/17/2014	10/27/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 C 1 I, Informational		
Detail 1/SG1-6020 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Kiosks, delete the number 2, and replace with the		
Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					sentence Refer to Signage Drawings and Sign		
					Message Schedule. Please note that for this sign		
					type, the designated message (the information		
					symbol), is located on the side of the sign that the		
					touchscreen display is located. Also note that the		
					orientation of locations A (reference north), B		
					(reference east), C (reference south), and D		
					(reference west) that refer to sign elevations are		
					constant throughout the Signage Drawings. In the		
					case of two Sign Type KC1s, if the signs themselves		
					are oriented differently from one another, a common		
					message assigned to location A on one may be		
					assigned on location B on the other. If in the Sign		
					Message Schedule no message is called out for a		
					sign's particular location (A, B, C, or D), assume that		
					the particular location is not meant to carry a		
					message.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 516 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0578	Sign Type Clarification per Detail 1/SG1-6020	Closed	10/17/2014	10/27/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Detail 1/SG1-6020 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Sign Type within Detail 1/SG1-6020 has been clarified. See attached SKSG #2005.		
Detail 1/SG1-6020 is titled KC1: Combined Touchscreen & Digital Display.							
The referenced detail notes one of the elevations is for KP1 One-Sided Digital Display Panel Kiosk - With Speakers.							
Please clarify the sign type within Detail 1/SG1-6020.							
<hr/>							
P1-0579	Electrical and Signage Requirements per Specification Section 10 18 00	Closed	10/17/2014	10/27/2014	11/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					It is confirmed that Sign Types KC1, KM1, KP1, KP3, KT1, and KT2 are to be on switchable lighting circuits. The requirement that they have a GJCI duplex power outlet, 120V, concealed in a lockable access port on a convenience power circuit has been eliminated as per the revised Specification Section 10 18 00. See attached.		
Detail 1/SG1-6020 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
Sheet E1-3203 (ASI 118 dated 6/20/14)							
Sheet E1-4302 (ASI 117 dated 4/23/14)							
The following Specification Sections indicate that sign types within Specification Section 10 18 00 Informational Kiosks are to have a GJCI duplex power outlet, 120V, concealed in a lockable access port on a convenience power circuit, and that power for internal lighting is to be on a switchable lighting circuit:					Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 C 1 v, Informational Kiosks (Sign Type KC1), delete in its entirety the sentence, ¿GFIC duplex power outlet, 120V, concealed in a lockable access port on a convenience power circuit.¿ Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 D 1 s, Informational Kiosks (Sign Type KM1), delete in its entirety the sentence, ¿GFIC duplex power outlet, 120V, concealed in a lockable access port on a convenience power circuit.¿ Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 E 1 r, Informational Kiosks (Sign Type KP1), delete in its entirety the sentence, ¿GFIC duplex power outlet, 120V, concealed in a lockable access port on a convenience power circuit.¿ Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 E 2 r, Informational		
10 18 00 2.2 C 1 v (Sign Type KC1)							
10 18 00 2.2 D 1 s (Sign Type KM1)							
10 18 00 2.2 E 1 r (Sign Type KP1)							
10 18 00 2.2 E 2 r (Sign Type KP3)							
10 18 00 2.2 F 1 s (Sign Type KT1)							
10 18 00 2.2 F 2 t (Sign Type KT2)							
Detail 1/SG1-6020 does not show a lockable access port on Sign Type KC1 Combined Touchscreen & Digital Display. In addition, electrical plans do not call out a							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0580	<div><div>Ticket and Added Value Machine Information</div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author:</div><div>REQUEST: SUGGESTION:</div><div>REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)</div><div>The following Specification Sections indicate that the ticket and added value machines are not in the contract, but the signage contractor is to coordinate with the machine manufacturer for power, dimensions and support structure:</div></div>	Void	10/17/2014	10/27/2014	Potentially		
			Answered By:				
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 518 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
10 18 00 2.2 F 1 n 10 18 00 2.2 F 1 o 10 18 00 2.2 F 2 n 10 18 00 2.2 F 2 o	<p>In addition, final quantities are to be determined by the TJPA representative.</p> <p>Please provide the manufacturer of the ticket and added value machines, and final quantities for the machines.</p>						
P1-0581	Power Requirements for Ticket and Added Value Machines	Closed	10/17/2014	10/27/2014	12/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)			Circuiting has been provided on the electrical drawings based on a preliminary estimate of power allocation for signage components. No electrical changes are proposed at this time. Per the signage drawings, signage contractor must confirm all power requirements on system submittals. In addition, the ticket machine power requirements need to be confirmed. When this info is provided, if additional power is required, wiring can be pulled in the existing conduits.				
The following Specification Sections indicate that the ticket and added value machines have separate power requirements from the associated kiosks:			UPDATE: Please see response to RFI PI-0530.				
10 18 00 2.2 F 1 n 10 18 00 2.2 F 1 o 10 18 00 2.2 F 2 n 10 18 00 2.2 F 2 o							
Electrical drawings do not show separate power for the ticket and added value machines.							
Please confirm no additional circuits are required for the ticket and added value machines, or revise the electrical documents to reflect the desired power and data requirements.							
P1-0582	Message for Sign Types RR5 and RR6	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 519 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Sheet SG1-6200 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</p> <p>The Sign Message Schedule does not provide a message for Sign RR6-P-02-017, Sign RR6-U-06-016, Sign RR5-U-06-015</p> <p>Per Detail 6/SG1-6200 Sign Types RR5 and RR6 are to receive Restroom messages.</p> <p>Specification Section 10 14 36 2.2 J 17 Sign Type RR5 designates "Toilet Room Door. Women" and Specification Section 10 14 36 2.2 J 18 designates Sign Type RR6 designates Toilet Room Door. Men".</p> <p>Please provide the required messages and graphics for Sign Types RR5 and RR6.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Sign Message Schedule has been revised to include required messages for Sign Types RR5 and RR6. See attached.</p>		
P1-0583	Verbiage for Sign Type SM1 Wall-Mounted Schedule Board	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Sign Message Schedule Specification Section 10 14 63</p> <p>The Sign Message Schedule indicates that Sign Type SM1 Wall-Mounted Schedule Board a message will be determined. Per Specification Section 10 14 63 2.2 G Electronic Panel Signage, Sign Type SM1 is to be an LED screen.</p> <p>Please confirm lettering is to be added to the LED screen, and provide the verbiage for Sign Type SM1 Wall-Mounted Schedule Board, amount of letters to be priced, or allowance amount to be used.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Confirmed that there will be no message/lettering associated with Sign Type SM1, and the Sign Message Schedule has been revised accordingly. See attached.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0584	Screen Type for Sign Type SM1 Wall-Mounted Schedule Board	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 14 63 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Specification Section 10 14 63 2.2 G, Electronic		
Detail 1/SG1-6010 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Panel Signage, the word "LED" has been deleted and		
Specification Section 10 14 63 2.2 G Electronic Panel					replaced with the word, "LCD". See attached.		
Signage calls for LED screens per Add Alternate No. 18.							
Detail 1/SG1-6010 depicts an LCD screen to be installed.							
Please provide the screen type required for Sign Type SM1 Wall-Mounted Schedule Board and revise the plans and specifications to match.							
P1-0585	Verbiage for Sign Type D2 Destination Identification	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					In reference to Sign Type D2, final names for the Food		
The Sign Message Schedule indicates that Sign Type D2					Court and Food Hall are yet to be determined by		
Destination Identification is to be determined for the					TJPA. For pricing purposes, assume a maximum of		
following locations: Food Hall (Name TBD), To Food hall					32 characters for each. For example: "To Transbay		
(Name TBD), To Food Court (Name TBD)					Transit Center Food Court" (32 characters). Final		
Please provide the verbiage for Sign Type D2 Destination					verbiage to be confirmed with TJPA prior to		
Identification, amount of letters to be priced, or allowance					fabrication.		
amount to be used.							
P1-0586	Verbiage for Sign Type ID1 Room Name with Braille	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					In reference to Sign Type ID1, final verbiage yet to be		
					determined by TJPA. For pricing purposes, assume a		
					maximum of 35 characters for each sign. Final		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 521 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Per the Sign Message Schedule, several message locations indicate "MSG TBD" or "MESSAGE TBD" for Sign Type ID1 Room Name with Braille. For example, ID1-U-02-008 Message A, ID1-U-04-010 Message, and ID1-G-04-012 Message.</p> <p>Please provide the ¿TBD¿ verbiage, or a basis of bid for additional lettering required to be on Sign Type ID1 is to be determined.</p>						
P1-0587	Verbiage for Sign Type AC1 Art Commission Plaque	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
The Sign Message Schedule states "Art Program message to be provided by TJPA" for Sign Type AC1 Art Commission Plaque Message A.							
Detail 6/SG1-6201 titled AC1 - Art Commission Plaque depicts language for the plaque.							
Please confirm that the verbiage depicted in Detail 6/SG1-6201 is what will be required for Sign Type AC1 or provide the correct Art Program message referenced in the Sign Message Schedule.							
In addition, if Detail 6/SG1-6201 is to be used for verbiage, please revise the Sign Message Schedule to reference the correct location of Message A.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 522 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0588	Electronic Display Options for Sign Type PD1 Bus Deck Dock ID	Closed	10/21/2014	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: Detail 3/SG1-6003 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification 10 14 26 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Key Note 5 on Detail 3/SG1-6003 indicates that the 40" electronic display on Sign Type PD1 Bus Deck Dock ID is to be selected based upon performance. Per Specification Section 10 14 26 2.1 C 1 o Pylon Signage there are 3 ea. named flat panel displays specified. Please confirm the flat panel displays for Sign Type PD1 are to be selected per Specification Section 10 14 26 and remove the reference to performance requirements. However, if the flat panel diplays are to be selected based upon performance, please provide the performance requirements.					In reference to Sign Type PD1, confirmed that the display screen is not to be selected based on performance. Keynote 5 on Detail 3/SG1-6003 has been revised. See attached SKSG-2006.		
P1-0589	Information for Audible Button on Sign Type PD2 Muni Plaza Bus ID	Open	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 4/SG1-6003 Detail 3/SG1-6003 Per Detail 4/SG1-6003 and Key Note 12 on Detail 3/SG1-6003, there is an audible "Next Bus" push button on Sign Type PD2 Muni Plaza Bus ID. The audible "Next Bus" button is not specified, nor is there any information on electrical information (power requirements, data requirements). Please provide a specification and electrical requirements for the "Next Bus" button.					See attached response.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 523 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0590	Message Confirmation for PD2-G-06-0616	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:		Confirmed that message is correct. The open quotation mark for sign location PD2-G-06-016 has been deleted. Refer to the attached revised sign Message Schedule.					
Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
The messages for PD2-G-06-016 have an open quotation mark. Message B and Message D currently reads: MUN-2, 38 Geary, 38L Geary Limited".							
Please confirm the message as shown is correct or provide the correct message.							
P1-0591	Route Information for Sign Type PD2 Muni Plaza Bus ID	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:		Confirmed that there is no ¿Route Information¿ for Sign Type PD2 that will need to be produced by the Sign Subcontractor. Route information ¿ to be finalized by MUNI/TJPA -- is to be displayed electronically on display screen(s) and will be produced by others.					
Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
Detail 4/SG1-6003 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
In multiple locations, it is indicated that final route information for Sign Type PD2 Muni Plaza Bus ID is to be provided by TJPA (ex. PD2-G-06-014).							
Detail 4/SG1-6003 does not show any layout information for the referenced route information.							
Please provide the referenced information and the layout for that information.							
P1-0592	Graphic Requirements for Sign PD2-G-06-014	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:		Text of final messages at PD2-G-06-014 are to be provided by MUNI/TJPA when finalized. For pricing purposes, assume a maximum count of 10 letters/numerals, plus one ¿MUNI¿ logo (graphic).					
Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
Sign PD2-G-06-014 on the Sign Message Schedule does							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 524 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>not call for a graphic (Muni, Marin, etc.).</div> <div>Please confirm no graphics are required at this location.</div>							
P1-0593	Vinyl Graphics per Muni Requirements	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Detail 3/SG1-6003 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				TJPA to provide color specifications for vinyl graphics when finalized. Keynote 14 of Detail 3/SG1-6003 has been revised accordingly. Refer to the attached SKSG-2007.			
Key Note 14 of Detail 3/SG1-6003 indicates that applied vinyl graphics are specified per Muni’s requirement.				R. Quesada: SFMTA will provide an electronic file to the successful bidder to produce the applied vinyl graphics.			
Please provide Muni’s requirement.							
P1-0594	Accessible Variants for Sign Types KT1 and KT2	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Detail 2/SG1-6021 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				Sign location plans have been revised to locate accessible variants (one adjacent to each point of vertical circulation connecting to the bus deck). See attached SKSG #’s 2008, 2009, 2010, & 2011.			
Detail 2/SG1-6021 identifies an accessible variant for Sign Type KT1 Ticket Vending Kiosk and Sign Type KT2 Ticket Vending Kiosk with Digital Display.							
The signage plan sheets do not identify locations for the accessible variants required at Sign Types KT1 and KT2.							
Please confirm no accessible variants at Sign Types KT1 and KT2 are required, or provide the locations of the accessible variants.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0595	Graphic Requirements for Sign Type KT1 Ticket Vending Kiosk	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 F 1 i, Informational		
Sheet SG1-6021 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Kiosks, delete the number 2 and replace with the		
					sentence, See Signage Drawingsand Sign Message		
					Schedule. See attached.		
Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 F 1 i Informational							
Kiosks indicates that Sign Type KT1 Ticket Vending Kiosk							
is equipped with 2 faces of graphics.							
Per Sheet SG1-6021 and the Sign Message Schedule,							
only one graphic is shown.							
Please confirm KT1 Signs are only to receive 1 graphic.							
P1-0596	Graphics and Messages for Sign Type KT2 Ticket Vending Kiosk with Digital Displ	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 F 2 i, Informational		
Sheet SG1-6021 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Kiosks, delete the number 2 and replace with the		
					sentence, See Signage Drawings and Sign Message		
					Schedule. See attached.		
Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 F 2 i Informational							
Kiosks indicates that Sign Type KT2 Ticket Vending Kiosk							
with Digital Display is equipped with 2 faces of graphics.							
Per Sheet SG1-6021 has only one graphic is shown. In							
addition, per the Sign Message Schedule, one message is							
given and the other is has (NO MESSAGE).							
Please clarify the graphics/messages to be provided on							
Sign Type KT2.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 526 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0597	Verbiage Layout for Sign Type PS1 Sidewalk Pylon	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:				Drawing has been revised to indicate text/verbiage layout. See attached SKSG #2014.			
Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
Sheet SG1-6000 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)							
The Sign Message Schedule calls out for ¿TRANSBAY TRANSIT CENTER¿ to be installed at several of the Sign Type PS1 Sidewalk Pylon sign locations.							
Sheet SG1-6000 does not provide material or layout of the verbiage (i.e. where on each face the verbiage is to appear, is it painted on, font size, word separation, etc.).							
Please provide the layout for verbiage required to be on Sign Type PS1.							
P1-0598	Verbiage for Sign Type PS1 Sidewalk Pylon	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:				In reference to Sign Type PS1, Sidewalk Pylon, final verbiage yet to be determined by TJPA. For pricing purposes, assume a maximum of twenty-five (25) characters as per the revised Sign Message Schedule. Confirm final message with TJPA prior to fabrication. Revised message schedule attached for reference.			
Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
Per the Sign Message Schedule, there are messages on PS1-G-02-023 and PS1-G-02-036 which are to be determined.							
Please provide the ¿TBD¿ messages for Sign Type PS1 Sidewalk Pylon, amount of letters to be priced, or allowance amount to be used.							
P1-0599	Spacing Dimensions for Sign Type PS2 Sidewalk Pylon	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	11/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:				In regards to Sign Type PS2, Sign Message Schedule has been revised to reflect a maximum of six (6)			
Detail 1/SG1-6001 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 527 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>3/31/14) Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)</p> <p>Per Detail 1/SG1-6001 the area above the PS2 Base is 5'-6", and the surface applied icons are 6" with a 3-5/8" separation.</p> <p>Based upon these dimensions, the maximum amount of icon which can be applied is 6.</p> <p>Per the Sign Message Schedule, the PS2 signs have 1 side which exceed this maximum. Please revise the spacing or number of required icons.</p>						icons. See attached.
P1-0600	<p>Sole Source for Pylon Signage per Specification Section 10 14 26</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 14 26 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 00 05 20 (dated 8/11/14)</p> <p>Per Specification Section 10 14 26 Pylon Signage (Specification Section 10 14 26 2.1 B 1 e for example), all of the pylon signage material is to be made of Kastone by Kreysler and Associates.</p> <p>Per Specification Section 00 05 20 2.07 Agreement, sole source procurement is only acceptable with prior approval by TJPA.</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable to sole source all of the signage pylon material.</p>	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
					Answered By:	Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
					ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
					Throughout Specification Section 10 14 26, Pylon Signage, and Specification Section 10 18 00, Informational Kiosks, the sentence "Kastone by Kreysler + Associates" has been deleted and replaced with the sentence, "Kastone" fiberglass reinforced polymer (FRP), manufactured and fabricated by Kreysler + Associates (707.552.3500), or an equal FRP product as manufactured by Miles Fiberglass (507.775.7755)." See attached.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 528 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0601	Painting Specifications for Signage Materials M8 and M13	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)
Color/Font/Material/Symbol/Icons Report
Detail 4/SG1-6001

Per the Color/Font/Material/Symbol/Icons Report, Materials M8 and M13 require painting in some locations (Sign Types PS4 Rooftop Directional Pylon Sign with Exit Sign and RR4 Restroom Signage for example).

While colors are provided, no specification for painting of the signs has been provided (i.e. multiple manufacturers, mil thickness, prep requirements, etc.).

Please provide a specification (including light enhancing paint called out on Key Note 3C on Detail 4/SG1-6001) for signage to receive paint.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Paint, where indicated on Signage Drawings, has been addressed in the following specification revisions:

- Specifications Section 10 14 19 2.1 C, Dimensional Lettering Signage, add "C", "Paints and Coatings: Inks, dyes, and paints that are recommended by manufacturer for optimum adherence to surface and are UV and water resistant for colors and exposures indicated."
- Specifications Section 10 14 19 2.6 C, Dimensional Lettering Signage, add "C", "Baked Enamel or Powder-Coat Finish: AAMA 2603 except with a minimum dry film thickness of 1.5 mils (0.04 mm). Comply with coating manufacturer's written instructions for cleaning, conversion coating, and applying and baking finish."
- Specifications Section 10 14 19 2.7 A 7 b, Dimensional Lettering Signage, delete in its entirety, " : Spraylat Star-Brite White EF as manufactured by Spraylat Corporation (914-738-1600, http://www.spraylat.com) or equal.
- 1) Spraylat Star-Brite White EF as manufactured by Spraylat Corporation (914-738-1600, http://www.spraylat.com) or equal.
- 2) Matthews Paint 281 500SP High Reflective White 1.800.323.6593
- 3) Polar White as manufactured by Prismatic Powders 1.866.774.7628
- 4) Or equal . . . 1

and replace with the words, "manufacturer's standard white reflective paint."

- Specifications Section 10 14 19, Dimensional Lettering Signage, throughout the specifications section, remove the words "Construction Intent" and replace with the word, "Signage".

Page: 530 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 531 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0602	Unidentified Icons per Sign Message Schedule	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	11/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Color/Font/Material/Symbol/Icons Report					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The Sign Message Schedule calls out for Icons not identified on the Color/Font/Material/Symbol/Icons Report (PS6-G-05-022 calls for Icons ASU-1, ACT-2 and ARU-1 for example).					Icon layouts for Sign Types PS2, PS5, PS6 have been revised to accommodate a maximum of 7-8 icons, depending on the specific message. See SKSG #2037, attached. Icon layouts for Sign Type PS4 has been revised to accommodate a maximum of 8 icons. See SKSG #2038, attached.		
Please coordinate all of the icons called out on the Sign Message Schedule with the information provided on the Color/Font/Material/Symbol/Icons Report.					See the attached revised sign Message Schedule for sign Types PS1, PS2, PS4, PS5 and PS6. Additional pages of the Sign Message Schedule (reflecting no changes or revisions) have also been attached for reference.		
P1-0603	Clipper Tagging Devices for Sign Type PS6 Interior Directional Pylon with Clipper	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Details 3 & 7/SG1-6001 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Details 3 & 7/SG1-6001 call out for a Clipper Tagging Device on one side of the Sign Type PS6 Interior Directional Pylon with Clipper Tagging.					The sides (elevations) and quantities of Clipper Tagging Devices to be installed at each Sign Type PS2 pylon varies based on that PS2's specific location (e.g., a PS2 that is backed up against the wall and away from traffic flow may not receive any Clipper Tagging Device, while a PS2 located in the middle of Grand Hall may receive multiple devices). The side (elevation) of a particular PS2 that will need to accommodate this device or devices is indicated on the Sign Message Schedule.		
Per the Sign Message Schedule, some PS6 Pylons have 0 ea. (ex. PS6-G-03-020), 1 ea. (ex. PS6-G-05-022), or 2 ea. (ex. PS6-G-05-015).					Note: As stated in the previous response to P1-0557, the "Clipper Tagging" device and is part of the vendor-supplied system to be bought-out separately by TJPA. The Sign Subcontractor would be responsible only for its installation and integration within the pylons and wall surfaces in which the devices are designated to be installed.		
Please confirm the number of Clipper Tagging Devices to be furnished and installed with PS6 Pylons.							
P1-0604	Material Isolation Requirements per Signage Sheet & Key Notes	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project


Page: 532 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div>			<div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div>Co-Author:</div>							
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>REFERENCE:</div><div>Sheets SG1-6000 through Sheet SG1-6202 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</div><div>Several General Sheet Notes and Key Notes on Sheet SG1-6000 through Sheet SG1-6202 require that all dissimilar materials be isolated (ex. General Sheet Note F and Key Note 1c on Sheet SG1-6002).</div><div>Please provide the requirements for isolating each material from each other.</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div><div><div>· Specifications Section 10 14 16 2.3 A 4, Cast and Etched Graphics, add the sentence, ¿Where dissimilar metals are in contact, the surfaces are to be protected against galvanic or corrosive action.¿</div><div>· Specifications Section 10 14 19 2.7 A, Dimensional Lettering Signage, add the words, ¿against galvanic or corrosive action.¿ to the last sentence.</div><div>· Specifications Section 10 14 19 2.4, Dimensional Lettering Signage, add:</div><div>¿2.4 FABRICATION</div><div>A. Dissimilar metals: Where dissimilar metals are in contact, the surfaces are to be protected against galvanic or corrosive action.¿</div><div>· Specifications Section 10 14 26 2.3 A, Pylon Signage, delete the word, ¿or lead¿. Add the words ¿against galvanic or corrosive action.¿ to the last sentence.</div><div>· Specifications Section 10 14 26 2.4 E, Pylon Signage, add the sentence ¿Where dissimilar metals are in contact, the surfaces are to be protected against galvanic or corrosive action.¿</div><div>· Specifications Section 10 14 33 2.3 A, Illuminated Panel Signage, delete the word, ¿or lead¿. Add the words ¿against galvanic or corrosive action.¿ to the last sentence.</div><div>· Specifications Section 10 14 33 2.4 E, Illuminated Panel Signage, add the sentence ¿Where dissimilar metals are in contact, the surfaces are to be protected against galvanic or corrosive action.¿</div><div>· Specifications Section 10 14 36 2.4 C, Non-Illuminated Panel Signage, add the sentence, ¿Where dissimilar metals are in contact, the surfaces are to be protected against galvanic or corrosive action.¿</div><div>· Specifications Section 10 14 66 2.3 A, Floating</div></div></div></div>				





Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 534 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0606	Required Font and Size for Sign Type PD1 Bus Deck Dock ID Signage	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	11/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
REFERENCE: Detail 1/SG1-6003 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)						Drawings have been revised to provide font name and layout dimensions for Sign Types PD1 and PD2. See attached SKSG #2017.	
Detail 1/SG1-6003 does not identify the font or size for the graphics on Sign Type PD1 Bus Deck Dock ID (3 fonts and associated sizes are shown on the Color/Font/Material/Symbol/Icons Report).							
Please provide the desired font and size for the verbiage on Sign Type PD1.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 535 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0607	LCD Requirement for Sign Type PD1 Bus Deck Dock ID	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 1/SG1-6003 Detail 3/SG1-6003 Per Detail 1/SG1-6003, a 22" LCD is required on both sides of Sign Type PD1 Bus Deck Dock ID. Per Key Note 10 on Detail 3/SG1-6003 the 22" LCD is to be viewed by drivers. Please confirm a 22" LCD is required on both sides of Sign Type PD1 per Detail 1/SG1-6003.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the 22" display screen (LCD) indicated on the drawings will be required on both sides of Sign Type PD1.		
P1-0608	LCD Specification for Sign Type PD1 Bus Deck Dock ID	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Detail 1/SG1-6003 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 10 14 26 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Per Detail 1/SG1-6003, a 22" LCD is required on both sides of Sign Type PD1 Bus Deck Dock ID. Specification Section 10 14 26 2.1 C Pylon Signage does not specify a 22" LCD for Sign Type PD1. Please specify a 22" LCD for Sign Type PD1.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> · Specification Section 10 14 26 2.1 C 1 p q, Pylon Signage, added specification language for 22" LCD for Sign Type PD1: p. Display: 22" diagonal flat panel display, commercial-grade LCD panel and components, full HD resolution, capable of displaying digital video signals, controllable via the IP network or RS-232. q. Manufacturer List: 1) NEC 2) Samsung 3) Toshiba Display Systems (Integrated Display Technology) 4) Or approved equal · As part of this RFI, in Specification Section 10 14		

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0609	Verbiage and Layout for Sign Type PS6 Interior Directional Pylon with Clipper Tag; Closed	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div><div><div><div>From:</div><div>Webcor Construction LP</div></div><div><div>To:</div><div>Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div><div>Co-Author:</div><div></div></div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>REFERENCE: Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Detail 3/SG1-6001 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</div><div>Per the Sign Message Schedule, Sign PS6-G-06-006 Message D is ¿MUNI BUS PLAZA (FINAL NAME TBD BY TJPA)¿.</div><div>Detail 3/SG1-6001 does not provide material or layout of the verbiage (i.e. where on each face the verbiage is to appear, is it painted on, font size, word separation, etc.).</div><div>Please provide the layout for verbiage required to be on Sign Type PS6 Interior Directional Pylon with Clipper Tagging. In addition, please provide the ¿TBD¿ verbiage, or a basis of bid for additional lettering.</div></div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>26 1.2 A 3 a, Pylon Signage, we have deleted the sentence Temperature Change (Range): 120 deg F (67 deg C), ambient: 180 deg F (100 deg C), material surfaces.¿ and replaced it with the sentence, ¿Temperature Change (Range): 120 deg F (48.8 deg C), ambient: 180 deg F (82.2 deg C), material surfaces.¿ . As part of this RFI, throughout Specification Section 10 14 26, Pylon Signage, we have deleted the words ¿Construction Intent¿ and replaced with the word ¿Signage¿. See attached.</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Issue addressed in response to RFI #P1-0605.</div></div><div><div>Answered By:</div><div>Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div></div></div></div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 537 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0610	Key Note 2A per Detail 4/SG1-6003	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 4/SG1-6003 Detail 3/SG1-6003 Detail 4/SG1-6003 calls out Key Note 2A. There is no note 2A on Detail 3/SG1-6003. Please provide Note 2A.					In regards to Detail 4/SG1-6003, it is confirmed that Key Note 2A is not used, and the reference to note 2a has been deleted. See attached SKSG #2012.		
P1-0611	Commercial Grade LCD Types Required for Sign Types SM1, SS1, and SX1	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
REFERENCE: Detail 3/SG1-6010 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 2/SG1-6011 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 10 14 63 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Per Key Note 1 on Detail 3/SG1-6010, the commercial grade LCD for Sign Types SM1 Wall-Mounted Schedule Board and SS1 Digital Display are to be selected based on performance requirements. Per Key Note 1 on Detail 2/SG1-6011, the commercial grade LCD for Sign Type SX1 Grand Hall Schedule Board is also to be selected based on performance requirements. Per Specification Section 10 14 63 2.2 B Electronic Panel Signage, there is a specific list of named LCDs specified for these sign types. Please confirm the LCDs for Sign Types SM1, SS1, and SX1 are to be selected based upon Specification Section 10 14 63, and not performance requirements.					References to Digital Displays and their selection based on performance requirements has been eliminated from Key Notes. See attached SKSG #s 2018 through 2023 inclusive. Note: Drawing SG1-6003 has not been included as part of the response to this RFI, as the same issue was addressed previously in another RFI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 538 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0612	Sole Source for Informational Kiosks per Specification Section 10 18 00	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:		Issue addressed in our response to RFI #P1-0600.					
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
Specification Section 00 05 20 (dated 8/11/14)							
Per Specification Section 10 18 00 2.1 A 1 (10 18 00 2.2 C 1 c, etc.) Informational Kiosks, all of the informational kiosk base material to be made of Kastone by Kreysler and Associates.							
Per Specification Section 00 05 20 2.07 Agreement, sole source procurement is only acceptable with prior approval by TJPA.							
Please confirm it is acceptable to sole source all of the informational kiosk base material.							
P1-0613	Verbiage for Sign Type KC1	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE:		Revised message for KC1 location G-04-005. All KC1 are assigned with messages. See attached Sign Message Schedule.					
Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
Per the Sign Message Schedule, the messages for KC1-G-04-005 are TBD.							
Please provide the ¿TBD¿ verbiage, or a basis of bid for additional lettering required to be on Sign Type KC1 Combined Touchscreen Directory and Digital Display signage.							
P1-0614	Braille Raster Bead Locations for Sign Type KC1 Combined Touchscreen & Digital	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	11/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCED:		Specific to Sign Type KC1, please see attached SKSG #2039 for revised message information for the					
Detail 1/SG1-6020 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>3/31/14)</p> <p>Per Detail 1/SG1-6020 braille raster beads are to be installed on the perforated aluminum access panel for Sign Type KC1 Combined Touchscreen & Digital Display.</p> <p>Please provide the message and exact dimensions for locating the braille raster beads.</p>						
P1-0615	<p>Footing Requirements per Specification Section 10 18 00 Informational Kiosks</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)</p> <p>Per Specification Section 10 18 00 1.2 Informational Kiosks, the signage subcontractor is to provide informational kiosks capable of withstanding the effects of wind loads based on criteria defined on the structural drawings, seismic performance criteria defined in Specification Section 01 80 50 Seismic Design Criteria for Nonstructural Components, and thermal movements defined in Specification Section 10 18 00 Informational Kiosks. There is no requirement to design the substrate upon which the informational kiosks are located.</p> <p>In several locations (Signs KT2-G-05-56 through KT2-G-05-61 and KM1-G-05-055 in the Grand Hall for example), informational kiosks sit on top of the topping slab with no footing down to structure.</p> <p>Please confirm that as long as the design requirements called out in Specification Section 10 18 00 1.2 are achieved, it is acceptable for the informational kiosks to be attached only to the topping slab with no footing through to structure.</p>	Closed					
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>						
	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The Informational Kiosks referenced in this RFI, along with signage pylons or information kiosks (non-structural components) at Ground Floor, Second Floor, and/or Bus Level (PS1, PS2, PS5, PS6, PD1, PD2, KC1, KT1, KP1, KP3, KT2, KM1) are to be anchored directly to the structural slab or a housekeeping pad integrated into the structural slab as referenced in the Structural Drawings, Detail 1/S1-9102. Note that Section 1.2A of Specifications Section 10 18 00, Informational Kiosks, refers to Specifications Section 01 80 50 (Seismic design criteria for nonstructural components) for seismic provisions. Section 1.2B of that specifications section requires that the Contractor's design engineer designs and details the anchorage of these non-structural components. In the case of these aforementioned sign types, this design and detailing would be coordinated with the Signage Subcontractor's design and detailing of the signs' base components.</p> <p>Updated details and locations of the housekeeping pads will be provided with ASI 0128.</p>						
			10/21/2014	10/31/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 540 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0616	Braille Raster Bead Locations for Sign Type KT1 Ticket Vending Kiosk	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Detail 1/SG1-6021 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Detail 1/SG1-6021 braille raster beads are to be installed on the perforated aluminum access panel for Sign Type KT1 Ticket Vending Kiosk.					The Braille for KT1 and KT2 are to be integral to vendor-supplied ticketing machines. Key Note and note call-out locations have been revised. See attached SKSG #2024.		
Please provide the message and exact dimensions for locating the braille raster beads.							
P1-0617	Braille Raster Bead Locations for Sign Type KT2 Ticket Vending Kiosk with Digital	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Detail 4/SG1-6021 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Detail 4/SG1-6021 braille raster beads are to be installed on the perforated aluminum access panel for Sign Type KT2 Ticket Vending Kiosk with Digital Display.					This issue was addressed in response RFI# P1-0616 and SKSG #2024, attached.		
Please provide the message and exact dimensions for locating the braille raster beads.							
P1-0618	Graphic Requirements for Sign Type KT2 Ticket Vending Kiosk with Digital Display	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 10 18 00 Sign Message Schedule					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 F 2 i Informational Kiosks, Sign Type KT2 Ticket Vending Kiosk with Digital Display has 2 faces with graphics.					Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 F 2 i, Informational Kiosks, delete the number 2 and replace with the sentence, See Signage Drawings and Sign Message Schedule. See attached.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 541 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0619	Nominal Depth Requirement for Sign Type KT2	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 4/SG1-6021 Detail 6/SG1-6021				Nominal depths have been revised. See SKSG #2025, attached.			
Per Detail 4/SG1-6021, the nominal depth of Sign Type KT2 Ticket Vending Kiosk with Digital Display is 1¿-5¿.							
Per Detail 6/SG1-6021, the nominal depth of Sign Type KT2 is 1¿-0¿.							
Please clarify the nominal depth of Sign Type KT2.							
P1-0620	Key Note 12 per Detail 4/SG1-6021	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 4/SG1-6021 Detail 3/SG1-6021				Detail 4/SG1-6021 has been revised to delete reference to ¿Key Note 12¿. See attached SKSG #2013.			
Detail 4/SG1-6021 calls out Key Note 12.							
Detail 3/SG1-6021 does not define Key Note 12.							
Please define Key Note 12.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 542 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0621	Surface Applied Digital Print per Detail 3/SG1-6021	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Detail 3/SG1-6021 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				The rectangular space indicated on Detail 6/SG1-6201 and noted in Key Note 9 has not yet been finalized. Consequently, artwork for the final verbiage/graphic for the static graphic panel is not yet available from TJPA. Pricing can be based on the assumption that the final static graphic panel will be a large format digital print produced by Signage Subcontractor, fabricated and installed as per the current drawings and specifications.			
Key Note 9 on Detail 3/SG1-6021 indicate that the static graphic panels called out are to receive a surface applied digital print.							
No information has been provided on the surface applied digital print.							
Please confirm the referenced surface applied digital print is not included in the contract, or provide information on the surface applied digital print.							
P1-0622	Message Requirements for Sign Type KP1 One-Sided Digital Display Panel	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Detail 3/SG1-6022 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Sign Message Schedule (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 E 2 i, Informational Kiosks, Sign Type KP1, delete the number 2 and replace with the sentence, See Signage Drawings and Sign Message Schedule. See attached, including revised Sign Message Schedule.			
Per Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 E 1 i, Sign Type KP1 One-Sided Digital Display Panel has 2 faces with graphics.							
Per Detail 3/SG1-6022, Sign Type KP1 has 1 icon.							
Per the Sign Message Schedule, all of the Sign Type KP1 signs have (NO MESSAGE).							
Please clarify the messages to be installed with Sign Type KP1.							
P1-0623	Message Requirements for Sign Type KP3 Two-Sided Digital Display Panel with Signage	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 543 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Per Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 E 2 i, Sign Type KP3 Two-Sided Digital Display Panel with Speakers has 2 faces with graphics. Per the Sign Message Schedule, all of the KP3 Signs have ¿(NO MESSAGE)¿. Please clarify the messages to be installed with Sign Type KP3.				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
P1-0624	Key Note 5D per Detail 4/SG1-6022	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: REQUEST: REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 4/SG1-6022 Detail 2/SG1-6022 Detail 4/SG1-6022 calls out Key Note 5D. Detail 2/SG1-6022 does not identify Key Note 5D. Please provide information on Key Note 5D.				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 544 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0625	Drawing Titles for Detail 3/SG1-6022	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
REFERENCE:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Detail 3/SG1-6002 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)			Drawing titles have been clarified. See attached SKSG #2027.				
Detail 3/SG1-6022 title is ¿KP1: One-sided Digital Display Panel Kiosk ¿ With Speakers¿.							
Titles within the detail call out KP2.							
Please coordinate the drawing titles.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 545 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0626	Speaker Requirements for Sign Type KP1 One-Sided Display Panel	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
REFERENCE:				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Detail 3/SG1-6022 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)				In regards to Sign Type KP1, drawings and specifications section have been revised to confirm/accommodate the inclusion of speakers. See attached SKSG #2028. Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 E 1 o, Informational Kiosks, add the following:			
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)							
Detail 3/SG1-6022 title is ¿KP1: One-sided Digital Display Panel Kiosk ¿ With Speakers¿.							
Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 E 1 does not call out speakers, and drawing details within Detail 3/SG1-6022 does not call out speakers.							
Please confirm no speakers are to be included with Sign Type KP1.				o. Speakers:			
				1)Manufacturer: See Specifications Section 27 51 16 2.19.			
				2)Model: See Specifications Section 27 51 16 2.19.			
				3)Internally Mounted			
				4)Aluminum sheet grille integral to access door and flush with FRP surface, painted, Gray.			
				5)Speaker grill material specifications: Stainless steel, 22 gauge (0.032¿)			
				Round hole diameter = 0.0625¿ (1/16¿). Hole centers = 0.0938¿ (3/32¿)			
				Hole pattern = staggered. % open area = 41%. Transparency Index = 16,422. Example Product: as manufactured by McNichols Part#1511332238			
				See attached.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 546 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0627	Sole Sourcing for Sign Type KP3 Two-Sided Digital Display Panel with Speakers	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					· Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 E 2 o 1),		
Specification Section 00 05 20 (dated 8/11/14)					Informational Kiosks, the words ¿Intellovox Duran		
Per Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 E 2 o Informational					Audio¿ have been deleted and replaced with the		
Kiosks, speakers within the Sign Type KP3 Two-Sided					sentence, ¿See Specifications Section 27 51 16		
Digital Display Panel with Speakers are to be Intellovox					2.19.¿		
Duran Audio Model DC115.					· Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 E 2 o 2),		
Per 00 05 20 2.07 Agreement, sole source procurement is					Informational Kiosks, the word ¿DC115¿ has been		
only acceptable with prior approval by TJPA.					deleted and replaced with the sentence, ¿See		
Please confirm it is acceptable to sole source all of the					Specifications Section 27 51 16 2.19.¿		
speakers for Sign Type KP3.					Note: These speakers are components of the building-		
					wide Public Address and Paging System.		
P1-0628	Messages for Sign Type KM1 Static Map and Digital Display Panel	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 10 18 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 D 1 i, Informational		
Detail 1/SG1-6023 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated					Kiosks, Sign Type KM1, Static Map and Digital Display		
3/31/14)					Panel, delete the number ¿2¿ and replace with the		
Per Specification Section 10 18 00 2.2 D 1 i Informational					sentence, ¿See Signage Drawings and Sign Message		
Kiosks, Sign Type KM1 Static Map and Digital Display					Schedule.¿ See attached, including revised Sign		
Panel has 2 faces with graphics.					Message Schedule.		
Per Detail 1/SG1-6023 and the Sign Message Schedule,							
all of the KM1 Signs have ¿(NO MESSAGE)¿.							
Please clarify the messages to be installed with Sign Type							
KM1.							
P1-0629	Mounting Requirements for Sign Types BS3 and BS4	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 10 14 66 Specification Section 09 51 23</p> <p>Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 C 3 d Floating Signage, indicates that Sign Type BS4 6-Icon Overhead Directional is to be ceiling mounted.</p> <p>Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 C 2 d Floating Signage, indicates that Sign Type BS3 4-Icon Overhead Directional is to be ceiling mounted.</p> <p>Specification Section 09 51 22 Aluminum Ceilings does not address the mounting of Sign Types BS3 or BS4.</p> <p>Please confirm Sign Types BS3 and BS4 signs are to be directly supported from the structural deck, or coordinate Specification Section 10 14 66 with Specification Section 09 51 22.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>· Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 C 2 d Floating Signage, Sign Type BS3 has been eliminated as per previous RFI.</p> <p>· Specification Section 10 14 66 2.2 C 3 d Floating Signage, the word "Ceiling" has been deleted and replaced with the words, "Structural deck above suspended ceiling"</p>			
P1-0630	Verbiage for Sign Type BG1 Applied Message Band on Glass	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE: Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)</p> <p>Sign BG1-G-10-010 on the Sign Message Schedule indicates that Message A will be determined by the owner.</p> <p>Please provide the verbiage for Sign Type BG1 Applied Message Band on Glass, or provide a basis of bid.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The verbiage for Sign Type BG1, Applied Message Band on Glass, has not yet been finalized by TJPA. Pricing can be based on the assumption that the final graphic static map will be a double-sided, large format digital print to be sized, fabricated and installed as per the current drawings and specifications.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 548 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0631	Message Arrangement for Sign Type BS4	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) The Sign Message Schedule calls out that Message D for Signs BS4-B-06-003, BS4-B-04-002, and BS4-B-03-001 is to be ¿MESSAGING LEFT TO RIGHT¿. Please confirm this is direction for arrangement of the other messaging on the sign and move it to the notes column, or provide layout for the message.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that Message D for Signs BS4-B-06-003, BS4-B-04-002, and BS4-B-03-001 is to be ¿MESSAGING LEFT TO RIGHT¿. Sign Message Schedule has been revised to clarify. See attached		
P1-0632	Content for Sign Type IG1 Small Interpretative Panel	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 1/SG1-6080 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) 1/SG1-6080 states that signage bidders are to ¿see message schedule for content¿ for Sign Type IG1 Small Interpretative Panel. The Sign Message Schedule does not provide any information on Sign Type IG1. Please provide the artwork for Sign Type IG1.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pricing for Sign Type IG1 is to be based on information in Signage Drawings, associated specifications, and the Interpretive Graphic Report. As specified, Sign Subcontractor will retain a qualified ¿Signage and Graphic Illustrator/Content Designer¿ to work with TJPA and design team to finalize the graphics (text and illustrations) for this Sign Type. This issue addressed in this RFI was discussed and clarified in the ¿Pre-Con RFI Response Review Meeting¿ held on Wednesday, October 22, 2014, in the TJPA offices.		
P1-0633	Final Artwork for Sign Type IG1 Small Interpretative Panel	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 3/SG1-6080 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Key Note 1 on Detail 3/SG1-6080 indicates that the ¿final			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pricing for Sign Type IG1 is to be based on information in Signage Drawings, associated specifications, and the Interpretive Graphic Report. As specified, Sign Subcontractor will retain a qualified ¿Signage and Graphic Illustrator/Content Designer¿ to		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 549 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0634	<p>artworks to be provided¿ for Sign Type IG1 Small Interpretative Panel. No artwork has been provided.</p> <p>Please provide the artwork for Sign Type IG1, or provide a basis of bid.</p> <p>Vinyl Graphic for Sign Type FD1 per Detail 1/SG1-6190</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>REFERENCE:</p> <p>Specification Section 10 14 36 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Detail 1/SG1-6190 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)</p> <p>Per Specification Section 10 14 36 2.2 J 10 a Non-Illuminated Panel Signage, Sign Type FD1 Floor Directory at Elevator is to be a surface screen copy on existing elevator lobby wall surface.</p> <p>Per Detail 1/SG1-6190, Sign Type FD1 is to be a vinyl graphic.</p> <p>Please confirm Sign Type FD1 is to be a vinyl graphic.</p>	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Specifications Section 10 14 36 2.2 J 10 a, Non-Illuminated Panel Signage, Sign Type FD1: Floor Directory at Elevator, delete the words ¿Surface screen copy on existing¿ and replace with the words ¿Vinyl graphics applied onto¿. See attached.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 550 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0635	Finish Color for Sign Type FD1 Floor Directory at Elevator	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 1/SG1-6190 Detail 3/SG1-6190 Per Detail 1/SG1-6190, the finish color for Sign Type FD1 Floor Directory at Elevator is to be P9. Per Key Note 2 on Detail 3/SG1-6190, the finish color for Sign Type FD1 is to be P1. Please clarify the color to be used for Sign Type FD1.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> In regards to Sign Type FD1, drawing has been revised as per attached SKSG # 2030. Specifications section 10 14 36 2.2 J 10 a, Non-Illuminated Panel signage, delete the words "Surface screen copy on existing" and replace with the words "Vinyl graphics applied onto". See attached.		
P1-0636	Installation Height for Sign Type FD1 Floor Directory at Elevator	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Detail 4/SG1-6190 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Detail 4/SG1-6190 does not show the installation height of Sign Type FD1 Floor Directory at Elevator. Please provide the installation height of Sign Type FD1.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing has been revised to indicate correct installation height. See attached SKSG #2031.		
P1-0637	Verbiage for Sign Type SD3 Intercom Box Instructional Plaque	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	11/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: Sign Message Schedule (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Per the Sign Message Schedule, Sign Type SD3 Intercom Box Instructional Plaque is to be determined by the owner. Please provide the TBD verbiage for Sign Type SD3, or					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Final message has yet to be determined by TJPA. For pricing purposes, assume a maximum of 110 characters (letters/numerals). See attached revised Sign Message Schedule.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>provide a basis of bid.</div>							
P1-0638	Usage of Sign Type ISA1 International Symbol of Accessibility	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCE: Detail 4/SG1-6201 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 10 14 36 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Sign Type ISA1 International Symbol of Accessibility is detailed on Detail 4/SG1-6201 and specified in Specification Section 10 14 36 Non-Illuminated Panel Signage, but not called out on the signage plans or Sign Message Schedule. Please confirm Sign Type ISA1 is not required for the project.			Sign Type ISA1 International Symbol of Accessibility as detailed on Detail 4/SG1-6201 and specified in Specification Section 10 14 36 Non-Illuminated Panel Signage, is required for the project. Revised drawings (SKSG #'s 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, & 2036) and Sign Message Schedule are attached.				
P1-0639	Elevator Shaft Painting Requirements	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REFERENCES: Specification Section 09 91 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Per the responses to RFIs P1-0099 through P1-0099.2, the interior of elevator shafts are to be painted. Per Specification Section 09 91 00 1.1 D 12 Paint of ASI 127, elevator shafts are not to be painted. Please confirm elevator shafts are not to be painted, or revise the specification show the interior of elevator shafts to be painted.			Paint will be required on all GWB finished surfaces in the elevator shaft and exposed steel framing members of the shaft. Specification to be revised.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 552 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0640	Cement Plaster Mockup Painting Requirement	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 91 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					The Portland Cement Plaster work is not painted. Please refer to markup of Specification Section 09 91 00 with the edited paragraphs deleting Plaster paint work.		
Specification Section 09 91 00 1.7 C 1 Paint, indicates that painters are to refer to Specification Section 09 24 00 Portland Cement Plastering for painting of the cement plaster mockup.							
Specification Section 09 24 00 Portland Cement Plastering does not call out for the cement plaster mockup to be painted, and RFI P1-0428 indicates that the cement plaster is not to be painted.							
Please remove reference to painting the cement plaster mockup in 09 91 00.							
P1-0641	Incorrect Specification Reference for Painting Gypsum Board Mockup	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 91 00					Specification Section 09 91 00 1.7 C.1 is revised to delete Section 09 24 00 for painting cement plaster mockup... There is no paint system in the cement plaster work.		
Specification Section 09 21 16							
Specification Section 09 91 00 1.7 C Paint states, "Refer to Section 09 24 00 for painting cement plaster mockup and Section 09 29 00 for painting gypsum board mockup." The correct Specification Section for Gypsum Board is 09 21 16.					Specification Section 09 91 00 1.7 C.1 is revised to state the correct Gypsum Board Section 09 21 16.		
Please revise the specification to correctly reference Specification Section 09 21 16 Gypsum Board.							
P1-0642	Impending Rain for Paint Application	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 553 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REFERENCE:</p> <p>Specification Section 09 91 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)</p> <p>Specification Section 09 91 00 1.8 A 4 c Paint indicates that paint is not to be applied when there is a threat of impending rain.</p> <p>This requirement precludes installation of paint in areas that cannot be impacted by rain (i.e. interior spaces, covered spaces, etc.).</p> <p>Please revise to indicate environmental conditions are to be per the manufacturer's written installation instructions.</p>						Please see enclosed revised language on Specification Section 09 91 00 paragraph 1.8 A.4.
P1-0643	High Performance Coatings Requirements for Bus Crash Rail	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>REFERENCE:</p> <p>Specification Section 09 97 15 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)</p> <p>Specification Section 09 97 15 1.1 A 4 High Performance Coatings identifies the bus crash rail as an exposed steel surface to be painted with High Performance Coatings.</p> <p>Currently the bus crash rail is to be structural concrete.</p> <p>Please revise specification omitting the bus crash rail.</p>				<p>Please see enclosed revised language of Specification Section 09 97 15 1.1 A.4 that deletes Bus Deck crash rail work.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 554 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
P1-0644	High Performance Coating Requirements for Steel Surfaces	Closed	10/23/2014	11/02/2014	10/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 97 15 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Please refer to enclosed markup of revised paragraph 1.3B of Specification Section 09 97 15.		
Specification Section 09 97 15 1.3 B High Performance Coatings makes the subcontractor responsible to ¿ approve the preparation of the substrates to be painted and application of the primer, which are both to be performed in the steel fabricator¿s plant."							
Based upon the current construction schedule, steel is being primed and shipped to the project prior to Trade Package TG016.5 Paint being bid.							
Please revise language to indicate the paint subcontractor shall review the surfaces to be painted and report deficient installation of material to general contractor prior to commencing with the work.							
P1-0645	Application Conditions for High Performance Coatings	Closed	10/24/2014	11/03/2014	10/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 97 15 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Please see enclosed markup with revised paragraphs 1.10 A and 1.10 B of Specification Section 09 97 15.		
Specification Section 09 97 15 1.10 A High Performance Coatings requires that High Performance Coatings are applied only when temperature of surfaces to be coated and surrounding air temperatures are between 45 and 95 degrees F.							
Specification Section 09 97 15 1.10 B requires that High Performance Coatings are not applied when relative humidity exceeds 85%.							
These conditions do not match the manufacturer¿s written installation requirements for the specified products (ex. Carboguard 890 VOC, the minimum application surface and ambient temperature is 50 degrees F, and maximum							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 555 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0646	Paint Samples for High Performance Coatings	Closed	10/24/2014	11/03/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 97 15 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					For AESS colors, please refer to drawings: A1-8660, and A1-8661.		
Specification Section 09 97 15 2.4 A High Performance Coatings indicates that paint colors are to match the TJPA representative's control samples.					The physical samples will remain with the TJPA Representative and can be reviewed at the appropriate time at the PCPA/AAI offices. The contractor is to submit samples as specified in Division 01 to be reviewed by the TJPA Representative and returned to the contractor. The successful submitted samples will become the control samples.		
Please provide the referenced color samples.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 556 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0647	Wall Finish Callouts per Room Finish Schedule	Closed	10/24/2014	11/03/2014	10/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 09 91 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					Confirmed. Specification section 09 91 00 shall be		
Sheet A1-9601 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					corrected in ASI 0128.		
Sheet A1-9602 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14)							
Sheet A1-9603 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14)							
Sheet A1-9606 (ASI 122 dated 7/23/14)							
Specification Section 09 91 00 1.1 D 2 Painting, excludes the painting of concrete and CMU surfaces.							
Specification Section 09 91 00 3.7 Painting, specifies paint products for concrete and CMU surfaces.							
The Room Finish Schedules on Sheets A1-9601 through A1-9603 and Sheet A1-9606 call for paint finishes on concrete and CMU walls.							
Please confirm that painting of concrete and CMU surfaces are required at locations called out in the Room Finish Schedules and revise Specification Section 09 91 00 to match.							
P1-0648	Information for LAM-4 Formica Color	Closed	10/28/2014	11/07/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet A1-9610 (ASI 122 dated 7/23/14)					Drawing A1-9606 and drawing A1-9610 are revised to		
Specification Section 06 40 00 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14)					show that 'LAM-4' is not assigned and is not used, it is		
Sheet A1-9610 indicates LAM-4 is "XXXXXXXXX by Formica For Cabinet Base" and reference Specification Section 06 40 00 Interior Architectural Woodwork.					a spare.		
Specification Section 06 40 00 does not provide a laminate color for LAM-4. Please provide the laminate color for LAM-4.					The drawings will be issued as part of ASI 0128.		
P1-0649	Millwork for Security Desk and Info Desk in the Grand Hall	Closed	10/28/2014	11/07/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 32 91 00, 1.4.C-F (IFC Main Set) Clarify if 32 91 00, 1.4.D, E and F are meant to be part of 32 91 00, C. and that these types of soils are meant to be prepared as outlined in 32 91 00, C.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Yes. Clarification to specification 32 91 00 will be reflected in 12/16/14 ASI-0128.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
P1-0653	32 91 00 I-M	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 32 91 00, 1.4.I-M (IFC Main Set) Clarify if 32 91 00, 1.4.I, J, K, L and M are meant to be part of 32 91 00, H. and that these types of soils are meant to be prepared as outlined in 32 91 00, H.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Yes. Clarification to specification 32 91 00 will be reflected in 12/16/14 ASI-0128.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
P1-0654	Construction Manager for Soil Samples	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	12/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 32 91 00, 1.4.P (IFC Main Set) 32 91 00, 1.4.P states that "Prior to ordering the below listed materials, submit representative samples to the TJPA Representative, Construction Manager and Soil Scientist for selection and approval. Do not order materials until TJPA Representative's, Construction Manager's and Soil Scientist's approval has been obtained." Clarify if Construction Manager is meant to refer to Turner or Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture. Why would the Construction Manager be approving the soil samples?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: See attached SKLA-347 reflecting omission from that paragraph of reference to "Construction Manager". Original RFI references paragraph 1.4.P. Please note that due to formatting changes, paragraph 1.4.P is now 1.4.H.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 560 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<hr/>							
	REQUEST: Reference 32 91 00, 2.1.A (IFC Main Set) 32 91 00 2.1.A does not contain any MRc5 Option 2 language. Please add MRc5 Option 2 language to 32 91 00.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
			MRc5 Option 2 language will be reflected in specification 32 91 00 section 2.1.A in 12/16/14 ASI-0128.				
P1-0659	Stability Test Lab	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Reference 32 91 00, 2.2.D.b. (IFC Main Set) There is only one laboratory listed to perform stability tests. Is this the only qualified laboratory in the country? If not, allow for an "or equal" laboratory to perform stability tests.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
			Add "or approved equal." Clarification to specification 32 91 00 will be reflected in 12/16/14 ASI-0128.				
<hr/>							
P1-0660	Nutrient Amendment Program	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Reference 32 91 00, 2.3 (IFC Main Set) Clarify why the Contractor is meant to submit a preliminary proposal of Nutrient Amendment Program for Maintenance of Soil at time of bid? Award will not be impacted by this information.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
			Omit "At the time of bid." Add "within 60 days of award of contract." Clarification to specification 32 91 00 will be reflected in 12/16/14 ASI-0128.				
<hr/>							
P1-0661	Misspelled Word in 32 91 00 3.1.A	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference 32 91 00, 3.1.A (IFC Main Set)</p> <p>Confirm that this is meant to read as "repairs to damaged utilities at Contractor's own expense" and not "repairs to damaged utilities at Contract's own expense."</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Confirmed. Correction to specification 32 91 00 will be reflected in 12/16/14 ASI-0128.</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
P1-0662	Work Adjacent to Planting Soils	Open	11/03/2014	11/13/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From:	Webcor Construction LP	Andrew Kitchen	To:	Turner Construction Company	Phil Militello	Answered By:	
Co-Author:							
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference 32 91 00, 3.1.C (IFC Main Set)</p> <p>32 91 00, 3.1.C states as follows, "Verify that all work requiring access through or adjacent to areas where Planting Soils are to be placed has been completed and no further access (other than exterior planting installation) will be required. In the event that access will be required, access must be approved by TJPA Representative or Construction Manager and will be subject to replacing soil areas disturbed." This requirement will greatly impact the schedule, especially with decisions still pending on the Rooftop Restaurant and Café. The planting areas are throughout the roof park and all adjacent areas are not likely to finish before any soils will be placed. Revise accordingly.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 562 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0663	TJPA Representative During Placement of Planting Soils	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference 32 91 00, 3.2.A.4 (IFC Main Set)				Confirmed.			
Confirm that the Landscape Architect will act as the TJPA Representative staking all trees and shrubs during placement of the planting soil and that they will be readily available during the entire planting and soil placement process.							
P1-0664	Incorrect Reference in 32 91 00	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	12/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference 32 91 00, 3.3.D.1.b (IFC Main Set)				Per SKLA 350 dated 12/12/14, revise 32 91 00 3.3 D b to refer to 2.3.B (not C)			
This refers to "Section 2.3.C" which does not exist. Revise accordingly.				See attached.			
P1-0665	SSc7.1 Language	Closed	11/03/2014	11/03/2014	12/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference 03 33 12, 1.4.A.4				Omit "at this time." Clarification will be reflected in forthcoming ASI-0128.			
03 33 12, 1.4.A.4 states that "LEED submittal language for SSc7.1 is being added, but no minimum requirement language is being included at this time because the roof is over 50% vegetated and the ground level paving is shaded by architectural devices." Provide a minimum requirement or remove the phrase "at this time" if no minimum is required.							
P1-0666	SSc7.2	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 564 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Reference 03 33 12, 1.6 and 03 30 00, 1.9 & 1.10 (IFC Main Set) There is a discrepancy between the level of quality control outlined in the 03 30 00 Cast In Place Concrete specification and the 03 33 12 Landscape Cast-In-Place Concrete specification. Specification 03 33 12 references 03 30 00 for mix designs. Clarify if 03 33 12, 1.6 Quality Assurance requirements should be in alignment with the requirements outlined in 03 30 00, 1.9 Quality Assurance By Owner's Testing Agency and 03 30 00, 1.10 Quality Control by Contractor.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Spec section 03 33 12 and 03 30 00 are independent from one another. Per SKLA 349, page 3 or 15, dated 12/12/14, Reference to 03 30 00 has been omitted from 03 33 12. Mix design for 03 33 12 is identified in part 2.4 in 03 33 12. Quality Control for 03 33 12 is identified in part 3.13 in 03 33 12. See attached.		
P1-0670	Weather Requirements	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Reference 03 33 12, 1.8.A (IFC Main Set) Provide maximum and minimum temperature ranges that correspond to "extreme cold and heat". Define "hot dry weather"; provide temperature and humidity limits.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The temperature and humidity limits shall be per the product manufacturer's recommendations.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0671	Detail at the Amphitheater/Great Lawn Stairs	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference L1-2630, L1-8633, L1-8687, L1-9621, L1-9622, 04 43 00, 01 10 30/APE (IFC Main Set) Clarify if the amphitheater/great lawn stairs, between gridlines 3 and 4 are stone slab stairs as described in specification 04 43 00, or are wood deck as shown on L1-9621 and L1-9622. L1-2630 points to details that show stone (1/L1-8633, 1/L1-8687) and wood (L1-9622). The Note in details 2/L1-9621, 3/9621 and 1/L1-9622 refer to Alternate 33 which is for modification of stone paving. Sheet L1-9621 is referenced under Alternate 33 in specification 01 10 30/APE, but L1-9622 is not. Sheet L1-9621 and L1-9622 are labeled as wood deck and details refer to boards, not slabs and are using concrete masonry anchors. These details conflict with L1-8633 which shows the stairs as stone slab using stone stair anchor pins. L1-8687 also conflicts with L1-9621 and L1-9622. Overall there appear to be conflicting details for the amphitheater/great lawn stairs. Clarify which set of details are meant to be followed and delete any extraneous details. Correct 01 10 30/APE E.1.21 Alternate No. 33 reference drawings and specification sections.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Revisions to drawing and spec will be reflected in forthcoming 12/16/2014 ASI-0128.	
P1-0672	Stone Stairs	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 04 43 00, 1.5.C.1, L1-9621, L1-9622 (IFC Main Set) Specification 04 43 00, 1.5.C.1 states to "Construct a full width section of stone stair in length and with curve transitions as indicated in area shown on Drawings." There is no area indicated within the Drawings showing the section to be constructed as the in field mockup. Provide the area in the Drawings to be constructed as the in field mockup as stated in section 04 43 00, 1.5.C.1.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See revised sheet L1-2630 in forthcoming 12/16/2014 ASI 0128.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 566 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0673	Incorrect Callout on L1-2630	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference L1-2630 (IFC Main Set) Confirm that the call out for 5/L1-9622 on 2/L1-2630 should be 1/L1-9622.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Correction to sheet will be reflected in the forthcoming 12/16/2014 ASI 0128.			
P1-0674	Seismic Joint Tray	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 05 60 00, 1.4.E.1 Specification 05 60 00, 1.4.E.1 states "Seismic Joint tray: Provide area as indicated in drawings with all associated infill materials and sealants with the tray." There is no area indicated within the Drawings showing the section to be constructed as the mockup. Provide the area in the Drawings to be constructed as the mockup.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See 2/L1-7630.			
P1-0675	Wood Deck Mockup	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 06 15 35, 1.4.C.1 (IFC Main Set) Specification 06 15 35, 1.4.C.1 states "Install shims, nailer boards, and horizontal and vertical deck boards on the concrete structure for an area as indicated in the Drawings." There is no area indicated within the Drawings showing the section to be constructed as the wood deck mockup. Provide the area in the Drawings to be constructed as the wood deck mockup.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The wood deck is deleted. Revision to drawings will be reflected in 12/16/14 ASI-0128.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 567 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
P1-0676	Radial Wood Stair Mockup	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference 06 15 35, 1.4.D.1 (IFC Main Set)				The wood stairs are deleted. Revision to drawings will be reflected in 12/16/14 ASI-0128.			
Specification 06 15 35, 1.4.D.1 states "Install shims, nailer boards, and horizontal stair deck boards on the concrete structure for an area as indicated in the Drawings." There is no area indicated within the Drawings showing the section to be constructed as the radial wood stair mockup. Provide the area in the Drawings to be constructed as the radial wood stair mockup.							
P1-0677	Bus Jet Fountain Typical Radius for Mockup	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference 08 81 00, 1.3.D.3.a (IFC Main Set)				Use detail as indicated on 1/L1-7655.			
Specification 08 81 00, 1.3.D.3.a states to "Provide typical radius as indicated in the drawings." There is no typical radius for the Bus Jet Fountain glass wall panels. Each is specific to their precast module. Provide the typical radius to be used for the mockup.							
P1-0678	Mockup of Guying Systems	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Andrew Kitchen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference 32 93 00, 1.6.B.1 (IFC Main Set)				See 4/L1-9662 and 3/L1-9665.			
Specification 32 93 00, 1.6.B.1 states to "Prepare mock-up of guying system, as shown in landscape Drawings." There is no detail for the guying system in the landscape drawings. Provide the detail of the guying system to be used in the mock-up.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 568 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0679	Spacing for Bamboo Mockup	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 32 93 00, 1.6.C.3 (IFC Main Set) Specification 32 93 00, 1.6.C.3 states to "Provide mock-up of at least twelve plants at spacing indicated on Drawings with minimum one perimeter edge." There is no spacing indicated for the bamboo in the drawings. Provide the spacing required for the bamboo and the bamboo bracing system.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the plant legend on sheet L-0008 for plant spacing.			
P1-0680	Layout for Handrail Illumination Strips	Closed	11/13/2014	11/13/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 14 43 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 10 14 43 3.2 C Photo-Luminescent Exit Accessories indicates that handrail illumination strips are to be installed on all handrails including intermediate handrails. No details are given for layout of handrail illumination strips on handrails. Please provide layout details for the handrail illumination strips.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Handrail Illumination Strips of the Photoluminescent Exit Accessories (PLEA) in section 10 14 43 shall be applied in a continuous line to the handrail (not the guard) in all egress stairs, both sides of stair on the interior quadrant of the handrail. When applicable, provide Handrail Illumination Strip to the intermediate railing at top quadrant of handrail. The installation shall meet all requirements of the Building Code.			
P1-0681	Locations for Pylon Signage Photo-Luminescent Exit Accessories	Closed	11/13/2014	11/23/2014	01/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Specification Section 10 14 43 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Photo-Luminescent Exit Accessories (PLEA) are not a code compliance requirement, but they are part of the work. Please install PLEA accessories Type 1 and Type 2 according to the color coded areas in the			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 569 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Specification Section 10 14 43 1.1 A Photo-Luminescent Exit Accessories indicates that photo-luminescent stair & leading edge nosings, demarcation way-fining strips, obstacle markers, final exit door signs, intermediate directional signage, door hardware markings, and directional & door signs are to be furnish and installed on the project.</p> <p>The location of these items are not identified within the contract documents.</p> <p>Please confirm photo-luminescent stair & leading edge nosings, demarcation way-fining strips, obstacle markers, final exit door signs, intermediate directional signage, door hardware markings, and directional & door signs are not required for the project, or provide locations for each item.</p>						
P1-0682	Location of Room 0521 Maintenance per Finish Schedule	Closed	11/13/2014	11/23/2014	11/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
REFERENCE:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet A1-9603 (ASI 119 dated 6/20/14)					Refer to sheet A1-2305 for location of Room 01521 (west of elevators PE502 and PE503).		
Sheet A1-9603 references Room 01521 Maintenance, but that room does not exist on the plans.							
Please revise the finish schedule to delete the room, or provide location of the room.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 570 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-0683	Details for Typical Top of Concrete Wall Details	Closed	11/13/2014	11/23/2014	11/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Detail 5/S1-9051 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Per Detail 5/S1-9051 the top of non-bearing concrete wall has a 1" min. gap filled with compressible joint filler. Architectural plans do not provide typical top of concrete wall details showing fire rated assemblies (CMU walls are shown, but not conc.). Please provide typical top of concrete wall details.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the attached SKA-4313 for the typical detail at the top of CMU and Reinforced Concrete walls.		
P1-0684	Elastomeric Coating and Color for Roof Park Perimeter Concrete Wall	Closed	11/13/2014	11/23/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: RFI T-1857 The response to RFI T-1857 indicates an elastomeric coating specified in Division 09 is to be furnished and installed on the Roof Park Perimeter Concrete Wall. No elastomeric coating has been specified for this condition. Please provide the elastomeric coating to be furnished and installed on the Roof Park Perimeter Concrete Wall, and its associated color.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The elastomeric coating specification for the Roof Park Concrete perimeter wall and the Bus Deck Concrete crash rail is to be issued in ASI-0128.		
P1-0685	Paint Product Confirmation for Bus Crash Rail and Roof Park Perimeter Concerete Closed	Closed	11/13/2014	11/23/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: REFERENCE: Specification Section 09 91 00			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification Section 09 91 00 is revised to clarify the concrete painting in that section does not apply to the		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Per Specification Section 09 91 00 3.7 Painting exterior concrete surfaces are to painted with 100% acrylic flat paint.</p> <p>Per the response to RFI T-1857, an elastomeric coating specified in Division 09 is to be furnished and installed on the Roof Park Perimeter Concrete Wall.</p> <p>Please confirm different products are to be used to paint the Concrete Bus Crash Rail (exposed exterior concrete) and the Roof Park Perimeter Concrete Wall. In addition, please provide the color to paint the Concrete Bus Crash Rail.</p>						
P1-0686	Surface Prep for Terrazzo per Specification Sections 09 66 23 and 09 66 23	Closed	11/19/2014	11/29/2014	12/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REFERENCE: (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Specification Section 09 66 23 Specification Section 09 66 22		Yes. Reference to the preparation of the concrete slab and installation of the terrazzo crack suppression system shall be deleted from section 09 66 23. See the attached updated specification.					
Per Specification Section 09 66 23 3.1 C Epoxy Terrazzo Flooring, requires surface prep of the slab under epoxy terrazzo flooring (which includes removing sealers and coatings).							
Per Specification Section 09 66 22 a terrazzo epoxy crack suppression system (which includes WPM-13) is to be installed below all terrazzo specified in Specification Section 09 66 23.							
Please confirm that preparation of the concrete slab is to be as required in Specification Section 09 66 22, not Specification Section 09 66 23, and that the requirements in Specification Section 09 66 23 3.1 C will be removed from the documents.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
P1-180.1	VOID	Void	07/11/2014	07/21/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Co-Author:</div> <div>REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>VOID</div>							
P1-328	Void	Void	07/29/2014	08/08/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Zachary Moore To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Co-Author:</div> <div>REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Void</div>							
P1-550	Room 01642 Callout	Void	10/13/2014	10/23/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Co-Author:</div> <div>REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Reference A1-9703 ASI 124</div> <div>Detail 1 shows Room 01642 and Door 01642A as the GGT Supervisor Booth. A1-2306 shows Room 01642 as SFMTA. Please revise A1-9703 so that Room 01642 and Door 01642A correspond to the SFMTA Booth.</div>							
RFI B-0047	BRP - Backfill Over Barrette Pile Concrete	Closed	09/05/2014	09/15/2014	09/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jeremiah Kent</div> <div>ANSWERED By: Arup Kevin Clinch</div> <div>REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Part 3.4.D.9 of Section 31 63 32 - Barrette Piles - Bus Ramps states the following:</div> <div>Place concrete in a continuous operation until barrette pile is completely concreted to at least two feet above final top-of-pile elevation. Above this, place controlled low strength material (CLSM) or lean mix concrete to within 3 feet of the guide wall top. The top two feet of concrete and the CLSM shall be</div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 573 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	demolished during exaction for the pile cap.						
	SCCI believes that using drain rock or sand, instead of CLSM, to backfill above the structural concrete will ensure that the rebar cage is clean upon the backfills removal. Using this lighter material will also work to ensure that bearing pressure limits are not exceeded while the second barrette pile is installed.						
	Is it acceptable to use drain rock or sand instead of CLSM for this backfill?						
RFI T-0491	BSE - Extract Timber Piles at Footing Along Gridline 33.5	Closed	04/09/2013	04/19/2013	04/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From:	Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome	To:	Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:	Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:	Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Danny Walsh						
REQUEST:	Reference Specification: 02 41 19 Reference Drawings: GT-2103 & D-2213	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
	Based on conversation at the 4/3/13 weekly coordination meeting, BBII understands that the TJPA may consider lifting the ban on pile extraction previously issued in COM1347 (TCC letter dated 10-10-12) which directed all remaining piles to be removed by excavation and cutting.				This is not acceptable.		
	BBII requests an exemption to the direction issued in COM 1347 that will permit the timber piles beneath the existing footing on gridline 33.5 to be extracted per the contract documents. The piles beneath this footing should be considered for exemption since they fall outside of the Zone 4 J-line "critical areas", the thin strip orientation has a minimal area of influence on the J-Line wall, and the geotechnical drawings already allow non-ground deformation control pile removal along most of the footing (see sheet GT-2103 & D-2213 attached).						
	Please advise if this request is acceptable?						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 574 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
RFI T-1030	SSS - Second Level Canopy Framing Details	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/31/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On level 2 at the canopy areas and detail 1/S1-5032 refer to sketches CD RFI 171 SK1, SK2 & SK3 for items 1 to 4: 1) Confirm the erection aid angles bolted to the W sections are acceptable. 2) Confirm the required dimension of the angle to extend past the HSS. 3) Confirm the deck support angle indicated is acceptable and provide the required weld information. 4) Confirm the dimension for the bottom of deck to top of slab.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Acceptable. 2) Pop-Out perimeter angle is 4x4x1/4 on three sides. Plan Section A-A does not show perimeter angle per RFI T-0803.1 and 4/A1-8188. Please see page 5 of RFI PDF markup with location and dimension. 3) Acceptable. Provide a 3" long weld of 1/4" fillet weld every 12" on both sides of the angle, similar to that shown in 10/S1-5002. 4) Dimension is 1 1/4" - see page 5 of RFI PDF markup with dimension.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
RFI T-1096	BGP - Area 4 Exterior Wall Verts in Contact With Waterproofing	Closed	01/09/2014	01/19/2014	01/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto

REQUEST:

In Area 4, between soldier piles #41 and #42, there are approximately 13ea wall vertical bars that are in contact with the waterproofing due to CDSM Encroachment. Soldier Piles #41 and #42 were surveyed and shown to not encroach more than 1/2". However, at the elevation of wall lift 1, it appears that the CDSM encroaches vertically into the foundation wall. Due to the wall verticals having little or no clearance to the waterproofing, the first list wall vertical bars cannot be coupled onto the dowels protruding from the top of the haunch. Per discussion with TT field representative, Gerdau proposes the following:

Option 1: Remove the waterproofing, chip the CDSM wall between soldier piles 41 and 42 to allow for clearance between the vertical bars and waterproofing. Vertical bars adjacent to soldier piles 41 and 42, up to 6 total, will be abandoned.

Option 2: The dowels above the haunch will be slightly bent away from the CDSM wall to allow for threading of the first lift wall vertical bars. Prior to bending the bar, the haunch concrete will have to be chipped out a minimum of 1.5 ft wide by 1ft deep to allow for hickey bar access. Once the first lift vertical bar is threaded onto the dowel, then the vertical bar will be transitioned back into vertical alignment with a slight bend over approximately 6ft. Note that this transition will require the wall horizontals to be bent and cross-ties will need to be shortened to follow the profile of the wall verticals.

Please confirm if proposed options are acceptable.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Option 2 is preferred with the following modifications and additions:

- 1.Depth of haunch concrete removal shall be 1'-3" minimum at the encroaching bars.
 - 2.Bars shall be bent such that the top of coupler is displaced 1" from the waterproofing.
 - 3.Displacement shall be made in a controlled fashion.
 - 4.Bars shall only be bent in one direction.
 - 5.Embedded horizontal wall reinforcing that might prevent the field bend from occurring at the bottom of the 1'-3" excavation shall be locally removed. Other reinforcing shall be protected in place.
 - 6.As proof of concept, work shall begin with the bars immediately in front of steel soldier piles. If displacement cannot be controlled for all bars at the soldier pile locations, Option 2 shall cease and Option 1 shall commence. No bars will be accepted that have displaced more than 2" without nondestructive testing; 1", however, is the target. Option 1 may continue to bars between steel soldier piles only after acceptance of work by the structural engineer.
 - 7.The integrity of the waterproofing behind the excavation shall be maintained. Acceptance of the waterproofing by the manufacturer's representative and waterproofing contractor at the completion of field bending is required prior to patching the haunch excavation.
- Option 1 is acceptable only if Option 2 does not produce acceptable results. Modification and additions to Option 1 are as follows:
- 1.The target cover for wall reinforcing bars is 2" minimum.
 - 2.The minimum acceptable concrete cover over a bar or coupler at the level of the haunch is 3/4". This may require that CDSM grout be removed at the level of the haunch. To facilitate a smooth grout transition, this may require that grout be removed below the level of the haunch and perhaps excavation of the haunch itself. This has implications for waterproofing.
 - 3.At locations where 3/4" cover is not provided to the coupler at steel soldier pile locations, the coupler shall be removed with due regard to protecting the adjacent installed waterproofing.
 - 4.Any bars abandoned shall be replaced with bars having proper clear cover. It is not required that these



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 576 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i><u>Number</u></i>	<i><u>Subject</u></i>	<i><u>Status</u></i>	<i><u>Date Created</u></i>	<i><u>Date Required</u></i>	<i><u>Date Answered</u></i>	<i><u>Cost Impact</u></i>	<i><u>Proceed</u></i>
RFI T-1124	SSS - Plate Grade Substitution	Closed	01/21/2014	01/31/2014	01/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 577 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<hr/>							
From: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton Co-Author:		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Note SS-1 on drawing S-0007 states plate used for built-up shapes as follows: "ASTM A572, Grade 50, UON (58 ksi max yield for plates used for beam flanges) ASTM 709, Grade 70W where specifically specified." ASTM standards state the maximum plate thickness available in ASTM Grade 50 is 4", and for Grade 42 is 6" Numerous locations on the Moment Frame Columns specify thickened web plates that exceed 4" in thickness. Is it acceptable to use ASTM A572 Grade 42 for plate thicknesses over 4"? If not, please specify required material and grade.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The topic of this RFI is related to the thicken web at the moment connection panel zone. As specified, all steel plates for built-up shapes shall be ASTM A572 Grade 50, or A709 Grade 70 where specifically specified. It is our understanding from steel fabricators, grade 50 plates thicker than 4" are available by normalizing grade 42 plates (a small premium) to gain higher strength.				
<hr/>							
RFI T-1151	SSS - AESS Mockup Sequence Clarification	Closed	02/05/2014	02/15/2014	02/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please clarify the sequence the contractor is being asked to provide for the AESS mockup. Is the contractor required to provide a mockup (and have A/E review/approve) in the field at grid line 11 (South) per A1-8660 prior to fabricating all AESS elements as indicated in 05 12 14?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification section 05 12 14/1.6H states: "Mockups: Prior to fabricating AESS, construct mockups to demonstrate aesthetic effects as well as qualities of materials and execution." The purpose of the mock-up is to establish a standard of quality that will be provided in the other work. Fabrication of work prior to mockups approvals that may not meet the established standard of quality, presents a risk to the contractor. Submit a proposal to the TJPA Representative for when and how the contractor proposes to submit the mock-up and meet these goals within the Project Schedule.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 578 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
RFI T-1196	SSS - Rebar Coupler Attachment Plate	Closed	02/25/2014	03/07/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached sketch CD RFI # 315 SK1 for the rebar coupler attachment plate shown in detail 9/S1-3702 that is shown extended past the end of the transfer girder by 6". All other locations for similar plates are shown with the plates flush to the end of the girder. Please confirm the plates at these locations are intended to extend past the end of the girder by 6".		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The plate is to flush to the end of the girder. The plate detail shown on 9/S1-3702 is a graphical error.			
RFI T-1220	BGP - SFPUC Grounding Details	Closed	03/06/2014	03/16/2014	03/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ryan Brekke							
REQUEST: Reference: E1-6006, E1-3212 ASI 113 Revision Narrative, plan sheet EI-6006 states, "Moved SFPUC grounding layouts to sheet EI- 3213 for clarification." Sheet EI-3213 was not issued as a contract document, and is not listed as such on the drawing index, E- 0000. It is also not included in any ASI issued to date. Please provide plan sheet EI-3212.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The narrative is referring to details on sheet E1-3212, which has been issued with an ASI and bid package.			
RFI T-1233	SSS - HSS Sleeve for Light Column Anchor Bolts	Closed	03/14/2014	03/24/2014	03/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: AISC Code of Standard Practice allows for variation of 1/8" between the centers of any two Anchor Rods within an Anchor-Rod Group and an accumulated variation of ¼" between centers of Anchor-Rod Groups. To account for this variation and any slight offset of the galvanized duct around the light column anchor bars, Skanska requests to increase the size of the HSS tube welded to the underside of the top anchor plate. Please confirm it is acceptable to provide a 5.0"x 0.125"		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We confirm that the 5.0" x 0.125" HSS sleeve is acceptable.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>HSS sleeve as indicated in the attached sketch. Upon approval, this revision will be incorporated into the Light Column Anchor Bolt shop drawings and submitted for record.</div>							
RFI T-1305	SSS - Deck Support at MF Protected Zones	Closed	04/04/2014	04/14/2014	04/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 382 SK1 for items 1 & 2:		1) At the protected zone, do not use detail 8/S1-5003 as specified. Rather, use 18 gage closure plate and weld the closure plate to the top of the beam flange per typical deck welding detail.					
1) The bent deck support plates per detail 8/S1-5003 will not work at the shaped flanges.		2) see response to #1.					
Supply an alternate detail.							
2) The bent deck support plates per detail 8/S1-5003 occur inside the "Protected Zone."							
Confirm welding is acceptable or supply an alternate solution.							
RFI T-1344	BGP - Bike Ramp Column Jacket Ring Plate Welded Studs	Closed	04/22/2014	05/02/2014	04/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titche	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference S 1-3503 rev 2 detail 6, and A 1-9213 rev 0 detail 7 & 8.		It is acceptable to use 6" long welded studs at the bike ramp slab.					
Detail 6 on S1-3503 calls for 1/2" thick ring with 8" long welded studs at base of column, to be used for installation of column jackets. Details 8 & 9 on AI-9213 show the above 1/2" ring and jacket is required where a column extends through the bicycle ramp.							
Please confirm there is not a conflict when using 1/2" thick plate and 8" welded stud, in a 8" bike ramp slab.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
RFI T-1585	BGP - Deformed Bars at Seismic Joint Embed	Closed	08/04/2014	08/14/2014	08/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference S1-3010 and RFI #T-1547 response. Per RFI T-1547 response, please confirm deformed bars on seismic joint embeds on Detail 4 ofSI-3010 do not require a head.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that straight 1" welded rebars are acceptable as long as ASTM A706 bars are used.		
<hr/>							
RFI T-1594	BGP - Plumbing Sleeve Location Near GL 19.1	Closed	08/08/2014	08/18/2014	08/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: On sheets AI-2225 and AI-2845 an arrow points to a plumbing sleeve location where there is no mark for a sleeve. Please confirm whether a plumbing sleeve exists in the location shown.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A plumbing sleeve exists at the noted location.		
<hr/>							
RFI T-1631	SCS - Elevation at Transformer Vaults Room	Void	08/25/2014	09/04/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: On Sheet AI-2203, on the slab around the transformer vaults room, grid lines 12-C, the elevation is indicated as TOFF -7'-9". On Plan II A 1-3002, there is an elevation point corresponding to the same slab at grid lines 12.1-B.5 that indicates an elevation of TOC -7'-9". On the detail A/AI-9236 same point has an TOC elevation of-8'-2". Please confirm that elevation -7-9" on Detail I/AI-3003 corresponds to TOFF instead of TOC			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
SHIMM00-0326	BGP - Plumbing Clarifications Area 4	Open	09/18/2013	09/28/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference drawing PSK-2022 and IR Rreport 1633.							
On 0/10/2013 DBI inspector expressed concern about the installation of the 2" vent and 3" connections in the mat slab area 4 - See IR 1633.							
Please confirm that 2" ven and 3" connection pipes are to be installed per PSK-2022.							
SHIMM00-0361	Dewaering Well Re-Route	Open	10/21/2013	10/31/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference Detail 6/A1-8711 and S1-3201 of the Contract Drawings and the attached drawing.							
SCCI is requesting to re-route all 2" dewatering well llines as proposed in the attached drawings. The re-route is to eliminatne any potential conflicts with future work (bracing removal, wall waterproofing, rebar, and for/pour/strip). Upon completion of the use of the dewatering system, the line will be cut below the sleeve, capped and grouted in with the trestle block-out pour back. The line will be poured in place with the future mat and concourse slabs and all 3 wall lifts. The line will also be capped at the top of the final wall lift.							
Is this acceptable?							
SHIMM000-0001	BGP - Construction Joint Layout	Closed	11/15/2012	11/25/2012	11/15/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Tyler Shell		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm that the construction joint layouts for the Lower Concourse, Foundation Walls and Mat Slab as shown on sheet SL-025 (Exhibit A) are acceptable. Please note that the construction joint lengths of the Mat Slab				Construction joints on Sheet SL-025 are diagramatical in nature and is not intended to replace the design drawings. Proposed construction joint locations shall be included in a submittal per specifications and			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	exceed 120 linear feet in (7) of the specified areas.						
	conform with the requirements set forth in specification section 03 30 20.						
SHIMM000-0002	BGP - Foundation Wall Horizontal Construction Joint Elevation	Closed	11/27/2012	12/07/2012	11/27/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Tyler Shell		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP David Fields			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Drawings: S1-3201, SCCI#11 & #12 Reference Specification: 03 30 20 Please see attached drawings showing conflicts between the temporary waler lookouts and the horizontal wall construction joints as shown on drawing S1-3201. Please provide direction				Coordinate construction joint locations with TG0300 including but not limited to shop drawings and sequencing consistent with S1-3201. Submit proposed joint locations for evaluation.			
SHIMM000-0003	BGP - UV damage to Modified Bitumen Waterproofing	Closed	01/11/2013	01/21/2013	01/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Specification Reference: 07 12 10 Most of the self-adhering modified butimens are damaged by long-term exposure to UV. Can this membrane be exposed to ultraviolet radiation for extended periods of time? If so, how long?				Please refer to the Manufacturer's product data and specifications regarding allowable time the modified Butimen Waterproofing can be exposed to ultraviolet radiation. All means and methods of sequencing construction must adhere to the manufacturer's specifications and recommendations as defined for allowable UV exposure.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 583 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0004	BGP - Modified Bitumen Waterproofing	Closed	01/11/2013	01/21/2013	01/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 07 12 10 A two-ply self-adhered modified bitumen waterproofing system has been specified for this blind side application (Section 1.1 of Specifications). It is unusual for any modified bitumen system to be used in a blind side application (i.e., where the waterproofing is installed before the structure is constructed). Section 2.2 of the Specifications lists only one potential manufacturer, Laurenco Waterproofing Systems. The Laurenco system is a bitumen modified with chloroprene rubber and applied with a cold adhesive. The required waterproofing membrane properties listed in Section 2.4.B are identical to those published by Laurenco. We cannot find any other other modified bitumen manufactured with chloroprene on the market. Are you aware of any other systems?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> If Shimmick cannot find an equal system, proceed per the specified manufacturer.			

SHIMM000-0005	BGP - Waterproofing Wall System Layers	Closed	01/11/2013	01/21/2013	01/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 07 12 10, 3.2-3.3 1. Section 3.2, D. requires the protection board horizontal construction joints to be shingled lapping the upper sheet over the lower sheet by 4 inches. What is the purpose of this shingle? Since the waterproofing membrane will not be adhered directly to the protection board and layers will be present between them (e.g. drainage composite w/filter fabric, insulation, felt), the shingle does not seem necessary. Please confirm. 2.Section 3.2, F. reads "seal top edge of filter fabric to membrane". There is a layer of 1/2" thick insulation between drainage composite and waterproofing membrane. Please clarify. 3. In addition to these items, there is also a concern about the number of layers used on this wall including the stability and durability prior to concrete placement. There is a large potential for problems such as creep of the		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Adhere to the manufacturers' specified details. 2. Please provide the manufacturer's shop drawings depicting the 1/2" thick insulation between drainage composite and waterproofing membrane. 3. We concur that asphalt saturated felt layers, drainage composite, filter fabric, and EPS insulation are required by the specifications as layers in the waterproofing. Please submit specific RFI's requesting clarification for dispcrepancies between the specifications and what is shown in the drawings. Furthermore, please address specific locations shown on the contract drawings that are in concern with the manufacturer's details.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 584 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	adhesives securing the various layers together and loss of adhesion between layers. What is the purpose of the asphalt saturated felt layers, drainage composite, filter fabric and EPS insulation? Can some of these layers be eliminated? What level of adhesion is required between layers? Does this system of layers have sufficient rigidity to provide intimate contact between the waterproofing layer and						
SHIMM000-0006	BGP - Horizontal Construction Joints - Foundation Walls	Closed	01/16/2013	01/26/2013	01/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 03 20 00 Reference Drawing: S1-3001		Sheet S-0005 note GR-11 reads "APPLY DETAILS, SECTIONS, AND NOTES ON THE DRAWINGS WHERE CONDITIONS ARE SIMILAR TO THOSE INDICATED BY DETAIL, DETAIL TITLE OR NOTE."					
Please reference detail 7 on Drawings S1-3001 and Specifications Section 03 20 00 3 .2-B. Structural details do not clearly show size of the foundation wall horizontal construction joint keyway. Specifications Section 03 20 00 3 .2-B, however, calls out for: "1-1 12 inch deep key type construction joint at the end of each placement for slabs, beams and walls unless otherwise noted on drawings". Since Specifications take precedence over the drawings in this case, SCCI believes that all horizontal construction joints in the foundation walls shall have 1 1/2" deep keyway.		Sheet S1-3201 references 7/S1-3001 for all horizontal constructions joints in the foundation walls.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 586 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
penetration sleeve. Please advise.							
SHIMM000-0009	BGP - Geothermal Loop Soil Compaction	Closed	03/04/2013	03/14/2013	03/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
After observing existing subgrade compactions varying from 88%-95%, it appears that the existing conditions of the soil could be below the 95% compaction requirement. In the case of a geothermal loop being installed in areas with existing soils below 95%, can the geothermal loop be compacted to the localized compaction level in accordance with ASTM DI557? For example, if the first field has an existing condition of88% compaction, can the geothermal loop trenches be compacted to 88%? 95% compaction may not be possible with the existing soils and existing compaction in some areas.				See Response to RFI T-0387 and RFI T-0405.			
Please advise.							
SHIMM000-0010	BGP - Schedule Dates for GLS/GLR Manifold Construction	Closed	03/05/2013	03/15/2013	03/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Exhibit "I" of the TG06.1 bid package is a conceptual schedule. This schedule does not provide a date for the installation of the stainless steel geothermal manifold sleeve penetrations or manifolds themself. Please provide a date of installation for the sleeve penetrations and manifolds for each of the 15 fields.				Refer to 01 13 10 .1.2.C & F. Provide a revised schedule showing activities pertaining to the installation and testing of the geothermal sleeve penetrations and manifolds. Note that the installation of this work cannot delay follow on trades (i.e. superstructure concrete, superstructure steel). Coordinate with W/O as to the timing of the installation of these systems so as not to affect follow on trades.			
				Please coordinate off of the P6 schedule that W/O sends to SCCI weekly.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 587 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0011	BGP - Geothermal Pipe Elevation	Closed	03/06/2013	03/16/2013	03/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: M-5002 Per drawing M-5002, Detail I, the GLS/GLR manifold piping is above the TG06 SOW demarcation line. Due to constructability concerns of the manifold, is it acceptable to install the manifold at a lower elevation below the TG06 SOW demarcation line? Please advise.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per the 3/06/2013 Geothermal RFI meeting, install GLS/GLR manifold piping per M-5002.			
SHIMM000-0012	BGP - Monitoring Instrument Penetrations	Closed	03/11/2013	03/21/2013	03/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: A1-8711 Per plan sheet A1-8711, Detail 3, the monitoring instrument penetration sleeve is to be place around the monitoring instrument itself. From the field, it appears that some of these monitoring instruments exist as drawn in Detail 3 (Picture 1) while others seem to be placed within an additional, larger sleeve (Picture 2) casing. This additional casing occurrence isn't accounted for in the contract documents. Please advise to this type of sleeve dimensions and detail. Please note that one of these types of monitoring instrument sleeves is located in the first area to be water proofed and poured for the protection slab.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please reference BBII's dewatering/piezometer layout and Arup's Global Analyzer log in information for coordination of sleeves per detail 3 or detail 6 of A1-8711.			
SHIMM000-0013	BGP - Welding for Penetration Sleeves	Closed	03/12/2013	03/22/2013	03/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST: Reference RFI T-0411 The Engineer's response to RFI T-0411 states that the collar ring and cap plate cannot be shop welded prior to being installed and that the collar must be welded onto the		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reference Drawings: 2/S1-3003, 5/S1-3003, 6/S1-3003. Per detail 2, 5 and 6 on sheet S1-3003 the ring plates are shown to be field welded.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 588 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>sleeve prior to the mat slab pour for access purposes. However, in the submittal comments to SUB-TG0600-036, the Engineer clearly states that the "contract documents specify a field weld of the steel ring such that the pile can be cut and removed without the ring installed." Without access to weld the collar after the mat slab has been poured, it isn't possible to weld the assembly in the field. Additionally, if the collar is to be welded prior to the pile being cut, damage will most likely occur to the ring plate or sleeve during the cutting process as stated in the submittal comments. With the comments to submittal TG0600-036 and the response to RFI T -0411 clearly contradictive, please provide the necessary construction sequencing to avoid damage to the assembly in the field and enable a constructible design.</p>							
SHIMM000-0014	BGP - Geothermal Risers in Leaking CDSM Wall	Closed	03/18/2013	03/28/2013	03/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
With water leakage throughout the CDSM wall at many different locations, the likelihood of a geothermal loop riser being laid out in the location of a CDSM wall leak is high. In the event that the Geothermal Riser is located at the same location as a CDSM wall leak, what should S3H do? Should the riser be relocated to a portion of wall that isn't leaking? If the riser is to be embedded in the wall at the location of a leak, grouting the riser back into the wall will not be possible. Please advise.				Discussed in Geothermal RFI Meeting 3/06/2013. Refer to follow up RFI SCI-087.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 589 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0015	BGP - Shoring Beam in Sump Pit	Closed	03/18/2013	03/28/2013	03/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST: Reference Photo: attached Please find attached a photo of the sump pit near J Line in the Geothermal Field 1. In the pit, there is a H-beam from a previous shoring wall. There is potential for this beam to come in conflict with with geothermal loop. Is this beam to be removed? Please advise.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please confirm that the H pile is in conflict with the geothermal loop.			
SHIMM000-0016	BGP - Clarification of Mass Concrete Reporting Periods	Closed	03/25/2013	04/04/2013	03/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST: Please reference specification section 03 30 20.3. 11.A (pg 24). CTL Group "Thennal Control Plan Model ing" Figure 3 (submittal TG0600-20 1.1 It em #033000-0 I 1.1 pg 8), illustrates the max temperature di fferential is reached and has begun to drop at approximately 8 calendar days. SCCI will record temperature differentials at 6 hr intervals and report those readings on a daily (24 hr) basis. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Record temperature differentials per 03 30 20 3.11.A and submit to Webcor Obayashi with SCCIs daily reports.			
SHIMM000-0017	BGP - Concourse Slab Beams and Trestle Pile Conflicts	Closed	04/09/2013	04/19/2013	04/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Ref: S1-2202 through S1-2210 Submittal TG0300-284.1 revision 7 Please reference attached drawings. SCCI has overlaid the locations of the trestle and bridge piles onto Contract Drawings S1-2202 through S1-2210, the Lower Concourse Slab Framing Plans. The locations of the piles were taken from BBII Submittal TG0300-284.1 revision 7. These are the most recent drawings SCCI has available for the		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pursuant to sheet note #9 on sheet S1-2052 for each pile conflict please provide the northern dimension to the nearest alphanumeric grid line and easting to the nearest numeric grid line. Revise and resubmit.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 590 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	actual locations of the piles. The attached drawings show the piles running vertically through 22 future Concourse Slab beams. Please advise.						
SHIMM000-0019	BGP - Foundation Wall and Internal Bracing Conflict	Closed	04/09/2013	04/19/2013	04/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: Sketch - SCI-103		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to response provided in RFI RFI T-0527.2				
Please reference attached sketch of the top of the foundation walls. At gridlines 1 thru 26, top of the foundation wall above the lower concourse level is in conflict with the shoring level A. The A level lookouts encroach into the top of the walls for approximately 8". For constructability of waterproofing, and reinforced foundation wall SCCI requires 12" minimum clearance above the top of the wall. Conditions described herein do not allow top of foundation wall to be constructed per Contract Plans. Please advise.							



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
SHIMM000-0020	BGP - Waterproofing and CJ Layout Conflict	Closed	04/10/2013	04/20/2013	04/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Kirk Nielsen				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Please reference AI-2203 and SI-3201ofthe Contract Plans and the attached drawings. The current elevation at the bottom ofthe 2nd level bracing lookouts is at approximately -5.13, WEST of Grid 9 (see concourse slab drawing). The proposed top of concourse slab elevation is to be -5.42, WEST of Grid 9. Per the WPM-1 waterproofing system, the minimum overall tie-in dimension needed for the succeeding lift is approximately 1 '-11" (see attached waterproofing drawing). The current elevation at the bottom of the 2nd level bracing lookouts is at approximately -6.15, EAST of Grid 9 (see concourse slab drawing). The proposed top of concourse slab elevation CJ is to be -7.67, EAST of Grid 9. Per the WPM-1 waterproofing system, the minimum overall tie-in dimension needed for the succeeding lift is approximately 1'-11" (see attached waterproofing drawing). In both locations, the minimum required dimension (1 '-11") to tie-in to the next lift of waterproofing can not be reached with the current location of the 2nd level bracing lookouts and the proposed concourse slab elevations. SCCI is restricted in location for the CJ due to the absolute concourse slab location and elevation.</p> <p>Furthermore, a similar conflict exists in the 1st foundation wall lift and the 3rd level of bracing lookouts (see 1st wall lift drawing). With SCCI's current location of the CJ, there is virtually no room to allow for the waterproofing overlap to occur. SCCI fully understands its freedom to manipulate the location of the CJ's by lowering it approximately 2'. This will potentially change BBII's rebracing plans.</p> <p>Please advise.</p>				Consistent with RFI response #SHIMM000-0002 dated 11/27/12, revise the proposed locations of the CJ's to accommodate / coordinate with all of SCCI's work consistent with the sheet note on 1/S1-3201.			

SHIMM000-0021	BGP - Differential Movement in Waterproofing Layers	Closed	04/26/2013	05/06/2013	04/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Per the Engineer's response to Submittal TG0600-023.2, the Contractor is to install the waterproofing system to incorporate "provisions for differential movement". Please reference the contract documents that specify the design</p>				The submittal note states "...including provisions for differential movement between adjacent components as required by the membrane manufacturer" rather than any specification or drawing.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 592 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	criteria for the differential movement of the structure. Please advise to a specification or drawing note that details such.						
SHIMM000-0022	BGP - Testing of WPM-1 Seams	Closed	04/26/2013	05/06/2013	04/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 071210 - 3.5.B The Specifications call for testing of"seams" independently by Applicator and Manufacturer. In the waterproofing pre-installation meeting on 3/27113, the Manufacturer (Laurenco) and the Architect stated that testing of seams is not required as this is not a single-ply system. Please define "seam" and advise if testing of seams is required or not, and if it is, then to what extent?		Specification 07 12 10 3.5.B remains unchanged. A seam is where any specified waterproofing component joins by overlapping.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 593 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0023	BGP - Carlisle Miradrain 9900 Drainage Composite	Closed	04/26/2013	05/06/2013	04/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 07 12 10 2.5.C				Fully bonded Miradrain 9900 is available upon request of Carlisle. If Bestdoes not want to use Miradrain submit a request for substitution pursuant to specification section 011630 and 000440.			
This section calls for "Drainage Composite: Three dimensional plastic rolls bonded to a geotextile on one or both faces: Mirafi Miradrain 9900, or equal with a minimum compressive strength of30,000 psi." The waterproofing membrane manufacturer (Laurenco) states that the specified product "Miradrain 9900" no longer meets the performance requirements of the specifications since the woven filter fabric is no longer bonded at every dimple of the molded polystyrene core. Best Contracting has contacted the drainage composite manufacturer and they have confirmed that the woven filter fabric is bonded at every fourth dimple. Best Contracting has also performed a shop "mock up" using the aforementioned composite which resulted in complete separation and failure upon the installation of the waterproofing membrane. Please provide direction.							

SHIMM000-0024	BGP - Additional Fasteners for Protection Board Installation	Closed	05/02/2013	05/12/2013	05/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Kirk Nielsen				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference Spec Section 07 12 10 - 3.2.D. Spec Section 07 12 10 - 3.2.D states the following: "Secure 1/4" protection board to flanges of soldier piles with powder driven fasteners and washers spaced 12 inches o.c. Butt vertical joints . Maximum joint width : 1/4"..."				The pile plane always had a tolerance as was the CDSM surface was never continuously supported.			
The manufacturer of membrane waterproofing system (Laurenco) has indicated that due to "out of plane" piles, and relaxation of CDSM substrate requirement, they are requiring intermediate fasteners to hold the 1/4" protection board tight to the CDSM wall. Please review and advise.				Consistent with John Laurence (Laurenco's) comments during the 4/30/13 waterproofing meeting the concern over the protection board deflecting can be mitigated by two methods:			
				1. Intermediate fasteners 2. Ensuring when placing concrete SCCI does not cause the protection board to excessively deflect.			
				This is a means and methods issue at the discretion and cost of the Trade Subcontractor.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 594 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0025	BGP -Request for Revit Model	Closed	05/02/2013	05/12/2013	05/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
SCCI is requesting access to the latest, most up to date Structural and Architectural Revit models from the designers. The 3D database would be used for reference only and will not be used for construction. SCCI understands that the 3D Database is subject to change as the project design evolves. As a user of this 30 database, SCCI accepts the risk and acknowledge that the data is subject to change. SCCI also acknowledges the terms and conditions outlined in the Transbay Transit Specification Section 01 31 26.				Not proper use of an RFI as per specification section			
				Please			
SHIMM000-0026	BGP-Geothermal Field Riser Pipe Termination	Closed	05/13/2013	05/23/2013	05/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. John Berggren		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 23 57 34 Reference Drawing: A1-8712, M1-5002				Sleeves as shown on A1-8712 and M1-5002 are a part of S3H's scope of work. The grey SOW line on M1-5002 clearly stops short of the geothermal riser which continues into the manifold sleeves uninterrupted. Detail 3/M1-5002 also distinguishes the geothermal wall penetration as being apart of the TG06 scope of work.			
Stainless sleeves as shown on A1-8712 and M1-5002 (copies attached) are not part of the S3H's scope of work. Reference is made to Note 1 and Note 2 on M-0006 (copy attached), the highlighted notes in Detail2 on A1-8712, and the SOW demarcation line in Detail A on M1-5002. S3H Inc. will terminate pipe at grade as shown in Detail A on M1-5002 with pressure guage to be modified by Others. Please confirm. [S3H RFI No. 36]							
SHIMM000-0027	BGP - Temperature Probe Sleeve Penetration	Closed	05/13/2013	05/23/2013	05/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. John Berggren		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference is made to RFI T-0388.0 (copy attached) is stating the temperture probe piping shall be installed per Note 6 on Sheet M-0006. Per Note 2 on Sheet M-0006, the additional mechanical work shown above the demarcation line is for reference only and was not				Install per RFI T-0338 response. The demarcation line does not exclude any the mechanical work referenced as it stops short of the geothermal piping.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 595 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	included in the TG06.1 package. Please confirm and clarify the design intent.						
	[S3H RFI No. 028]						
SHIMM000-0028	BGP - Mat Slab Elevator Opening Embed Dimensions	Closed	05/10/2013	05/24/2013	05/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome						Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Ref. RFI T-0439.1		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
TJPA's response to RFI T-0439.1 stated "Final elevator post locations shall be coordinated with elevator manufacturer." The response has a second option to use a continuous L8x4x1/2 in lieu of the 1'-2" base. Please provide the elevator post locations if an elevator manufacturer has been selected? If not, SCCI is requesting to use continuous embeds. Please advise if this is acceptable.			The elevator manufacturer will not be awarded a contract for over a year and a half.				
SHIMM000-0029	BGP - High Congestion Mockup Revit File	Closed	05/20/2013	05/30/2013	05/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon To: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome						Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Gerdau is requesting the 3D Revit model of the isometric high congesting area shown in SI-3208/DI. This will allow Gerdau to determine conflicts prior to fabri cation of rebar for the upcoming mock up. Please provide Revit file showing this area.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Per response to RFI T-0534, "The updated In-Progress Revit computer model will be issued to TJPA for review and comment on May 31, 2013". TJPA will forward this model to the Contractor for information, review, and comment."				
			W/O will share the model as necessary once the model has been recieved and reviewed.				
SHIMM000-0030	BGP - Lower Concourse and Mezzanine Plumbing	Closed	05/21/2013	05/31/2013	05/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon To: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome						Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 596 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	<p>Please reference attached Contract Drawings PI-2202 IFB and PI-2202 IFC. Both IFB and IFC plumbing drawings have the callouts "BELOW GRADE PACKAGE FOR REFERENCE ONLY", "NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION" and do not contain the Architect's/Engineer's seal. This circumstance applies to all Lower Concourse Level and Mezzanine level Plumbing Contract Drawings, PI -2202 to PI-2211 and PI-2252. All Lower Concourse and Mezzanine plumbing depicted in these drawings is excluded from the Below Grade Package. The scope excluded from SCCI's work package includes, but is not limited to, floor drains, area drains, floor sinks and cleanouts. Please inform SCCI about which future package this scope is contained for coordination.</p>	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
<p>TG06 scope of work for the lower concourse and mezzanine includes all sleeves and openings as per the contract drawings and specifications. The future package containing the floor drains, area drains, floor sinks, and cleanouts has not gone out to bid.</p>							
SHIMM000-0031	BGP - S-3 Wall Stirrups Preassembled Using IDEA Machine	Closed	06/04/2013	06/14/2013	06/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	<p>Reference: RFI T -0340 and T -0526</p> <p>Approval was provided to utilize the IDEA machine per the response to RFI T-0340. Since the issuance of this response, approval has also been provided to utilize an S-3 stirrup in lieu of the T-9 hairpin within the walls per RFI 0526. Please confirm that it is acceptable, following the same criteria as outlined in the response to RFI 0340, to use the machine/welded holding wires to pre-assemble the stirrups within the wall reinforcing.</p>	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
<p>Voided per SCCIs request.</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 597 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0032	BGP - RFI 448.5, Dimension From Grid Line to Extent of Change	Closed	06/20/2013	06/30/2013	06/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: RFI T-0448.5							
Within the response to RFI 448.5 the proposal indicates to utilize Option 1 between CDSM piles #733 - #772. No dimension for reference has been provided to layout the reinforcing details. Please provide a dimension from the nearest grid or column line to the Eastern most extent in which the wall change is required per RFI 448.5.				The intent is to replace all the original reinforcement WR1 west of GL -06 as show on drawing S1-2060 with the modified reinforcement detail option One			
SHIMM000-0033	Foundation Wall Conflicts with Level A Bracing	Closed	06/24/2013	07/04/2013	06/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached drawings CJ-35 and CJ-66. Per response to RFI T-0527.1, Wall lifts W326 and W350 are still in conflict with the shoring level A. Please advise on how to proceed.				See attached response to RFI T-0527.2			
SHIMM000-0034	BGP - RFI T-0527.1, BSE- Revision to Zone 4 Bracing Elevations Level A-D, Clarific Closed		07/02/2013	07/12/2013	07/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu		To: Webcor Construction LP	Michael Spillane	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: RFI T-0527.1 - BSE -Revision to Zone 4 Bracing Elevations Level A-D							
In the response to RFI T-0527.1, W/0 included a comment "The TG06 Trade Subcontractor is to provide a credit for, to include however not limited to, the concrete rebar and waterproofing which has been deleted from the TG06 scope of work." Please confirm if the intent of the RFI response is to eliminate the 4th lift of wall reinforcing above the upper CJ as lowering the elevation of the CJ does not reduce the quantity of the reinforcing required.				The intent is to remove the 4th lift of wall reinforcement from the TG06 scope of work			
SHIMM000-0035	BGP - 'Intermediate' Base of Sleeve Flat Mud Slab Elevation for 8 Penetrations in F Closed		07/08/2013	07/18/2013	08/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 598 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference: SK-2676,S SCCI is in receipt of RFI T-0479.1 response outlining that there will be 8 additional areas requiring slab penetration detail per SKA-2676 and SKA-2677 (issued in original RFI#0479). Please provide the elevations of 'intermediate' base of sleeve flat horizontal mud slab area for all 8 trestle piles, pin piles or bridge piers.	To: Webcor Construction LP SUGGESTION:	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu			
SHIMM000-0036	BGP - Area 3 Room Layout Discrepancies	Closed	07/16/2013	07/26/2013	07/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon Co-Author: REQUEST: SCCI is in receipt of CR #071- ASI #104 on Jun 26th, 2013. This ASI #104 changes the layout of the room in area 3 mat slab. This changes the partition wall configuration and the dowels coming out of the mat slab that are required for the construction of the partition wall rebar. SCCI is also in receipt of RFI response to T-0612 on July 2nd, 2013, after the issuance of ASI #104. In this RFI response, the layout of the rooms and partition walls, as well as updated wall, door opening, and control joint locations for the B2 Emergency Electrical Room B2880 shown in A1-9214 are altered with the issuance of SKA-2746 to 2750. Please confirm which room layout, door opening, and control joint SCCL is to construct and install, especially the layout as shown on A1-9214. (E.G: Please provide the most final/ updated drawings)	To: Webcor Construction LP SUGGESTION:	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu			
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				The elevations of the penetration sleeves have been coordinated per field walk between Jose Verduzco (W/O), Scott Bunnell (SCCI) and Don Muns (TCCO). Please coordinate all sleeve elevations for Zone 4.			
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				SCCI is to construct and install per RFI T-0612 response, which is the most up-to-date drawing.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 599 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0037	BGP - Mass Concrete Specifications	Closed	07/17/2013	07/27/2013	07/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference attached letter published by Jon Feld, CTL Group, dated July 8, 2013. This letter contains further analysis of the "Perfomance-Based Temperature Differential Limit", also refered to as "Strength-Based Temperature Difference Limit", for Mat Slab mix # 1557204.				The conditional requirements set forth in RFI T-0585 by George Metzger appear to be satisfied. Procedural requirements are approved via submittal. Please revise and resubmit via submittal package TG0600-201.X (TG0600-201.2, item # 033020-011.1.)			
This additional analysis was prepared per RFI response T-0585, in which the reviewer found this PBTDL method to be acceptable based on satisfying four (4) conditions. See below:							
1. The attached analysis was specifically developed for mix #1557204							
2. SCCI confirms that all remaining mass concrete specification requirements shall still apply.							
3. Shimmick Construction will be providing field quality control and the required concrete maturity measurements through the "Concrete Maturity HardTrack System". Reference attached HardTrack system data and example concrete maturity data. This system has been procured by Shimmick Construction, and has been sucessfully tested on multiple mock-ups.							
4. It is confirmed that Shimmick Construction shall remain responsible for providing a mat foundation that meets requirements of the contract documents.							
Please confirm conditions have been satisfied. This analysis will be submitted as a supplement to the Mass Concrete Plan (TG0600-20 1.1)							
<hr/>							
SHIMM000-0038	BGP - Geothermal Loop Excavation in Zone 4	Closed	07/19/2013	07/29/2013	07/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Jackson Tukuafu	To: Shimmick Construction Comp Ben Gordon				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per discussions in the Trade subcontractor meeting with Turner, BBII, and WOJV, it is apparent that BBII has been directed to demo the buttress shafts in Zone 4 to bottom of				BBI's contract drawing GT-2103 and the Geothermal shop drawings (TG0600-065), indicate the excavation and demolition of the buttress is set to final subgrade			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 600 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>mud slab elevation. Per the geothermal trenching and backfill specification 31 23 34, 1.1.A.1, the only slot excavation in CDSM/concrete is to be in the wall panels. The specification does not require slot excavation/demolition for the horizontal field loops. Per Plan sheet GT-5201, the buttress shafts are to be demolished to a maximum of 4' below subgrade elevation (bottom of mud slab). The geothermal pipe is to be installed at 15" below the bottom of mud slab elevation, well within the 4 ' below mud slab demolition elevation. Please confirm that the geothermal loops in zone 4 will be trenched in soil like the rest of the project and as detail din the geothermal trenching and backfill specification (31 23 34).</p>						<p>elevation 41'-5" or bottom of the mud slab. SCCI¿s interpretation on plan sheet GT-5201 as it relates to demolition is incorrect. The note "...shafts shall be maximum 4 feet below, maximum 2 feet above subgrade elevation" is in reference to the parameters set for the concrete (high strength) being placed in relation to the CLSM mix. These parameters are not set as demolition or excavation bench marks.</p> <p>SCCI to proceed with geothermal loops in Zone 4 as shown in the approved shop drawing TG0601-065 and conform to specification section 31 23 34. SCCI to remit request for backfill and excavation requirements per specification 31 23 34 at buttress locations.</p> <p>SCCI to consider the following when re-submitting: Does SCCI plan to demo the buttress shafts down to the required 15",re-fill the area and meeting compaction requirements? or Does SCCI intend to seek a design variance by slot excavating through the buttress' and seek back-fill requirements within the buttress from the design team?</p>
SHIMM000-0107	BGP - Concourse Slab Embeds and Trestle Pile Conflicts	Closed	04/09/2013	04/19/2013	09/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Ref: S1-2202, S1-2203 and S1-2205							
Please reference attached drawings S1-2202, S1-2203 and S1-2205 with pile locations overlaid. There are three locations where the trestle piles interfere with the embedded assemblies at elevator and escalator openings/pits. Please advise.		Please refer to WOJV RFI T-726. Further coodination is required to anlyize other conflicts.					
SHIMM000-0141.1	BGP - Moment Beam and Pile Conflicts	Open	07/29/2013	08/08/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu				
		Answered By:					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 601 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: SCI RFI-141, RFI T-0510.1							
Please reference SCCI RFI # 141 and W/O RFI T-0510.1. The response to T-0510.1 provided details for rectifying the MFB conflict at internal Bracing Pin Pile #8. It was made clear this solution could only be used at Pin Pile #8. No guidance was provided for the additional five MFB conflicts shown in SCCI RFI #141.							
Please provide information for the five additional MFB and pile conflicts shown in SCCI RFI# 141.							
SHIMM000-0203.1	BGP - Blockout -Reinforcement and Size Detail Needed at Dewatering Well and Co Closed		07/19/2013	08/02/2013	08/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
As a follow up to RFI#T0584 response:							
1. General note GR9 on S-005 is not applicable for wall block out. Please provide block out detail for the reinforcement on the partition wall for blockout for: Dewatering Well #1, #21 and #22 2. For dewatering well #3- please provide detail for blockout for reinforcing at shearwall 3. Please provide size and extent for blockouts for all 4 dewatering wells.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 602 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0204.1	BGP - Locations of Electrical Outlets, Equipment, and Fixtures	Closed	07/31/2013	08/10/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: Spec Section, 34 05 34							
Per Specification Section 26 05 34, 3.2 B., the dimensions of the equipment fixtures and outlets are to be submitted via RFI for clarification pre pour. Attached is the layout for Electrical Room B2221 in the first Mat Slab pour.							
Please confirm that these dimensions are acceptable so that the conduit can be laid out correctly.							
SHIMM000-0204.2	Locations of Electrical Outlets, Equipment, and Fixtures.	Closed	08/23/2013	09/03/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please find attached the revised layout for Electrical Room B2221. Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.							
SHIMM000-0204.4	BGP - Locations of electrical Outlets, Equipment and Fixtures	Accepted	09/12/2013	09/22/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per the RFI response, please find attached the revised layout for the Electrical Room B2221. This revised layout shows the dimensions of the conduit locations in respect to the interior walls. Additionally, dimensions showing the room location in respect to the grid lines are shown. please advise if it is acceptable.							
SHIMM000-0233.1	BGP Bracing Removal Sequence - Area 5-13	Open	07/30/2013	08/09/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 603 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>The latest Webcor's weekly update schedule received by SCCI (Data date 06.17.2013), shows that:</p> <p>- Bracing Removal- Level D" (BGSOX-1120) is the driving predecessor to "Wall Waterproofing} st lift" (BGSOX-4000)- in each area.</p> <p>- Bracing Removal- Level C" (BGSOX-4100) is the predecessor to "Wall Waterproofing- 2nd lift" (BGSOX-4110)- in each area</p> <p>- Bracing Removal- Level B" (BGSOX-6000) is the predecessor to "Wall Waterproofing- 3rd lift" (BGSOX-6010) in each area</p> <p>Based on the current schedule logic, the bracing will need to be modified to allow the removal of walers and struts in each area, separately and independently from each other. E.g: Any walers spanning two areas will need to be cut during removal of bracing so SCCI can proceed with the waterproofing install in that area, without having to wait for the adjacent area. This is applicable to Bracing Removal level B, C and D. As requested in RFI#233 response, please find attached bracings that SCCI assumes are going to be removed/ cut prior to SCCI's specific wall pour.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						
SHIMM000-0242.1	BGP - 100% CD Phase 1 Documenation	Accepted	08/22/2013	09/01/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The responses to SCCI's s RFI#0242/ WOJV RFI T-0633 refers to "100% CD Phase 1 Documentation" for the drawings that have not been issued in ASI#104 SCCI does not have access to and has not received the following drawings that are needed to finalize the pricing of ASI#104: A 1-2224-2231 A 1-2844-2846, 2848-2851 Please provide 1 00% CD Phase 1 Docs for the pages listed above							



SHIMM000-0255	BGP - Plumbing Scope Clarification ASI 104	Closed	07/26/2013	07/27/2013	07/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP		Jackson Tukuafu		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu	
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jackson Tukuafu					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference: Drawing P1-6001, Spec Section 22 13 01				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As per the attached drawing:			
See attached marked up Rev 0 and Rev 1 Drawings P 1-6001. PI-6001 Rev 1 is a revision per AST 104. Rev 1 of the noted drawing does not have any "for reference only" notations in the details.				1. Detail 1, 2 and 5 of drawing sheet P1-6001 (ASI #104) depict typical standpipe details. These details are not applicable to the TG06 package. 2. Detail 4/P1-6001 (ASI #104) depicts a change in the floor clean-out cover. This detail is applicable to the TG06 package where the floor drains are either at the concourse and mat slab level and the specific detail is called-out for "floor cleanout detail." 3. Detail 6/P1-6001 is applicable if below the concourse slab. Typ. 4. Detail 11 and 12 of sheet P1-6001 show sump pump details titled "Detail At Mech Pump Room B2230 and B2442." The applicable scope to TG06 includes embedded pipe in the mat slab or added pony wall, pony wall and pit opening.			
Is the intent of the Designers to significantly change the scope of TG06 work?							
Please clarify the scope of work, i.e. applicable and non applicable details of the CD P1-6001 for the TG06 package.				WOJV welcomes a page-turner with SCCI for any			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0261	ASI#104- TG06's Scope Clarification	Closed	07/26/2013	08/05/2013	07/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon	To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	There are multiple changes between the Issued for Construction (IFC) drawings to the newly issued ASI #104 drawings. This RFI requests for information regarding TG06's scope of work that may or may not be added through the issuance of ASI #104 due to removed notations "For Reference Only " or similar. Please provide clarifications of TG06's Scope per ASI #104 in the following drawings (also attached):		Per the attached drawing:				
S1-7005, S1-7101, S1-7111, S1-7600, S1-7602, S1-7660, S1-9000, S1-9050 and S1-9051.		1. Per drawing S1-7005 (ASI #104), exclude all steel/stair components, all other details are applicable. Show credits for wall removal etc. accordingly in pricing review of ASI #014. 2. Per drawing S1-7101 (ASI #104), the only applicable detail is 1/S1-7101. All othe detail are shown to be on the ground level, second level and bus deck level. Please note, there will be no poured in place walls on the concourse level in the TG06 package; however, SCCI will provide the applicable dowels to accomodate the tie-in. 3. Per drawing S1-7111, the details in question are on the ground, second and bus deck level. Not applicable 4. Per drawing S1-7600, the details in questions are metal stair related. Not applicable. 5. Per drawing S1-7602, see item #4. Details are Slab On Metal Deck. 6. Per drawing S1-7660, all details in question are applicable to TGO6 trade package. 7. Per drawing S1-9000, the only applicable scope to TG06 package will be dowels for CMU tie-in 8. Per drawing S1-9050, see note 7. 9. Per drawing S1-9051, the detai lin question is applicable only if this detail occurs at the concourse slab and below.					
SHIMM000-0263	BGP - Revised Attached Method of Nelson Studs to the Elevator Pit Embedded An	Closed	07/24/2013	08/03/2013	08/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon	To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 606 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0264	REQUEST: Reference: Spec Section 05 50 10 While attaching the 3/4" diameter by 8" Nelson Studs to the 8" X 4" X 1/2" angle it was determined the studs were not fusing to the base metal (angle). To maintain the procurement schedule of this fabrication needed for the Zone 1 - Area 03 Mat Slab placement, our fabricator (Gerlinger Steel) used the fillet weld method performed under the attached Welding Procedure Specifications (WPS) to attach studs to the angle(s). The welding was witnessed by the dispatched (IR #001459) ISI Shop CWI. Attached for the readers informationm and use are the shop fabrication drawing, the employed WPS, and photographs of the finished fabrication. Is the alternate means of attaching the Nelson Studs to the angle, using the fillet weld method in lieu of the fusing method, acceptable?	SUGGESTION:	Closed	07/24/2013	08/03/2013	08/07/2013	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	ANSWER: Reference: Spec Section 05 50 10 The angled stud in the interior of the angle requires a different type of ferrule (heel) to address the angled condition. The alternate means used to attach Nelson studs for angles in this RFI is acceptable provided that at least 2 studs per angle have been verified by bend test per specification section 03 20 00 2.2.C.2, which references AWS D1.1-2010 (Paragraph 7.8 for testing requirements).	ANSWER:					
SHIMM000-0264	REQUEST: Reference: Drawing S1-3001, Spec Section 03 30 20 A few potential conflicts exist between the typical shear wall vertical dowels and the 36" OD shoring Pipe Struts in Area 1. See attachment for locations of conflict. Based on Detail A shown in S1-3260, the typical shear wall verts will be lap spliced. Per the schedule in Detail 1-S1-3001, the #9 vertical shear wall reinforcement requires a 63" lap splice, which places the top of dowel at elevation -30'-5". The centerline of Level D diagonal bracing atop Area 1 is shown to be at EL -29'-0" and the bottom of the 36" OD pipe strut at level D is at EL -30'-6". The pipe strut will potentially encroach on the shear wall	SUGGESTION:	Closed	07/24/2013	08/03/2013	08/07/2013	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	ANSWER: Reference: Drawing S1-3001, Spec Section 03 30 20 The contractor proposed lap splice length is acceptable only at locations where the conflict exists.	ANSWER:					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 607 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	dowels since the vertical spacing is #9 at 10" OC.						
	Please confirm that a 60" lap splice is acceptable at locations where conflicts exist, if not please provide soultions.						
SHIMM000-0265	BGP Embedded Conduits in Mat Slab for the Light Column	Closed	07/24/2013	08/03/2013	08/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Please reference attached drawing E1-2205 and E1-4105.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per the attached lighting plan drawings, there are no electrical conduits shown to be embedded exclusively for the Light Column on drawing S1-6005.				No, there are no embedded conduits required in lower concourse slab or mat slab.			
Please confirm that there are no conduits required for the light column in both the concourse slab and mat slab or provide the location, route and size of the conduit at each level.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0266	BGP - Temporary Perimeter Lighting	Open	07/24/2013	08/03/2013	07/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per the TG06.0 pre bid Q&A TG06.0-0036 response dated 6/11/12 (attached), the temporary perimeter lighting drawings are to be issued to the trade subcontractor prior to the start of the work. When is this work scheduled to begin? Are the drawings and specifications for the perimeter lighting available? Please provide the required documents or clarify when they will be provided.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> SCCI to produce and provide all information including, but not limited to, product data and layout drawings necessary for installing and maintaining temporary lighting along the perimeter of the site at 50'-0" O.C. and installed in such a manner that it does not interfere with the structure and at all walkways utilized by the workers and the public, as required to provide code-minimum lighting at egress paths, as well as sufficient foot candle lighting levels to safely perform the work at all times. SCCI is responsible for maintaining the temporary lighting and related facilities until completion of the work.			
<hr/>							
SHIMM000-0267	BGP - Mat Slab Conduits	Closed	07/24/2013	08/03/2013	08/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A1-9204, E1-6001 The electrical conduit details on sheet A1-9204/Detail 1 and Detail 5 on E1-6001 regarding the electrical conduits on the columns are in conflict. Detail 1 on A1 -9204 indicates an embedded junction box in the long portions of the columns at Line D.8 above the Train Platform Level. Detail 5 on E1- 6001 indicates all conduits are to be stubbed up 12" at the face of the column. This Detail 5 shows all conduits (shown dashed) above the 12" stub up in the Mat Slab are to be installed in future phases outside of the TG06.0 contract. The columns are part of the TG06.0 scope. 1. Please clarify if these junction boxes and conduit are to be embedded in the columns or stubbed up through the slab at the face of each column at all four (4) locations.. 2. If the conduits and boxes are to be embedded in the columns please provide a revised embedded conduit detail indicating conduits as part of TG06 Below Grade Scope.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The embedded junction box details on A1-9204 applies only to the flat surfaces (north and south sides) of the columns along GL D.8 of Platform 2 (refer to note on details 1 & 2 on A1-9204) and shall have embedded boxes and conduits. Locate the conduit and boxes such that the device faceplates will be finished flush to the finished column cladding. The east and west sides of the columns indicated on the note shall have surface mounted junction boxes and conduits (refer to detail 1 on A1-9204). For all other columns in the BGP, the junction boxes and conduits are typically surface mounted (refer to detail 5 of E1-6001).			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 609 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0268	BGP - Column and Reshoring Struts Conflict	Closed	07/26/2013	08/05/2013	09/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Drawings The highlighted areas on the attached re-shoring drawings show re-shoring struts against some of the oval shaped columns. In order to construct the concrete columns SCCI will need at least 30" of clearance between the column face and the struts. Please confirm that the reshoring struts will be moved enough to provide needed clearance.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Further review and coordination of specific struts that are in conflict or in close proximity to formwork is required. Please submit as-built of all locations that are in concern.			

SHIMM000-0269	BGP - 1st Street 48" Bridge Pile Asbuilts	Open	07/25/2013	08/04/2013	07/31/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing S1-3003 48" temporary bridge piles (00 1 through 010 in the drawing attached) under the 1st Street temporary bridge exceed the 48" diameter required per Detail 6 on Plan Sheet S 1-3003. The varying diameter of each temporary bridge pile is the result of the pile being a 48" CIDH concrete pile instead of a steel pile like the rest of the slab penetrations. As typical of a CIDH pile, the surface profile varies much greater than the 1 /2" gap tolerance required per Detail 6 on S 1-3003. Attached is an as built of the 48" piles with their varying diameters. In consequence the penetration sleeves will not fit the current conditions of the 48" piles. Please advise how to proceed.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> BBI's temporary bridge detail drawing SH-5101, depicts the CIDH pile diameter at 48". Our review of the the Caltrans specification on CIDH piles indicate no reference to tolerances; therefore, we cannot ascertain any diameter larger than 48". SCCI to proceed as shown on the BBI and contract drawings with the CIDH pile at 48" in diameter. Please note, SCCI has ten (10) sleeves fabricated and onsite. The remaining sleeves are in fabrication at this time.			

SHIMM000-0270	BGP - Clear Cover to Mat Reinforcing at CDSM Pile Encroachment	Closed	07/30/2013	08/09/2013	08/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing S1-3201, Spec Section 03 30 20		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Encroachment into the 6" clear dimension is			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 610 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Per Section 1 on S1-3201, the mat slab reinforcing is shown with 6" of clear cover from the outside face of the concrete wall. When the outside face wall and mat foundation step in and out due to CDSM encroachment, the 6" clear dimension shown on 1/S1-3201 will be encroached upon.</p> <p>Please confirm this is acceptable. This would apply in any area where the wall thickness is being reduced due to encroaching CDSM Pile.</p>						
SHIMM000-0272	bgp - Pin Pile Encroachment	Accepted	08/23/2013	09/02/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu		Answered By:		
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: See attached photo.							
Pin pile No. 6 is encroaching into the future RCW. This RCW is not part of TG06 package, but the form savers fo rfuture walls are. With the pin pile in the way SCCI will not be able to install form savers in the area of encroachment.							
Please advise.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
SHIMM000-0274	BGP - Rebracing Conflict RKB 15	Open	08/15/2013	08/25/2013	08/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: PSK-2022, Spec Section 22 13 01				Reference: Attached RFI# PBA-172			
Please see attached.				Please see the internal RFI response from PB&A that allows the rakers to move as noted in the RFI.			
After performed layout of the drainage system in the mechanical room SCCI has discovered that the reshoring raker base plate ofRKB#15 lands over the floor cleanout. Top of floor cleanout is supposed to be set to FFE (EL - 35.42) which is 3" above the top of mat slab. Floor cleanout at this location will be protruding into the raker's base plate.							
Please advise on how to proceed on this matter.							
SHIMM000-0275	BGP - Rebracing Conflict RKB 16	Open	08/15/2013	08/25/2013	08/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: PSK-2022, Spec Section 22 13 01				Reference: RFI# PBA-172			
Please see attached.				Please see the internal RFI response from PB&A that allows the raker to move as noted in the RFI.			
After performed layout of the drainage system in the mechanical room SCCI has discovered that the reshoring raker base plate ofRKB#16 lands over the floor drain. Top of floor drain is supposed to be set to FFE (EL -35.42) which is 3" above the top of mat slab. Floor cleanout at this location will be protruding into the raker's base plate.							
Please advise on how to proceed on this matter.							
SHIMM000-0279	Placing Protection Slab on Sloped Surfaces of Pits	Open	08/21/2013	08/21/2013	08/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please reference attached sketch SK-PSOOI.				The proposed option is unacceptable. Without any protection on the sloped surfaces of the pits, iron			



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>Due to quality and constructability concerns of placing a 4" thick slab on the 45-degree plane of the pits, installed on waterproofing membrane, SCCI is proposing the option to pour the sloped plane of the pits with the mat slab. In order to provide protection from pit reinforcing steel, SCCI will place the protection slab in the bottom of the pit, 12" up the sloped plane on all sides, and the horizontal placement will stop at the top edge of the pit.</p> <p>Per the Grace waterproofing requirement that the membrane not be left exposed for more than 56 days after installation, SCCI will ensure that the membrane never exceeds the 56-day exposure limit.</p> <p>Please confirm this option is acceptable?</p>						
SHIMM000-0282	Temporary Power from Skids #3 and #4	Open	08/14/2013	08/24/2013	08/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>SCCI and Bass had planned to use Temporary Power "skids #3 & #4 for temporary power needs. Currently Skids #3 & #4 are not available and have been removed and are unavailable. Will these skids be up and running in time to use for temporary power? If not, where should SCCI and Bass route temporary power from? Serving the projects temporary power needs from Skids #1 and #2 is not feasible.</p>		<p>To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Spencer Sayles</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: <input type="checkbox"/> Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Please refer to Drawing SL-001 of Exhibit A.</p> <p>Temporary power skids 3 & 4 are not represented in any of trade group package TG06 contract documents. As indicated in trade group package TG06 Exhibit A, SCCI is required to tie into the "nearest" power source; furthermore, the Site Logistics Plan drawing SL-001 shows the location of three (3) skids (Skid 1, 2 and 5) to tie into. Servicing the projects temporary power needs is a means and methods by SCCI. Overcoming distance and circuitry limitations, include but not limited to, increasing the load capacity to each zone and/or using available Skid 5.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 613 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0283	BGP - Moment and Spandrel Beams 180 Degree Hooks Versus 135 Degree Hooks	Accepted	08/26/2013	09/06/2013	08/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached Gerdau's RFI#068, S1-3600, S1-3410 At the contractor's option, Gerdau is requesting to change the 135 degree hooks on the Moment Frame and the Sprandrel Beam sstirrups to 180 degree hooks. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractors proposal to replace the 135 degree hooks with 180 degree hooks on the Lower Concourse Moment Frame Beam and Spandrel Beam Perimeter Stirrups is acceptable.			
SHIMM000-0284	REBAR - Configuration at Moment Beam	Closed	08/13/2013	08/23/2013	08/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached Gerdau's RFI #066 Withing all of the Moment Frame Beam Sections found in the structural drawings, the T9 ties are depicted alternating. Gerdau is proposing to install the T9 ties within the Moment Frame Beams with all the 90 degree hoods at the bottom rather than alternating. During the installation of the mock up, it was evident that the process of hooking the 135 degree hook around the bars at the bottom of the beam was problem due to the limited clearance (1.5") and the depth of the 135 hook (4.5"). By eliminating the alternating ends and only installing the 90 degree hook end down, it would resolve this situation. Please confirm that this configuration is acceptable withing the Moment Frame Beams.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per meeting between TT, WOJV and SCCI on 08/08/2013, TT rejected the non-alternating configuration per code.			
SHIMM000-0287	BGP - North Shear Wall Concrete Mix	Accepted	08/21/2013	08/31/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached drawing regarding the North shear wall. Due to the monolithic pours at the intersection of the shear wall, foundation wall and mat slab chamfer, there will be		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 614 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0290	BGP - Couplers for Future Construction	Accepted	08/19/2013	08/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
differentiating concrete mix uses. The attached drawing assigns the portions of this intersection with its corresponding concrete mix.							
Please verify the use of these concrete mixes at this location as acceptable.							
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference drawings: S1-3001, S1-3206							
See attached photo of the form savers that are going to be used for the couplers for future construction as depicted on Detail 4 of S1-3206, and Detail 6 of S1-3001. SCCI believes that Detail 6 on S1-3001 is not applicable due to the following: 1. As shown on the attached photo, epoxy coated form savers have tin cap incorporated into coupler's body. This tin cap will protect the rebar until the future construction. 2. Whatever tar intended to be used with form savers is not compatible with the Grace waterproofing. 3. Detail 6 on S1-3001 is a detail for the slabs, where future walls are to be constructed.							
SCCI proposes to install the couplers for future construction as shown on Det. 4 S1-3206 with form savers set against the waterproofing membrane. Care shall be taken to ensure that waterproofing is not damaged.							
Is this acceptable?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 615 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0291	BGP - FF&FL Values for Mat Slab and Concourse Slab	Accepted	08/23/2013	09/03/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Don Muns		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1. Please confirm the contract documetns (TG06.0) do not specify a FF value for the Mat Slab.							
2. Also, please reference ACI 302.1R and contract specification 033020.3.6.B. ACI 302.1R does not provide any recommendations on F-numbers for broomed surfaces. Furthermore, table 8.15.3.b of ACI 302.1R (page 46) demonstrates to achieve FF value of 20 for a slab on grade, it must be a smooth, floated surface.							
Please clarify if the designer intends to have a rough broom/rake finish, or intends to have the concourse slab finished to a value of 20.							
3. Please confirm the concrete finish within the train box							
SHIMM000-0292.1	Cast-In-Place Concrete - FF & FL Values for Concourse Slab	Closed	10/02/2013	10/12/2013	02/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Ted Williams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
This RFI is being submitted in resposne to RFI response T-0691. Please refernce TG0600 contract specificaiton section 033020.3.6.B. Section 3.6.B specifies a FF value of 20 for the surface of the lower concourse slab.		Refer to T-0777					
Table 8.15.3b of ACI 302.1R (page 46) statres that to achieve a surface with an FF value of 20, it must be a smooth floated surface. ACI 302.1R does not provide any recommendations of "F" numbers for broomed surfaces.							
Please clarifiy if th edesigner intends to have a rough broom/rake finish, or intends to have the concourse slab finished to a FF value of 20.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 616 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0293	BGP - ASI-104 Electrical Clarifications	Closed	08/22/2013	09/01/2013	08/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Note B on the SKE-01-3201, SKE-01-3202, & SKE-02-3201(from RFI T-0633 response) indicate that all electrical equipment shown in halftone is to be included in the later phase 2 construction (outside of TG06.0 scope). With that, there is extensive electrical equipment (switch gear, panels, etc) that are shown in full tone on the drawings. Please clarify whether or not this electrical equipment is to be furnished and installed under the TG06.0 scope of work. Additionally, if it is required, please provide the specifications pertinent to the required equipment.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> All termination points, conduits and boxes shall be clearly identified and labeled for future connections to be performed by other trade subcontractors for the electrical equipment shown. All Electrical equipment shown in the attached sketches are excluded from trade package group TG06.0 and will be included in the phase 2 construction as noted..			
SHIMM000-0294	BGP - Rebar Configuration at Moment Beam with Incorporation of S-3 vs T-9 Ties	Accepted	08/23/2013	09/03/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please find attached Gerdau's RFI#70. At the contractor's option, Gerdau would like to propose utilizing S-3 stirrups with only one T-9 tie (see attached sketch) for the vertical ties in the moment frame beam. This will be installed in lieu of installation all T-9 ties. This is done to avoid the constructability issues associated with alternating the hooks under the 1.5" of clear cover beneath the bottom beam bars. Please confirm that the proposed reinforcing configuration is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
SHIMM000-0296	BGP - Drain Line and Micro Pile Conflict at K.5 5.5	Accepted	08/22/2013	08/30/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached photo and CD PI-2030. After performed layout of the drainage line system around		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 617 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0297	GL K5 SCCI has discovered that a row of micro piles is in conflict with the 4" cast iron pipe drain line. SCCI suggest shifting the drain line run to clear the micro piles.						
	Is this acceptable?						
	BGP - Drain Line conflict with reinforcement at GL K3	Accepted	08/22/2013	08/30/2013			Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic	To: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: See attached photos and CD P 1-2030.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
	Tails of the bottom rebar mat at the drainage pit are interfering with the construction of drainage lines and catch basin. SCCI proposes following: 1. Shift the catch basin to where it clears the reinforcement tails. 2. Cut the rebar tails to allow installation of the drainage lines and the catch basin.						
	Please advise.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0298	Additional Rebar Conflict for Plumbing Trim at GL2/D.4	Accepted	08/23/2013	09/03/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Due to the density or the typical N-S top mat bars (#10) and additional bars (#11) near the elevator pit at Gridlines 2 and D.4, the additional trim rebar per 1/S1-3501 for interrupting the bars over the plumbing opening cannot be installed to the East of the plumbing opening within 3" of the opening. The alternative solution would be to install the additional steel in a new layer below the top mat; however, due to proximity of the piping to the steel the bars cannot be placed below the top mat. Gerdau proposes the folloing options:</p> <p>A. Omit the additional trim bars to the East of the trimmed opening.</p> <p>B. Relocate the additional trim bars approximately 3'-0" East of the opening where the rebar spacing would allow for additional steel.</p> <p>Please advise if proposed options are acceptable. (see attached SKS-1)</p>							
<hr/>							
SHIMM000-0299	BGP - Additional Rebar Conflict for Floor Sink Trim GL B.7/2.7	Accepted	08/23/2013	09/02/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>See attached Gerdau's RFI#72</p> <p>Due to the density of the typical N-S top mat bars (#10), additional N-S top mat bars (#11) and pin pile trim steel (#11 with lap splices directly over floor sink) near the floor sink at Gridlines 2.7 and B.7, the additional trim rebar per 1/S1-3501 for interrupting the bars over the plumbing opening cannot be installed on either side of the plumbing opening. The alternative solution would be to install the additional steel in a new layer below the top mat; however, due to the proximity of the plumbing piping to the steel the additional bars cannot be placed below the top mat. Also, the additional bar to the East of the opening would conflict with the pin pile. Gerdau proposes to cut top mat bars to allow for the floor sink installation and omit the additional trim bars.</p>							
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 619 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please advise if the proposed solution is acceptable.							
SHIMM000-0300	BGP - Glass Guard Rail Attachment by Others Clarification	Open	09/12/2013	09/26/2013	09/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Refer to drawing S1-3410. Please reference attached detail 7, S1-3410. Please confirm SCCI is to provide 3/8x7xcontinuous plate only, and no tthe tabs shown at 5'-0" OC.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Tabs will be included in the scope for that "future" contractor, when that connection of the glass guardrail is finalized in Phase 2 per coordination with the preconstruction team.			
SHIMM000-0301	BGP - Vehicle/Bike Beam End Suppoert Embed	Accepted	08/27/2013	09/09/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please reference attached drawing S1-3411 . Detail I calls for a W'x4"x 18" embed plate at the toe of the corbel. 1D/S1-3411 details this embed and shows it as 24" rather than 18". Please clarify the correct dimensions for this embed.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 621 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Some of the drainage lines and fixtures are designed to be constructed in close proximity of the concrete columns, similarly S1-3005 depicts typical mat shear reinforcement schedule and details. Some of these shear reinforcement bars will be interfering with the drainage lines and fixtures. SCCI suggest to displace these shear reinforcement bars where conflicts occur. Displacement would occur laterally, in 8" increments, governed by the grid of the mat slab main reinforcement bars.</p> <p>Please advise.</p>							
SHIMM000-0305	BGP - Haunch Reinforcement at Double Waler Condition	Closed	08/29/2013	09/08/2013	09/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. John Berggren		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Gerdau RFI No. 075 dated August 29th, 2013						The revised haunch reinforcement clear cover as described in the RFI per field coordination is confirmed.	
This RFI is to confirm the resolution as proposed in the field. At the double shoring waler condition, where the waler web is lower than that of a single waler, the tail of the #10@8" (10C262 on BM-3t) haunch reinforcement interferes with the web of the shoring waler. The condition was observed at Grid 2/ A and will likely repeat at other double waler locations. The resolution to the condition shall be to adjust the position, where required, so that the interfering tail clears the double waler web. As a result the 1-1/2" clear cover will deviate up to 4-112" of clear cover. The plan location of the tail shall remain as close as possible per the placement drawings. See the attached sketch for further details. The 1-1/2" clear spacing shall remain at locations unaffected by the reduced clearance of the double-waler. For pieces not yet fabricated and delivered, Gerdau has submitted in [Gerdau] RFI #074 {SCCI #303} a proposed solution to conform to the 1-1/2" clear cover.							
Is this confirming RFI accurate and acceptable?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 622 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0307	BGP - Jitter Bug Finish on Mat Slab Surface	Accepted	09/03/2013	09/13/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Spec Section 033020.3.6.B.I.c. See attached photos for a visual reference. Please reference TG06.0, BGP contract specifications 033020.3.6.B.I.c. SCCI is proposing to finish the top surface of the Mat foundation Slab, as a "Jitter Bug" finish. All other finishing requirements will remain the same. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
SHIMM000-0308	BGP - Haunch Reinforcement Atlternative Detail	Accepted	08/30/2013	09/16/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: S1 -3201 Reference Spec: 03 20 00 Attached Gerdau Sketch: SKS-76.1, SKS-76.2, SKS-76.3 A portion of the #10 @ 8" haunch bars cannot be installed as fabricated due to conflicts with overhead obstructions (shoring walers and struts) and the dewatering well sleeves. Per discussions with Sean McNeil where bars cannot be installed due to the obstructions, a modified #1 0 haunch bar with an HRC 555 head can be installed in place of the typical haunch bar. The attached sketches (SKS-76.1 and SKS-76.2) depict the magnitude of the obstructions at the dewatering wells in Area 3. Please confirm if this is acceptable. Additionally, please provide the required embedment length for the headed tail of the modified haunch bar.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
SHIMM000-0308.1	BGP - Haunch Reinforcement Alternative Detail	Accepted	09/03/2013	09/13/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Jackson Tukuafu	To: Shimmick Construction Comp Ben Gordon	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	See attached Gerdau's RFI #79.						
	The RFI Response to RFI T -0702 stated that the 180 degree hook chamfer bars are acceptable where the bars conflict with the double shoring walers. The intent of the RFI was to request the use of the 180- degree hook for the chamfer bars throughout the structure regardless of whether or not the bars were below a double or single walers.						
	Please confirm that this is acceptable.						
SHIMM000-0309	BGP - Mat Slab Added Steel Interference	Accepted	08/31/2013	09/16/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Drawing S1-3003 and Spec Section 03 20 00 See attached Gerdau Sketch SK-77, BM-3b, BM-3t							
Due to the location of select trestle and pin piles, the #9@16" (bottom mat) and #11@16" (top mat) added North-South layer reinforcement cannot be installed at the desired spacing. The proposed solution is to cut the added #9 or #11 bars, where interrupted by a pile, and add a hook of equal size or greater (#11 hook max) with a lap splice similar to the hooks used for the trestle and pin pile trim steel.							
Please confirm if this is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 624 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0310	BGP - Area 3- Partition Wall Pier Rebar Conflict With Plumbing Near GL3/C.3	Closed	09/03/2013	09/13/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached Gerdau's RFI #078.							
Near Gridlines 3/C.3, there is a conflict between the partition wall pier dowels and the installed 6" plumbing pipe (8" with insulation). The wall pier currently overlaps with the plumbing pipe by approximately 6". Gerdau proposes to move the wall pier to the East, or West to allow the dowels to clear the pipe.							
Please provide the acceptable direction (East or West) to shift the wall pier.							
Please note that there are conduits stub up on the East side that would need to be moved, should the opening is shifted towards the East.							
<hr/>							
SHIMM000-0311	BGP - Couplers for Future Walls	Accepted	09/03/2013	09/13/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Det. 6 on S1-3001							
See attached photo of the form savers that are going to be used as couplers for future walls.							
<hr/>							
SHIMM000-0312	NW Corner Wall intersection Horizontal and Haunch - Area 3	Closed	09/04/2013	09/14/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Drawing: 3/S 1-3001							
Reference Spec: 03 20 00							
Per field coordination with the on-site structural engineer the following conditions are to be confirmed as acceptable:							
1. In the Northwest comer of Area 3, comer bars matching							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 625 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the size, spacing and lap splices of typical horizontal reinforcing are installed in-lieu of bent typical horizontal bars. See Bar A in sketch FC-1</p> <p>2. In-lieu of hooked haunch horizontal bars, straight bars of the same size have been installed with the required embedment. See Bar B in sketch FC-1.</p> <p>3. At the intersection of the North and West haunch bars, the haunch bars along the North (Bar D) wall have been trimmed at the approximate intersection with the West (Bar C) haunch bars. Reference sketch FC-2. The observed condition is acceptable, but at future locations within the intersection of two haunches the detail for Bar E will be used unless Bar D already has 42" of embedment.</p>						
SHIMM000-0313	BGP - Haunch Reinforcing Intersection with Dewatering Wells	Closed	09/04/2013	09/04/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference drawing: 1/S1-3201 Reference spec: 03 20 00							
Per field coordination with the on-site structural engineer the following conditions are to be confirmed as acceptable:							
1. In Area 3 along Gridline A, the haunch bars have been trimmed at the approximate intersections with the bottom mat. See sketch FC-3							
2. In Area 3 along Gridline 1, (2) haunch bars have been trimmed at the approximate intersection with the top mat with no embedment. See sketch FC-4.							
At future locations where dewatering wells interrupt haunch bars, use detail for bar E in sketches FC-3 or FC-4 if the haunch bars do not have 42" of embedment into the mat slab.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>odd number of bars interrupted (typical bars and add bars) the number of bars added on either side of the opening can be (number of interrupted bars +1)/2.</p> <p>2. Detail 1 on Sheet S1-3501, which applies to sinks, can be relaxed in terms of additional bars. For an even number of bars interrupted (typical bars and add bars) the number of bars added on either side of the opening can be (number of interrupted bars)/2. For an odd number of bars interrupted (typical bars and add bars) the number of bars added on either side of the opening can be (number of interrupted bars +1)/2. The minimum requirement of 2 bars on either side of the opening need not apply.</p> <p>3. The number of bars and maintenance of clear spacing will take precedence over 8" or 4" module spacing as to minimize the number of potential bar interruptions (and minimize resulting add bars). Any bar may be displaced to avoid conflict. The maximum center-to-center spacing of any two adjacent bars may be as large as 16". Clear spacing of 1 bar diameter shall be maintained between bars where bar relocation necessarily reduces spacing in the vicinity of relocation. Where bar relocation affects a lap splice, noncontact lap splices will be allowed up to 6" for #10 and #11 bars. This remedy shall apply in particular when seeking to avoid interruptions at small penetrations such as risers, vents, sinks and conduits.</p> <p>4. Clear spacing of 1db minimum shall be maintained in all mat reinforcing except for contact lap splices.</p> <p>5. Measures to reduce congestion at other locations such as catch basins, sump pits, elevator pits, shoring bracing and bridge piers will be considered on a case-by-case basis during field coordination with Thornton Tomasetti's field representative.</p>						
SHIMM000-0318	BGP - Mat Slab CJ Layout Areas 2/4, 6	Accepted	09/10/2013	09/20/2013	09/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference the attached CJ layout drawing, CJ-04, regarding the proposed CJ layout for Areas 2/4 and Area 6. These changes are to eliminate conflict with diagonal pit			The requested approval must be submitted via submittal process. Please re-send using the next submittal package designated for this shop drawing:				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 628 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	rebar as well as micro piles. Please verify that these changes are acceptable.						
SHIMM000-0320	BGP - Sump Pump Conduit Terminations Between Grid Lines 1 & 12	Open	09/12/2013	09/22/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Detail 7 on plan sheet E1-6001, sump pump conduits for the below grade package are to be terminated 12" above the mat slab directly adjacent to the future train platform wall. With the train platform wall beginning at grid line 12 and moving east, where are the conduit terminations for the sumps to be installed west of grid line 12 where there is not a train platform? Is there a set dimension the conduit should be set away from the sump when the train platform is not present? Please advise. Please note that for the two sumps that have been poured							
in Area 3, the conduits were placed roughly 9' to the north of each sump opening to avoid the future train tracks. There are 8 total sumps west of grid line 12 with 6 of them left to be placed.							

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	associated with the corbel are not required to penetrate the mat slab. This RFI confirms that the column and corbel ties, as placed, are acceptable based on the observation by the TT field engineer.			are indicated for both the column and the corbel. Only the column ties are required to penetrate the mat at the designated spacing for a distance of at least 12¿ below the lowest top mat elevation. The ties associated with the vertical corbel are not.			
				As the corbel ties are not required below the mat, the corbel ties observed in the field are necessarily confirmed as acceptable.			
				The column ties, which are required to penetrate the mat, shall be placed per the contract drawings. This RFI response does NOT confirm the placement or spacing of the column ties observed in the field.			
SHIMM000-0324	BGP - Area 1- Confirming RFI- Knock Out Corbel and Haunch at SW Corner	Closed	09/17/2013	09/27/2013	09/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Per field coordination with TT field engineer, please confirm it is acceptable to omit the pilaster ties of Detail 2/S1-			George Metzger				
3204 within the body of the haunch provided that:			9/17/2013				
¿ The pilaster West corner bar (Bar A in attached photo) is tied with 135 hooks in both directions			RESPONSE:				
¿ Ties shall be #4 bars spaced at 4" o.c.			The pilaster detailing as described in the RFI is acceptable within the body of the haunch.				
¿ The tie perpendicular to the South wall shall be developed a minimum of 14" into the South wall beyond the haunch.							
¿ The tie parallel to the South wall shall be hooked around the pilaster East corner bar (Bar B in attached photo).							
¿ In lieu of two individual ties, it is also acceptable to combine the ties into a single shape with a 90 degree bend at Bar A.							
¿ The extent of the ties shall be from the top of the mat to the top of the haunch, after which Detail 2/S1-3204 will resume.							
¿ The horizontal haunch bars shall terminate with a							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 631 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>spliced matching hook.</p> <p>¿ The horizontal formsaver bars for the future train tunnel shall be #7 @ 6" O.C. on the inside and outside face of the 3'-0" foundation wall.</p>						
SHIMM000-0325	BGP - Area 6 CJ Layout Modifications	Open	09/18/2013	09/28/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic</p> <p>To: Webcor Construction LP</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>		Jackson Tukuafu	<p>Answered By:</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>See attached photos of the construction joint at mat slab area 6 South, near grid line 8.5, and CJ layout drawings.</p> <p>Due to congestion and access SCCI would like to shift the walls and concourse joints at this location 14.5" to the East. This adjustment does not affect any other structure's elements and complies with the CJ parameters outlined in the contract specifications.</p> <p>Is this acceptable?</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			
SHIMM000-0327	BGP - Area 6 East Bulkhead and Catch Basin Conflic	Open	09/20/2013	09/30/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic</p> <p>To: Webcor Construction LP</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>		Jackson Tukuafu	<p>Answered By:</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>See attachments.</p> <p>SCCI had to shift the construction joint between mat slab areas 6 and 7 Eastward due to the interference with the micropiles and trestle piles. This shif i nt ht eCJ puts the bulkhead against the catch basin near GL G11.</p> <p>in order to mitigate this conflict SCCI propose shifting the catch basin location 24" +/- (in East/Wet direction), on either side of the bulkhead/CJ.</p> <p>Is this acceptable.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 633 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0330	BGP - Haunch Bar Grade and Size Increase	Open	09/25/2013	10/05/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please confirm if it is acceptable to utilize Grade 75 #10 or #11 rebar in-lieu of the Grade 60 #10 rebar for the 3'-0" haunch.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
SHIMM000-0331	BGP - Geothermal Fields 11, 12, & 13 Layout in Zone 4	Closed	09/30/2013	10/10/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles		Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Attached are the two proposal drawings fo rthe geothermal layout in zone 4. Please confirm which layout is acceptable, Option #1 or Option #2.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
SHIMM000-0332	BGP - Mat Slab Construction Joint Between Area 2 and Area 4	Closed	10/01/2013	10/11/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles		Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference TG0600-30.2 Submittal.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
As discussed in the prior progress meetings, SCCI plans to combine slab pours S102 and S104 into one pour without bulkhead forms in between. Is this acceptable?							
SHIMM000-0333	Loc. of Electrical Equipment and boxes for Elec. Room B2560	Open	10/02/2013	10/02/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP		Spencer Sayles			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please find attached the revised layout for Electrical Room B2560 in Mat Slab Area 8. Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
SHIMM000-0333.1	Loc. of Electrical Equipment and Boxes for Elec. Room B2560	Open	10/28/2013	11/07/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<hr/>							
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon	To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference RFI #T-0782, drawing EI-2025, AI-2105, and Spec Section 26 05 34.							
RFI #T -0782 response proposes layout for electrical equipment and box layout in Electrical Room B2560 - Area I 0 in CAD format. See attached.							
Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.							
SHIMM000-0333.2	BGP - Loc. of Electrical Equipment and Boxes for Elec. Room B2560	Closed	11/25/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>		
From: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	To: Shimmick Construction Comp	Sylvia Hartanto	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The response to RFI 0782.1 stated that the walls in the attached CAD layout were not properly coordinated and included an AAI mark-up. Per 1/A1-9225 which was provided in the response to RFI T-0899, the walls between the mat slab and conccouse level are knee walls with a 4" lip. As shown and laid out, the knee wall lip will be 4 3/8" on three sides and 4 3/4" on the wall nearest to GL 19.9. This area will be included in the pour on 12/07/2013 and the form savers and conduits ha ve already been installed, therefore any layout changes will incur additional costs.							
Please confirm layout as shown is acceptable.							
<hr/>							
SHIMM000-0334	Locc. of Electrical Equipment and boxes for Elec. Room B2441	Open	10/02/2013	10/12/2013	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>		
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams	To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please find attached the revised layout for Electrical Room B2441 in Mat Slab Area 9. Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.							



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>	
SHIMM000-0334.1	Loc. of Electrical Equipment and Boxes for Elec. Room 82441	Open	10/28/2013	11/07/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:				
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference RFI #T-0781, drawings EI-2024 and AI-2104 and Spec Section 26 05 34.								
RFI #T-0781 response proposes layout for electrical equipment box layout in Electrical Room B2441 - Area 09 in CAD format. See attached.								
Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.								
SHIMM000-0334.2	BGP - Loc. of Electrical Equipment and Boxes for Elec. Room B2441	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Jackson Tukuafu	To: Shimmick Construction Comp	Sylvia Hartanto	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP			Jackson Tukuafu
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The response to RFI 0781.1 stated that the walls in the attached CAD layout were not properly coordinated and included an AAI mark-up. The AAI mark-up shows the incorrect gridline location for Electrical Room B2640. In addition, due to the fact that the walls at this location are knee walls with a 4" lip per 1/A1-9225 that was provided to SCCI in RFI T-0899 response received on 11/15; the walls submitted in RFI T-0781.1 are indeed coordinated correctly per the sketch dimensions (AAI sketch is based on platform drawing, not mat slab drawing room which SCCI based the layout from). This area will be included in the pour on 11/23/13 and the form savers and conduits have already been installed; there any layout changes incur additional costs.				The latest layout and/or revisions to the aforementioned Electrical Room was provided in RFI T-0899 on 11/15/2013. Please submit the as-built layout as coordinated with RFI T-0899. Submit layout via submittal shop drawing package as directed in RFI T-0781.1 for review.				
Please confirm layout as shown is acceptable.								
SHIMM000-0335	Location of Electrical Equipment and Boxes for Electrical Room B2460	Open	10/02/2013	10/12/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:				
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please find attached the revised layout for Electrical Room B2460 in Mat Slab Area 15. Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.								



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 636 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0335.1	Loc. of Electrical Equipment and Boxes for Elec. Room B2460	Open	10/28/2013	11/07/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference RFI #T-0780, drawings EI-2026 and AI-2104, and Spec Section 26 05 34.							
RFI #T -0780 response proposes layout for electrical equipment and box layout in Electrical Room B2460 - Area 08 in CAD format. See attached.							
Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.							
SHIMM000-0335.2	BGP - Loc. of Electrical Equipment and Boxes for Elec. Room B2460	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Jackson Tukuafu	To: Shimmick Construction Comp	Sylvia Hartanto	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The response to RFI 0780.1 stated that the walls in the attached CAD layout were not properly coordinated and included an AAI mark-up. The AAI mark-up shows the incorrect gridline location for Electrical Room B2640. In addition, due to the fact that the walls at this location are knee walls with a 4" lip per 1/A1-9225 that was provided to SCCI in RFI T-0899 response received on 11/15; the walls submitted in RFI T-0780.1 are indeed coordinated correctly per the sketch dimensions (AAI sketch is based on platform drawing, not mat slab drawing room which SCCI based the layout from). This area has already been poured with the form savers positioned per the CAD layout and as shown per ASI 107 Architectural drawings. Any changes in the layout of this area ill incur additional costs.		The layout provided in your RFI appears to be satisfactory; however, please submit the layout as coordinated with RFI T-0899. Submit layout via submittal shop drawing package as directed in RFI T-0780.1 for review and approval.					
Please confirm layout as shown is acceptable.							
SHIMM000-0336	Locations of Electrical Equipment and Boxes for Electrical Room B2461	Open	10/02/2013	10/12/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please find attached the revised layout for Electrical Room B2461 in Mat Slab Area 8. Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 637 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0336.1	Loc. of Electrical Equipment and Boxes for Elec_ Room B2461	Open	10/28/2013	11/07/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference RFI #T-0779, drawing EI-2024, and Spec Section 26 05 34.							
RFI #T - 0779 response proposes layout for electrical equipment and box layout in Electrical Room B2461 - Area 08 in CAD format. See attached.							
Please confirm layout is acceptable.							
SHIMM000-0336.2	BGP - Loc. of Electrical Equipment and Boxes for Elec. Room B2461	Closed	11/25/2013	11/25/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Jackson Tukuafu	To: Shimmick Construction Comp	Sylvia Hartanto	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The response to RFI 0779.1 stated that the walls in the attached CAD layout were not properly coordinated and included an AAI mark-up. The AAI mark-up shows the incorrect gridline location for Electrical Room B2640. In addition, due to the fact that the walls at this location are knee walls with a 4" lip per 1/A1-9225 that was provided to SCCI in RFI T-0899 response received on 11/15; the walls submitted in RFI T-0779.1 are indeed coordinated correctly per the sketch dimensions (AAI sketch is based on platform drawing, not mat slab drawing room which SCCI based the layout from). This area has already been poured with the form savers positioned per the CAD layout and as shown per ASI 107 Architectural drawings. Any changes in the layout of this area ill incur additional costs.							
Please confirm layout as shown is acceptable.							
SHIMM000-0337	Loc. of Electrical Equipment and boxes for Elec. Room B2640	Open	10/02/2013	10/12/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please find attached the revised layout for Electrical Room B2640 in Mat Slab Area 8. Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 638 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0337.2	BGP - Loc. of Electrical Equipment and Boxes for Elec. Room B2640	Closed	11/19/2013	12/05/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Shimmick Construction Comp Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The response to RFI 0778.1 stated that the walls in the attached CAD layout were not properly coordinated and included an AAI mark-up. The AAI mark-up shows the incorrect gridline location for Electrical Room B2640. In addition, due to the fact that the walls at this location are knee walls with a 4" lip per 1/A1-9225 that was provided to SCCI in RFI T-0899 response received on 11/15; the walls submitted in RFI T-0778.1 are indeed coordinated correctly per the sketch dimensions (AAI sketch is based on platform drawing, not mat slab drawing room which SCCI based the layout from).				The layout provided in your RFI appears to be satisfactory; however, please submit the layout as coordinated with RFI T-0899. Submit layout via submittal shop drawing package as directed in RFI T-0778.1			
Please confirm layout as shown is acceptable.							
<hr/>							
SHIMM000-0338	Clarification of Vehicle/Bike Beam End Supports	Open	10/02/2013	10/12/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon To: Webcor Construction LP Spencer Sayles			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
This RFI is being submitted in response to RFI resonse T-0453.1. Please confirm the Vehicle/Bike Ramp end support angles. Confirm the acute angle is 56 degrees and obtuse angle is 124 degrees.							
<hr/>							
SHIMM000-0339	Type C31/D22 Coupler Stagger	Open	10/03/2013	10/03/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon To: Webcor Construction LP Spencer Sayles			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Detail 1/S1-3301 requires the couplers for the adjacent column vertical bars be staggered with a vertical distance of 24" or more; however, due to the pattern and spacing of vertical bars for the type C31/D22 detailed on S1-3306, the condition cannot be met.							
Attached is a sketch of a proposed pattern for the vertical bars in the type C1/D22 columns, please confirm if it is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 641 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0343	Partition Wall Pilaster and Plumbing Conflict at GL C.5/4.8	Open	10/08/2013	10/18/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The reinforcement for the partition wall pilaster at approximately GL C.5/4.8 is in conflict with the drainage pipe below. Per not 3 on detail 0/S1-9050 the ties will be installed if possible. Two vertical bars in the pilaster will have to be bent in order to clear the pipe and two others will have to be slightly displaced to clear the pipe. See the attached sketch for details. Please confirm if this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
SHIMM000-0344	Haunch Hook Embedment	Open	10/08/2013	10/18/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per discussions with TT Field Engineer, the embedment lengths of the haunch hooks (see RFI T-716) provided average 35", but are no less than 29", as measured from their intersection with the wall interior reinforcing curtain. See sketch for more details. Please confirm if this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
SHIMM000-0345	Mat Slab S110 East Construction Joint Modifications	Open	10/08/2013	10/18/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attachments. After the layout of the East construction joint in mat slab area 10 SCCI discovered several constructability issues with the mat keyway and other project structure elements. SCCI proposed to install the CJ between area 10 and 11 as shown on the attached sketches. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 642 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0346	Follow-up and Field Adjustmetn to RFI T-0627.1 - Area 6 CDSM	Open	10/10/2013	10/20/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
During field layout of CDSM encoachment in Area 6, the follwoing extend of encoachment has been moved:							
-For encoachment at SP696, we have moved the East extent to SP694, this is due to SP695 encroaching during the buried bar layout. This accounts for 4' additional wall length with 33-5/8" due to CDSM encroachment.							
- For encoachment at SP104, the West extent of encoachment was moved to SP102. The rebar option 1 for SK1 with #11 rebar @ 6" OC will be used from SK102 to the West Extent of WR2 at Gridline 11							
Please confirm that this deviation from RFI T-0627.1 response is acceptable.							
SHIMM000-0347	Area 4 Wall Vertical Reinforcement Spacing	Open	10/10/2013	10/20/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: RFI T-0622 and RFI T-0622.1.							
The Area 4 wall vertical reinforcement has been installed different from the layout in RFI T-0622.1.							
Please confirm if the spacing of wall vertical reinforcement, as shown in the attached sketch, is acceptable. Note that the wall thicknesses remain the same as approved in RFI T-0622.1.							
SHIMM000-0348	Area 2 Foundation Wall Vertical Spacing	Open	10/10/2013	10/20/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
A 16ft portion of the Area 2 wall vertical reinforcement, between GL 6 and 7, has been installed at 6" OC instead of the required WR1 spacing (8" OC). Please confirm if the							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 643 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
spacing of wall vertical reinforcement, as shown in the attached sketch, is acceptable.							
SHIMM000-0349	Top Mat Reinforcement Placement Tolerance	Open	10/10/2013	10/20/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: ACI 117.							
Per discussions with TT Field Representative, please confirm if it is acceptable to increase the top mat slab reinforcement placement tolerance from +/-1/2" to +1/2" and -1". This would also change the concrete cover tolerance from -1/2" to +/-1/2".							
SHIMM000-0350	Seismic Joint Drawing Discrepanices in Contract Drawings	Open	10/14/2013	10/14/2013	10/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Jackson Tukuafu	To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference detail 7/A1-8881 and 4/S1-3010 of the contract drawings.		1. The current contract drawing details differ from those provided and referenced in the RFI. Refer to architectural drawing A1-8881 dated 07/17/13 and structural drawing S1-3010 dated 11/12/27.					
1. Detail 7/A1-881 shows several elements that are not shown on the structural drawing (highlighted in red). Please confirm these are required in the assembly and provide details for tabs, bolts and welds.		2. See response to Item #1 above.					
2. The same detail depicts a "y" shaped object protruding from the seismic embed. What are these objects and what is their function?		3. See response to Item #1 above.					
3. Detail 4/S1-3010 depicts a 3/4" diameter stud that is not shown on the Architectural drawings. Please clarify.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 645 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0354	verticals in the C21 embedded column at Gridlines 16.9/J was changed from 6" OC to 5" OC due to the CDSM soldier pile encroachment. As a result, there is an odd number (19) of verticals per layer which would leave one row of verticals to not be straddled by a U-bar. Gerdau proposes to widen the final U-bar in the embedded column and straddle 3 rows of vertical bars. See attached sketch for details. Please confirm if this is acceptable.						
	BGP - Concourse Elevator Pit Sill Plates	Open	10/16/2013	10/26/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon	To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Please reference A1-2824 through A1-2847 (BGP TG06.0 Contract Drawings). Please confirm all delvator it sill plates are not int he TG06.0 scope of work.	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
SHIMM000-0355							
	BGP - Concourse Opening Dimension Clarification	Open	10/16/2013	10/26/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon	To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Please reference A1-2844 and S1-2204 (BGP TG06.0 Contract Drawings). Please clarify North-South concourse opening dimension at gridlines 13/C. 8'-8 3/4" or 7'-7"?	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
SHIMM000-0356							
	BGP - Elevator Rail Supports Dimension	Open	10/16/2013	10/26/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon	To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Please reference attached detail 4, S1-7630. Please confirm length of embed dimension is 2-7", as shown in red.	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0357	BGP - Structural Steel Embeds in Concourse Slab/Columns	Open	10/17/2013	10/27/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>Attached is a rebar congestion model of the concourse slab and column C2 at C24.9. As is apparent, the structural steel shear lug portion of the plate embed is in conflict with the reinforcing steel and will not fit with required rebar spacing. The rebar conflicts with he shear lug and blockout that are present, include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Typical MFB Beam at C24.9 (blue colored bars in model)- B-68 Beam (yellow colored bars in model)- Main concourse slab (pink colored bars in model)- Column C-2 vertical T-Heads (purple colored bars in model) <p>Please provide a solution that will provide a constructible blockout and embedment of the structural steel plate.</p>							

SHIMM000-0358	Sump Pit Rebar Tail and Trestle Pile @ GL 18.5/E - Area 9	Open	10/17/2013	10/27/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>Reference: RFI T-0644</p> <p>Three of the sump pit lower mat #11 tails near grid line 18.5/E are in conflict wit the nearby trestle pile. The bars have been trimmed to clear the trestle pile and provide an LTE of 34" instead of 60" as required per plans.</p> <p>Typically, a bent bar would be spliced to the interrupted bar as required in SKS-0281 in the response to RFI T-066; however, the trimmed bars have a 70" length which would not beet the 78" LTS requirement. Gerdau propose to leave the 3 ea trimmed bars as-is and not incoporate an additional spliced bent bar. Please confirm if this is acceptable.</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 647 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0359	Vehicle Ramp Beam and Wall Support Embeds Clarification	Open	10/17/2013	10/27/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference attached TG06.0 contract drawings S1-2251, A1-7401, S1-3411, S1-3203 and S1-3204.							
1. Please confirm embed locations as shown on attached S1-2251 (reference drawings for description of embeds).							
2. Please provide angles for embeds highlighted on A1-7401 (4 total embeds, with acute and obtuse angle for each embed); (similar to RFI Response T-0453.2)							
SHIMM000-0362	Area 11 to 16 Mat Slab Layer 3 Lap Splice Relocation	Open	10/21/2013	10/31/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Due to limited access between the waterproofing and access trestle, Gerdau proposes to shorten the mat slab typical layer three (North-South) 67'-0" bars at Areas 11 through 16. This requires the lap splice location to be moved from the center of column line, as specified on Note 1 of the Mat Top Bar Notes in S1-2052, to the location shown in the attached sketch.							
Please confirm if this is acceptable.							
SHIMM000-0363	Lower Concourse Construction Live Load Variance	Open	10/23/2013	11/02/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference Specification Section 03 10 00 - 3.2.A.2 and the attached project spreadsheet. This spec section calls for a minimum construction live load of 50 psf without referencing or indicating before or after concrete is placed. According to D.H. Charles (shoring designer), falsework projects of this application typically approach the falsework design for 50 psf before concrete is placed and 20 psf afterwards, while always maintaining a minimum design load (dead + live) of at least 100 psf. See attached D.H.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Charles project history spreadsheet using this same design approach. Falsework calculations to follow. Is this design criteria acceptable?

SHIMM000-0364	Lower Concourse Slab Edge Dimensions	Open	11/04/2013	11/14/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:		<input type="checkbox"/>
The structural drawings for the lower concourse (SI-2202 through SI-2207, framing plans) do not include dimensions for the slab openings. Scaled dimensions from these drawings conflict with many of the dimensions provided on the architectural slab edge plans (AI-2842 through AI-2847).							
Please see attached for observed conflicts (highlighted). Please confirm that the dimensions shown on the architectural plans at the slab openings are correct.							

SHIMM000-0365	TG0600-103 Interior Wall Thickness Change Clarification	Open	10/28/2013	11/07/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:		<input type="checkbox"/>
Reference: Submittal TG0600-0103 Per the submittal review notes for TG0600-0103, the train platform future interior wall thicknesses are increased in Areas 8 and 11. The reviewer has included a note "For 1'-4" walls use same coupler reinf as 14" walls. Coordinate with RFI T-0587." The note does not include 12" walls which were previously 10". Please confirm if the now 12" wall is to use the same coupler reinforcing as the 10" walls.							

SHIMM000-0366	Vehicle Ramp Wall Embedded Supports	Open	11/05/2013	11/15/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 650 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
SHIMM000-0368	Conflict of elevator Opening Embed and Future Walls	Open	11/04/2013	11/14/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:				
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference attached Detail4 on SI-7630, attached AI-2202 thru AI-2205 and AI-2207, SI-2202 thru SI-2205 and SI-2207, SI-7130, SI-7132, SI-7134, SI-7136 and SI-7139.								
Please confirm no conflict exists between embed Detail 4 on S 1-7630 and future walls highlighted on attached architectural drawings.								
SHIMM000-0369	Column Tie Change from T9 to T12	Open	11/05/2013	11/15/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:				
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please confirm if it is acceptable to replace the typical T9 column ties (90° or 135° bend on either end) with T12 ties (135° bends on both ends). See the attached sketch for further details.								
SHIMM000-0374	BGP - Horizontal Cast-In Inserts: Walls 111,165, 164	Open	02/13/2014	02/13/2014	02/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titche	To: Webcor Construction LP	Claude Titche	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP			Claude Titche
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1. Horizontal Cast-In inserts in 1st lift foundation wall 111 & 165, elevations -22.25, -27.08 and-31.92, were installed at elvations -22.08, -26.91 and-31.75 respectively. Please confirm this is acceptable? See attached sketch.		SCCI is to construct and install per RFI T0599.1, which is the most up-to-date drawing.						
2. Horizontal Cast-In insert in 1st lift foundation wall 164, elevation -27.08, 13'-10" in length from East end ofW164, was installed at elevation -27.20. Please confirm this is acceptable? Please note the remainder of the Cast-In insert in wall 164 was installed at elevation -27.08. See attached sketch.								
Please note all other Horizontal Cast-In Inserts will be installed per approved comprehensive lift drawings.								



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 651 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0376	BGP - ASI 107 - Concrete Curb and RCW - Concourse Level	Open	11/11/2013	11/21/2013	11/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Shimmick Construction Comp Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1. ASI #107 reissues A1-2222 to A1-2227 with changed note at the top right of page. Previously, CC= concrete curb were stated as "CC- Cone curb not in TG06". In ASI107, this note was revised to "Cone curb ref to A-00022 for cone curb schedule. Ref to structural dwgs for coupler details". Is it the intent to add the concrete curb scope into TG06 contract by the issuance of ASI 107?				Please prepare and submit a cost proposal for revisions: 1. Concrete Curbs (CC) and 2. Reinforced Concrete Walls (RCW) as released in ASI 107.			
2. On the same changed note, RCW Previously stated "Reinf conc wall not in TG06 ref to structural dwgs". In ASI 107, this note is changed to RCW : "Reinf cone wall ref to structural dwgs". Is the intent to add the RCW scope into TG06 contract thru the issuance of ASI 107?				Please itemize the aforementioned scope items as in your proposal for CR U-089 - ASI 107.			
SHIMM000-0377	ASI 107- Cone Curb and RCW- Concourse Level- Follow up to RFI SHIMM-00376	Open	11/14/2013	11/24/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto To: Webcor Construction LP Spencer Sayles			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
SCCI is in receipt of response to RFI SHIM000-0376 in which WOJV requests SCCI to submit a cost proposal for revisions:1 Concrete curbs (CC) and 2. Reinforced Concrete Walls (RCW) as released in ASI 107. Please clarify the following: 1. SCCI to to price the construction of the concrete partitions (shown as 'ghost lines' in Architectural drawings) to the full height up to the ground level. This means that the construction of the concrete wall at concourse level cannot take place until level A bracing and Rebracing RA is taken out (after TG07.2 contractor build the ground level). 2. Since the RCW I concrete wall is now to be installed by TG06 contractor, dowels are to be installed (similar to platform rebar dowels in Area 3), instead offormsavers. Please confirm that this will not create inefficiency with TG06 or TG07 contractor. 3. 3.ASI 107 new notes on A1 -2222-A1-2231 state: "CC- Cone Curb- Refto A-0022 for concrete curb schedule- refer to struct dwgs for coupler details." Please provide the most recent copy of A-0022. SCCI has							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 652 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	not been able to locate concrete curb schedule in the most current A-0022 copy (IFC). Please provide curb reinforcing detail as well 4. Dwg AI-2222-AI-2223 also contain walls noted as "cone wall". Please confirm that SCCI is to treat these walls as RCW.						
SHIMM000-0380	Seismic Joint Clarifications	Open	11/14/2013	11/24/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please reference attached Details 7/AI-8881 (ASI #107) and 4/S1-301 0 (ASI #100). 1. Detail 7/A1-8881 calls for a "neoprene gasket compressed by bar and bolt typ". Please provide sizes for tabs and bolts. Also, provide welding instructions (if necessary). 2. The same detail shows pipe penetrations through the seismic joint at both levels. Plumbing drawings show a 4" "SAN/ AD" running parallel to the seismic joint. Please confirm this pipe penetrates the joint. If so, provide locations off of grid and pipe sleeve dimensions. Also, provide details on how to seal this penetration (watertight). 3. Detail4/S1-301 0 shows a 3/4" Dia Headed Stud at 12" oc with 6" embed. Is this to be one row as the drawing shows? 4. Detai14/S 1-3010 also calls for 4" diameter hole at 2'-0" oc. What is the purpose of these holes? If the clamping system is continuous, then what will support the rod at the hole locations? Please clarify.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 653 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SHIMM000-0381	Seismic Joint Specification Clarifications	Open	11/14/2013	11/24/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference Specifications Section 07 09 16 - 2.6.A.I. Section states "Provide joint assemblies in single lengths between changes in direction with vulcanized, mitered comers where joint changes directions or abuts other materials." 1. Please confirm that this is in reference to the Omega Seal gasket, and not the clamping system and embedded steel. 2. Please confirm that it is acceptable to use clamping components with 4'-0" maximum lengths with butt joints not to exceed 1/8". 3. Please confirm that it is acceptable to use 14' max lengths on steel embed with butt joints not to exceed 1/8".							
SHIMM000-0404	BGP - Geothermal Riser Pressure Gauge Location	Open	12/20/2013	12/30/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Previous geothermal fields and risers had a "cat walk" behind the risers at grade. Additional pipe and 90s were added to bring the gauges up to grade to allow for pressure monitoring from this "catwalk." At fields 09-15 no cat walk exists, thus no location to access these gauges from. Please provide the location for the geothermal riser gauges for inspection from Field 09 through Field 15.							
SHIMM000-0405	SCS - CDSM follow up question in response to RFI#T-1655 answer	Closed	11/06/2014	11/16/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
RPI #T-1655 SCS -0013 Response provided the following: A. Confirmed notching depths with an updated sketch. B. Referenced ASI 123 roadway at curb (low point) elevations to be used to calculate notching		See attached sketch for notching elevations.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 654 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>elevation.</p> <p>Shimmick was the able to determine cut elevations for Minna Street from grid line 1 to grid line 18. CI-2001 shows extent of below grade train box and shoring wall at STA: 2+30.85. Using the same reference point on CI-4001 to determine the North West comer of the shoring wall in relation to roadway stationing Shimmick was then able to follow the south flow line proposed grade profile as the bottom of curb elevation for the south side of Minna Street elevations.</p> <p>1. Please confirm that GL 1 correlates with STA: 2+32.85.</p> <p>2. There isn't an equivalent elevation for Natoma Street (south shoring wall), Shimmick requests that reference point with stationing be provided and added to the C 1-4004 drawing.</p> <p>Some areas lack a CI Flow Line Profile. Shimmick requests that a different reference point, such as top of ground level deck, be provided for</p> <p>3. the west shoring wall from grid line A to X,</p> <p>4. the south shoring wall from grid line X to start ofCI-4004 which is the first drawing sheet for Natoma Street, and</p> <p>5. First street to Fremont for the south shoring wall.</p>						
SHIMM000-0406	SCS - CDSM follow up question in response to RFI#T-1655 answer	Void	11/06/2014	11/16/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang		To: Webcor Construction LP	Spencer Sayles	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>RPI #T-1655 SCS -0013 Response provided the following:</p> <p>A. Confirmed notching depths with an updated sketch.</p> <p>B. Referenced ASI 123 roadway at curb (low point) elevations to be used to calculate notching elevation.</p> <p>Shimmick was the able to determine cut elevations for Minna Street from grid line 1 to grid line 18. CI-2001 shows extent of below grade train box and shoring wall at STA: 2+30.85. Using the same reference point on CI-4001 to determine the North West comer of the shoring wall in relation to roadway stationing Shimmick was then able to follow the south flow line proposed grade profile as the</p>		<p>See attached sketch for notching elevations.</p>					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 655 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	bottom of curb elevation for the south side of Minna Street elevations. 1. Please confirm that GL 1 correlates with STA: 2+32.85. 2. There isn't an equivalent elevation for Natoma Street (south shoring wall), Shimmick requests that reference point with stationing be provided and added to the C 1-4004 drawing. Some areas lack a CI Flow Line Profile. Shimmick requests that a different reference point, such as top of ground level deck, be provided for 3. the west shoring wall from grid line A to X, 4. the south shoring wall from grid line X to start of CI-4004 which is the first drawing sheet for Natoma Street, and 5. First street to Fremont for the south shoring wall.						
SHIMM000-204.3	BGP - Locations of Electrical Outlets, Equipment, and Fixtures	Rejected	08/30/2013	09/09/2013	09/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Per the RFI response, please find attached the revised layout for the Electrical Room B2221. This revised layout shows the dimensions off of the interior walls as requested.			The sketch included with this RFI is not acceptable for submission. Refer to the response to RFI T-0655.1 and T-0655.				
Please advise if it is acceptable.			- It is nearly illegible. - Comments from the previous revisions of this RFI instruct the contractor to coordinate with architectural wall dimensions. It looks like they have just removed any room dimensions previously included on the sketch. - This is not submitted on current contract document backgrounds as instructed in the last revision of the RFI. - Fire was indicated on the color key but no fire lines are included.				
			Please provide an acceptable sketch before this will be processed any further.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 656 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
SHIMM000-314.1	BGP - Embedded Conduits in Columns	Closed	09/04/2013	09/14/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:				
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
In the MEP meeting on 9/4/13, the response to RFI T-0693 was clarified. To confirm conversations with the WSP Electrical Design representative, the only conduits to be embedded in columns per the RFI T-0693 response are to be fire management conduits per the locations depicted in the response. All other conduits (power recepticals etc) are to be stubbed up on the face of the columns and are not to be embedded in the column.								
SKAN000-385	SSS - Embedded Plate Scope Clarification	Closed	03/03/2014	03/13/2014	03/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Gregory Kemerer	To: Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Galoyan	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP			Gregory Kemerer
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1. Please confirm the embedded steel in the following details which is not connected to any TG07.1R steel is not in TG07.1R scope and will be supplied and installed by others: 4 & 5/S1-3002; 4 & 6/S1-3203; 2, 3, 6 & 7/S1-3205; 2/S1-3207; 3, 5 & 7/S1-3210; 4/S1-3281; 1/S1-3282; 1 & 10/S1-3411; 3 & 6/S1-3412; 6/S1-3502; 6/S1-3503; 2A/S1-3706; 4 & 7/S1-7604; 3 & 8/S1-7631; 5 & 9/S1-7660 and 6, 7 & 9/S1-9052.				1) Confirmed that embedded steel not connected to TG07.1R steel is not in TG07.1R scope. However, several details listed by Skanska appear to be connected to TG07.1R steel (3 & 6/S1-3412, 3 & 8/S1-7631, 8/S1-7602, 1/S1-3705, 9 & 11/S1-7600) and are included in Skanska's scope. Detail 2A/S1-3706 is an edge of metal deck support, and is included in Skanska's scope.				
2. Please confirm the embedded steel in 8/S1-7602 which is clearly indicated below the scope delineation line is not in TG07.1R scope and will be supplied and installed by others. Skanska will field weld the 3/8" plate to the embed steel as indicated on see SK1.				2) See response to item #1				
3. Please confirm the embedded plate and angle in detail 1/S1-3705 will be supplied and installed by TG06 and Skanska will field weld the double angle connection to the embedded plate as indicated on SK2.				3) See response to item #1				
4. Details 9 & 11/S1-7600 indicate the top and bottom connections for stair 202 & 403 between the Train Platform Level and the bottom of the Lower Concourse slab. As the scope delineation line clearly shows the embedded plates will be supplied and installed by TG06. Once these embeds are poured in place the HSS post cannot be installed as detailed. Please confirm these HSS post will be supplied and installed by TG06 after the platform slab has been poured and before the Lower Concourse slab. See SK3 for clarification.				4) See response to item #1				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 657 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SKAN000-385.1	SSS - Embedded Plate - Scope Clarification	Closed	03/25/2014	04/04/2014	03/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Galoyan	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
As per SK RFI 385 response, Skanska has the following comments on the details WO indicated are included in TG07.1R scope:				1) OK			
1) 3 & 6/S1-3412: As no clear scope delineation line is indicated on these two details and the embeds are attached to TG07.1R steel, Skanska will provide the embedded plates for others to install as detailed on 3 & 6/S1-3412 SK1.				2) Drawing S1-7102 has not been issued for construction by the design team. It is currently listed as issued for bid. The attached S1-7102 is provided for your reference only.			
2) 3 & 8/S1-7631: Drawing S1-7102 partial plan at Roof Park level has not been issued to date. Therefore framing steel and decking at top of steel elevation 86' 1-1/4" was not included in our bid. Please provide this drawing and allocate a CO number for this work.				3) Skanska to field weld 3/8" plate to embedded angle. Embedded angle to be provided and installed by others.			
3) 8/S1-7602: Although the embedded plate is clearly indicated below the scope delineation line, for erection purposes Skanska will supply the angle with welded connection plate for TG06 to install as per SK2.				4) OK			
4) 1/S1-3705: As no clear scope delineation line is indicated and the embedded plate is attached to TG07.1R steel, Skanska will provide the embedded plate and angle for others to install as detailed as per SK3.				5) Details 9 & 11/S1-7600 are not included in Skanska's scope. These embeds noted are to be provided and installed by others. W/O confirms that the train platform level referenced in detail 1/S1-7016 has not been poured yet.			
5) 9 & 11/S1-7600: In RFI SK 385 Skanska questioned the scope and erectability of the HHS posts as detailed in 9&11/S1-7600. The scope of the embedded angles was already confirmed by WO as not in TG07.1R scope in RFI T-1067 #6. As 11/S1-7600 occurs between GL1.4 & 2 at the train platform level which has already been poured WO should verify this embed has been installed by TG06 as detailed.				Skanska to include all embeds connecting to structural steel in their Erection Drawings, including embeds provided and installed by others. Please denote "by others" adjacent to embeds not provided by Skanska to facilitate coordination with other contractors. Shear plates and other attachments to embeds provided "by others" are to be provided by Skanska as field welded.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>The contract drawings indicate that lift eyes will be provided for shop handling. The lift eyes that were cast into the back side of the ground level cast nodes have now been machined off by Bradken, leaving only the lift eyes inside the nozzles. In order to safely handle these castings, new lift features need to be added to the back side to replace those that were machined off.</div><div>It is requested that drilled and tapped holes be added to the back side of the ground cast nodes by Bradken to facilitate safe and efficient shop handling as indicated by the contract drawings.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Note 6 on the Cast Connex drawings indicates "PICKING EYE(S) TO BE LOCATED WITHIN THE INTERIOR OF THE CASTING'S NOZZLE(S)."</div><div>Removal of additional lift eyes not within the cast node nozzles is in line with this note. Please note that the picking eyes provided are intended for use in lifting the weight of the cast nodes only, and are not intended to support the weight of any additional material attached subsequently.</div></div>				
SKAN000-655.1	SSS - Field Drill Final Bolt Size and Location	Closed	08/13/2014	08/23/2014	08/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jeff Galoyan</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>		<div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jeff Galoyan</div></div>					
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Please confirm that per RFI response T-1486 below, Skanska will leave the beam blank for the W-1 design-build contractor to field drill.</div><div>"SKS 2, 3, 4 - Preliminary bolt sizes given on sheets S1-6092, 6093, 6094, included in superstructure package for information only. Final bolt sizes and location of bolt holes can only be determined by the W-1 design-build contractor after analysis of value engineered W-1 geometry."</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Confirmed. W-1 connection holes will be field drilled by the W-1 install contractor. Skanska to provide a credit for the associated work now being performed by an alternate contractor.</div></div>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
SKAN000-727.1	SSS - Shaw Alley Bridge Concrete Edge Plate Scope Clarification	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	08/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 533 SK1 for the following: Please confirm that the ½" edge plates and temporary support angle are not in TG07.1R's scope of work, and in the follow-on concrete trade subcontractor's scope of work.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> PL½" is part of the Shaw Alley bridge structure as shown on structural drawings and is to be provided by Skanska along with the metal deck. Temporary support angles are at Skanska's and metal deck subcontractor's option. Rebar, DBAs and metal deck shoring are by others.			
SKAN000-751.1	SSS - ST601 Above Roof Park Level Scope Clarification	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Galoyan Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please confirm that the four HSS 10x8x1/2 for landing steel shown on 4/S1-7013 - which are solely anchored into the concrete structure above the elevation of the Structural Framing at Roof Park Level - are not in TG07.1R scope, and are in the follow-on Stair Subcontractor's scope of work.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.			
SKAN000-905	SSS - ST401 Revised Beam Locations at Ground Level	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	11/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Galoyan Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 672 SK1: The dimensions shown in Field Oder 027 have been revised in ASI-127 as shown. Confirm the steel may remain as located in Field Order 027 as this steel has already been issued for fabrication.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Skanska was given direction to proceed on ASI-127 on 9/25/2014. Skanska shall proceed with the most current information as directed.			
SKAN000-923	SSS - ASI 127 Bus Crash Barrier Scope Clarification	Closed	11/05/2014	11/15/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Galoyan Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Sheet S1-8000 in ASI 127 eliminated connection details		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Field drilled holes and shim plates associated with the			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 661 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	for the steel Bus Level Crash Rail. In Sheet S1-5031, it appears that the top flanges are field welded to accommodate the Crash Rail bolts. Please confirm that the field welds, fielddrilled holes, tapered shims and shim plates are no longer necessary, and that pricing for a credit for this field work should be submitted in the comprehensive pricing for ASI 127.						
SKANS360-0001	test	Closed	01/13/2014	01/23/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		To: Webcor Construction LP	Gregory Kemerer	Answered By:			
Co-Author:				ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 183.1 SK1A, SK1B, SK2A & SK2B for items 1 & 2: 1.) Confirm the elevator rail support connection with erection aids is acceptable as shown. 2.) Confirm the elevator rail support connection with erection aids is acceptable as shown.		SUGGESTION:					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 662 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T- 0851	BGP - Lower Concourse Shoring/Reshoring Calculation for Construction Live Load		10/23/2013	11/02/2013	11/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please refer to attached excerpt of Specification Section 03 10 00 - Concrete Formwork - Below Grade Package.			George Metzger 11/4/2013				
Per Article 3.2, Section A.2 of Spec Section 031000, the minimum construction live load design criteria for shoring and reshoring is 50 psf. The specification section is unclear whether the live load of 50psf is prior to or post concrete placement.			RESPONSE: Specification 03 10 00: Design of formwork is the responsibility of the contractor. See Section 1.3C for formwork design requirements that include conformance with SEI/ASCE-37 and ACI 347. See Section 3.2 for Shores and Reshores including conformance with ACI 347.2R.				
According to D.H. Charles (SCCI shoring designer), falsework projects of this application typically approach the falsework design for 50 psf before concrete is placed and 20 psf afterwards, while always maintaining a minimum design load (dead + live) of at least 100 psf. The attached list of D.H. Charles project used the this same design approach. Falsework calculations are to follow.			ACI 347.2R typically assumes that the Live Load is associated with the placement of fresh concrete and that the Live Load is removed upon the completion of placement. Depending on the contractors planned use of "working surfaces" and the particular shoring/reshoring scheme, the Live Load may be more or may be less than the 50psf minimum after placement operations.				
Is the D.H. Charles design criteria acceptable?			Unless measures are taken restrict construction access to specific areas, it is assumed that the entire Lower Concourse will be a working surface and that the contractor will assign an Operational Class per SEI/ASCE-37 Section 4.8.1. Justification for the assumed uniform load will form part of the required submittal.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0001	Article 6 Changes in Work - Clarification	Closed	10/11/2010	10/25/2010	11/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Spec Section 00 07 00, Article 6 - Clarifications and Changes in Work					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Article 6 in the General Condition specification section 00 07 00 defines the procedure for changes in work. The procedures defined throughout Article 6 are conflicting. According to section 6.01.A, CM/GC shall promptly comply and proceed with changes issued by the TJPA in the form of a Change Order or Field Order. Section 6.02.B states that the TJPA will respond to RFI's with written Clarification deemed necessary and consistent with the Contract Documents or a Field Order requiring minor changes in work. Per section 6.01.A, the CM/GC is to proceed with the Field Order immediately. However, according to section 6.03.A, CM/GC shall submit a Change Order Request within 21 days of written directive. Please advise if the CM/GC is to proceed with changes promptly and prior to approval or if the CM/GC shall receive approval prior to proceeding with any changed Work.					00 07 00 - 6.01.A specifies that, "TJPA may..order additions, deletions, or revisions in the Work by Change Order or Field Order, CM/GC shall promptly comply with such orders and proceed with the Work,.."[emphasis added]. Under paragraph 6.02.B, TJPA may issue a Field Order in response to an RFI submitted by CM/GC. Under paragraph 6.03A, the CM/GC must submit a COR within 21 days if in the opinion of the CM/GC, the Field Order is considered to be a Change to the Contract.		
					Therefore, TJPA expects the CM/GC promptly to proceed with Work as may be clarified or directed through a Field Order, unless instructed otherwise. CM/GC has the recourse of submitting a COR when appropriate to do so, within the time limit stipulated. To avoid confusion, TJPA's Field Orders will clearly state whether the CM/GC is required to carry out the instruction promptly. Nevertheless, the CM/GC shall whenever possible incorporate a Field Order directive into the Work with minimal disruption to the planned sequence of activities.		
T-0002	Transit Center Building Address Clarification	Closed	10/20/2010	11/03/2010	10/28/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please clarify the building address for the Transbay Transit Center. This is required to complete our site specific Click Safety program, complete insurance documents, etc.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					425 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94105		
					Answered by Alfred Lau TJPA (PMPC) 10/28/2010		
					Constructware RFI #T-0003		
T-0003	301 Mission Wall Specification Format	Closed	11/17/2010	12/01/2010	11/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet: C-0001 issued 11/04/10; 301 Mission Interim Screen Wall - General Notes

We are in the process of preparing submittals for this project. In doing so we would like to know what specification division format would be most appropriate for us to submit and track these project documents. Please provide us with the desired specification division format as soon as possible so that our submittals can be processed with the proper efficiency.

SUGGESTION:**ANSWER:****Accept Suggestion:** ☐

All submittals for the 301 Mission Interim Screen Wall shall be submitted under the new CSI Division, "301 Mission Interim Screen Wall," that has been created and is available in Constructware under Transit Center Building (140). Within CSI Division "301 Mission Interim Screen Wall," there is a list of available "spec sections" that are equal to the drawing sheet number (and paragraph heading as applicable) that the submittal is called out on. If there are multiple "spec sections" on one sheet, the suffix ".X" has been added. For example, "S-0001.5 Concrete and Reinforcing" shall contain all submittals found on sheet S-0001 under the heading "Concrete and Reinforcing." If there is no suffix, the description of the spec is simply the title of the drawing.

T-0004**Transbay Project Signs****Closed****From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford**To:** Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner**12/01/2010 12/15/2010 12/03/2010 Potentially** ☐**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau**Co-Author:****REQUEST:**

Spec Section: 01 15 01

Webcor/Obayashi is initiating project sign procurement per Spec 01 15 01 and will require the artwork and locations for four 4x8 post mounted signs. What are required graphics/logo's for sign fabrication and where shall each sign be located.

SUGGESTION:**ANSWER:****Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Graphics for Project ID Signs specified per 01 15 01 will be issued to CMGC as soon as the names for mayor and SFCTA Board members are confirmed in early January, 2011. Information for locations will be issued prior to installation.

T-0004.1**Transbay Project Signs****Closed****From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford**To:** Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner**04/01/2011 04/11/2011 04/12/2011 Potentially** ☐**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau**Co-Author:**



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 668 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0009.1	301 Mission Wall Storage Location for Planter Boxes of 301 Mission Wall	Closed	12/17/2010	12/27/2010	12/29/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
In Transworld's review of the existing planter box condition at the 301 Mission Screen Wall, Transworld's viewpoint after close inspection of the site is that the planter boxes were originally installed with the intent of being permanent fixtures. There are connection points for these planter boxes that appear to be initial anchor points for original placement of these fixtures and there is concern that these planter boxes were never intended to be reinstalled/relocated after the initial installation. With all do skill and care, Transworld intends to relocate these planter boxes with mininmal damage. As a point of advisement, since these boxes do not appear to be designed for relocation, Transworld is concerned that such action will render these boxes unuseful. Please confirm that the design is to relocate these boxes in lieu of replacing them with new ones.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			The intent is to salvage and store these boxes in lieu of replacing them with new ones. Per Contract Drawing C-2000 Contractor is to cut and cap all existing irrigation and electrical lines feeding planter boxes. Contractor can remove plants and dirt if needed to uncover and remove anchorage, then salvage precast planter boxes.				
<hr/>							
T-0010	EPA Permit Number	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:Transbay Joint Powers Authority Edmond Sum				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please confirm the EPA permit number is CAR000197558.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Confirmed, the EPA identification number to use on waste manifests for the Transit Center construction is CAR 000197558. The site address is 425 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94105. The generator and primary contact is Edmond Sum, Engineering Manager, with the Transbay Joint Powers Authority.				
<hr/>							
T-0011	301 Mission Wall Waterproofing Submittal	Closed	12/21/2010	12/31/2010	12/29/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By:Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Regarding the waterproofing submittal, since the driveway is still covered with pavers the existing material and application procedure is unknown to Transworld. Therefore					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Confirmed: Webcor-Obayashi/Transworld can defer the waterproofing submittal until after the material is exposed and the existing waterproofing material and				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0012	301 Mission Wall - Requesting Specifications for Utility Plug	Closed	12/21/2010	12/31/2010	01/04/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 301 Mission Wall Drawings sheet C-5000					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
There is not enough information to determine the material and dimensions for the utility plug at the 301 Mission Wall. Please provide specifications and product data for the "Utility Plug" on sheet C-5000, sheet note 5.					Contractor to determine dimensions of temporary plug in the field and propose material appropriate to meet the requirements specified in note 5 on sheet C-5000.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 670 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0013	BSE IFC Table of Contents Discrepancy	Closed	01/05/2011	01/15/2011	01/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Alfred Lau	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Ref IFC TOC dated 12/15/10 (attached)				1. 00 01 10 Rev 3 and 00 01 15 were released to W/O on 07JAN2011, rectifying issues cited in the RFI.			
We have received the revised Issued for Construction (IFC) drawings and specifications for the BSE package. The table of contents has check marks to indicate added specification sections. Specification section 02 41 19, Pile Removal is not noted with a check mark but a revised specification was issued. The excavation and backfillll (31 23 10) section was not re-issued, however, a check mark is next to it.				2. Since it is TJP/PMPC's opinion that the formatting of the revision box for the technical sections is adequate and appropriate as is. Change to match the abbreviated version of the Div. 00 and 01 sections should be formally requested by W/O such that Design Team and TJP/PMPC could fully review that and agreed to from a QA/QC point of view.			
Also, the revision logs at the end of each section need to be revised to show only the revision number and dates.							
Please advise and re-issue.							
T-0014	TG03 BSE IFC Drawing Set	Closed	01/06/2011	01/16/2011	01/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Alfred Lau	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
We received multiple versions of PDF Drawings G-0000, A-0000, A-0005, and A-0010 (see the attached images) for TG03 IFC Drawing Set.				Confirm that "Use the 1/3/2011 CD for the PDF files. Use the 1/4/2011 CD for the DWG and DWF files. Disregard the PDFs on the 1/4/2011 CD."			
Please confirm the following answer from PMPC via email on 1/5/2011.							
"Use the 1/3/2011 CD for the PDF files. Use the 1/4/2011 CD for the DWG and DWF files. Disregard the PDFs on the 1/4/2011 CD."							
T-0015	301 Mission Wall - Concrete Mix Design	Closed	01/07/2011	01/17/2011	01/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu		Answered By: URS Corporation		David Fyfe	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: Attached submittal package TG1901-001 review comments and letter from concrete supplier				Comply with contract documents "Concrete and Reinforcing" Note number 6 on Sheet S-0001, which states:			
Per the comments received on the concrete mix design							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 671 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0016	<p>submitted in submittal package TG1901-001, please confirm that the admixture for air entrainment shall be compliant with ASTM C260.</p> <p>Transworld has been informed by their concrete supplier that ASTM C260 requires a mix of 6% air entrainment and such amounts of air entrainment are specified only in freeze/thaw areas for durability. The Bay Area is generally not considered a freeze/thaw area and therefore a mix with 6% air entrainment is not typically used. The concrete supplier, Bode Concrete, has provided a letter from BASF related to this specific issue.</p> <p>BSE - Current Trainbox Structural Drawings</p> <p>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>In order to accurately design and locate elements of the bracing, trestle and bridges, please provide the most up-to-date and reliable architectural and structural drawings (including cad files). Also, drawings (including CAD files) of the train box and any other component of the transit center that has the potential to conflict with the BSE scope of work.</p>	Closed	01/14/2011	01/24/2011	01/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>See Issued for Construction - Buttress/Shoring/Excavation documents dated 12/10/10.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 672 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0017	BSE - CDSM Wall Alignment	Closed	01/14/2011	01/24/2011	01/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: The response to pre-bid RFI #177 indicated that the CDSM shoring line alignment is expected to change "prior to installation". We request the revised re-alignment be provided to us as soon as possible. We are currently designing and issuing steel mill orders based on the current alignment. If the revision comes after mill orders are finalized we risk missing our rolling schedule thereby losing our bid date pricing.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per TJPA's direction, the Trainbox plan and extent have been modified at the Southwest corner of the site. See the attached sketch SKGT-0001-R1, that show the revised shoring wall alignment. For your reference, see the attached structural sketches that indicate the revised in-progress Trainbox structural columns and shearwalls that will be issued for construction in the future. These sketches are: SKS -0088 Foundation Level - Zone 02 Plan Phase 1, SKS- 0089 Foundation Level - Zone 03 Plan Phase 1, SKS-0090 Foundation Level - Zone 07 Plan Phase 1, SKS-0091 Foundation Level - Zone 10 Plan Phase 1, and SKS-0092 Lower Concourse Level - Partial Plans Phase 1.	
T-0017.1	BSE - CDSM South Wall Alignment Construction Drawings	Closed	09/22/2011	10/02/2011	10/04/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas Co-Author:			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Reference RFI T-0017 and attached Sketches Please confirm the attached sketches issued and approved with CR T-005B are "For Construction" and the notes indicating "draft in progress" and "not for regulatory approval, permitting or construction" will be removed on a future issuance of these sheets.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The sketches attached to previous RFI's reflect the confirmed CDSM shoring alignment. Text indicating "draft in progress" and "not for regulatory approval, permitting or construction" shall not be transferred to revised "Issued for Construction" drawings. Documents that are included in Change Orders shall be considered a Contract Document.	
T-0018	BSE - Waler to CDSM Wall spacing	Closed	01/14/2011	01/24/2011	01/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: There may be a potential conflict with the walers and the train box reinforcement. Spec 31-55-00 allows 6" minimum spacing from CDSM Wall to face of waler, but based upon			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti Response: It is permissible to use mechanical couplers for the vertical reinforcement interrupted by the whaler for the condition where	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 673 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0019	<p>301 Mission Wall - Stone Panel Anchorage to 301 Mission's Screen Wall</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference: Attached pages from the 2008 Building Code</p> <p>After removing stone panels in the demolition of the original 301 Mission Wall, the existing system of the stone panels does not utilize an anchoring system for mounting the stone panels to the wall. In addition, section 6.2.2.4 of the 2008 Building code does not specify mechanical fasteners for masonry less than 2-5/8" thick. The stone thickness used on the new wall will match the thickness of the existing, which is approx 10mm thick. Therefore, according to section 6.3 of the 2008 Building Code, the stone panel system for the Transbay Interim Screen Wall that should be used is the adhesion application.</p>	Closed	01/18/2011	01/28/2011	01/31/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>ANSWERED By:URS Corporation David Fyfe</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed anchorage system can not be evaluated prior to inspection of the retained stone sample.</p> <p>Please provide retained samples of stone from the demolished 301 Mission Street Screen Wall in order to confirm dimensions of the existing stone and evaluate proposed anchorage system.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 674 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please confirm that Transworld can use the adhered method for the stone panels in lieu of mechanical fasteners.</p>							
T-0019.1	301 Mission Wall - Stone Panel Anchorage to 301 Mission's Screen Wall	Closed	02/07/2011	02/17/2011	02/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu		Answered By: URS Corporation		David Fyfe
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: RFI T-0019 and attached photos							
RFI T-0019 requested samples of stone from the demolished 301 Mission Street Screen Wall in order to verify thickness of the stone that will be used on the wall, and confirm that a mechanical system had not been used to mount the stone. A sample has been shown to URS and pictures of that sample are attached to this RFI. Please confirm that mechanically fastened panels are not necessary and that a thin set adhesive application will be an acceptable means to setting the stone on the new screen wall.						Mechanical fastening of matching stone panels is not required. Location of face of stone as shown on A-6000 detail D is a contract requirement. Please provide complete detailing of proposed attachment of stone and how the location of the face of stone will be achieved using thinset.	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0020	BSE - Demo Contract Shoring Wall and Bracing	Closed	01/27/2011	02/07/2011	02/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet D-2203 and Specification Section 02 41 01 The BSE contract drawings shows a temporary shoring and bracing that is installed by the demo contract and subsequently removed by the BSE contract. In order for Balfour Beatty to properly plan their work, they request the following information: 1 - The shoring design drawings for the shoring wall on the east side of Fremont St. (shown on D-2203) that was submitted by the Demo Contractor. 2 - As-built location of the above mentioned shoring wall. 3 - Bracing drawings and details that submitted for the basement wall rakers that are schematically shown on detail 1 of sheet D-5100 and details 1 & 2 on sheet D-5102			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Approved Shop Drawings Submittal #312000-01.3 - Interim Shoring Wall REV 3 will be transmitted through Constructware today 2/2/11. 2 - Wall is currently being constructed in the location indicated on the approved shop drawings. 3 - Bracing drawings are not currently available for transmission. They will be transmitted to W/O when available.				
T-0021	BSE - Existing Unknown Concrete Wall	Closed	01/27/2011	02/07/2011	02/04/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing Set D and Specification Section 02 41 01 Based upon Balfour Beatty observations of the site, there appears to be a concrete wall approximately 18in wide that is outside of the existing terminal basement walls adjacent to the 301 Mission Property line and the east side of Fremont St. that is not shown on BSE contract drawings or the existing Terminal drawings. Does this wall continue around the entire perimeter of the Zone 4 basement? Will this wall be removed by the demo contract prior to BSE NTP #02? Please provide as-builts of the wall location if it is to remain.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Full extent of unforeseen concrete foundation wall not confirmed. Existing Terminal and Ramps Demolition Project contractor (EBI) has been directed to remove extents of unforeseen foundation wall that are within limits of removal as shown in contract documents to a depth consistent with removal of adjacent structures (pile caps/footings). Portion of unforeseen concrete foundation wall within Fremont Street to remain in place. Portions of unforeseen concrete foundation wall that are exposed but that are to remain in place are to be documented via as-builts. As-builts will be provided as completed. Existence of similar walls in Zone 2 and 3 not				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 676 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Does a similar wall exist around the basement walls in Zone 2 and 3?						
T-0021.1	BSE - As Built Location of Concrete Foundation Wall Along Fremont St.	Closed	03/01/2011	03/11/2011	03/15/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	confirmed. Attached San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, Department of Trinagulation and Surveys, San Francisco Topography Maps dated August 1934 (pages 27-32) are the best available information at this time and have been provided for your information.				
	REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0021 (BBI #005) and Drawing Set D Please provide BBII with as-built locations of the unforeseen concrete foundation wall within Fremont Street which is to remain in place. Please also provide as-built locations for the soldier pile & tie back wall which parallels Fremont Street adjacent to the Buttress. BBII and BECHO want to confirm that there is enough room for their equipment to drill the Buttress Shafts along Fremont Street, and to identify any potential conflicts.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Portion of unforeseen concrete foundation wall within Fremont Street to remain in place as shown on attached. The attached San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, Department of Triangulation and Surveys, San Francisco Topography Maps dated August 1934 are the best available information at this time were provided in RFI T-0021 Rev.0. This is believed to be existing concrete full basement wall extending under the sidewalks remaining from pre Transbay factory/businesses. As-Built Fremont St. Shoring wall installed by Evans Bros/Malcolm Inc. the soldier pile and tie back wall is also attached. Survey points for the I-Beams was previously transmitted to Webcor-Obayashi Transmittal No. 140-00650.				
		</					



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0022	Quality Management System - Org. Chart	Closed	01/28/2011	02/07/2011	02/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Jim Coughlin				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref - Attached Org. Chart Please identify the appropriate personnel associated with the attached org. chart found the in the program Quality Management System.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A revised PMPC organization chart is with TJPA for review. However, I don't understand why this is an RFI. What W/O activity requires this information? The organization chart in the QMS is deliberately generic (titles only) and we have no intention of changing it.				
T-0023	Construction Manager Quality Plan	Closed	01/31/2011	02/10/2011	02/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Bob Garcia To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp. Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Page 30 Paragraph 8.5.5 of the QMS manual makes reference to "the construction management consultant's quality plan". Please advise when the Construction Managers Quality Plan for the TTC will be issued?			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractually - the Draft Quality Plan from CMO Construction Manager Oversight is due 2/14/11. Final Quality Plan is due 3/28/11.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 678 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0024	Re-bracing for Revised SW Corner Alignment	Closed	02/02/2011	02/11/2011	02/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-1112 and Specification Section 31 55 00 The response to RFI T-0017 showed a revised CDSM wall alignment at the SW corner of zone 1 and the addition of the structural shear walls on wall X1-1. The RFI response implied that BBII's cross-lot bracing needed to be re-designed so there are no conflicts with the concrete columns and shear walls. In order to minimize the cost and impacts as a result of this change, BBII suggests using rakers for the re-bracing in this corner. The cross lot bracing would be installed as specified for the initial excavation (ref stage 10 on GT-1112) similar to the layout shown on the attached sketch #1. Then for the re-bracing stage 12 and stage 15 rakers could be used in locations shown in attachment sketch #2. Would a design based on this concept be acceptable? If not, BBII is available and willing to brainstorm additional ideas.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The use of rakers as rebracing is acceptable provided the design criteria specified in the construction documents is satisfied. This includes, but is not limited to, the bracing stiffness requirements. The effective stiffness of the rakers will be affected by the stiffness of the permanent train box wall and mat slab and tiedowns. The response to this RFI must include input from Thornton Tomasetti regarding the impact on the permanent structural elements. As discussed at the Feb 9, 2011 TG03 BSE Subcontractor - Design Team Coordination Meeting, it may be possible to reduce the requirement for rebracing if the permanent trainbox shear walls can be built sequentially and their construction coordinated with the removal of struts. Arup suggests a meeting with Arup, the Contractor, and Thornton Tomasetti as this requires an understanding of the proposed construction sequence and an evaluation of the permanent structural elements. Thornton Tomasetti (TT) Response: We have review the response by Arup, and found this is consistent with our prior discussion with Arup. No further comment from TT is needed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 679 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0025	BSE - Request for Recent Groundwater Monitoring Data	Closed	02/02/2011	02/12/2011	02/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 31 55 00 and GDR Table 7-2 (attached) The Project GDR table 7-2 shows the last GW level reading in Feb of 2010. Can BBII receive a copy of any readings taken within the last year?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached T0025-SK01 for groundwater readings.		
T-0026	301 Mission Wall - Sample chip of paint color for exposed concrete	Closed	02/07/2011	02/17/2011	02/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A-5000 note 6 Note 6 on sheet A-5000 states, "Color of paint for exposed concrete to match sample chip provided by TJPA representative". Please provide color sample chip per this note.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Omit note 6 on sheet A-5000. Color of paint for exposed concrete wall shall match color of paint provided on existing exposed planter boxes.		
T-0027	301 Mission Screen Wall - Dowels for Screen Wall	Closed	02/08/2011	02/18/2011	02/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached pictures Upon laying out the dowel embedment locations for the new concrete wall, the locations are very close to the edge of the existing manholes and vault lids. Transworld is concerned that the location of the doweling is too close to these existing items and does not believe it to be the intent. Please see attached pictures showing the areas of concern. Please respond ASAP with direction on where to place the dowels, as Transworld has no slack in the schedule to accomodate any stoppage of work.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The final condition for the dowels drilled into the 301 Mission existing basement perimeter wall is shown on attached sketch. Dowels shall be drilled 6 inches from exterior face of existing basement perimeter wall. Verify location of existing basement perimeter wall prior to drilling. These dowels remain within 1 inch of centerline of the new concrete wall. See attached RFI coordination sketch.		
T-0027.1	301 Mission Screen Wall - Dowels for Concrete Wall: Layout Acceptance	Closed	03/29/2011	04/08/2011	04/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 680 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Co-Author:</div><div>REQUEST: Reference: RFI T-0027 Please confirm that per site walk on 03/22/11 with Danny Lo and Erik Liu of Transworld, David Hungerford with Webcor-Obayashi, and David Fyfe and Christine Baudier of URS, that the layout of the core holes for the #8 dowels in the concrete wall are acceptable. RFI T-0027 included a response sketch directing dowels to be in line and set 6" from the south face of the existing wall below. Due to the existing condition of the wall below, which was poured against a shoring wall and therefore not exactly straight, the dowels are laid out to be in line with each other and therefore vary in dimension measured off of the south face of the existing basement wall below. Please confirm, as it is understood, that the existing layout is acceptable. Dowels are being set in epoxy today, so an immediate response is requested.</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company</div><div>ANSWER: It was verified in the field that #8 dowels were drilled approximately 6" from the exterior face of the existing vault wall and that #8 dowels will have a minimum 2" concrete cover. The layout of the #8 dowels is acceptable.</div></div><div><div>Answered By: URS Corporation</div><div>David Fyfe</div></div></div>							
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.</div><div>REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 31 55 00 and attached sample calculations The response to pre-bid RFI #TG0300-058 provided an equation for calculating the stiffness of the bracing system. Attached is BBII's designer's sample "template" calculation for stiffness for the proposed waler and strut bracing system. BBII requests a confirmation that the designer's interpretation and use of the provided stiffness calculation is correct, prior to progressing further submittal calculations and procuring steel bracing members. Additionally, BBII requests an expedited response to this RFI.</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>Answered By: Arup</div><div>Kevin Clinch</div></div></div>							
T-0028	BSE - Bracing Stiffness Calculation Confirmation	Closed	02/08/2011	02/18/2011	02/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 681 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0029	301 Mission Screen Wall - Sub Surface Structure Conflict with New Wall Location	Closed	02/09/2011	02/19/2011	02/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: Photograph attachments 1-8				To accommodate unforeseen location of existing structures, new concrete wall to be shifted south so that the south face of new concrete wall is flush with the exterior face of the existing 301 Mission street basement perimeter wall.			
In laying out the location of the new concrete wall, Transworld has determined that the new concrete wall will extend over existing sub-surface structures, which is not per the contract documents. Please reference attached photos.				Interfering regions of existing sub-surface structures (manhole rings and vault sides) at the base of new concrete wall shall be incorporated into new concrete wall. All surfaces of interfering concrete regions to be incorporated into new concrete wall shall be prepared as bonded construction joints. Verify functioning of manhole and vault lids/openings are not obstructed by new concrete.			
First, there are two manhole covers that are incorporated in concrete rings. These rings conflict with the location of the new wall and are included in photographed attachments. Due to the size of these concrete rings, a portion of the ring will be buried by the new wall. Second, the steel frame of the existing electrical vault doors is of similar condition as the manhole covers; this condition can also be seen in the photographed attachments.				Contractor to provide chalk line at updated south and north faces of new concrete wall for verification of updated location in field by TJPA representative prior to construction of new concrete wall.			
Please confirm that Transworld is to proceed with the plan location of the new concrete wall which will cover and bury a portin of these existing sub-surface structures.				See attached RFI coordination sketch.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 682 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0030	301 Mission Screen Wall - Detail required for concrete sleeve installation	Closed	02/09/2011	02/19/2011	02/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Attached 1/C-5001 and photo					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The existing condition of the manhole covers are not consistent with the contract documents. Detail 1/C - 5001 indicates that the existing manhole sits above an existing concrete slab, to which is to be drilled into with 1 inch embedment. However, please refer to the attached photograph in attachment 1 which shows the manhole cover is actually a part of a subsurface concrete ring assembly, and wrapped with waterproofing. Please provide a new detail and instructions for the installation of the required concrete sleeve and a detail for penetrating the existing waterproofing.					Per contract documents;		
					Remove manhole lid;		
					Retain existing concrete and steel collar/frame;		
					Dowel into existing concrete collar/frame (1" max) with #3 hoops @ 10" O.C.;		
					Prepare existing concrete surfaces to be incorporated into new sleeve as bonded construction joints;		
					Cast in place 6" thick concrete sleeve directly over manhole (concrete and steel collar/frame);		
					Provide Kadee SS 1/8" circular grate satin finish.		
T-0030.1	301 Mission Screen Wall - Concrete sleeve installation	Closed	02/24/2011	03/06/2011	03/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: RFI T-0030					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The final measurement from the edge of the steel collar/frame at the existing manholes to the face of new wall is (+/-) 4-3/4", this dimension less form material (+/-) 3/4" to 1", results in the new cast in place concrete sleeve to be 4" thick at the point closest to the wall . Response to RFI T-0030 notes that the sleeve is to be 6" thick. Please clarify if the 4" thickness is acceptable.					4" minimum thickness acceptable only where new CIP concrete sleeve is in conflict with new interim screen wall. Remaining portions of new CIP concrete sleeve not in conflict with new interim screen wall shall be 6" thick per contract documents.		
					Contractor shall provide 3/8" expansion joint material between face of new interim screen wall and outside face of new CIP concrete sleeve.		
					See attached coordination sketch.		
T-0031	301 Mission Screen Wall - In-ground lighting	Closed	02/09/2011	02/19/2011	02/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

REQUEST:

Reference: Note 10 on C-2000

The new in-ground lighting as anticipated in plans and note 10 on page C - 2000 must be substituted because the contract design cannot be accommodated in the new construction. The contract design requires:

1) that the new lighting match the existing with the same model and size.

The issue here is that the existing light fixtures are larger than can be accommodated within the thickness of the new construction.

2) that the existing electrical lines servicing the existing lights be disconnected so that it is reconnected to the new lights.

The issue here is that the electrical lines for the existing light fixtures are embedded in the concrete curb that is to be removed. Upon removal of the existing concrete curb, there will be no existing electrical lines to reconnect for the new lighting power.

Please provide a new detail and instructions for the in-ground lighting.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Additional information is required to understand/interpret existing conditions and facilitate a response to this RFI.

Please provide all available information on existing conditions that pertain to this RFI, including but not limited to the following;

1. type, model, size and manufacturer of existing light fixtures;
2. type and size of existing electrical conduit/conductor;
3. sketch illustrating alignment of existing electrical conduit/conductor, including junction boxes, termination points and power source; and,
4. sketch illustrating thickness of existing/new construction where new lights are to be set/placed.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 684 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0031.1	301 Mission Wall - In-ground lighting	Closed	03/31/2011	04/10/2011	04/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: URS Corporation		David Fye
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: Attached photos and sketch				We note that the Contractor has installed new electrical conduit and outlet boxes within the new concrete wall.			
Response to RFI T-0031 requested additional information.				To document the as-built conditions of all work and to verify conformance with all applicable codes and standards, Contractor shall submit drawing(s) illustrating full routing of all conduit(s), including alignment, conduit material type, couplings/fittings, outlet boxes, etc. Drawings shall detail the connection between existing electrical line and new electrical line and connection between new electrical line and new lights/fixtures.			
1. See the attached pictures for the information known about the lights that were removed.				Drawings shall be sufficiently detailed to document all electrical work is in conformance with all applicable codes and standards, and shall be sufficient for permitting and/or inspection of electrical work.			
2. The existing conduit is 3/4"				All conduit and/or boxes shall be set so as to provide minimum 1 1/2" clear from all rebar, anchor bolts or other embedded structural steel items. Outlet boxes located in new concrete wall shall be fully coordinated for direct connection with the new light(s)/fixture(s).			
3. Attached is a sketch and a photo showing the approximate location of the existing conduit.				It is our understanding that the existing 301 Mission driveway/roadway section (approximately 3 1/2" paver over 1 1/2" sand bed over 4 1/2" to 8 1/2" concrete topping slab) does not allow use of new lights/fixtures matching original lights/fixtures. It is recommended use of the Ligman Paragon square 186mm (50338-N-35) light/fixture, or approved equal, in lieu of the original light/fixture (Hydrel M9410). The new Ligman Paragon square light fixture (or equivalent fixture) shall be placed adjacent to new concrete wall and shall be mounted exposed above ground (not in ground) with the base of new light fixture located aligned to top of paver(s). See attached coordination sketch.			
There is one existing conduit on the south side of the wall protruding from the soil coming from the basement wall. The electrical conduit is approximately 6 feet east from the western transformer vault vent opening. Attached you can see the pictures of this conduit that is currently sticking out below the scaffolding planking.				Please confirm the use of Ligman Paragon square 186mm (50338-N-35) light(s)/fixture(s) can be fully coordinated with all work.			
4. Please advise the location and mounting details for the new lights.				See attached product data for Ligman Paragon square 186mm (50338-N-35) light/fixture.			



<u><i>Number</i></u>	<u><i>Subject</i></u>	<u><i>Status</i></u>	<u><i>Date Created</i></u>	<u><i>Date Required</i></u>	<u><i>Date Answered</i></u>	<u><i>Cost Impact</i></u>	<u><i>Proceed</i></u>
----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------

In addition, in response to item 2 of RFI No.T-0031, Contractor please coordinate with 301 Mission Building management to ensure that the new light shall be connected correctly to the existing power supply.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 686 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0031.2	301 Mission Wall - Light Fixtures	Closed	06/29/2011	07/09/2011	07/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:URS Corporation David Fyfe	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: Attached light specs			URS provided four lighting options to Webcor-Obayashi on April 22, 2011 to coordinate with 301 Mission management personnel. It is noted that the lighting attachment to this RFI (Allscape BL-81) is similar to one of the four lighting options provided by URS (Allscape BL-80).				
Per field conversations with 301 Mission staff, the light fixture proposed in response to RFI T-0031.1 is not acceptable. Webcor-Obayashi has coordinated with 301 Mission management personnel and the lighting attachment to this RFI has been requested by 301 Mission. Confirm that the attached light specs are to be installed at the stucco slot locations.			The Allscape BL-80 model (with 39 watt/240 volt, metal halide lamp and prismatic tempered glass lens) was selected by URS because it provides photometric qualities and operating electrical amperage comparable to the original lighting fixture (Hydrel M9410, 35 watts/277 volt, metal halide lamp).				
			It is noted that the lighting attachment to this RFI, Allscape BL-81 model (with 150 watt/277 volt, metal halide lamp and prismatic tempered glass lens) may provide photometric qualities and operating electrical amperage not similar to the original lighting fixture. It is also noted that the Allscape BL-81 model luminaire is 14.5" wide, which is greater than the 14" width stucco slot(s) specified in the contract documents.				
			Prior to order and/or installation of the lighting attachment to this RFI (Allscape BL-81, 150 watt/277 volt metal halide lamp) Contractor to confirm the following;				
			301 Mission building existing electrical circuit/feed that is to be used is sufficient to handle electrical load required by the Allscape BL-81, 150 watt/277 volt metal halide lamp(s); 14.5" width of the BL-81 luminaire(s) can fit within the stucco slot(s) constructed, note contract documents specify 14" wide stucco slot(s); and photometric qualities of 150 watt lamp (e.g. lighting intensity/brightness) is acceptable to/preferred by 301 Mission management personnel.				
<hr/>							
T-0032	301 Mission Screen Wall - Tie Beam Below Grade Conection to Screen Wall	Closed	02/09/2011	02/19/2011	02/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By:URS Corporation David Fyfe	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>					
Reference: Attached photo		RESPONSE 02/16/2011 per David Fyfe					
See attached picture of 301 Mission Screen Wall construction in progress. This picture was taken Nov of 2008, and shows a lateral support tie beam below grade connected to each vertical steel member of the screen wall. These tie beams are not shown on the plans and need to be cut so that the existing wall can be removed by others, as this scope is below and out of Transworld's contract. Please provide details for this condition.		Tie beams shall be saw cut cleanly at exterior face of existing 301 Mission street basement perimeter wall.					
		Restoration of waterproofing is required.					
		Detail 1 on attached 301 Mission Street drawing S3-3.13 (rev 6, 04/04/2008) is the best available information at this time and has been provided for your information.					

		RESPONSE 02/23/2011 per Kevin Chiu					
		Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.					
T-0033	301 Mission Screen Wall - Concrete Demo Scope of Work Clarification	Closed	02/14/2011	02/24/2011	02/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company	Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>					
Reference: attached text document		Response from David Fyfe on 2/23/11:					
Please see attached text document explaining Transworld's request.		Removal of element is in scope per contract documents, see detail B on sheet C-5000.					

Transworld Construction requests that TJPA, Turner Construction, and Webcor-Obayashi make a final determination as to work scope based on the documents and discussions provided herein. It is Transworld's contention and belief that the 301 Mission wall relocation work scope does not require Transworld to remove the (e) concrete structure below the dark gray colored curb. For clarity see Exhibit D, page 1 and page 2.		Response from John Adams on 2/24/11:					
		1. Demolition scope Utility Vault "foundation" to be demolished by Evans Bros see attached sketch C-5000 Detail A.					
		2. Existing "Concrete Slab" in accord with attached sketch C-5000 Detail B - this element is in scope and is to be removed by Transworld per C-5000 Detail B including concrete as shown.					
Attached please see text explanation and Exhibits A, B, C, and D.		3. Demolition scope "unforeseen grade beam" to be severed by Evans Bros see attached sketch C-5000					



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Detail B.							
T-0034	301 Mission Screen Wall - Change of walkway from original logistics	Closed	02/14/2011	02/24/2011	02/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:URS Corporation	David Fyfe
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The conditions of the worksite have changed significantly from what Transworld originally bid and have changed the entire logistical plan for the execution of this contract work. The original logistics plan, as well as the contract documents, show a walkway along the South side of the original existing screen wall. Now, the entire walkway has been removed and nothing exists except an open pit. Please see all four pages of Exhibit A that is attached to this RFI. This change of condition affects Transworld's ability to execute the contract work. There is no longer available workspace to erect the structural steel and the South side finishes. This condition now requires a modification to our contract such that Transworld may use the parking/driveway on the North side of current barricaded area. The exact impact is not yet fully developed because there are ongoing discussions related to further demolition and removal of concrete structures that currently exist for our construction work. If the current and remaining working areas are further deteriorated by additional demolition, even greater challenges will arise. Transworld Construction requests reasonable accommodations for access to the worksite from the parking/driveway that is North of the currently erected temporary barricade wall.				301 Mission Street driveway shall remain open to building tenants/occupants for through traffic at all times.			
				Per 2/17/11 field meeting, if coordinated with and approved by 301 Mission Street property owner in advance, one lane of driveway may be temporarily used short term by contractor for deliveries.			
				Contractor shall prepare and submit a Logistics Plan to the TJPA Representative and 301 Mission Street property owner for review and approval prior to use of driveway. At a minimum Logistics plan shall include the following;			
				- scheduled dates and duration of driveway use; - traffic control plan/sketch (including extent of driveway to be used, proposed/required signs, barricades, flagmen, etc.); and, - extent of temporary barricade wall dismantling and restoration.			
				Contractor shall provide all necessary traffic control measures (signs, barricades, fencing, flagmen, etc.) during use of driveway as directed by the TJPA Representative and/or 301 Mission Street property owner.			
				Contractor shall restore temporary barricade wall at end of each day if dismantled.			
T-0035	BSE - Additional Trainbox Drawings	Closed	02/16/2011	02/26/2011	02/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 690 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	1.A - Full length section along Grid A 1.E - Full length section along Grid E 1.J - Full length section along Grid J unfolded along wall alignment 2 - Full width section at Column Line 3 3 - Full width section at Column Line 7 4 - Full width section at Column Line 10.5 5 - Full width section at Column Line 18 (CL First St) 6 - Full width section at Column Line 23 7 - Full width section at Column Line 26 (CL Fremont St) 8 - Full width section at Column Line 30 9 - Full width section at Column Line 34.5 (Beale St.) 10 - Section at "flare?" 11 - Section at "flare?" Please provide either electronic 2D CAD files at for each section where BBII can dimension, or hardcopy drawings that are fully dimensioned.						
T-0036	BSE - Bracing Load Discrepancy	Closed	02/16/2011	02/26/2011	02/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-1110, Specification Section 31 55 00, and attached memo Please see the attached memo from BBII's bracing design engineer, PB&A. PB&A are finding more than a slight discrepancy between the bracing loads given in the tables of GT-1110 when compared to loads they calculated using the "design profile" earth pressured diagram as shown on the same sheet. As required by note 6 on GT-1110, BBII is continuing their design with the forces given in the tables, however BBII feels it is prudent to note the variances.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See the attached reply. ----- Attached Response from ARUP - 02/18/2011 Kevin Clinch The internal bracing system shall be designed to satisfy the criteria specified in the contract documents including the strut loads given in the tables on GT-1110. Our review of the calculations included with the RFI was limited to that necessary to understand the Contractor's questions. The calculations have not been reviewed for conformance with the contract documents. A more complete review will be undertaken when the calculations are issued as a			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0037	BSE - Request for Utility As-Builts From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. REQUEST: Reference Sheets U-2021 to U-2023, U-4005 BBII is requesting as-built data for the phase 1 electrical ductbanks at First St. and Fremont St. BBII is particularly interested in receiving the coordinates, elevations, width and depths of the ductbank where they intersect the CDSM wall as shown on utility drawings U-2021 through U-2023 Additionally, BBII would like to receive more info on the phase 2 utilities shown in section X&Y on U-4005: - What material are these ducts and are they encased? - Can the spacing shown on U-4005 be shifted to accommodate bridge girder spacing?	Closed To: Turner Construction Company SUGGESTION:	02/17/2011	02/28/2011	03/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Nhi Tran	Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
		Ural Yal	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			Phase I electrical ducts as shown on the AECOM Relocation of Utilities Project (RUP) Plans sheets U-2020, U-2021, U-2022 and U-2023 on First and Fremont streets have been constructed or will be constructed by PG&E. AECOM has requested as-built information from PG&E on what has been constructed to date and will provide upon receipt.				
			Sections X and Y on RUP sheet U-4005 shows utilities in the proposed final locations following construction of the Transit Center substructure and permanent utility corridors on First and Fremont streets. Not all utilities shown need to be incorporated and supported by the interim bridge structures on First and Fremont streets.				
			Only PG&E and Verizon Phase II utilities need to be incorporated and supported from the interim bridge structure. The remaining utilities i.e. AT&T, TCG and PG&E "NIP" (PG&E New Bushiness) indicated in section, will be constructed following construction of the Transit Center substructure and permanent utility corridors.				
			PG&E has proposed steel conduit for the ducts to be supported by the interim bridge structures. Verizon has proposed PVC conduits.				
			Proposed modifications to utility alignments (horizontal and vertical) and conduit configuration may be acceptable upon review and acceptance by AECOM and the private utility. AECOM suggests a coordination meeting between BBII, AECOM and the				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 692 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
private utilities to help facilitate the interim bridge and utilities support design.							
T-0037.1	BSE - Request for Utility As-Builts	Closed	03/24/2011	04/04/2011	04/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0037 and Sheets U-2020, U-2021, U-2022 and U-2023 Please provide BBI with as-built information from PG&E on what has been constructed to date, as mentioned in the response to RFI #T-0037		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> PG&E's substructure work on First and Fremont Streets is scheduled to be complete by April 28, 2011. PG&E will provide as-built drawings following completion of their work.			
T-0037.2	BSE - Request for Utility As-Builts	Closed	03/24/2011	04/28/2011	04/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0037.1 Please provide BBI with as-built information from PG&E on what has been constructed to date, as mentioned in the response to RFI #T-0037 and RFI#T-0037.1		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please see response to RFI #T0037.1. Asbuilts will be available once received from PGE. This issue has being denoted in the open issues log and does not require an open RFI to track the issuance of the asbuilts.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0038	BSE - Shear Walls for Rebracing	Closed	02/17/2011	02/27/2011	02/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Reference response to RFI #T-0024, Sheet GT-1112, and attached drawing The response to RFI #T-0024 noted discussions that took place during the TG03 BSE Trade Subcontractor - Design Team Coordination Meeting, about utilizing the permanent shear wall as re-bracing during the train box build out. Attached is a sketch showing a staged wall construction and strut removal sequence that BBII believes would eliminate the need for re-bracing along the SW Wall. Is this sequence acceptable?			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti Response: The conditions depicted in Stage 12 & 13 of sketch GT-1112 for shearwalls to be used as re-brace elements will cause overstressing of the mat slab and excessive movement of the Trainbox wall, and therefore, is not acceptable. Note however, that once the Lower Concourse slab is constructed and develops the design strength, the upper portion of the shearwall above the Lower Concourse slab can be used as re-braces. See attached SKS-0101 that illustrates the load path of the shearwall. ARUP Response: The use of the permanent concrete shearwalls as bracing is acceptable provided the design criteria specified in the construction documents is satisfied. This includes, but is not limited to, the bracing stiffness requirements. The effective stiffness of the shear walls will be affected by the stiffness of the permanent train box wall and mat slab and tiedowns. The response to this RFI must include input from Thornton Tomasetti regarding the impact on the permanent structural elements.	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0038.1	BSE - Shear Walls for Rebracing	Closed	11/06/2014	11/16/2014	11/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference RFI T-0038.				The response to RFI T-0038 stands. The purpose of conceptual sketch SKS-0101 is to illustrate acceptable and unacceptable reaction force couples. The sketch does not speak to the adequacy, detailing, or completeness of the load path for the excavation shoring, including the presence or absence of a corridor. The contractor is solely responsible for excavation shoring and protection of the structure in all temporary conditions. This includes all required calculations, detailing, and verification of completeness and adequacy of load path. Provided the contractor has fulfilled this obligation, the shearwalls may be used as rebracing, as was stated in RFI T-0038 response.			
The response to RFI T-0038 states that once the Lower Concourse has reached design strength the permanent shear walls can be utilized as re-braces. The response also contains a sketch detailing the load path of the shear wall, however the sketch details the Lower Concourse shear walls being poured up to the foundation wall. The design has evolved since and the contract drawings now show a corridor running along the southwest corridor creating a gap between the shear wall and foundation wall. Please clarify the design intent and confirm shear walls can be used as re-bracing per contract document.							

T-0039	301 Mission Screen Wall - Base Plate Dimensions	Closed	02/17/2011	02/27/2011	02/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:URS Corporation David Fyfe			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: 2/S-5000, D/S-5000, attached sketches				Neither options A nor B are acceptable for the anchor bolt mounting system. Provide a base plate as detailed on S-5000 that has the dimensions of 14" by 18".			
See the 301 Mission Screen Wall drawings, specifically details 2 and D/S-5000. Is it acceptable to use a base plate with dimensions 14" x 14", in lieu of the 14" x 18" per plan below the HSS 10" x 10"? See attached sketches of proposed anchor bolt mounting options A and B. If acceptable, please choose the detail you prefer.							



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>	
T-0042	301 Mission Screen Wall - Elevation of concrete wall	Closed	02/24/2011	03/06/2011	03/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:URS Corporation David Fyfe					
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Please clarify the following information regarding the field elevation of the new concrete wall. Detail A/S-4000 indicates that the concrete foundation wall height shall be +/- 2'- 2" to 2'- 8". Based on this reference the tallest part of the concrete wall will be the East point of the wall. The height of the wall will then decrease as the wall moves west towards Fremont St. (the west side). If we use a wall height of 2'- 8" at its tallest point (the east side), that would result in a wall height of 20.5 inches at Fremont Street (the west end). This is less than 2'-2" as indicated in the contract drawings; therefore please confirm that Transworld will be building a concrete wall height between 20.5 inches to 2'- 8". As a point of comparison, the original existing screen wall had this exact same dimension of 20.5 inches at the low and 2'- 8" at the high.</p>					<p>New concrete wall height of 20.5" above the existing embed plate on west end is not acceptable.</p> <p>Contract documents show the new concrete wall height varies from 2'-2" +/- to 2'-8" +/- . This is based on the driveway elevations shown on the existing plans provided by Millennium Partners, developer for 301 Mission Street, and allowing for a code required minimum 18" high concrete wall from top of paver/driving surface for vehicle safety. As noted on A/S-4000, "Top of (E) Vault Wall Elevation may Vary, Contractor to VIF, Adjust Concrete Wall Accordingly", please adjust top of concrete wall to be minimum 18" above top of paver/driving surface (approximately 2'-4" +/- to 3'-4" +/- in wall height).</p> <p>See attached coordination sketch.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0043	301 Mission Screen Wall - Temporary Vault Plug at Utility Vault Opening	Closed	02/25/2011	03/07/2011	03/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:URS Corporation David Fye				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Regarding the transformer vault plug as shown on page C-5000; Transworld has been asked to submit some proposals as to how a plug should be installed. The original existing ventilation for the vault was open to the air at the original planters. This original ventilation was completely open and secured only by a metal grate to prevent access, but not water or air. As located on page C-5000, Transworld construction proposes to install 2 x 4 backing studs attached to the left and right vertical walls of the existing opening. These 2 x 4 backing studs will be adhered with powder actuated nails. Spanning across the backing studs Transworld construction proposes to install two 2 x 4 crossmembers which will be nailed to the 2 x 4 backing studs. This assembly can be seen in the attached pictures pages 1 and 2.</p> <p>The assembly noted above is option 1. Option 2- Added additionall 2x4 crossmembers which would further restrict air flow to the (e) vault. Option 3- Nail on a plywood sheet that would enclose the entire vault vent opening. Option 4 - Nail on a plywood sheet and waterproof the plywood to prevent water intrusion as well.</p> <p>Note: Transworld Construction is concerned about restricting airflow into a vault that originally was designed to have this open vent. We are not familiar with any impact sealing this vent will have on the existing equipment.</p>						<p>Contractor shall provide the transformer vault plug based on the Option 4 solution with the following amendments;</p> <p>1. Provide 2x4 cross members at max. 12" o.c. spacing; 2. Face of all 2x4 members shall be flush with outside face of existing vault wall to facilitate extension of plywood sheet beyond ventilation opening (see number 5 below); 3. Plywood sheet shall be two layers of 5/8" for a total of 1.25" thick, laminate plywood layers with waterproof adhesives; 4. Secure plywood to 2x4 members with galvanized nails or screws at min. 6" spacing; 5. Extend plywood sheet min. 6" beyond edge of ventilation opening (all four sides); and, 6. Seal perimeter of plywood sheet and existing concrete vault wall with appropriate sealant to ensure weather tightness (all four sides).</p> <p>In addition, Contractor is required to ensure sufficient air flow is provided to existing underground vault/electrical equipment at all times. Existing ventilation openings (one per vault) shall not be plugged until new ventilated manhole covers per C-5000/C-5001 are installed. The new ventilated manhole covers must be protected from damage and/or soiling from concreting activities of the adjacent stem wall. The existing ventilation openings must be plugged prior to start of BSE activities to restrict entry of water and/or construction debris into the existing underground vault/transformer spaces.</p>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 698 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0044	BSE - Pile Mat Slab Connection	Closed	02/25/2011	03/07/2011	03/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet S-3003 Reference Detail 2 on S-3003 - "Slip Detail @ Trestle Pile Mat Connection" Please confirm that this detail only applies to the trestle and not the bridge as stated.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TT Reply: The trestle supports the bridge, therefore detail 2/S-3003 does apply to the bridge.	
<hr/>							
T-0045	301 Mission Screen Wall - Void Below Existing Embed	Closed	03/02/2011	03/12/2011	03/17/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached pictures The new 301 Mission screen wall location is to be laid out over an existing embed plate. At that plate #8 rebars are to be epoxied per RFI T-0027. Currently in the field the embed has been cut where the dowels are to be installed and holes are being drilled to the required 30" depth. It has been discovered that there are voids below the exitsing embed plate of up to 1.5". See attached pictures for some locations where this condition occurs. Please advise if this void is to be filled.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Voids below the existing embed plate shall be filled by use of grouting applied by use of low pressure grouting methods to deliver grout into void spaces. The result following grouting shall be that all voids are fully grouted. All grout materials shall be non-shrink grout. Pressure grouting shall be performed by qualified personnel who have experience in low pressure grouting steel plates. Contractor shall submit qualifications in the form of resumes identifying project experience utilizing low pressure grouting for personnel performing the work. The Contractor shall provide a submittal identifying the non-shrink grout mix proposed for use and a narrative providing a full description of the means and methods proposed to result in grout flow from input point to output point including methods to result in prevention of trapped air (air is to be displaced by grout flow). A narrative describing means and methods shall specifically include identification of proposed equipment and the proposed porting and venting to allow installation of non-shrink grout and displacement of trapped air. Where the embedded plate is not continuous (where the plate is not provided), the existing concrete surface shall be prepared meeting all requirements of a bonded construction joint. - David Fyfe 03/16/2011	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>=====Additional Response=====</div> <div>Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.</div> <div>- Kevin Chiu 03/17/2011</div>							
T-0046	BSE - CLSM Slump	Closed	03/03/2011	03/13/2011	03/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification Section 03 30 01				03/03/2011 Kevin Clinch			
The CLSM slump range for the Buttress Shoring Excavation Work is listed between 10" to 12". BBII has concerns about the CLSM mix segregating during placement with such a high slump. Please confirm if it is acceptable to provide a CLSM mix with a slump range of 7" +/- 1" in lieu of the 10" to 12" called for in the Specification.				ARUP Response - A CLSM mix with a slump range of 7" +/- 1" is acceptable pending our review of the Contractor's mix design. Arup will work with the Owner's Testing Agency to refine the Field Quality Control procedures for checking slump and segregation of the CLSM.			
T-0047	BSE - Joint Preconstruction Survey	Closed	03/03/2011	03/13/2011	03/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification Section 01 15 40 and attached list				Arup has been, and will continue, performing interior preconstruction surveys at the properties listed by BBI. Arup will share the information with contractors as it becomes available. A representative from BBI may accompany Arup at the remaining site surveys. Contact Stephanie Reichin 415.227.9700 for a schedule of the remaining site visits.			
Attached is the list of buildings that BBI has identified for joint survey, in accordance with specification section 01 15 40. BBI requests confirmation of this list.							
Please provide BBI a contact for coordinating the joint survey effort. BBI would like to do this work on the week of March 14, 2011.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 700 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0047.1	BSE - Preconstruction Joint Survey Exteriors of Buildings	Closed	03/21/2011	03/31/2011	03/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Alfred Lau	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference RFI #T-0047 and attached email				Response to RFI T-0047 was specific to the query posed relating to the preconstruction survey of adjacent building interiors (basements) that Arup is conducting and the feasibility for the contractor joining Arup for any future visits.			
Please confirm the exterior of the building, in accordance with item 1.5 D in the specification 01 15 40 Joint Survey, is also covered by the response of RFI T-0047 as well as the interior of the building.				For the pre-construction joint-examination and photographing of adjacent building exteriors per 01 15 40 - 1.5.D, please coordinate with Turner (CMO), who will coordinate with Singer Assoc, TJPA's outreach consultant, to invite and/or coordinate the possible attendance of adjacent property owners. Please submit a list of properties and planned schedule of the examination/photography activities ASAP for record and for coordination.			
If not, please contact "property owners within 25 feet of the construction excavation" and arrange the joint survey immediately.							
<hr/>							
T-0048	BSE - Building Demolition in Zone 1	Closed	03/03/2011	03/13/2011	03/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference CR-T-005 and Sheet SKGT-0001-R1				The "Eminent Domain" legal process is incomplete at this time - estimated completion date is 5/29/11. Therefore the demolition contract for 60 Tehama, 85 Natoma, 564 Howard and 568 Howard has not been issued and a schedule cannot be provided. The estimated demolition completion date is between 7/29/11 and 8/29/11.			
CR T-005 appears to require additional building demolition. Please provide a schedule for this demolition work and an estimated completion date as this will potentially impact BBI's schedule and work sequence.							
<hr/>							
T-0049	BSE - Constructware	Closed	03/03/2011	03/13/2011	03/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification Section 01 10 40				Trade contractors will be given "View Only" access to Constructware. Contact Turner to schedule access and training. W/O is still responsible for managing the information flow to and from their trade contractors. TJPA will not accept information entered by trade			
Specification Section 01 10 40 Article 1.6 B4 states: "TJPA will provide Trade Subcontractors with the necessary training and access to Constructware"							

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 703 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference Specification Section 01 14 19, 1.4</div><div>According to the referenced specification section, Parcel P is available as of November 1, 2010 and will be available until 2013. BBI was informed that this parcel will not be available for this contract.</div><div>Please confirm.</div><div>If this parcel is not available, are there any alternative parcels that will be available for construction staging?</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Parcel P is available for Webcor-Obayashi use in accord with Spec. 01-14-19 - see attached sketch for shared use with TJPA.</div>		
T-0053	BSE - Waler Standoff	Closed	03/09/2011	03/19/2011	03/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Nhi Tran</div><div>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.</div><div>Ural Yal</div></div>		<div>To: Turner Construction Company</div> <div>Daphne Faulkner</div>		<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>			
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference Sheet GT-1110, RFI #T-0018, and attached photos and drawings</div><div>Previous RFI #T-0018 - BSE - Waler to CDSM Wall spacing addressed BBI's concern with only having 6" clear between the face of the CDSM Wall and the Waler. Conversations in the weekly TG03 BSE Design Team Coordination meetings have re-raised the issue and BBI believes it requires additional consideration. The response in RFI #T-0018 said that rebar couplers in the wall verticals (in the next contract) would be used to eliminate the conflict. BBI believes that this seems to be impractical and not cost effective for over 3000 lf feet of wall and 4 levels of walers. Providing a standoff equal to the wall thickness would be an additional cost to the BSE contract, but BBI believes it would be minor compared to dealing with the cost to deal with the conflict later.</div><div>BBI is requesting to please re-evaluate and provide direction.</div><div>Attached is a suggested detail as well as examples where it has been used before, for your consideration.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>ARUP Response:</div> <div>Provided the criteria shown in the Contact Documents is satisfied, the proposal is acceptable.</div> <div>Additionally:</div> <div>Provided this proposal is acceptable to the TJPA, the internal bracing design submittal shall include the details and calculations associated with this proposal.</div> <div>The soldier piles shall be checked for the increased moment due to the eccentric strut reaction. This check shall be reported in the internal bracing submittal.</div> <div>No increase in torsional loading on the soldier pile is permitted.</div> <div>End of Comments</div>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 704 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0053.1	BSE - Waler Standoff	Closed	03/09/2011	03/19/2011	03/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Alfred Lau	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Sheet GT-1110, RFI #T-0018, and attached photos and drawings				REVISED RESPONSE TO RFI #T-0053			
Previous RFI #T-0018 - BSE - Waler to CDSM Wall spacing addressed BBI's concern with only having 6" clear between the face of the CDSM Wall and the Waler. Conversations in the weekly TG03 BSE Design Team Coordination meetings have re-raised the issue and BBI believes it requires additional consideration. The response in RFI #T-0018 said that rebar couplers in the wall verticals (in the next contract) would be used to eliminate the conflict. BBI believes that this seems to be impractical and not cost effective for over 3000 lf feet of wall and 4 levels of walers. Providing a standoff equal to the wall thickness would be an additional cost to the BSE contract, but BBI believes it would be minor compared to dealing with the cost to deal with the conflict later.				TJPA revises response to as follows:			
BBI is requesting to please re-evaluate and provide direction.				The W/O and BBI proposal to increase the spacing between the waler and CDSM wall is acceptable to TJPA since it meets the requirements in 31 55 00 1.5 DESIGN subsections I, J, K, L, and M. This design is for Contractor use. This proposal from the Contractor creates multiple benefits for W/O and BBI including The waler is out of the way of the rebar and this will help W/O with their coordination with the Train Box concrete work subcontractor. W/O benefits since more rebar can be installed with this increased spacing which saves time to the schedule and costs associated with the waterproofing and rebar installations. BB benefits because it appears that there is a decrease to the number of times that struts and walers must be moved. BB benefits in that strut length remains essentially the same when restrutting after Train Box wall sections are completed.			
Attached is a suggested detail as well as examples where it has been used before, for your consideration.				TJPA and the Program Management Team suggest that W/O and BB proceed with a 3' - 6" spacing or whatever dimension is necessary to insure that the walers are not within the Train Box Wall profile. If the walers position requires rework, the Contractor and SubContractor take full responsibility to meet design requirements with no change to contract cost. TJPA agrees to this suggestion from the Contractor to offset the waler from the CDSM wall to allow for the construction of the Train Box wall. TJPA requests that the Contractor proceed on this issue as a no-cost resolution to these RFIs. If W/O finds that this Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall design does have an additional cost to TJPA, the funds will come from the CM/GC Contingency Fund.			
T-0053.2	BSE - Waler Standoff	Closed	03/09/2011	03/19/2011	03/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Douglas Jacobson	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0054	Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	Reference Sheet GT-1110, RFI #T-0018, and attached photos and drawings		TJPA and Program Management Team expect that the Contractor and Sub-Contractor meet the design requirements for the Design/Build of the Internal Bracing as specified in 31 55 00 INTERNAL BRACING FOR SHORING WALL and per the Contract Drawings. As subsection 1.8 M. states,				
	Previous RFI #T-0018 - BSE - Waler to CDSM Wall spacing addressed BBI's concern with only having 6" clear between the face of the CDSM Wall and the Waler. Conversations in the weekly TG03 BSE Design Team Coordination meetings have re-raised the issue and BBI believes it requires additional consideration. The response in RFI #T-0018 said that rebar couplers in the wall verticals (in the next contract) would be used to eliminate the conflict. BBI believes that this seems to be impractical and not cost effective for over 3000 lf feet of wall and 4 levels of walers. Providing a standoff equal to the wall thickness would be an additional cost to the BSE contract, but BBI believes it would be minor compared to dealing with the cost to deal with the conflict later.		"Walers are to be placed against the shoring wall on spacers to provide a minimum of 6 inches of clearance between the waler and the shoring wall. The 6 inch clearance is to provide a continuous path to allow the outboard curtain of reinforcement of the permanent wall to be routed through this space without requiring use of couplers or added lap splices at walers..."				
	BBI is requesting to please re-evaluate and provide direction.		The Submittal for Internal Bracing needs to address the concerns expressed by the reviewers including Arup in their response to RFI T-0053 which states:				
Attached is a suggested detail as well as examples where it has been used before, for your consideration.		"Provided the criteria shown in the Contact Documents is satisfied, the proposal is acceptable.					
			Additionally:				
			Provided this proposal is acceptable to the TJPA, the internal bracing design submittal shall include the details and calculations associated with this proposal.				
			The soldier piles shall be checked for the increased moment due to the eccentric strut reaction. This check shall be reported in the internal bracing submittal.				
			No increase in torsional loading on the soldier pile is permitted."				
	</						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 706 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>attached material information</p> <p>For the temporary bridges, BBII will be using the attached structural bridge deck material from Big R Bridge. The troughs are filled completely with AC to the top of the decking, and an overlay will be applied over the top. BBII would like to use a 2" minimum overlay, resulting in an overall cross section with an average 4" thickness. Bridge geometry requirements specified in section 01 53 13 - 1.3.A.6 will be met without reducing the overlay thickness below the 2" minimum.</p> <p>Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>						
T-0055	BSE - Request for Soil Parameters	Closed	03/09/2011	03/19/2011	03/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal						
	REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-1110 and Specification Section 31 55 00 In the TG03 BSE Design Team Coordination meeting held on 03/09/2011, Arup said they would provide BBII with soil input parameters for use in BBI's model. Please provide BBI with this information.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			ARUP Response: Summary tables of the soil properties used in Arup's PLAXIS analysis are attached.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0056	BSE - CR T-006	Closed	03/09/2011	03/19/2011	03/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Compy Daphne Faulkner			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference CR T-006 The Change Request documents do not indicate who will have the maintenance responsibility for the AC walkway. BBII has the following questions: 1. Should BBII include pricing for maintenance? If this walkway is going to get placed on top of the 3" minus rubble, a fair amount of maintenance would be required. 2. When is this walkway scheduled to be constructed? And if maintenance is needed, when would it start? 3. Are the typical fence and K-rail shown in the section the same ones that are protecting the perimeter, or an additional row that creates a walkway that has both sides fenced, protecting the public from construction and vehicle traffic? BBII needs to have this information in order to provide accurate pricing for this Change Request T-006. Please advise.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is not an RFI. W/O has control of the site and is to coordinate maintenance duration with their subcontractor for pricing.			
<hr/>							
T-0056.1	BSE - CR T-006	Closed	03/24/2011	04/03/2011	04/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Compy Jack Adams			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI T-0056 and CR T-006 Please confirm that any necessary repairs of the AC overlay are excluded from CR T-006 scope as discussed at the TG03 BSE - Design Coordination Meeting on 3/23/2011. Also, please provided additional sketches we discussed at the meeting as well. Finally, please provide a complete copy of Demo Contractor's change order related to CR T-006 to fully understand the limits of their responsibility.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> CM/GC is responsible for maintenance of site - including these sidewalks- debris, cleaning, graffiti etc. as specified in contract documents. The AC overlay was installed by Demolition Contractor per RFI 24.2. The basements were filled per contract using crushed concrete, compaction methods were used by EBi and verified by ISI Special Inspector. The AC overlay was installed per RFI 24.2 with asphalt applied no less than 3" thick. However, the CM/GC's concern is related to the required repair if there is a failure of this asphalt. If there is a failure of the AC overlay (if caused by pedestrian traffic on this sidewalks- not construction			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 708 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>that the CSL tubes do not fail at the joints.</div> <div>Please confirm if this is acceptable.</div>							
T-0058	BSE - Underground Utilities Removal on Beale Street	Closed	03/11/2011	03/21/2011	03/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner		
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference Sheet D-2230				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per Drawing D-2230 Note 2, "Unless specified otherwise all utilities to be removed have already been cut and capped outside limits of work by Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project including future utilities installed by the Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project. Contractor to coordinate removal of utilities with TJPA representative." Please confirm that the work described in Note 2 has been completed for all underground utilities on Beale St. If work has not yet been completed, please provide a list of utilities not yet abandoned and dates when the said utilities are to be cut and capped.				Beale Street Utilities PGE and ATT. Substructure installation and work is incomplete. Work is scheduled to complete by 5/30/11. Cabling/cutovers & pressurizing gas pipe forecasted to be complete by 6/30/11. ATT will finish in this window also.			
				***** These dates are subject to change due to weather, operational issues and any conflicts outside the control of PG&E*****			
				Beale St. Webcor-Obayashi: Relocation of Utilities project will provide the completion dates for utilities on Beale St.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0059	BSE - Underground Utilities Removal on Fremont Street	Closed	03/11/2011	03/21/2011	03/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal	Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
REQUEST: Reference Sheet D-2230 Per Drawing D-2230 Note 2, "Unless specified otherwise all utilities to be removed have already been cut and capped outside limits of work by Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project including future utilities installed by the Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project. Contractor to coordinate removal of utilities with TJPA representative." Please confirm that the work described in Note 2 has been completed for all underground utilities on Fremont St. If work has not yet been completed, please provide a list of utilities not yet abandoned and dates when the said utilities are to be cut and capped.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Fremont Street PGE Final conduit installation scheduled to be complete 4/11/11. Cabling and cutovers forecasted to be complete by 6/4/11. ***** These dates are subject to change due to weather, operational issues and any conflicts outside the control of PG&E***** Fremont St. Webcor-Obayashi: Relocation of Utilities project will provide the completion dates for utilities on Fremont St.			

T-0060	BSE - Underground Utilities Removal on 1st Street	Closed	03/11/2011	03/21/2011	03/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal	Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
REQUEST: Reference Sheet D-2230 Per Drawing D-2230 Note 2, "Unless specified otherwise all utilities to be removed have already been cut and capped outside limits of work by Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project including future utilities installed by the Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project. Contractor to coordinate removal of utilities with TJPA representative." Please confirm that the work described in Note 2 has been completed for all underground utilities on 1st St. If work has not yet been completed, please provide a list of utilities not yet abandoned and dates when the said utilities are to be cut and capped.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> First Street - Substructure installation scheduled to complete by 4/30/11. Cabling and cutovers forecasted to be complete by 6/24/11 ***** These dates are subject to change due to weather, operational issues and any conflicts outside the control of PG&E***** First St. Webcor-Obayashi: Relocation of Utilities project will provide the completion dates for utilities on First St.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 711 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0061	BSE - Concerns About Pile To Mat Slab Connection	Closed	03/15/2011	03/25/2011	03/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet S-3003 and attached detail BBII has concerns that the trestle pile to mat slab slip connection as shown in detail 2 on S-3003 will not work as intended. Based on BBII's understanding that this joint is intended to allow the mat slab to deflect upward and our limited knowledge of the permanent structure design, BBII has listed some concerns with this connection below: 1. BBII does not think the sleeve will be able to slide with the bolts and slotted holes completely encased in concrete. (see attached) 2. If the slab does deflect upwards and the lower section of pile is no longer in contact with the bearing plate, then the mat slab is carrying the entire load on the pile. 3. Any upward movements of the slab will affect the trestle supper structure framing. Differential upward deflections could cause damage depending on severity. BBII does wish to bear the risk of re-designing this joint due to the interaction with the permanent structure, however BBII has attached a suggestion that they feel would eliminate some of their concerns listed above. Please provide a revised detail or rebut BBII concerns if you still believe the detailed connection is the best suited for this application.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti response: Comments in response to BBII concerns: 1. Bolts/slotted holes could be isolated from the concrete via styrofoam blocks. 2. Anticipated slab movement upward is due to rise of groundwater pressure after the dewatering pumps are turned off - which is after structure is completed and trestle work is completed. Comments regarding proposed alternate detail: 1. Proposed detail does not address waterproofing at bottom of mat and allows water infiltration into the mat as currently presented. AAI Response: Alternate detail will not satisfy waterproofing requirements.				
T-0062	BSE - Concrete Submittals	Closed	03/16/2011	03/26/2011	03/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 03 30 00 BBII believes a number of the submittals listed under the Cast In Place concrete spec section are not applicable to the BSE package. - 03 30 00-1.6.A.5 Joint Locations for Concrete Slabs to receive a terrazzo finish ¿ None of the concrete work in this package is to receive flooring. - 03 30 00-1.6A.6 Preconstruction Survey - This is intended for locations where concrete interfaces with			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti response: Confirmed that the submittals listed in the RFI are not applicable for the BSE contract.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 712 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>existing construction. The mud slab does not interface with existing concrete, and BBII is not anticipating using concrete at the temporary bridges.</p> <p>- 03 30 00-1.6.A.7 Survey of Flat Plate or Flat Slab Concrete Floors - No flat plates included in the BSE package.</p> <p>- 03 30 00-1.6.A.8 Survey of as-built floor conditions - This is applicable to finish floors only, which are not included in the BSE package.</p> <p>- 03 30 00-1.6.A.8 Structural Repairs - BBII does not believe there is any structural concrete requiring repair procedures in the BSE package.</p> <p>- 03 30 00-1.6.A.10 Patching defective concrete finishes - The concrete work in the BSE package is not finished or exposed concrete, so BBII does not believe patching procedures are necessary.</p> <p>Please confirm that the above submittals are not necessary for the BSE contract.</p>						
T-0063	BSE - Request for Final EIS/EIR for Mitigation and Monitoring	Closed	03/16/2011	03/26/2011	03/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Specification Section 01 35 65</p> <p>BBII has been unable to obtain the report titled "Final EIS/EIR" dated November 29, 2007, as described in specification section 01 35 65, 1.1.A. The report requires the contractor to be responsible for mitigation measures and monitoring requirements that are included in the specification section.</p> <p>Please provide BBII with this report.</p>						
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>						
			<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>A copy of Final EIS/EIR as referred in 01 35 65 is available in Constructware at the following location:</p> <p>File Director - Programwide - 5 Program Coord - 10 Environmental - 11 EIS/EIR - EIS/EIS Transit Center - 2004 EIS - Original</p> <p>A Constructware screenshot is attached for your information.</p>				
T-0064	BSE - Demolition Contract Backfill Material	Closed	03/16/2011	03/26/2011	03/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p>						
			<p>Answered By:Transbay PMPC</p> <p>Alfred Lau</p>				
					</		



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 715 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0067.1	BSE - Joint Preconstruction Survey Follow-Up	Closed	02/06/2012	02/16/2012	02/15/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Arup Kevin Clinch		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Fields					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per 01 15 40 and confirmed within RFI #T-067: ARUP is to provide monitoring information from adjacent buildings including but not limited to, active crack monitoring. ARUP will make the initial survey and subsequent monitoring information available to BBII. Please provide this information.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Arup has provided the pre-construction surveys to the TJPA via the Architect. The Contractor's request will be addressed by the TJPA.				
T-0067.2	BSE - Monitoring Information for 545 Mission	Closed	02/13/2012	02/13/2012	02/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref RFI T-0067 and T-0067.1 Please provide the monitoring information from 3/23/2011 through 11/01/2011 as agreed to in response to RFI T-0067.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger - ARUP Response: Arup has provided the TJPA, via the Architect, the reports and photographs documenting our visits which have been made at the request of the TJPA. The Contractor's request will be addressed by the TJPA. Per Jack Adams of Turner Construction: Contractor is directed to fulfill their contractual obligations and perform the work described in Specification Section 01 15 40 PROTECTION OF PROPERTY for all buildings adjacent to the Project. Contractor will coordinate the Joint Survey to establish authenticity of claims by coordinating access and access dates with TJPA Representatives (Singer Associates).				
T-0068	BSE - Soil Encountered During Installation of Pile Removal Instrumentation	Closed	03/22/2011	04/01/2011	03/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
						</	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 717 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 718 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference attached photos showing concrete sidewalk and sewer manhole in Zone 4, adjacent to 301 Mission building The sidewalk and sewer manhole (as seen in the photos) is not in the BSE contract work and will need to be removed prior to pre-trenching. BBI is scheduled to start their pre-trenching activities on 04/11/2011. Please advise.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Demolition Drawings D-1014, D1060, D-1063, D-1072, D1076, D-1202, D-1206 , D-1215 define extent of demolition contract. Refer to Contract and BSE Drawings D-0001 and D1001 Notes for BSE Demolition scope.				
T-0073	BSE - Request for Response Spectra	Closed	03/30/2011	04/09/2011	04/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner					
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 During a meeting with the San Francisco DBI & DPW, it was expressed that BBII must use response spectra generated by ARUP in the design of the temporary bridges. It was also noted that if the bridges are going to be in place for over 5 years, the design must be for a permanent structure and the specified ground motion may not be suitable. Therefore, BBII requests response spectra for a ground motion with a 10% probability of exceedence in 50 years as specified, as well as for a ground motion with a 7.5% probability of exceedence in 75 years.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: This request needs to be discussed in more detail. We will provide this in time for Tuesday's meeting. Adamson Comment: The meeting referenced will be held on April 12, 2011. The purpose of delivering the information in the meeting is to confirm that the Contractor and Arup have a common understanding of the requested information and the data being transmitted.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0073.1	BSE - Request for Response Spectra	Closed	03/30/2011	04/09/2011	04/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner		
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference Response to RFI#T-0073				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
During a meeting with the San Francisco DBI & DPW, it was expressed that BBII must use response spectra generated by ARUP in the design of the temporary bridges. It was also noted that if the bridges are going to be in place for over 5 years, the design must be for a permanent structure and the specified ground motion may not be suitable. Therefore, BBII requests response spectra for a ground motion with a 10% probability of exceedence in 50 years as specified, as well as for a ground motion with a 7.5% probability of exceedence in 75 years.				ARUP Response:			
				Attached are:			
				1. Arup Amec (2010) report Tables 3-3(bedrock), 3-7a (base of structure West end of box), 3-7b (base of structure East end of box), 3-9 (ratio vertical to horizontal spectral acceleration ratios) and Table 3-4 giving scale factors for near-fault effects. Note that these spectra exclude structural interaction effects and do not include the progressive softening effects that will occur progressively in the Old Bay Clay.			
				2. Output from LS Dyna dynamic analyses of the temporary (1 in 100 year return period) condition at 301 Mission, adjacent Fremont Street abutment, using the Kobe bedrock and far-field motions to generate the horizontal acceleration spectrum at the top of the shoring wall. This produces increased spectral accelerations at the fundamental period (understood to be 0.8s) of the Contractor's bridge structure.			
				Arup recommends that a meeting be held to review and discuss these after the Contractor's engineer has examined them.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0074	301 Mission Wall - Nelson Stud and Stirrup Locations	Closed	04/01/2011	04/11/2011	04/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: RFI T-0027					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per field conversation, please confirm that it is acceptable to install/weld nelson studs at 9" on center at locations in front of the vault intrusions into the concrete stem wall, where the #8 size dowels are also spaced at 9" on center, per RFI T-0027. The Nelson Stud spacing will match dowel embedment locations. This spacing also facilitates the installation of rebar stirrups and provides two tie points, one being the dowel, and the other the nelson stud.					Industry standard practice is to use miscellaneous added tie rebar (e.g. #3 or #4 bar) to provide for requirements to tie reinforcement bars as required. This RFI is a request to change spacing of nelson stud bars from 12" o.c. to 9" o.c. (where #8 dowels are spaced at 9" o.c.) in lieu of use of added tie bars.		
This work is currently ongoing and immediate confirmation is requested. Please confirm this layout is acceptable.					We note this request is for convenience of the Contractor and on this basis take no exception to reducing the spacing of the nelson stud bars from 12" o.c. to 9" o.c. (where #8 dowels are spaced at 9" o.c.). Accordingly, no change in contract and/or extension in schedule will be provided to accommodate this Contractor request. All impacts including cost and schedule associated with reducing spacing of nelson stud bars shall be borne solely by the Contractor.		
					David Fyfe, 04/01/2011 ----- No CR will be issued for work associated with the change in nelson stud spacing from 12" o.c. to 9" o.c. (where #8 dowels are spaced at 9" o.c.).		
					Kevin Chiu, 04/01/2011		
T-0075	BSE - Specification Section 32 12 17 and 32 12 18	Closed	04/04/2011	04/14/2011	04/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
We noticed that the Specification 32 12 17 at the bid has been revised to 32 12 18 in the IFC Document. 1. Please confirm that the content of the specification "STREET EXCAVATION AND RESTORATION" was unchanged between pre-bid and post-bid. 2. Please confirm that the Trade Subcontractor shall continue to use the Specification Number 32 12 18 and TJPA shall revise the Table of Contents and other specification sections referring to "32 12 17."					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					1. Confirmed. Street Excavation and Restoration specification was issued as 32 12 17 in the IFB set, and issued as 32 12 18 to avoid duplication with the Pavement Restoration specification for the Utilities trade packages.		
					2. Confirmed. As stated above, 32 12 17 is for Pavement Restoration section for the Utilities trade packages, and is not applicable for TG03 Work.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 721 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0076	BSE - Footing and Pile Removal at Bent 59 - 61	Closed	04/04/2011	04/14/2011	04/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
REQUEST: Reference Sheet D-1072, D-1030, D-1046, and D-5103 and Spec Section 01 35 65 Please advise the following as discussed with BBII on 03-28-2011 have been completed per the Demolition Contract: - Bent 59-61 - Removal of columns, footings and timber piles as required to complete 4'x4' x13' excavation below grade complete and backfilled. (Refer to drawings D-1072, D-1030, D-1046).			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Demolition of both Bent 59 and 61 was completed per Demolition Contract Drawing D-1046 Rev.0 Dated 01/04/10 and Drawing CL-17456 Rev.1 dated 8/10/09. Bent footings were demolished to the minimum 3 feet below grade per drawing D-1046 and applicable notes. Locations of these Utility Pole Foundations were determined by SFMTA (MUNI) and BLHP (Street Lighting). The three (3) locations total for the new Utility Pole Foundations had the bent footings removed and were excavated to a depth of 13' (+/-). Wood piles were not "pulled." Pile removal consisted of removing the top of pile as required to install the pole foundations to depth.				
T-0077	BSE - Monitoring Plans and Data for Zone 4 and Lot N	Closed	04/04/2011	04/14/2011	04/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 01 35 65 As discussed at the site walk through meeting on 03-28-2011 with BBII, BBII requests a copy of the demolition contract monitoring plan and any data in relation to demolition contract mitigation monitoring of Lot N and Zone 4.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Project "110 - Existing Terminal Building & Ramps Project" in Constructware contains the following submittals with the monitoring data requested- 1. 011540-02.0 Pre-Construction Survey - 181 Fremont St 2. 011540-04.0 Pre-Construction Survey - 199 Fremont St Note: 301 Mission did not provide the demo contactor access therefore data is not available for this property.				
T-0078	BSE - Timber Piles Not Yet Surveyed by EBI	Closed	04/04/2011	04/14/2011	04/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 722 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Reference attached photos and sketch</p> <p>While BBII was excavating the trial pile extraction area and exposing the timber piles on 03/31/11, piles that were not surveyed by EBI were discovered on the eastern side of the TPE area close to pile 215053. Please advise on how to proceed.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0080	BSE - Additional Timber Piles Not Surveyed by EBI From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0078 and attached photos and sketch While BBII was excavating the trial pile extraction area and exposing the timber piles on 04/01/2011, piles that were not surveyed by EBI were discovered on the southern side of the TPE area close to piles 215044, 215043 and in the centre of the TPE area at 215054, as shown in the attached drawing. The pile next to 215054 was extracted due to its proximity to 215054. A total of 7 additional piles have now been discovered to date. Please advise BBII on how to proceed.	Closed	04/04/2011	04/14/2011	04/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> BBII should follow contract Spec 02-41-19 Pile Removal Para 1.4 and provide existing timber pile documentation. Each pile over contract quantity will be reimbursed as force account (unless parties can agree on a unit rate) in accord with CCO no. T-001 Rev 2 dated 4/8/11.				
T-0081	BSE - Revised Shoring Wall Alignment Dimension From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal REQUEST: Reference attached sheet SKGT-0001-R1 The dimension from gridline J to the intersection of wall segments 1-1 and X1-1 was not updated for the revised shoring wall alignment - see attached drawing for reference. Please provide the correct dimension.	Closed	04/05/2011	04/15/2011	04/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The dimensions have been revised. See the attached SKGT-0001-R3.				
T-0082	BSE - Hazardous Material Removed From Site From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal	Closed	04/05/2011	04/15/2011	04/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			ANSWER: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Specification Section 00 03 35</p> <p>Please confirm that all hazardous material has been removed from site per the extent of demolition contract drawings for Zone 4 and Lot N.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Above ground structures and foundations were demolished at Parcel N, including footings to minus 3 feet. Demolition contract Hazardous materials scope was completed including 133 Beale st. Bar and Grille.</p> <p>Refer to Demolition Drawings D-1011, D-1012, D-1013, D-1029, D1030, D1044-1046 and D-1252 for extent of removal of structures and hazardous material.</p>				
T-0083	BSE - Existing Utilities Decommissioning Lot N and Zone 4	Closed	04/05/2011	04/15/2011	04/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Sheet D-2230 and Specification Section 02 41 01</p> <p>Please provide as built drawings for all decommissioned utilities in Lot N and Zone 4 to BBII.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Parcel N: Exisiting Utilities were decommissioned (e.g. cut and cap) in accord with Contract Drawings which only is 133 Beale st. Bar and Grille per D-1252.</p> <p>Parcel D Zone 4 : Exisiting Utilities were decommissioned (e.g. cut and cap) in accord with Contract Demolition Drawings D-1202, D-1203, D-1206, D-1207, D-1210, D-1215</p> <p>However: Two (2) locations of Existing Combined Sewer Connections ("SEWER") shown on D-1202 and D-1206 were as left unplugged to assist BBII with Dewatering discharge pipes. Locations are identified as follows: "3/D-1210 SEWER" on sheets D-1202, D-1206 and "-/- SEWER" on sheets D-1202, D-1206 (NE Corner of Lot D; no detail number provided).</p> <p>Demolition Contractor has not completed their scope of Contract and therefore has not submitied their final as-built drawings in Constructware. However, they are available in Demolition Contractor's trailer office for your viewing.</p>				
T-0083.1	BSE - Existing Utilities Decommissioning Lot N and Zone 4	Closed	04/05/2011	04/15/2011	05/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.</p> <p>REQUEST: Reference Response to RFI#T-0083, Sheet D-2230 and Specification Section 02 41 01</p> <p>The following response of RFI T-0083 is not acceptable and will become out of control of the RFI documentation process: "they are available in Demolition Contractor's trailer office for your viewing."</p> <p>Please provide BBI with as built drawings for all utilities which has been decommissioned to date in Lot N and Zone 4 to BBII.</p>	<p>Ural Yal</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Demolition Contractor has no Utility Demolition scope at Parcel N.</p> <p>Demolition Contractor has completed Utility Demolition scope at Parcel D (Zone 4) per contract drawings except where agreed by BBII.</p> <p>These as-built Utility Demolition Drawings are currently under review by the Engineer of Record and will be issued to Webcor/Obayashi for their use after this review is complete.</p>					<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>T-0084</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.</p> <p>REQUEST: Reference Sheet D-2230 and Specification Section 02 41 01</p> <p>There are 2 existing storm drain basins in Lot N not yet decommissioned. Please provide BBII the status of decommissioning or modification of these lines.</p>	<p>BSE - Existing Storm Drains Decommissioning in Lot N</p> <p>Nhi Tran</p>	<p>Closed</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>04/05/2011</p>	<p>04/15/2011</p>	<p>04/11/2011</p>	<p>Potentially</p>	<p>Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Parcel N: Existing Utilities were decommissioned (e.g. cut and cap) in accord with Contract Drawings which only is 133 Beale St. Bar and Grille per D-1252.</p> <p>There are two Storm Drain outlets on parcel N and their status' are unknown because they are outside the scope of the demolition contractor. Unforeseen Catch Basin at Beale Street Bar & Grill is identified under Demolition Contractor RFI -00058. These have been observed draining the water from parcel N during the rainy season.</p>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 726 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0084.1	BSE - Existing Storm Drains Decommissioning in Lot N	Closed	04/21/2011	05/01/2011	05/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0084, Drawing Sheet D-2230, and Specification Section 02 41 01 RFI response T-0084 has not provided clear direction for decommissioning these SD lines. The drawings indicate that the SD drain flows towards Beale Street and will conflict with the CDSM wall. Please advise on status for decommissioning the above SD lines.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As stated in response to RFI T-0084 there are two Storm Drain outlets on Parcel N and their status' are unknown because they are outside the scope of the demolition contractor. Unforeseen Catch Basin at Beale Street Bar & Grill is identified under Demolition Contractor RFI -00058. This is outside the scope of the Demolition and the BSE contract. Webcor-Obayashi RUP relocation of Utilities Project Manager will be contacted for reroute or decommissioning these Parcel N parking lot storm drain lines.		
<hr/>							
T-0085	BSE - Existing Site Conditions Lot N	Closed	04/05/2011	04/15/2011	04/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 01 15 40 Prior to demolition work Lot N surface consisted of asphalt paving, however a majority of the Lot is not currently paved. BBII assumes that the lot will be restored to its original condition. Please confirm			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Demolition Contractor was not required to restore areas specified for demolition with asphalt paving (areas such as Parcel N). This was not specified for in the demolition Contract drawings or Spec. The demolition contractor is required to backfill after removal of below grade structures with recycled crushed/processed demolition concrete. For Parcel N - Refer to drawing D-1029 Note 9.		
<hr/>							
T-0086	BSE - Clean Debris From Adjacent Buildings To Lot N and Zone 4	Closed	04/05/2011	04/15/2011	04/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 01 15 40 Please confirm that demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners, and BBII will only be responsible for cleaning dust and debris generated by BBII during its own			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners to date. This was confirmed through conversation with both EBi and Singer Associates.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 727 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
operations, after the turnover of these are completed.							
T-0087	BSE - Zone 4 Gate	Closed	04/05/2011	04/15/2011	04/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner		
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Demo Contract Drawings		Demolition Contractor second 16 foot gate eliminated due to Fremont Shoring wall. Demolition contractor used alternate means and methods for truck traffic to-from parcel D Zone 4.					
Per note 5 on drawing D-1006 of the demolition contract, each discreet fenced area shall have a minimum of two 16ft gates at the conclusion of demolition work. Currently, zone 4 only has one gate in place. BBII requests an additional gate be provided on the Fremont St. side of zone 4. BBII is available to meet and coordinate an ideal location.		That said, Demolition contractor has offered gate credit which could be used to install a 16 wide gate either at SW corner near 181 Fremont St. or on the Beale St. fence line. However- Demolition contractor would not be responsible for curb cut, removal of parking meters or other ancillary scope if Beale St. gate is chosen - that would be the responsibility of BSE Contractor. BBII can use/modify and relocate barrier fence and gates as needed per your contract. A field coordination meeting after the Monday 4/11/11 Street Coordination meeting is recommended.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 728 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0088	BSE - Temporary Shoring Wall and Buttress Conflict	Closed	04/06/2011	04/16/2011	04/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29 The temporary shoring wall installed under the demolition contract was moved East away from Fremont St. to avoid an unknown existing concrete wall. The as-built alignment of the wall now falls along the edge of the third column (C) of buttress shafts. In an effort to avoid conflicts with column C shafts generated by the revised temporary shoring wall alignment, BBII suggests that the buttress formation be moved 12" East.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: This issue was discussed at yesterday's (4/6/11) BSE meeting. The information which will be included in the Contractor's drilled shaft work plan is needed by Arup to evaluate the feasibility of the proposed shift and to consider other options.				
T-0088.1	BSE - Temporary Shoring Wall and Buttress Conflict	Closed	04/06/2011	04/16/2011	04/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: The response for RFI #T-0088 was not an answer to the question Please provide an appropriate direction to start preparing the submittal and the work as soon as possible. ----- Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29 The temporary shoring wall installed under the demolition contract was moved East away from Fremont St. to avoid an unknown existing concrete wall. The as-built alignment of the wall now falls along the edge of the third column (C) of buttress shafts. In an effort to avoid conflicts with column C shafts generated by the revised temporary shoring wall alignment, BBII suggests that the buttress formation be moved 12" East.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The contractor may relocate the entire buttress structure up to 12 inches east of the design location in order to clear any conflict with the Fremont Street shoring wall. Contractor is requested to identify the new layout and any impacts prior to start of buttress construction.				
T-0088.2	BSE - Temporary shoring wall and buttress conflict	Closed	04/06/2011	04/27/2011	04/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 729 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>The response for RFI #T-0088.1 was not an acceptable answer to the question.</p> <p>Please provide exact revised layout as required.</p> <p>The Buttresses have exact Coordinate Locations to define the layout, as shown on GT-2201.</p> <p>The existing coordinates must be changed to reflect the new layout the TJPA desires.</p> <p>History</p> <p>Information from RFI#T-0088.1</p> <p>The response for RFI #T-0088 was not an answer to the question Please provide an appropriate direction to start preparing the submittal and the work as soon as possible. Answered By: George Metzger Answered On: 20-Apr-2011 Answer: The contractor may relocate the entire buttress structure up to 12 inches east of the design location in order to clear any conflict with the Fremont Street shoring wall. Contractor is requested to identify the new layout and any impacts prior to start of buttress construction.</p> <p>----- ----- Information from RFI#T-0088</p> <p>Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29</p> <p>The temporary shoring wall installed under the demolition contract was moved East away from Fremont St. to avoid an unknown existing concrete wall. The as-built alignment of the wall now falls along the edge of the third column (C) of buttress shafts. In an effort to avoid conflicts with column C shafts generated by the revised temporary shoring wall alignment, BBII suggests that the buttress formation be moved 12" East. Suggestion Cost Impact Potentially Cost Amount</p>						
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>						
	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>ARUP Response:</p> <p>The Contractor's cover sheet describes this as RFI 0088.2, but the correct number is 0088.3.</p> <p>See attached SKGT-0002.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 730 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>Schedule Impact Potentially Days</div> <div>Answered By George Metzger</div> <div>Date Answered 2011-04-20</div> <div>Answer The contractor may relocate the entire buttress structure up to 12 inches east of the design location in order to clear any conflict with the Fremont Street shoring wall. Contractor is requested to identify the new layout and any impacts prior to start of buttress construction.</div>							
T-0088.3	BSE - Temporary shoring wall and buttress conflict	Closed	04/06/2011	04/27/2011	04/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner		
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The response for RFI #T-0088.1 was not an acceptable answer to the question.		ARUP Response:					
Please provide exact revised layout as required.		The Contractor's cover sheet describes this as RFI 0088.2, but the correct number is 0088.3.					
The Buttresses have exact Coordinate Locations to define the layout, as shown on GT-2201.		See attached SKGT-0002.					
The existing coordinates must be changed to reflect the new layout the TJPA desires.							
History							
Information from RFI#T-0088.1							
The response for RFI #T-0088 was not an answer to the question							
Please provide an appropriate direction to start preparing the submittal and the work as soon as possible.							
Answered By: George Metzger							
Answered On: 20-Apr-2011							
Answer:							
The contractor may relocate the entire buttress structure up to 12 inches east of the design location in order to clear any conflict with the Fremont Street shoring wall.							
Contractor is requested to identify the new layout and any impacts prior to start of buttress construction.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>----- ----- Information from RFI#T-0088 Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29 The temporary shoring wall installed under the demolition contract was moved East away from Fremont St. to avoid an unknown existing concrete wall. The as-built alignment of the wall now falls along the edge of the third column (C) of buttress shafts. In an effort to avoid conflicts with column C shafts generated by the revised temporary shoring wall alignment, BBII suggests that the buttress formation be moved 12" East. Suggestion Cost Impact Potentially Cost Amount Schedule Impact Potentially Days Answered By George Metzger Date Answered 2011-04-20 Answer The contractor may relocate the entire buttress structure up to 12 inches east of the design location in order to clear any conflict with the Fremont Street shoring wall. Contractor is requested to identify the new layout and any impacts prior to start of buttress construction.</div>						
T-0089	BSE - Existing Asphalt and Concrete Removed Zone 4	Closed	04/06/2011	04/16/2011	04/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Sheet D-1001 and Demo Contract Dwgs D-1060, D-1072 and attached photos Please see attached photos showing asphalt pavement at the entrance to zone 4 on the northeast corner. The referenced asphalt driveway is not in the BSE contract work and will need to be removed. Please advise.				The asphalt pavement at the entrance to zone 4 on the northeast corner is not in demolition contract scope. Contract scope included concrete columns, footings and mat slab to be removed as defined in contract drawings. Refer to demolition drawing D-1058 for best depiction of extent of demolition. Refer also to D-1014, D-1030, D-1058, D-1060, D-1063 and D-1072			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 732 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0090	BSE - Timber Piles Not Surveyed By EBI 04/04/11	Closed	04/06/2011	04/16/2011	04/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference attached photos and sketch While BBII were excavating the trial pile extraction area and exposing the timber piles on 04/04/2011, piles that were not surveyed by EBI were discovered on the eastern side of the TPE area close to pile 215053 and in the western side of the TPE area at 215055 as shown in the attached drawing. The pile next to 215055 was extracted due to its proximity to 215055. A total of 10 additional piles have now been discovered to date. Please advise on how to proceed.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> BBII should follow contract Spec 02-41-19 Pile Removal Para 1.4 and provide existing timber pile documentation. Each pile over contract quantity will be reimbursed as force account (unless parties can agree on a unit rate) in accord with CCO no. T-001 Rev 2 dated 4/8/11.		
<hr/>							
T-0091	Reciept of Construction Documents	Closed	04/06/2011	04/16/2011	04/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per the 110325_MSTR_CD_Work_Plan schedule, transmitted to Webcor/Obayashi on March 28, 2011 and discussed in the OAC Meeting on April 6, 2011; confirm the following dates should be implemented in the next monthly schedule update: 1. Webcor/Obayashi will receive the 90% CD documents on August 24, 2011 2. Webcor/Obayashi will receive the 100% CD documents on December 2, 2011			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirm. These are the current scheduled dates provided by the Design Team.		
<hr/>							
T-0092	BSE - Timber Piles Not Surveyed By EBI 4/5/11	Closed	04/06/2011	04/16/2011	04/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference attached photos and sketch While BBII was excavating the trial pile extraction area and exposing the timber piles on 4/5/11, two further piles			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> BBII should follow contract Spec 02-41-19 Pile Removal Para 1.4 and provide existing timber pile documentation.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 734 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0095	BSE - Zone 1 CDSM Test Section Relocation	Closed	04/11/2011	04/21/2011	04/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-2101, Specification Section 31 56 13 and attached drawing Per discussion with ARUP at the Wednesday April 06, 2011 Design Coordination Meeting, the Engineer was willing to consider relocating the Zone 1 CDSM test panel as shown on Dwg. GT-2101 from Zone 1 and into Zone 2. BBII and DND Construction are therefore proposing to relocate the Zone 1 CDSM test panel to the location shown on the attached drawing, near gridline 10. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: This is acceptable.		
T-0096	BSE - Old Existing Footing Along 301 Mission in Zone 4	Closed	04/11/2011	04/21/2011	04/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 02 41 01 During Pre-Trench BBII found an existing footing along the Low Rise 301 Mission wall. The footing consists of bricks and concrete. It also has a perpendicular footing that come out from footing that is parallel to the 301 Mission building wall. BBII has exposed a 20 to 30ft section of this footing (approximately on Grid Line "A" between 30 and 32). Please advise BBII as to how to proceed.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per Contract Spec. 31-56-13 Shoring wall by CDSM Method Para 3.2 Pretrenching and removal of Obstructions, Contractor is to " remove any obstructions that might be encountered along the alignment of the walls. The depth and width of trench shall be that required to remove the obstructions from the path of the shoring wall." The Archaeologist was contacted and viewed the exposed section of wall and brick debris on 4/11/11. Further archeological investigation will follow as pre-trenching continues and areas are exposed - Ref: Spec. 00-08-12 for Archaeological conditions in Zone 4. Demolition of underground obstructions shall be per Spec 02-41-01 and Demolition Debris shall be handled in accord with Spec. 01-74-00.		
T-0096.1	BSE - Old Existing Footing Along 301 Mission in Zone 4	Closed	04/20/2011	04/30/2011	05/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							



Additional Details:
As noted in the RFI response, the Archeologist has already examined the site. BBII (W/O) will notify the TJPA if additional structures or items are encountered.



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0097	BSE - Protective Material Along 301 Mission St Wall	Closed	04/20/2011	04/30/2011	05/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference attached photos BBII has encountered a drainage material along the 301 Mission wall while pretrenching. During pretrenching, this drainage material has been removed because it was not affixed to the structure. The wall does not have any exterior waterproofing system. Upon installation of the CDSM shoring system, the cementitious material will be against this wall. The existing wall is a 5' deep cantilevered beam on the backside of the existing garage shaft for 301 Mission. Does TJPA plan to install any waterproofing along this wall that can tolerate the installation of a CDSM shoring system? Please advise BBII of the TJPA's plan for waterproofing of this building.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Drainage material encountered is to be removed from the 301 Mission Wall as it was a temporary measure installed at the time of 301 Mission building construction. No waterproofing is required at this location. See attached email response from R. Rothenburger at PMPC. ----- 04/19/2011 - George Metzger TJPA to provide direction to GC.				
T-0098	301 Mission Wall - Tube Steel Alignment	Closed	04/12/2011	04/22/2011	04/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: B/S-5000 and D/A-6000 Detail B on sheet S-5000 shows the 10" tube steel centered on the 14" concrete wall below, however this is in conflict with D/A-6000 which shows the steel tube off set from the center of the wall. Please confirm per the 301 Mission subcontractor meeting conversation yesterday, that the tube steel is to be centered on the center of the wall as dimensioned in B/S-5000.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> "Confirmed. The 10"x10"x5/8" HSS section shall be erected on the center line of the concrete wall as dimensioned in Section B on S-5000."				
T-0099	BSE - Depth of Fremont Street Shoring Wall in Zone 4	Closed	04/12/2011	04/22/2011	04/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet D-2203 and attached as-built, photos,			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The temporary Fremont St. shoring wall was				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>and document</p> <p>CPM Activity Impacted - SX-BB42640</p> <p>While excavating adjacent to the existing Fremont street shoring wall as shown on contract drawing D-2203, BBII has found the existing shoring wall's height to be approximately 2' shorter than the 14 feet depth indicated in the as-builts (attached). This wall does not provide adequate shoring height for BBII to excavate and expose the timber piles prior to extraction. (See attached photo for illustration)</p> <p>The contract documents D-2203 and pre-bid Q&A response #182 (also attached) indicate this wall would accommodate the buttress area pile removal, however actual existing field conditions do not provide adequate shored depth</p> <p>Please provide direction.</p>						
T-0100	BSE - Slurry Wall Along 301 Mission St Garage	Closed	04/13/2011	04/23/2011	04/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference RFI#T-0096, Specification Section 02 41 00, and attached photos					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference from RFI#T-0096 (BBI RFI #67): "During Pre Trench BBII found an existing footing along the Low Rise 301 Mission wall. The footing consists of bricks and concrete. It also has a perpendicular footing that come out from footing that is parallel to the 301 Mission building wall. We have exposed a 20 to 30ft section of this footing (Approximately on Grid Line "A" between 30 and 32)."					Per Contract Spec. 31-56-13 Shoring wall by CDSM Method Para 3.2 Pretrenching and removal of Obstructions, Contractor is to " remove any obstructions that might be encountered along the alignment of the walls. The depth and width of trench shall be that required to remove the obstructions from the path of the shoring wall."		
After the Concrete and Brick Footing was discovered, a very large mass of slurry was discovered in the same area, and continues where the RFI#T-0096 (BBI RFI# 67) Concrete Footing" stopped. ***Please See Attached Photos***					The Archaeologist was contacted and viewed the exposed section of wall and brick debris on 4/11/11. Further archeological investigation will follow as pre-trenching continues and areas are exposed - Ref: Spec. 00-08-12 for Archaeological conditions in Zone 4.		
					Demolition of underground obstructions shall be per		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 738 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0101	a clean location to construct the CDSM Wall. Due to the unknown depth of the obstruction, at BBII discretion Sheet Piles or trench boxes may be used to support trench walls. All OSHA approved, safe practices will be used by BBII employees during the Demolition.						
	Additional Details: As noted in the RFI response, the Archeologist has already examined the site. BBII (W/O) will notify the TJPA if additional structures or items are encountered.						
	BSE - Pile Extraction Procedure Modification		Closed	04/14/2011	04/24/2011	04/15/2011	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 02 41 19 and attached response for TG0300-310 Production Extraction Plan BBII proposes to eliminate the "stroking" of the steel casing right before the CLSM is placed. Upon removal of the steel casing, BBII proposes to "stroke" the steel casing after the CLSM is placed. BBII believes the same effect of filling the void will be achieved, and this procedure will help to expedite the Project schedule. Please kindly review our proposal. Your prompt response is appreciated.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: This is not acceptable. The proposed procedure does not allow the volume of placed CLSM to be measured after the stroking of the casing.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0102	BSE - Confirm Project Coordinates	Closed	04/15/2011	04/25/2011	04/19/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings U-0100 and GT-0100 BBII's surveyor, KCA Engineers, has noticed some slight variations in bearings between the Utility drawings and the BSE drawings. Please see the following of KCA's observations and confirm coordinates provided on drawing GT-0100. Drawings U-0100 has coordinates along the center lines of various streets. The result of those coordinates put a bearing on the center line of Mission Street and Minna Street at North 46° 18 ' 19.6" East and the center line of First Street at North 43° 41 ' 39.0" West. This results in those streets not being at right angles to each other. Drawings GT-0100 has coordinates on Column Line E. The result of those coordinates puts a bearing of North 46° 18' 09.7" East on the terminal Tills is 00° 00' 10" off from being parallel with Mission and Minna Streets. Is this correct or should Column Line E be parallel with Mission and Minna Streets? The numerical column lines are shown at right angles to Column Line E, which gives them a bearing of North 43° 41 ' 50.3" West. It was observed that Column Line 18 appeared to be in almost the same location as the center line of First Street, but First Street has a bearing of North 43° 41 ' 39.0" West which is 00° 00' 11" different than Column Line 18. Is it just a coincidence that the center line and column line are almost exactly in the same location or should something be adjusted to make the two lines identical? Please advise if the bearings of the terminal should remain or be changed.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The Building Grid and bearing has been established to best-fit the numerous constraints on the project. It is coincidental that the street control lines (note, these are not necessarily in the center of the Right-of-Way and should not be construed as Center Lines) are very close, but at slightly different bearings. The building elements are constructed based on the building grid, whereas the utilities and subsequent street level improvements will be constructed based on the street control lines. The Numerical Bearings of the North South Grid lines appear to be correct. A follow-up survey control meeting should take place to ensure the shoring wall layout is performed as intended.	
T-0103	BSE - Existing Concrete Footing Gridline J between Gridline 26.5-30	Closed	04/15/2011	04/25/2011	04/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings D-5103, D-2203 and GT-5104			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per Contract Spec. 31-56-13 Shoring wall by CDSM	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 741 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0103.1	<p>Please see attached photos showing an unknown concrete structure discovered on the south side of zone 4. This structure is located between gridline 26.5-30 along gridline J. BBII is not aware of the purpose for this structure, or if it has any affect on the stability of the adjacent structures (177/181 Fremont street).</p> <p>The unknown structure was not present in the BSE contract drawings and is in direct conflict with the CDSM wall alignment, Please advise BBII how to proceed.</p> <p>BSE - Existing Concrete Footing Gridline J Between Gridline 26.5-30</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference RFI#T-0103 and Specification Section 02 41 01</p> <p>BBII interprets the Response to RFI T-0103 (BBI 0074) as TJPA's approval for the removal of this unforeseen structure. Please confirm.</p> <p>BBII proposes to follow the method outlined below for the removal of this unforeseen structure. Please confirm in writing that the removal of this unforeseen structure is approved and that provided that it is performed with the method outlined below, no damage to adjacent buildings will occur.</p> <p>Pre Trench Obstruction Removal Method</p> <p>Location: Parallel along the 177/181 Fremont Street (Grid line J, approximately between lines 26.5-30).</p>	Closed	04/27/2011	05/07/2011	05/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Method Para 3.2 Pretrenching and removal of Obstructions, Contractor is to " remove any obstructions that might be encountered along the alignment of the walls. The depth and width of trench shall be that required to remove the obstructions from the path of the shoring wall."</p> <p>The Archaeologist was contacted and viewed the exposed section of wall and brick debris on 4/11/11. Further archeological investigation will follow as pretrenching continues and areas are exposed - Ref: Spec. 00-08-12 for Archaeological conditions in Zone 4.</p> <p>Demolition of underground obstructions shall be per Spec 02-41-01 and Demolition Debris shall be handled in accord with Spec. 01-74-00.</p> <p>Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Construction means and methods are the contractor's responsibility exclusively. RFI response are not authorization of any change in contract sum or contract time.</p> <p>We take no exception to above method for the removal of structure. This work will be tracked in accord with CR T-0010.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Obstructions: A large concrete structure.</p> <p>Method: BBII will first expose the obstructions and use an excavator mounted and hand held jackhammer to demolish the large masses into smaller more manageable sizes. An excavator with a bucket will then clear the debris, until the debris is removed from the area of the CDSM Wall location. BBII will chase the obstruction as deep as it goes in order to remove all debris necessary for a clean location to construct the CDSM Wall. Due to the unknown depth of the obstruction, at BBII discretion Sheet Piles or trench boxes may be used to support trench walls. All OSHA approved, safe practices will be used by BBII employees during the Demolition.</p> <p>Additional Details: As noted in the RFI response, the Archeologist has already examined the site. BBII (W/O) will notify the TJPA if additional structures or items are encountered.</p>						
T-0104	BSE - Request for Report (PSI for Caltrans)	Closed	04/18/2011	04/28/2011	04/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Alfred Lau	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification 01 13 50 and 00 03 35 The Site Mitigation Plan in Spec section 01 13 50 of Volume 1, References the report "PSI for Caltrans, 1999." After looking through the contract documents for the Analytical back-up, BBII, Treadwell & Rollo, and Republic Services, have not been able to find it. It is necessary to have this information to properly dispose of the Hazardous Materials. To Complete the Profile of the work site, the Disposal facility, Republic Services, BBII need the Lab Data/Analytical Data from the report. At this time, the lack of information is halting the process of Material Off-Haul. Please Advise, or supply the Needed Report Information.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans' Site Investigation Report for SFOBB West Approach, prepared by PSI in 1999 can be assessed from Constructware or from ftp site as below: ftp://ftp.tjpa.org/Document%20Control/1104168/ Log In Instructions 1. Enter case-sensitive Username (public) and Password (PublicFTP1) 2. Select View\Open FTP Site in Windows Explorer 3. Drag file(s) to your desktop			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 743 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please contact PMPC Document Control should there is problem of accessing the information.							
T-0105	BSE - Train Box Beam Sizes	Closed	04/20/2011	05/02/2011	04/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference attached sketches and Sheet S1-3201				Thornton Tomasetti Reply:			
Drawing S1-3201 provides information on beam sizing in the permanent concrete structure. BBII was recently provided additional structure sections in response to T-0035.1, and a number of the beams appear to have changed in size. Beams at gridlines 18, 26, 34, & 35 should be 5' wide according to schedule A on drawing S1-3201. However, from the section provided at gridline A, these all appear to be sized at 7' wide. The sizes of these beams are critical in determining the final geometry and location of our temporary bridges. BBII acknowledges that the structural drawings are not to be scaled, so please advise if these beams are to be 60" wide as indicated in schedule A, or if they have increased in size to 84" wide.				The concrete beams at gridlines 18, 26, 34, & 35 at Ground Level have increased to 84" wide. The design is "in-progress".			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0106	301 Mission Wall - Connection from Metal Stud to Tube Steel	Closed	04/20/2011	04/30/2011	04/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference: E & C/S-5000				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please see E & C/S-5000. Transworld has attempted in their shop to set #10 SMS through the structural tube steel, as per plan. The attempt was unsuccessful, therefore Transworld tried the use of a Hilti X-U fastener into the structural steel. Attached are Hilti spec sheets for the X-U Universal Knurled Shank Fastener as well as a photo showing the X-U fastener through the structural steel. Welding is another option for connection to the tube steel. Please advise how Transworld is to fasten the metal stud to the structural tube steel.				The proposed Hilti X-U fasteners are for interior use only and are not acceptable for use on the 301 Mission exterior screen wall. Welding will damage the structural steel paint and light gauge steel galvanized coating and is not an acceptable means of connection. To fasten metal stud to structural tube steel contractor may: 1) Use shot pins rated for exterior use (i.e. Hilti X-CR fastener - ESR 1663); or 2) Pre-drill holes and tap stainless steel machine screws.			
<hr/>							
T-0107	BSE - Visual Test in Lieu of Formally Testing for Verticality in CSL Tubes	Closed	04/20/2011	04/30/2011	04/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference RFI#T-0057, Sheet GT-5202, Specification Section 31 63 29, and attached documents CPM Activity Impacted - Buttress Wall				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Below are three cases (A, B, and C) in which formally testing for verticality on CSL tubes, BBII argues would prove to be highly unusual and counter-productive:				ARUP Response:			
A. Specification Section 31.63.29.I.3 states "The contractor shall perform a test to determine verticality of the steel tubes, or drilled holes, that are going to be used for the sonic tests." Balfour Beatty has been advised by a number of testing firms that verticality tests cannot be performed on steel access tubes as well as piles reinforced with steel. Magnetic interference from steel reinforcement and steel tubes will cause the instrument to not function properly. BBII has also been advised by Terracon (please see attached email from Dextra), a reputable CSL testing firm that there are currently no known cases in the US where verticality of CSL tubes in steel reinforced piles have been formally tested.				This is acceptable.			
B. Attached is a case study that details the investigation of							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>debonding that occurs when using PVC as CSL access tubes. The results of this study clearly show the use of steel tubes (BBII is proposing to use Sonitec tubes) should be preferred over PVC.</p> <p>C. After doing some research, the closest we came to find any mention of verticality in CSL tubes was this excerpt from EPA's website which states, "If the CSL access tubes are not installed in a near-vertical position and/or the distance between them varies significantly along the length of the shaft, errors in velocity calculations may occur." Judging by this approach to verticality in CSL tubes in most specs, BBII concludes that parallelism and symmetry between tubes are more important factors in ensuring accurate CSL test readings.</p> <p>In summary, BBII in lieu of formally testing the CSL tubes for verticality will perform a visual test making sure that the tubes are symmetrical (equally spaced) in a circle and parallel. This is the most important inspection to ensure accurate pulse readings.</p> <p>Please confirm that this is acceptable.</p>						
T-0108	BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demoli Closed From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 01 15 40 Please confirm that the demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners, and BBII will only be responsible for cleaning dust and debris generated by BBII during its own operations, after the turnover of these are completed.	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner SUGGESTION:	04/20/2011	04/30/2011	04/29/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Turner Construction Comç Jack Adams				
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
			Confirmed. Demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners to date. This was confirmed through conversation with both EBi and Singer Associates.				
T-0108.1	BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demoli Closed From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		05/04/2011	05/14/2011	05/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Turner Construction Comç Jack Adams				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 746 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference response to RFI#T-0108 and Specification Section 01 15 40 W/O requests information on the measures used to clean the adjacent structures ----- RFI#T-0108 - BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demolition Work Question - Reference Specification Section 01 15 40 Please confirm that the demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners, and BBII will only be responsible for cleaning dust and debris generated by BBII during its own operations, after the turnover of these are completed. Response - Confirmed. Demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners to date. This was confirmed through conversation with both EBi and Singer Associates.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Demolition Contractor ceased dust generating activities and turned over Zone 3 for BBII use on 4-13-11. BBII did occupy the site and did commence work activities, and is responsible for dust control in accord with Mitigation and Monitoring Specifications from 4-13-11 until completion of BBII work activities. BBII is only responsible for cleaning dust and debris generated from Zone 3 during BBII operations from 4-13-11 going forward.			
T-0108.2	BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demoli Closed		05/04/2011	05/14/2011	05/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference response to RFI#T-0108, RFI#T-0108.1 and Specification Section 01 15 40 The response to RFI#T-0108.1 did not provide the requested information. W/O requests information on the measures used to clean the adjacent structures		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There are no prescribed measures. The cleanliness of the adjacent buildings is subjective. Cleanliness is discussed with building owners requesting cleaning of their property upon completion of demolition work and initiated by the adjacent property owner/manager. Discussion with adjacent property owners is coordinated through TJPA Representative and Singer Associates.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 747 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	----- RFI#T-0108.1 - BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demolition Work W/O requests information on the measures used to clean the adjacent structures ----- RFI#T-0108 - BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demolition Work Question - Reference Specification Section 01 15 40 Please confirm that the demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners, and BBII will only be responsible for cleaning dust and debris generated by BBII during its own operations, after the turnover of these are completed. Response - Confirmed. Demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners to date. This was confirmed through conversation with both EBI and Singer Associates.						
T-0109	BSE - Existing Drains & SD Basin Clear Of Debris Generated By Demo Contract Work Closed						
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner					
	Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal						
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 01 15 40 Please confirm per the site walkthrough on 04-18-2011 that all active SD and sewer have been cleared of all debris generated by the demolition contract work. BBII is requesting as-builts to confirm the above.	SUGGESTION:					
			04/21/2011	05/01/2011	05/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			Demolition Contractor has continuously covered the Catch Basins and inlets to storm sewers and occasionally has cleared debris generated by others outside of the demolition contract work. Demolition contractor will provide per Demolition Spec. 02-41-13 at conclusion of their work which is scheduled for June				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 748 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0110	BSE - Existing Utility Decommissioning Zone 4	Closed	04/22/2011	05/02/2011	05/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams			
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0083, Drawing Sheet D-2230, and Specification Section 02 41 01 RFI response to RFI#T-0083 issued on 4-15-2011 has not provided direction for decommissioning or abandoning these utilities per BBII drawing # D-2230 Note 2 Please advise on decommissioning the utilities after dewatering work has been completed.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Parcel D Zone 4 : Demolition of the Zone 4 sewer/storm drain piping after dewatering work has been completed is BBII contract scope. The best examples are BSE Drawings D-2230, D-2231, D-5100 through D-5103. Beale St. Zone 4 sewer/storm drain piping decommissioning/abandoning scope is defined in the Webcor-Obayashi RUP Relocation of Utilities Project . Coordinate Beale St. Zone 4 sewer/storm drain piping decommissioning/abandonment with the Webcor-Obayashi RUP Relocation of Utilities Project Manager. Parcel N Zone 4 :Refer to RFI 84.1 for Parcel N: The decommissioning or abandoning these Parcel N utilities which is outside the scope of the Demolition, BSE contract and the RUP contract. Webcor-Obayashi RUP Relocation of Utilities Project Manager will be contacted for reroute decommissioning, or abandonment of these Parcel N parking lot storm drain lines.			
T-0111	301 Mission Wall - Torque Spec	Closed	04/22/2011	05/02/2011	04/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford Co-Author:		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe			
REQUEST: Reference: S-5000 In regards to the structural steel bolts at the 301 Mission Wall, please confirm that the torque spec is 150 ft-lbs, per attached email.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, structural steel anchor bolts shall be installed snug tight to a torque of 150 ft-lbs.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 749 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0112	BSE - Project Control	Closed	04/22/2011	05/02/2011	05/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Sheet GT-0100 and Specification Section 01 10 50		Response provided by PMPC.					
Drawing GT-0100 shows four control points. BBII's surveyor, KCA Engineers, have surveyed their locations and found the following: 1) Survey Control Point #101: This point has been damaged - the brass disk is missing, though the rivet remains in the concrete sidewalk. There are score lines in the concrete BBII assumes would intersect on the brass disk. 2) Project Benchmark Point #54: KCA was able to locate this point. Please confirm that it is acceptable to use the coordinates of this point for horizontal control, even though it is listed as a benchmark. 3) Survey Control Point #106: KCA was unable to locate this point. 4) Survey Control Point #105: KCA was able to locate this point.		RFI T-0112 is a Survey and Control issue. Webcor/Obayashi is responsible for coordination with their subcontractors and this RFI lies within their domain of responsibility. Please ask W/O to coordinate their Survey Subcontractor (Contract T05.1 Chaudhary & Associates) provide a response to their BSE Subcontractor (Contract TG03 - Balfour Beatty). 1) Regarding Control Point #101 by Martin M. Ron (Drawing GT-0100), TJPA is requesting a meeting with Martin M. Ron (DPW). In the meantime W/O surveyors should assume that the riven and cross marks constitute the mark on Drawing GT-0100 and to submit the results of their check survey against the other remaining points to see if the given coordinates match those given on Drawing GT-0100. W/O should consult with Chaudhary & Associates now under subcontract to W/O, as to how Chaudhary & Associates used this point and whether it was damaged then. TJPA will set up a meeting with Martin M. Ron, Chaudhary & Associates, W/O and TJPA representatives. 2) Regarding Project "Benchmark" Point #54, the coordinates of this point given on Drawing GT-0100 are given for use as line survey control as well as elevation. 3) Regarding Control Point #106 (Drawing GT-0100), W/O is to consult with DPW and Chaudhary & Associates as to their knowledge of the last time this point was located. This can be done by W/O alone or in the meeting the TJPA representative will set up. With the 3 remaining Control Points #101, #054, #105 (Drawing GT-0100), W/O should use the given position of Control Point#106. If this has already been done TJPA will re-establish this Control Point. 4) No action requires.					
With the current condition of the provided control points, KCA is not able to do a hard check on their survey work.		TJPA requests that the BBI and W/O surveyor submit their notes on what they have completed and verified to date.					
Please confirm that all the control points above may be used for the TG03 BSE Trade Package. Please reset the damaged or missing points for KCA's use.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 750 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0112.1	BSE - Project Control	Closed	05/20/2011	05/30/2011	05/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Transbay PMPC	
Alfred Lau							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference RFI#T-0112, Transmittal No. 140-01593, Sheet GT-0100, Specification Section 01 10 50, and attached document				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Chaudhary's Transbay "Survey Grid Control Document" was transmitted to Ed Sum (TJPA) and Agnes Katanics (URS) on 5/18/11 (transmittal #140-01593, attached) following a meeting which took place on 5/17/11 with URS, F3, DPA and TJPA. In an effort to confirm the four survey control points shown on GT-0100, Chaudhary discovered that Point #101 and Point #106 were missing.				Adopting Chaudhary's survey grid control document is acceptable.			
Due to the missing points, W/O requests TJPA to either approve Chaudhary's Survey Grid Control Document included as part of transmittal #140-01593, or have the monuments missing from GT-0100 replaced.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 751 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0112.2	BSE - Project Control	Closed	07/14/2011	07/24/2011	07/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Ted Williams			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference RFI #T-0112.1 and attached drawing							
Last month Webcor/Obayashi was requested to mark an alleged property line @ 199 Fremont between Beale and Fremont streets per the 12-10-2008 CAD file data provided by the Bruce Storrs of DPW. Chaudhary & Associates completed the task and the results were forwarded for TJPA review on June 20, 2011 via Transmittal # 140-01864. In that transmittal it was recommended that alleged Property Line (PL) data points as indicated within the attached (coordinates added) be presented to Bruce Storrs of DPW for verification of PL data accuracy. Has this been accomplished and, if so, what was the outcome?							
Be advised that as previously confirmed in RFI #T- 112.1 Webcor/Obayashi is ONLY using Grid Control for construction reference, layout and staking.							
<hr/>							
T-0113	BSE - Unforeseen Object - Metal Casing In Production Pile Extraction Area	Closed	04/22/2011	05/02/2011	04/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference attached sketch and photo							
While BBII was excavating the production pile extraction area and exposing the timber piles on 4/19/11, a metal casing was discovered close to pile 302050. Please advise on how to proceed.		This metal casing is to be removed per Spec. 02-41-01 "Demolition - Existing Underground Structures". If the casing is over an existing wood pile - notify the TJPA Rep/Geotech Engineer prior to removal - refer to Spec. 02-41-19..					
		Demolition of underground obstructions shall be per Spec 02-41-01 and Demolition Debris shall be handled in accord with Spec. 01-74-00.					
<hr/>							
T-0114	BSE - Monitoring Plans and Data for Zone 3	Closed	04/27/2011	05/07/2011	05/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 752 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 01 35 65 As discussed at the site walk through meeting 4-18-2011; BBII requests a copy of the demolition contract monitoring plan and any data in relation to demolition contract mitigation monitoring of Zone 3.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please clarify specifically what mitigation monitoring data you are requesting. Specification Section 01 35 65 is comprised of many different required submittals so we need a clarification on which one you are requesting			
T-0115	BSE - Hazardous Material Removed From Site in Zone 3	Closed	04/27/2011	05/07/2011	05/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 00 03 35 Please confirm that all hazardous material has been removed from site per the extent of demolition contract drawings for zones 3.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous material has been removed from site per the extent of demolition contract drawings for zones 3. Zone 3 above ground structures and foundations were demolished to extent shown on Demolition contract drawings and Demolition Spec. 02-41-00. Hazardous materials abatement scope was completed within the scope of demolition only. Refer to Demolition Drawings D-1050, D-1051 and D-1073 and D-1074 for representation of limits of structures demolished and hazardous material abatement. Utilities were cut/capped and were demolished to extent shown on Demolition contract drawings and Demolition Spec. 02-41-00. Refer to drawings D-1202-1207 and 1210-1215 inclusive for representation of limits of extent of removal of utilities. BSE Contractor to handle remaining Hazardous Materials in accord with their contract documents. Ref: BSE Drawings D-5101 and D-5102 for extent of BSE Demolition. BSE Contractor to handle remaining demolition and abatement in accord with BSE Spec 00-08-14 Health and Safety Criteria Para 1.2 and 1.3 Lead hazards, BSE Spec. 02-41-01 "Demolition" and BSE Spec. 01-13-50 "Hazardous Materials Procedures".			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 753 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0116	BSE - Demolition Contract Drawings	Closed	04/27/2011	05/07/2011	05/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Comf Jack Adams			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Please supply BBII with an electronic copy (PDF), of the 'issued for construction' drawings for the demolition contract (EBI).		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> BBII should contract Webcor-Obayashi for an electronic copy (PDF), of the 'issued for construction' drawings for the demolition contract.			
T-0116.1	BSE - Demolition Contract Drawings	Closed	05/03/2011	05/13/2011	05/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Comf Daphne Faulkner			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference response to RFI#T-0116 Webcor-Obayashi cannot verify "issued for construction drawings" in PDF format for the demolition contract in the past communications. If the confirmed drawing set was sent to Webcor-Obayashi before, please let us know the transmittal number and the date. If not, please send us the drawing set immediately. ----- ----- Please supply BBII with an electronic copy (PDF), of the 'issued for construction' drawings for the demolition contract (EBI).		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Demolition Issued for Construction drawings were issued to W/O on 12/8/2010 via Transmittal #110-00076 in Project (110) in Constructware. Please find a copy of the transmittal attached for your use.			
T-0117	BSE - As-built Drawings for Utility Decommissioning in Zone 3	Closed	04/27/2011	05/07/2011	05/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Comf Jack Adams			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Demo Contract Drawing Sheets D-1202,D-1203, D-1204, D1205, D1206 and Specification Section 02 41 01 Please provide as-built drawings for all utilities that have been decommissioned, or cut and capped per the demolition contract for Zone 3.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Demolition as-built drawings for Zone 3 utilities that have been decommissioned, or cut and capped per the demolition contract are attached. Drawing D-1202-1207 and D1210 through D1215 inclusive. NOTE: Demolition contractor is not contractually responsible for submitting their As-Built drawings until completion of their contract which is June 2011 ref. Spec. 01-17-00 for Demolition Contractor.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0118	BSE - Crash Cushion Modules on Natoma & Minna Street	Closed	04/27/2011	05/07/2011	05/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			Confirmed. Demolition Contractor will install Crash Cushion modules at K -Rails installed on Fremont St (east), Natoma St. and Minna St. in accord with Demolition Drawing D-1007.				
Reference Demo Contract Drawing Sheet D-1007 - Note 5							
Currently the crash cushion or k-rail as specified in the Demo Drawing D-1007 note 5 has not been installed. Please confirm the above will be installed by the demo contractor.							
T-0119	301 Mission Wall - Metal Stud Layout Alignment	Closed	04/28/2011	05/08/2011	05/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			The light gauge steel studs will remain per plan as shown in Section B on S-5000. The light gauge steel studs shall be placed on both sides of the tube steel as shown on the contract documents.				
Reference: RFI T-0098, Sheet A-6000							
Per response to RFI T-0098, the 10" x 10" tube steel columns are to be set in the center of the 14" concrete wall. The architectural drawings (sheet A-6000 dated 11/04/10) show 10" metal studs aligning with the 10" tube steel, however, per response to RFI T-0098, the tube steel is to shift in the architectural drawings 1/2" and align in the center of the concrete wall. Please confirm that the metal studs will remain per plan, and not shift as the steel tube has.			Per direction provided at 5/2 weekly coordination meeting, 1 - 5/8" light gauge studs shown on Detail A, Sheet A-6000 shall be in line with 10" light gauge steel stud (i.e. both sides of tube steel).				
T-0120	301 Mission Wall - Stone Panel Layout	Closed	04/27/2011	05/07/2011	05/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			Per contract documents, at exposed concrete wall sections, full height of concrete wall above finished top of paver (and finished concrete walks at east and west ends) shall be exposed.				
Reference: RFI T-0042							
Per RFI T-0042, the concrete wall height increased to achieve a min 18" above the finished paver surface. Please clarify if the exposed concrete areas shown on A-5000 are to be min 18" above the pavers. If so, the 1st stone above the exposed concrete would have to be			Cutting of stone panel(s) to a height of approximately 6.84" and cutting of stone panels in an "L" shape as				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0121	301 Mission Wall - Aluminum Panel Layout	Closed	04/27/2011	05/07/2011	05/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: A-5000 Regarding the aluminum panels on the 301 Mission wall, bottom panel at each end of the wall will need to be trimmed. The standard panel is 2-11 1/2" tall, but the bottom panel measures out to be 2'-1"+/- on the west end and 2'-9"+/- on the east. Please confirm that this is acceptable. If not, please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per contract documents aluminum panels shall match original aluminum panels. Existing bottom aluminum panel(s), as shown in photos on sheet C-5010, have an approximate 1" gap between the bottom of panel and top of existing grade. Contractor shall place bottom aluminum panel(s) to provide an approximate 1" gap between bottom of panel and top of finished/existing grade. It is acceptable to provide bottom panel(s) that are less than 2' - 11-1/2" tall to provide an approximate 1" gap between bottom of panel(s) and top of finished/existing grade.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 756 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0122	BSE - Hazardous Material Removed From Zone 3 (Potential Contaminated Material Closed		04/29/2011	05/09/2011	05/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 00 03 35, 1.2 During Investigation of Zone 3, BBII discovered potential lead based material existing on site. The specific area of concern is the pedestals on Fremont Street. Please confirm that all contaminated material (specifically the referenced pedestals) as specified in the specification section 00 03 35, Article 1.2 has been removed and abated by the Demolition Contractor. BBII is scheduled to remove these pedestals next week and cannot proceed with this critical work until it is confirmed that the site is cleared of lead based materials as required by the Specifications. The TJPA's attention is directed to the following Section of the Specifications: SECTION 00 03 35 2 EXISTING CONDITIONS: HAZARDOUS MATERIALS "1.2 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS REPORTS A. The TJPA's environmental consultants have surveyed the facility for the presence of various hazardous materials. Materials investigated may include asbestos, lead, PCB ballasts, mercury containing lamps, contaminated soils, underground storage tanks, and other hazardous materials. The demolition contractor for the Demolition project (Evans Brothers Inc.) is responsible for removing and abating products containing asbestos, lead, or PCB ballast, and mercury-containing lamps."			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous material has been removed from site per the extent of demolition contract drawings for zones 3 - this does not include the "pedestals" in Zone 3. The building and above ground structures were demolished to the extent shown on Demolition contract drawings. Hazardous materials abatement scope was completed within the scope of demolition only. Refer to Demolition Drawings D-1050, D-1051 and D-1073 for representation of limits of structures (specifically the referenced pedestals) demolished and hazardous material abatement. BSE Contractor to handle remaining demolition and abatement in accord with BSE Spec 00-08-14 Health and Safety Criteria Para 1.2 and 1.3 Lead hazards, BSE Spec. 02-41-01 "Demolition" and BSE Spec. 01-13-50 "Hazardous Materials Procedures".				
T-0123	301 Mission Wall - SASM and Insulation Tape Materials	Closed	04/29/2011	05/09/2011	05/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fye				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: S-0002, A-6000 Clarification is requested regarding the notes and details			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Insulation tape shall be used between all treated wood and metal surfaces. SASM shall be used as a waterproofing barrier around the entire wall as shown				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page:757 of 3091

Date:06/17/2015

Time:02:27 PM

Job:30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>on Sheet S-0002, and A-6000 (see attached marked up sheets). Note 1 within the "WALL FINISH" section of the notes on page S-0002 says to use insulation separation tape between treated wood surfaces and steel framing. In note 2 on page S-0002, SASM is specfied as a different material, but on the details of page A-6000 SASM is shown to be used in the same areas as is described for the insulation tape. It is the interpretation of Transworld that the insulation tape is to be used at all locations referenced on sheet A-6000 as "SASM". Please clarify if these two different materials are to be applied in the same areas.</p>						<p>on the contract documents.</p> <p>These two materials (SASM and insulation tape) may overlap in certain locations where insulation tape is provided between treated wood and metal surfaces and where waterproofing is also required.</p>
T-0123.1	301 Mission Wall - SASM and Insulation Tape Materials	Closed	05/06/2011	05/16/2011	05/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:URS Corporation	David Fyfe
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: RFI T-0123, A-6000, S-0002							
<p>The response provided to RFI T-0123 is in conflict with the contract documents. The response requires the contractor to create a waterproofing barrier for the entire length of the wall; however, the contract documents do not indicate a complete waterproofing barrier. References to SASM on page A-6000 instructs the application of SASM at all points where pressure-treated or moisture resistant wood comes in contact with metal. This application instruction, therefore, would not result in a waterproof barrier along the entire length of the wall. Please clarify if on the details "SASM" was intended to read "insulation tape", because the application locations of the SASM, as per A-6000, are called out and described to be at all locations of the insulation tape defined on S-0002.</p>						<p>This is not a new contract requirement. SASM is referred to on A-6000 in two different instances. It is referred to when there is treated wood blocking/elements. At these locations, the insulation tape shall be used. There is also SASM shown on the front and back face of the wall as shown on Detail D, A-6000. Contractor shall provide SASM as shown.</p>	
<p>In the alternative, is it the intention of the design team to apply additional waterproofing not shown on the contract documents?</p>							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0124	301 Mission Wall - Dimension Between Screen Wall and Existing Garage Wall	Closed	05/02/2011	05/12/2011	05/31/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: C-2000				Gap shall be closed for the full height of the new interim screen wall and width of gap. The closure of this gap must meet ADA handrail loading requirements as well as the wind and seismic loading requirements. See attached Figures 1, 2, and 3 for recommended details of gap closure.			
The dimension between the new location of the 301 Wall and the existing garage wall is approx 8". Please advise as to how this gap is to be closed off.				Per discussions at weekly meeting on 5/23/2011, Contractor may provide suggested alternatives to address the 8-inch gap for URS to review.			
T-0124.1	301 Mission Wall Enclosure Panel Method of Connection	Closed	09/01/2011	09/16/2011	09/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Constable To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: RFI T- 0124, URS response to RFI T- 0124				Material substitution (two 1/8" thick aluminum panels glued together in lieu of a single 3/16" thick aluminum panel), "Proposed gap closure per RFI #T-0124-Option3" provided in attached Change Request No. 10C from Transworld Construction Inc. to Webcor/Obayashi dated 7/26/2011 is acceptable, provided aluminum panels are fastened to metal stud with rivets or sheet metal screws at 24" o.c.			
Per recent Change Order negotiations for the required 301 Mission Wall end panel per RFI # T-0124, the panel detail is now being revised to a two-piece, glued enclosure panel. Please confirm the method of two-piece panel attachment to the existing wall is the same as that indicated in RFI # T-0124.							
T-0125	BSE - CDSM Corner Overlap	Closed	05/02/2011	05/12/2011	05/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Sheets GT-2101-2103, GT-5101 and Specification Section 31 56 13				ARUP Response:			
In the Owner's preferred method of soil mixing, the triple auger method, a continuous wall is formed by drilling adjacent sets of columns with a 100% overlap of the outer columns (see 2/GT-5101). A CDSM wall's strength, permeability, and homogeneity is largely contingent upon this remixing action. This overlap also helps ensure the				Arup received from DND the two sketches attached to this response at the BSE meeting on May 4, 2011 as further clarification of the Contractor's proposal. The Contractor's proposal is acceptable.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 759 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	verticality and alignment, as the augers in the secondary panels tend to follow the path of the outer columns of the primary panels. Based upon the beam and column layout shown in GT-2101-2013, the corners formed by Wall Segment A/33.5-35 & 35-1 and R2-1 & X1-1 do not receive the complete remixing obtained by the typical 100% outer column overlap. These corner details are atypical compared to industry standards, and will lead to permeability issues. Is it acceptable to move a small number of beams slightly closer together (~0.1') near those corners, such that the panel layout is shifted enough to have a 100% column overlap at the corners?						
T-0126	BSE - Confirmation of Utility Abandonment on Fremont St, East side of Phase 1 El Closed		05/02/2011	05/12/2011	05/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Douglas Jacobson		
	Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	In order to drive sheet piles for the hammer head wall location along Fremont St and the North West Corner of Zone 4, BBII requests confirmation of the abandonment of all utilities east of the PG&E electrical duct bank. BBII also will need the As-Build drawing of the PG&E duct bank location.		Today, 5/11, BBI has sawcut AC and removed one lane-width and two laborers have exposed the utility lines in the street east of the PG&E duct bank. Verizon came and cut two of their 4" ducts. The remaining lines will be identified by the utility subcontractors in the next day or two. Please contact Jason Dunne (W/O) for the field conditions of abandoned utilities.				
	BBI needs this information to proceed on the extra unforeseen concrete wall in the hammer head area of the buttress wall.						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0127	BSE - Openings Below Screen Wall at 301 Mission Building	Closed	05/04/2011	05/14/2011	05/16/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheets GT-2201, GT-5102 Sec. 10, and attached photos In the northwest corner of Zone 4, BBII has exposed 2 openings below the screen wall in the 301 Mission structure. The first opening is located approximately 6 feet east of gridline 27 and the second opening is located approximately 8 feet east of gridline 29. These openings are approximately 18" x 36" in size. (See attached pictures). These openings are not shown on construction documents. Please advise how to proceed. BBII requests an expedited response prior to the end of this week, as this matter is pertinent to backfill operation.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Plugging of existing ventilation shafts/openings below screen wall is specified in the 301 Mission Interim Screen Wall contract documents. Webcor-Obayashi to coordinate all work amongst tradegroup packages/subcontractors.		
T-0128	BSE - Old Existing Concrete Floor Along 301 Mission in Zone 4	Closed	05/05/2011	05/15/2011	05/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Douglas Jacobson				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 02 41 01 During pre-trenching, BBII found an existing concrete floor along the 301 Mission St garage wall. It is located between the 301 Mission building wall and the buttress area between Grid Line 29 and 30. BBII has exposed a 20ft-30ft section of this floor (approximately on Grid Line A between Grid Lines 29 and 30), and have demolished the slab within the pre-trench area that has been exposed. It appears to BBI that this unforeseen obstruction continues further into the buttress area. If this unforeseen obstruction continues further into the buttress area, it would have to be removed so the buttress construction can continue. Please advise on how to proceed.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The obstruction was removed by BBI. Remove pre-trench obstructions per contract requirements and Force Account agreement with TJPB.		
T-0129	BSE - Unforeseen Timber Pile in Pre-Trench Along 301 Mission in Zone 4	Closed	05/05/2011	05/15/2011	05/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div><div>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.</div><div>Ural Yal</div></div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference Specification Section 02 41 01 and attached photo</div><div>During pre-trenching, BBI discovered existing timber piles along the 301 Mission St garage wall between Grid Lines 29 and 30. These piles are less than 1foot away from the 301 Mission St garage wall and within the CDSM shoring wall limits. These unforeseen piles need to be removed as soon as possible. Please advise on how to proceed.</div><div>W/O requests that the Engineer Of Record (Arup) review this on site with BBII prior to responding.</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Arup Response:</div><div>1. For the westernmost 3 timber piles along the line of piles 16 to 18" from the face of the 301 Mission wall: in order to minimize ground loss at 20 to 30 ft depth beneath the PG+E vault and adjacent corridor, BBI needs to use best endeavors to carry out the pile removal using the method agreed following the initial trials. This means vibrating in the casing in advance of removing any of those piles.</div><div>2. For the remaining timber piles along this line, the piles are anticipated to be 30' long and will thus lie within the influence of the c. 70' deep shoring wall for the 301 Mission Low-rise parking garage. Each pile can be removed without casing, working from east to west. Concrete to be placed in the remnant pile hole as rapidly as possible after pile removal and before removal of the adjacent pile.</div></div></div>							
T-0130	301 Mission Wall - FCR 043 Concrete Wall Crack	Closed	05/06/2011	05/16/2011	05/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: URS Corporation	
David Fyfe		Co-Author:					
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference: Field Condition Report No. 043</div><div>See attached FCR No. 043. The east end of the 301 Mission concrete wall has cracks and also spalled in one corner. This had been discussed on 05/02/11, in Transworld's subcontractor meeting with Turner, URS, TJPA, Webcor-Obayashi, and Transworld. Please advise as to how Transworld is to repair the spalled corner and cracks.</div></div>		<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>		<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Defective concrete shall be removed and concrete shall be restored in accordance with ACI 301 Section 5.3.7.3. An epoxy bonding agent shall be used in lieu of bonding grout where new concrete and existing concrete interface. After removal of the defective concrete and prior to restoration, contractor shall contact engineer to inspect the removal areas in field.</div><div>If crack(s) go beyond/into the anchor bolts and reinforcement, the concrete shall be removed minimum of 1" around the reinforcement and anchor bolts. Contractor shall shore/support the existing structural steel as necessary in order to prevent damage to other areas of existing concrete.</div></div>			
T-0130.1	301 Mission Wall - FCR 043 Concrete Wall Patch Material	Closed	06/09/2011	06/19/2011	06/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 763 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>framing per attached sketches around the perimeter of the wall. Sizes of metal framing were used to align with adjacent framing per plan. This work is currently installed, please confirm framing modifications per attached marked up details are acceptable.</p> <p>3.) Blocking a the top of the wall at the north side (between the framing and 8"x 8" tube steel) was not installed, as there was no room between the framing and steel. Framing was attached directly to the tube steel. See attached.</p> <p>Please confirm that the framing modifications in item 2 and 3 are acceptable and provide direction at the base plate conflict per item 1.</p>			<p>stone panels, aluminum panels, 3-coat stucco, etc.) as shown on contracts documents, cost and schedule shall be borne solely by the Contractor.</p> <p>Item/Issue 3) Intention of wood blocking is to provide spacing and allow fastening of aluminum panels. If there is not sufficient space to provide wood blocking, it is acceptable to fasten aluminum panels directly to tube steel members and omit wood blocking on north side of wall as shown in attached sketch, "RFI T-0131: (Item 3) Omission of Blocking Between 8" x 8" Tube Steel and Framing (North Side Only). Accordingly, prior to deletion of wood blocking Contractor shall ensure all architectural wall finishes (SASM, cement board, stone panels, aluminum panels, 3-coat stucco, etc.) can and will be installed as shown on contract documents.</p>			
T-0132	BSE - Lead Based Paint On Bent Pedestals	Closed	05/06/2011	05/16/2011	05/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Balfour Beatty Infrastructu Ural Yal			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please see information attached regarding the paint on the old bent Pedestals existing along Fremont Street. The information provided indicates the level of lead is above the permissible level. This area is now considered part of the lead abatement program; this work will be commencing on Saturday 5/7/2011. Cost of this Lead abatement will be charged to the owner.				Voided. See the attached email on 05/09/2011.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 764 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0133	BSE - CDSM Test Section & Start of Work	Closed	05/09/2011	05/19/2011	05/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, 1.6. F. 1-2 Please confirm that the acceptance of Zone 4 Test Section strength and permeability results is the prerequisite to begin Zone 4 & 3 shoring work, and acceptance of the Zone 1/2 Test Section results is the prerequisite to begin work Zones 1 & 2.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The acceptance of Zone 4 Test Section strength and permeability results is the prerequisite to begin Zone 4 & 3 shoring work, and acceptance of the Zone 1/2 Test Section results is the prerequisite to begin work Zones 1 & 2.				
T-0134	BSE - 301 Mission Guide Wall	Closed	05/09/2011	05/19/2011	05/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Douglas Jacobson				
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-2103, Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached sketch Typically in CDSM shoring, a guide frame constructed from steel beams is used, which straddles the CDSM wall. The guide frame is used to align the augers, align and place beams, and expand/collapse the drill rods. The existing 301 Mission building wall is approximately 5-6" away from the outside of the CDSM shoring wall. As such it will not permit placement of a standard steel beam guide frame. Is it acceptable to construct a temporary concrete/rebar guide wall on the outside of the CDSM wall and adjacent to the existing 301 Mission footing wall? See attached sketch details of the proposed guide wall.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This guide wall proposal is for Contractor convenience. Please submit more information for this proposal, e.g., spacing, depth, and diameter of anchors/studs, discuss means and methods, and describe condition that contractor will leave the CMU wall when finished. Once the above information is returned, TJPA will meet with 301 Mission to negotiate authorization for this proposal.				
T-0135	BSE - Unforeseen Timber Piles in Pre-Trench Along 301 Mission St. in Zone 4	Closed	05/10/2011	05/20/2011	05/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0129 and Specification Section 02 41 01 The response to BBII RFI 094 [RFI #T-0129] regarding the unforeseen timber piles along 301 Mission Street,			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The material for filling the void left by the extracted				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 765 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	"Concrete to be placed in the remnant pile hole as rapidly as possible after pile removal of the adjacent pile." Per DND Construction, concrete backfill is incompatible with soil mixing methods. Please provide clarification on what material will be placed within the CDSM wall limits that will not conflict with the mixing of the CDSM wall.						
					timber pile needs to be filled by a material which can be drilled by the CDSM shoring equipment. Kevin Clinch 12 May 2011		
T-0136	301 Mission Wall - Manhole Vents	Closed	05/10/2011	05/20/2011	05/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Reference: A/C-5000, Per Justin Burke of Turner Construction, the 3' tall sleeves on the north side of the 301 Mission Screen Wall are per PG&E preference. At Turner's request, please review the design for the sleeves as shown on C-5000 and consider a grated cover over the manholes at grade, as opposed to the 3' tall sleeves per the documents.				5/23/11 UPDATED RESPONSE from Kevin Chiu: Pending approval by TJPA, a CR may be issued. =====			
				5/20/11 Response per Kevin Chiu: Contractor is to eliminate the referenced "(N) 3'-0" HIGH CIP CONCRETE SLEEVE OVER MANHOLE WITH (N) KADEE S.S. CIRCULAR GRATE SATIN FINISH (TWO LOCATIONS)" per C-5000. Elimination of sleeves was agreed upon by TJPA (Brian Dykes), PG&E (Mike Balmy) and Mission Street Development (Steve Hood).			
				5/13/11 Response per URS' David Fyfe: 3' tall concrete sleeves are required per the Easement Agreement between the TJPA and Mission Street Development, LLC (MSD). Eliminating use of 3' tall concrete sleeve(s) and providing grated PG&E manhole lid(s) at existing grade elevation must be approved by TJPA, MSD, and PG&E.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 767 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>			
	which will reduce the of damaging the wall at 301 Mission. BBII is willing to meet with the Engineer to discuss and develop this method.				each of the 3 western-most timber piles at a date and time (Friday May 13, 2011 mentioned as the earliest) chosen by the Contractor. Mechanical methods to control and hold the vibratory pile puller away from the wall, as well as any method of pre-protection of the aluminum panel clad corner, are suggested. ----- 5/11/2011 Roger Rothenburger As discussed in the Wednesday May 11, 2011 BSE meeting, the Engineer (Arup) is seeking (response to RFI T-0129) "best endeavors" to use the casing on the three (3) timber piles furthest west. The remaining seven (7) or so piles to the east of these piles may be pulled directly withou using casing as long as there is replacement filling of the timber pile void as soon as it is pulled. TJPA is aware of the risk of exterior damage to the 301 Mission Parking Struture at the corner and sides, but weighs the potential for more serious structural damage in the basement around the PG&E vault to be greater risk than the exterior damage. The work is in accordance with the force account directive CRT-010 for removal of obstructions so the risk becomes part of the cost which TJPA is willing to bear for avoiding potential greater risk of basement structural damage. (1) At a date and time (Frday May 13, 2011 mentioned as the earliest) chose by the BSE Subcontractor, BBII, TJPA representatives including the Engineer (Arup), Architect (AAI) will observe the BBII "best efforts" to install casing and pull each of the 3 wesrtn most timber piles. Mechanical methods with the excavators or other equipment to control and hold the vibratory pile hammer away from the wall are suggested as well as any method the experienced work crews suggest. An attempt to protect the aluminum panel clad corner by any means is also advisable. (2) The material for filling the void left by the extracted timber pile needs to be filled by a material which can					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 768 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0138.1	BSE - Unforeseen Timber Piles in Pre Trench Along 301 Mission St. in Zone 4 - Coi Closed From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. REQUEST: Reference response to RFI#T-0129, RFI#T-0138, Specification Section 02 41 01 and attached documents The response to BBII RFI 094 [RFI#T-0129] regarding the unforeseen timber piles along 301 Mission Street, "Concrete to be placed in the remnant pile hole as rapidly as possible after pile removal of the adjacent pile." Concrete is not compatible with CDSM mixing. After clarification on the issue in RFI Response #T-0138, BBII proposed and furnished Central Concrete Sand Slurry Mix FOA100CX under the direction of the Engineer. The Engineer of Record's field engineer reviewed, approved and observed the installation of this mix in the pile voids along 301 Mission Street. The mix was recommended by ARUP Field Engineer prior to placement in the field, please confirm that this mix design meets the field engineer's requirements. Attachments: Mix as requested is being submitted for record.	Nhi Tran Ural Yal	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	05/20/2011	05/30/2011	05/23/2011	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Mix FOA100CX is acceptable. Contractor shall verify that this mix is acceptable to the CDSM shoring wall installer.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0139	BSE - Unforeseen Timber Pile in Pre Trench Along 301 Mission St. in Zone 4 - CR 1	Closed	05/10/2011	05/20/2011	05/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Response to RFI #T-0129 [BBI RFI 094] and Specification Section 02 41 01 Please clarify if the removal of the unforeseen timber piles along 301 Mission Street will be reimbursed by CR T-010.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As discussed in the BSE meeting of Wednesday, May 11, 2011 the removal of the unforeseen piles in the CDSM shoring wall pre-trenching along 301 Mission is paid under CRT-010.		
T-0140	BSE - Bridges Submittals	Closed	05/12/2011	05/22/2011	05/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 BBII proposes breaking up the bridge submittals to allow submittal fundamental structural drawings and calculations for the bridge, independent of accessories and specialized components necessary for a complete bridge package. Specifically, the first set of submittals would include Structural drawings and calculations for the bridge structure from the pavement and decking down - piers, cap beams, girders, abutments, and associated connections. Additionally, it will include standard edge railing/barriers. Follow on coordination submittals will include traffic coordination components, gates, hardware, locking mechanisms, fences, Muni OCS components, utility support details, surface grading and drainage. BBII believes that it will take some time to finalize a complete bridge package that satisfies all interested parties. Isolating the core bridge structure into it's own submittals will ensure that detailing and fabrication of the main components of the bridge will not be held up while working out the details. Please confirm this is acceptable			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The approval to split the temporary bridge submittal into two submissions is provided subject to the following conditions: 1. Items which are provided in the initial submission shall be designed for all loading to support all features which are deferred. This includes loading attributable to but not limited to the following: operable gates; vehicle barriers; required thickness of pavement for all purposes, added thickness of paving for pedestrian areas, curbs and provisions for slope inducement for handling of surface water; support for utilities; lighting poles/standards; OCS poles/wires; and any other items specifically required to meet city of SF requirements brought to the attention of the contractor team by review meetings with city staff. 2. Items deferred to the second submission shall be in full conformance with specifications requirements. 3. Any items for which a deviation from the specifications is sought shall be fully identified in the first submission.		
T-0141	BSE - Inclinometers IW-5 to IW-8 Install Locations	Closed	05/12/2011	05/22/2011	05/16/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 770 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. REQUEST: Reference Sheets GT-1301, GT-1302, GT-2201 & 13/GT-5101 and Specification Section 31 56 13 Please clarify if locations IW-5 to IW-8 exist. They are not shown on GT-1301 and GT-1302.	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner SUGGESTION:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Inclinometers IW-5 to IW-8 do not exist.		
T-0142	BSE - Instruments I-104 to I-107	Closed	05/13/2011	05/23/2011	05/16/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. REQUEST: Reference Sheets GT-1301, GT-1302, GT-2201, & 13/GT-5101 and Specification Section 31 56 13 On Sheet GT-2201, please confirm that Instrument I-104 to I-107 is detail 13/GT-5101.	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner SUGGESTION:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Instruments I-104 to I-107 require detail 13/GT-5101.		
T-0143	BSE - Confirmation of Utility Decommissioning and As-Built for Fremont Street	Closed	05/16/2011	05/26/2011	05/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. REQUEST: Reference Sheet D-2230 and attached sketch During BBII potholing work on the Fremont street hammer head, BBII exposed the existing live PG&E concrete duct bank. The duct bank is located under BBII Buttress drill pad (see attached sketch), the drill pad is scheduled to be poured 5-26-2011/5-27-2011. BBII has concerns that the duct bank will not be able to support the load for the drilling equipment. The concrete duct bank will need to be removed prior to drill pad installation. Please advise.	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner SUGGESTION:			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Removal of existing duct bank is in RUP scope, see U-1123. Coordinate BSE work activities with RUP scope. Target date given by PG&E to have duct bank decommissioned is 6/24/11. If RUP's removal of duck bank is not complete prior to drill pad installation, BBII is to protect the existing utilities.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 771 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0144	BSE - Unknown Concrete Structure along 199 Fremont St in Zone 4	Closed	05/18/2011	05/28/2011	05/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference Specification Section 31 56 13			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
BBII discovered the unforeseen concrete structure in the attached photo. Tills concrete mass is unknown and is in direct conflict with the BSE CDSM wall.			Demolition of underground obstructions shall be per Spec 02-41-01 and Demolition Debris shall be handled in accord with Spec 01-74-00.				
The concrete mass is approx 2ft wide and extends 8ft depth the entire between GL J 30-33.5 adjacent 199 Fremont Street building. During the excavation at 8ft there was water egress into the excavation from underneath the concrete structure see photos attached.			----- 5/20/2011 - George Metzger				
BBII requests immediate direction from the TJPA on this issue.			ARUP Response:				
			If the CDSM shoring wall is to be installed in the location shown, then the material which is in the way, including any rubble which will interfere with the soil mixing for the CDSM wall, will need to be removed.				
			Arup requests TJPA to provide direction to the Contractor regarding removal of the obstacles encountered.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 772 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0145	BSE - Existing Concrete Footing Gridline J between Gridline 26.5-30 along 181 Fre Closed		05/18/2011	05/28/2011	05/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference Specification Section 02 41 00			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
BBII followed the method approved to remove a section of the unforeseen structure in RFI #74 & 74.1, and found a separate concrete footing bellow that. It is believed to be a footing that extends below the 177/181 Fremont St. building. The top of this footing is approximately 8 feet below the original grade, and it is approximately 3 feet wide, and 3 feet deep. BBII is concerned with the removal of this footing and the extensive rubble that was exposed below it. When a bucket of dirt was removed along the footing, a large amount of water gushed out, from below the 177/181 Fremont St. building, and through the large amount of stone rubble that was exposed. At this point the bottom of the footing was found, and the soil was quickly replaced. This footing is within the CDSM wall extents, and will have to be removed. Due to the fragile nature, and the age of the 177/181 Fremont St. building; please clearly describe and advise. Please See Attached Pictures.			ARUP Response: The RFI refers to RFIs 74 and 74.1. We understand these are BBI numbers; the corresponding RFI numbers in Constructware are 103 and 103.1. If the CDSM shoring wall is to be installed in the location shown, then the material which is in the way, including any rubble which will interfere with the soil mixing for the CDSM wall, will need to be removed. Based on field observations made earlier today, and recent email correspondence, we understand the concrete (unreinforced) basement wall immediately adjacent to 181 Fremont has been removed. Arup requests TJPA to provide direction to the Contractor regarding any additional demolition and/or excavation should it be necessary. ----- ----- Adamson Associates, Inc. Comment: CM (Turner) is to confirm that TJPA approves in writing the approach and work the Contractor proposes at this location as the Field Actives and Contractor actions may impact the adjacent property.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 773 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0146	BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building South Zone 4	Closed	05/19/2011	05/29/2011	05/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0103 and attached photo During BBII demolition of the unknown concrete structure along South side of Zone 4 adjacent 177/181 Fremont building (Refer to [RFI#T-0103] BBII RFI# 74), BBII discovered timber piles beneath the unknown concrete structure - see photos attached. The location timber piles are in conflict with the alignment of the CDSM wall. Please advise on the method of removal of the obstruction. Note: BBII has concerns regarding the stability of the adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building (old brick structure).			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: 1. We suggest that the timber piles be exposed no more than 3 at a time, and that they are removed and the remnant void is infilled immediately with a material that can be drilled by the shoring wall equipment of DND. A suitable material was proposed for the similar situation adjacent to the parking garage/low rise portion of 301 Mission. 2. If more timber piles are revealed along this part of the pre-trenching, then the process in 2 above should continue along the northern flank of 181 Fremont and for a distance of 20 ft east of the northeast corner of the building. 3. 181 Fremont building is equipped with crack width gauges, and Arup staff will take readings of the gauges before and after removal of the timber piles along this length of pre-trenching provided the building owner grants us access. 4. Inclinometers to monitor the effects of the installation of the shoring wall and the subsequent train box excavation will be installed in due course. 5. The Contractor shall take appropriate measures to retain the material under 181 Fremont and keep it from sloughing into the excavation. ----- ----- Adamson Associates, Inc. Comment: CM (Turner) is to confirm that TJPA approves in writing the approach and work the Contractor proposes at this location as the Field Activates and Contractor actions may impact the adjacent property.				
T-0146.1	BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building South Zone 4	Closed	05/20/2011	05/30/2011	05/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 774 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference RFI#T-0146</div><div>Please provide the TJPA's specific written direction and procedure on how to remove the unforeseen piles along North face of 181 Fremont Street according to the response for RFI T-0146.</div><div>The contractor cannot proceed on this extra and critical work without the specific direction and procedure provided in writing by the TJPA.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>The Sheet pile method using sheet piles either interlocked or not interlocked for 20 feet or so, removing the piles (3ft of exposed pile required to remove) described to TJPA and its representatives this morning (May 20, 2011) on site is compliant with the Contract Specifications Section 02 41 19 (Pile Removal and Section 31 56 13 (CDSM Shoring Wall) Part 3.2 (Execution - Pre-trenching)</div></div>		
T-0146.2	BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building South Zone 4	Closed	05/23/2011	06/02/2011	05/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Nhi Tran</div><div>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.</div><div>Ural Yal</div></div>		<div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div>	<div><div>Answered By:Turner Construction Com</div><div>Kevin Chiu</div></div>				
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference RFI#T-0146.1</div><div>Based on the joint meeting between W/O, BBII and the TJPA on 5/23/2011, BBII would like to confirm the following:</div><div>181 Fremont Street Pile Extraction:</div><div>1. BBII will install additional survey control to establish the back of the shoring wall limit.</div><div>2. BBII will contact DND Construction to confirm the allowable distance between an existing pile and the back of the shoring wall.</div><div>3. BBII will expose, in the presence of the engineer, 3 piles at one time.</div><div>4. BBII and the Engineer will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall.</div><div>5. BBII will install flat sheet piles between the building and the wood piles to prevent caving of soils under the building.</div><div>6. BBII will extract the wood piles with vibratory hammer, with the same stroking procedure without steel casing. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile.</div><div>7. BBII will backfill the void with low strength material</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Per Brian Dykes, this work is authorized to proceed. Allowable work hours will be established after 199 Fremont pile extraction begins.</div><div>-----</div><div>-----</div><div>5/24/2011 - George Metzger</div><div>ARUP Response:</div><div>The procedure described is consistent with that discussed and agreed to at yesterday's meeting with the following exceptions:</div><div>Item 4 shall read: BBI and TJPA will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall. Arup will be on site to assist the TJPA.</div><div>The Contractor may wish to consider placing the steel sheet prior to excavating to retain the material under 181 Fremont and keep it from sloughing into the excavation.</div><div>Items 10 and 11 will be reviewed by others.</div></div>		



ANSWER: ☐ **Accept Suggestion:**

The row of timber piles closest to 199 Fremont are only 6"-9" clear of the 36-inch theoretical CDSM wall thickness. TJPA in order to avoid the potential risk of these timber piles some of whom are canted and not straight pulled if any part of the pile is within 12" of the theoretical CDSM wall line. Since this work has previously been classified as an "unknown obstruction" paid on force account; if there is damage to the 199 Masonry wall that the cost of repair is considered part of the force account work. BBII is to exert efforts to avoid damage and use the method of pulling the piles that gives least amount of risk for damage to the masonry wall. This response is only for 199 Fremont. Discussions must be held when starting pile removal along 181 Fremont.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 776 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
	<p>2. BBII will contact DND Construction to confirm the allowable distance between an existing pile and the back of the shoring wall.</p> <p>3. BBII will expose, in the presence of the engineer, 3 piles at one time.</p> <p>4. BBII and the Engineer will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall.</p> <p>5. BBII will install flat sheet piles between the building and the wood piles to prevent caving of soils under the building.</p> <p>6. BBII will extract the wood piles with vibratory hammer, with the same stroking procedure without steel casing. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile.</p> <p>7. BBII will backfill the void with low strength material Central Concrete Mix FOA100CX (RFI #T-0138.1).</p> <p>8. BBII will backfill the piles.</p> <p>9. BBII will remove the sheet piles and start over with Step 3.</p> <p>10. All of this work will be tracked and compensated on force account under CR T-010.</p> <p>11. Similar to the extraction in front of the 301 Mission garage wall, BBII will take every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall; however, due to the proximity of the hammer to the wall, BBII will not guarantee not damaging the wall. If damage to the adjacent wall occurs in any phase of the pile extraction operation described above, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.</p> <p>Please confirm the above as soon as possible. In addition, BBII requests immediate confirmation of allowable work hours for the work described above.</p>							
T-0146.4	BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building South Zone 4	Closed	05/27/2011	06/06/2011	05/31/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal						
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Per Turner's request on 5/27/2011 this RFI is being asked, to modify the 177/181 Fremont pile extraction procedure				Item 8 - BBI shall make every attempt to ensure voids are completely filled but is not required to test/verify				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 777 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0147	<p>as desired by ARUP:</p> <p>Based on the revised proposal for unforeseen pile extraction work along 181 Fremont St. from ARUP, BBII (W/O) can agree with revisions as the follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Item 6 should read, "BBII will extract the piles with vibratory hammer only as necessary. BBII will use as little vibration as possible to remove the piles from the ground. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile."- Item 8 should read, "BBII will back fill the pile voids using a tremie pipe of minimum length 20ft attached to the concrete bucket. The tremie shall be inserted as far into the pile hole as possible prior to pouring the concrete, and the concrete shall be placed using normal tremie techniques. BBII will make efforts to pour the material into the void as possible, but BBII is not responsible to eliminate void completely." <p>Other items shall remain the same.</p> <p>Please also clarify that the response from RFI#T-0146.3 stating "Since this work has previously been classified as an "unknown obstruction" paid on force account; if there is damage to the 199 Masonry wall that the cost of repair is considered part of the force account work. BBII is to exert efforts to avoid damage and use the method of pulling the piles that gives least amount of risk for damage to the masonry wall." is this instead, meant to address the property and work related to 177/181 Fremont? If not, please address the question regarding 177/181 address.</p>	Closed	05/19/2011	05/29/2011	05/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>6. BBII will backfill the void with low strength material Central Concrete Mix FOA100CX (RFI #T-0138.1).</div> <div>7. BBII will backfill the piles and start over with Step 3.</div> <div>8. All of this work will be tracked and compensated on force account under CR T-010.</div> <div>9. Similar to the extraction in front of the 301 Mission garage wall, BBII will take every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall; however, due to the proximity of the hammer to the wall, BBII will not guarantee not damaging the wall. If damage to the adjacent wall occurs in any phase of the pile extraction operation described above, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.</div> <div>Please confirm the above as soon as possible. In addition, BBII requests immediate confirmation of allowable work hours for the work described above.</div>						
T-0148.1	BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 199 Fremont Building Zone 4	Closed	05/23/2011	06/02/2011	06/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner		
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference RFI#T-0148				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The response RFI T-0148 did not answer for Item 8 and 9. Please respond for Item 8 and Item 9.				Confirmed-In regards to item #8 and 9 in the response to RFI T-0148; All of this work will be tracked on force account under CR T-010. If BBII takes every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.			
----- RFI#T-0148 Question: Reference RFI#T-0146.2				There is no Noise moratorium for 199 Fremont. This includes demolition, pile pulling, excavation, backfill, equipment set-up etc. is allowed at all times adjacent to 199.			
Based on the joint meeting between W/O, BBII and the TJPA on 5/23/2011, BBII would like to confirm the following:				Good neighbor notification policy is in effect - WO/BBII will notify Singer Assoc. whenever work will encroach on 199 Fremont property or when work activity will disrupt the tenants of 199 Fremont - both inside lot and on sidewalk/street.			
199 Fremont Street Pile Extraction:							
1. BBII will install additional survey control to establish the back of the shoring wall limit.							
2. BBII will contact DND Construction to confirm the allowable distance between an existing pile and the back of the shoring wall.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>3. BBII will excavate, in the presence of the engineer, 8 piles at one time.</p> <p>4. BBII and the Engineer will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall.</p> <p>5. BBII will extract the piles with vibratory hammer, with the same stroking procedure without steel casing. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile.</p> <p>6. BBII will backfill the void with low strength material Central Concrete Mix FOA100CX (RFI #T-0138.1).</p> <p>7. BBII will backfill the piles and start over with Step 3.</p> <p>8. All of this work will be tracked and compensated on force account under CR T-010.</p> <p>9. Similar to the extraction in front of the 301 Mission garage wall, BBII will take every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall; however, due to the proximity of the hammer to the wall, BBII will not guarantee not damaging the wall. If damage to the adjacent wall occurs in any phase of the pile extraction operation described above, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.</p> <p>Please confirm the above as soon as possible. In addition, BBII requests immediate confirmation of allowable work hours for the work described above.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 781 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0149	BSE - Revised Contract Drawing GT-2201	Closed	05/24/2011	06/03/2011	05/26/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-2201, RFI#T-0088.2, and attached sketch SKGT-0002 BBII agreed with the TJPA's proposal in the response of RFI T-0088.2. Therefore, please issue the revised contract drawing of GT-2201. Also, please note that attached Sketch SKGT-0002 includes an error in the CDSM wall alignment at gridline J/34-35.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Based on the 5/26/2011 meeting between TJPA, PMPC, Turner and AAI, and as directed by TJPA a revised contract drawing of GT-2201 will not be issued at this time. However, the attached sketch has been revised to correctly show the CDSM shoring wall outline. See attached SKGT-0002-R1.				
T-0150	BSE - CDSM Top of Pile Elevations At Zone 4	Closed	05/25/2011	06/04/2011	05/31/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-5101 and attached sketch Please reference table 16/GT-5101. To facilitate construction on the streets and the Buttress area, at no additional cost to the owner BBII plans to install the CDSM piles on Fremont St., Beale St., and Zone 4 per the table below: # - (a) Location / Description; (b) Per 16/GT-5101 Top of Pile Elevation; (c) Proposed Top of Pile Elevation 1 - (a) Piles at Fremont St. and Beale St.; (b) EL 13.0 and EL 15.0; (c) Flush to street elevation 2 - (a) Piles in the Buttress Work Pad area along 301 Mission; (b) EL 14.0; (c) Approx. EL 14.0 w/c flush to Top of Pad 3 - (a) Along 301 Mission, piles between the Buttress Work Pad and Beale St.; (b) EL 13.0; (c) Approx. EL 15.0 w/c is 1' above grade 4 - (a) Piles along the 181 Fremont side of Zone 4; (b) EL 14.0; (c) Approx. EL 15.0 w/c is 1' above grade Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The proposed top of pile elevations are acceptable provided the elevation at the bottom of the pile is not less than that shown in 16/GT-5101.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 782 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0151	BSE - Buttress Footprint Increase Due to Oversized Casing	Closed	05/26/2011	06/05/2011	05/31/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference attached sketch Becho will be utilizing a 2200mm OD temporary casing for the Buttress Pile Installation. Becho requests that the spacing between tangent piles remain at 4" minimum and the secant piles overlap remain 1'-6". This will approximately increase the Buttress footprint by approximately 4'-4" to the east and 1'-9" to the south. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: This is acceptable provided no portion of the overall buttress shifts north-south. In particular, the Contractor shall verify that row R, once shifted east as proposed, can be installed in the same northsouth location, given the corner projection of the 301 Mission low-rise. Contractor to verify that the existing timber piles within the larger footprint have been removed and that the equipment pad is enlarged as necessary.		
T-0152	BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 199 Fremont Building	Closed	05/26/2011	06/05/2011	06/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-2103 and RFI#T-0148 In regards to item #4 in the response to RFI T-0148; field investigations of the curvature in first few piles removed along 199 Fremont, BBII feels that at a minimum it is necessary to remove all piles that's top is within 12" of the "neat line" 36" wide CDSM wall. Please confirm that removal of these piles to the limits described above, in addition to any associated damage to adjacent structures caused by the extraction will be reimbursed under CR T-010. Item 4: 4. BBII and TJPA will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed-In regards to item #4 in the response to RFI T-0148; All of this work will be tracked on force account under CR T-010. If BBII takes every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.		
T-0153	BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building	Closed	05/26/2011	06/05/2011	06/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Reference Sheet GT-2103 and RFI#T-0146.2</p> <p>In regards to item #4 in the response to RFI T-0146.2; field investigations of the curvature in first few piles removed along 199 Fremont, BBII feels that at a minimum it is necessary to remove all piles that's top is within 12" of the "neat line" 36" wide CDSM wall.</p> <p>Please confirm that removal of these piles to the limits described above, in addition to any associated damage to adjacent structures caused by the extraction will be reimbursed under CR T-010.</p> <p>Also, please confirm allowable work hours, since 199 extractions have already begun.</p> <p>Item 4: 4. BBII and TJPA will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall.</p>						
T-0154	BSE - Becho Tremie Placement Process	Closed	05/26/2011	05/26/2011	05/31/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.	Nhi Tran Ural Yal	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 31 63 29, 3.5.G.4.K SS31.63.29.3.5.G.4.k states "The tremie discharge end shall be immersed at least 25' in concrete at all times after starting the flow of concrete." Becho requests concrete tremie embedment to be reduced to 10ft minimum for all piles and 5ft minimum tremie embedment at the secondary pile transition zones between structural and CLSM mix pushing the minimum contaminated structural/CLSM concrete zone at sub grade to +5 foot above sub grade elevation. Please confirm this is acceptable.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: This is acceptable. Note that the procedure described pertains to both the primary and the secondary piles, not just the secondary piles as described in the RFI.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0155	BSE - Primary Concrete Mix Tolerance	Closed	05/31/2011	06/10/2011	06/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 03 30 01, 1.5.F BBII, Becho, Central Concrete, W/O, ARUP and Adamson Associates met on Tuesday 5/24/2011 to discuss the results of Buttress Primary Concrete Mix Trial Batches. During this meeting, Central Concrete expressed concern about variability in the Buttress Primary Concrete mix due to slight variations in material and batching. The Buttress Primary Concrete Mix is a very high performance mix and even small variations in the mix constituents can result in significant changes in strength. Please advise how much of a working tolerance is acceptable for the primary buttress concrete mix.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The strength of concrete which has been placed in the primary shafts will be considered satisfactory if both of the following requirements are met: 1. Every arithmetic average of any three consecutive strength tests (each test consisting of at least two 6 by 12 in. cylinders or at least three 4 by 8 in. cylinders made from the same sample of concrete) equals or exceeds 2,000 psi. 2. No individual strength test (average of two 6 by 12 in. cylinders or at least three 4 by 8 in. cylinders) falls below 1,800 psi.	
T-0156	BSE - Primary Concrete Mix 90-Day Compressive Strength	Closed	05/31/2011	06/10/2011	06/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 03 30 01, 1.5.F Per Specification Section 03 30 01 - 1.5F Trial Batches: "The mixes shall be proportioned to develop a compressive strength of 2,000 psi at 28 days." Per the response to Question TG0300-0262, "The rate of strength gain can be reduced so that the design strength is reached after 28 days but less than 91 days". Please confirm that the Buttress Primary Shaft Concrete may take up to 90 days to achieve 2,000 psi.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The rate of strength gain can be reduced so that the design strength is reached after 28 days but less than 91 days, provided the Contractor submits test data demonstrating that the mix will reach 2,000 psi at or before 90 days. At a minimum, compressive strength tests of the mix shall be taken at 7, 14, 28, 56 and 90 days. Each test shall consist of a minimum three cast cylinders and a minimum three cores taken from trial batch cubes placed in accordance with submittal TG0300-385. At shafts C/2, C/4 and C/6 (refer to GT-2201), the mixes shall be proportioned to develop a compressive strength of 2,000 psi at 28 days. Contractor to submit proposed mixes and corresponding test results for approval prior to their use.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 785 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0156.1	BSE - 120 Day Acceptability of Buttress Primary Shaft Concrete	Closed	04/16/2012	04/26/2012	04/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 4/12/12 Central Letter					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
BBII requests that in the event that the Buttress Primary Mix test specimens do not meet the 2,000 psi specified strength of 2,000 psi at 90 days (reference Response to previous RFIs #T-0157.2, and #T-0156), additional cylinders are to be taken and tested at 120 days. During this cooler climate, initial temperature may be impeding overall strength at the required time. Although only a few specimens are suspect of low strengths, Central Concrete is confident that at 120 days, the specimens in question will reach the required strength. If this criteria can be accepted for all test specimens at 120 days, this can mitigate any future concerns of suspect low strength.					ARUP Response:		
					This is acceptable for shaft N-2. For future shafts, we will evaluate on a case by case basis. However, this will require the TJPA to take an additional cylinder at the sampling frequency required in the specifications so that, if the first cylinder tested at 90 days is less than 2,000 psi, there can be three samples tested at 120 days.		
					Christina Young : Per Turner, the additional cylinder sampling is to be performed by the Contractor's own testing agency.		
T-0157	BSE - Primary Concrete Mix 500 PSI At 7-Days	Closed	05/31/2011	06/10/2011	06/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 03 30 01, 2.2.E					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
BBII, Becho, Central Concrete, W/O, ARUP and Adamson Associates met on Tuesday 5/24/2011 to discuss the results of Buttress Primary Concrete Mix Trial Batches. One of the concerns for the Buttress Primary Concrete is to provide a mix that is able to consistently achieve both 500 psi at 7 days and 2,000 psi at 28 days. The Buttress Primary Concrete Mix is a very high performance mix and even small variations in the mix constituents can result in significant changes in strength. Please advise if it acceptable to allow a working tolerance for the 500 psi requirement at 7 days.					ARUP Response:		
					The 7 day compressive strength of primary shaft concrete (Type "A" concrete in spec section 03 30 01) shall be 500 psi +/- 200 psi.		
T-0157.1	BSE - PSI Schedule for Buttress Shaft Primary Mix	Closed	01/13/2012	01/23/2012	01/18/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 786 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Fields				
REQUEST: To date there are multiple RFI responses that address the scheduled PSI requirements for the primary shaft mix which is resulting in confusion and unnecessary Vela issues. For clarification sake please confirm the following schedule is correct: 1. 300 psi at 7 days pursuant to RFI response T-0157. 2. 2000 psi based on an arithmetic average of tests on or before 90 days pursuant to RFI response T-0155 and T-0156.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFI is void and answered in RFI T-0157.2		
T-0157.2	BSE - PSI Schedule for Buttress Shaft Primary Mix	Closed	01/18/2012	01/28/2012	01/18/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: To date there are multiple RFI responses that address the scheduled PSI requirements for the primary shaft mix which is resulting in confusion and unnecessary Vela issues. For clarification sake please confirm the following schedule is correct: 1. 300 psi at 7 days pursuant to RFI response T-0157. 2. 2000 psi based on an arithmetic average of tests on or before 90 days pursuant to RFI response T-0155 and T-0156.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The cylinder test results will be tracked in Vela as follows: 7 day report: below 300psi: Failure. Add an issue in Vela 28 day report: below 300 psi: Failure. Keep the issue in Vela open below 2,000 psi: below specification but within RFI T-0156 guidelines; monitor; if the 7 day break for the same report was less than 300 psi, then the Vela issue stays open; if the 7 day break for the same report was greater than 300 psi, no Vela issue 90 day report: below 2,000 psi: Failure. Add an issue in Vela above 3,000 psi: Failure. Add an issue in Vela Regarding the question of averaging, see response to RFI 155.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 787 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0157.3	BSE - PSI Schedule for Buttress Shaft Primary Mix	Closed	01/19/2012	01/29/2012	01/23/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Kirk Nielsen		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
To date there are multiple RFI responses that address the scheduled PSI requirements for the primary shaft mix which is resulting in confusion and unnecessary Vela issues. For clarification sake please confirm the following schedule is correct:				The cylinder test results will be tracked in Vela as follows:			
1. 300 psi at 7 days pursuant to RFI response T-0157.				Below 300 psi at 7 days: fail			
2. 2000 psi based on an arithmetic average of tests on or before 90 days pursuant to RFI response T-0155 and T-0156.				Above 300 psi at 7 days: pass			
				Below 2,000 psi at 90 days: fail			
				Above 2,000 psi at 90 days: pass			
				Above 3000 @ 28 days does not conform with the specifications, but this will not be tracked in Vela.			
				Regarding the question of averaging, see response to RFI 155			
T-0158	301 Mission Wall - Architect of Record	Closed	06/01/2011	06/11/2011	06/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: URS Corporation David Fyfe		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Alfred Lau	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please clarify who is the registered Architect of Record, for the 301 Mission Interim Screen Wall Project.				URS is the Architect/Engineer of Record per signature and seal affixed to the drawings.			
T-0159	BSE - Unforeseen Obstruction - Timber Piles Within Pre-Trench Limits Zone 3	Closed	06/02/2011	06/12/2011	06/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Sheet D-2212, Specification Section 02 41 01, attached sketch and photo				06/06/2011 - Daphne Faulkner			
During Pre-trench, BBII found additional unforeseen timber piles within the pre-trench limits along gridline A, between gridlines 24 & 25.				Response provided by S. Rule of Turner.			
Per Contract Drawing D-2212 (attached), there should only be a single row of timber piles in conflict with the CDSM wall, although when the area was exposed there are three rows within the CDSM wall limits (see attached photo). These will have to be removed and will be considered extra work.				Please refer to note on Drawing D-2212 in the upper half between grids 23–26 which states,			
				"In areas where (N)CDSM wall conflicts with the existing pile caps and piles, remove (E) pile caps and/or piles prior to construction of (N) Transit Center Building CDSM perimeter shoring wall (see Note 3 and 6)."			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0159.1	<div><div>BSE - Unforeseen Obstruction - Timber Piles Within Pre-Trench Limits Zone 3</div><div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.</div></div><div><div>Nhi Tran</div><div>Ural Yal</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company</div><div>Daphne Faulkner</div></div></div></div> <div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference RFI#T-0159, Sheet D-2212, Specification Section 02 41 19, and attached photos</div><div>The Response to RFI#T-0159, appears to have misunderstood the question. Therefore BBII is providing additional information.</div></div>	Closed	06/08/2011	06/18/2011	06/27/2011	Potentially	<div><div></div><div>Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu</div></div>
	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div></div></div>		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<div><div></div><div>The response to RFI T-0159 applies. The contractor shall remove all piles encountered during pre-trench activities.</div><div>Per note 7 on D-2212, it was made clear at the time of bid that the actual existing conditions may differ from</div></div>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 789 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0160	<p>BSE - Timber Piles Not Extracted in Zone 4</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference CR T-010 and attached summary and sketch</p> <p>BBII continues to remove unforeseen timber piles along 199 Fremont Street in Zone 4 and soon will commence extraction along 181 Fremont Street.</p> <p>As of May 31, 2011, BBII has left 7 piles in place as they were estimated to be more than 12" away from the limits of the CDSM shoring wall. In addition, 5 piles were broken during extraction a portion of which were left in place due to their proximity to the adjacent building walls. While these piles also appear to be more than 12" outside the limits of the CDSM shoring wall, due to possible undulations and alignment changes underground, the possibility of these piles encroaching into the CDSM shoring wall area exist.</p> <p>These piles are not shown on the contract plans and are extracted with extreme caution under the TJPA's direction and prescribed methods, taking the integrity of the adjacent buildings in consideration. Please confirm that it is the TJPA's intention to leave these piles in place.</p>	Closed	06/03/2011	06/13/2011	06/16/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
				<p>Answered By: Turner Construction Comp. Jack Adams</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Contractor is to remove the wood piles adjacent to 199 and 181 Fremont using alternate means and methods. Wood pile can remain along this line if it will not interfere with installation of CDSM wall.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0161	BSE - CDSM Wall Soldier Pile Installation	Closed	06/03/2011	06/13/2011	06/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, 3.13 and attached detail sketch					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Is it acceptable to cut a 1.5" diameter hole, 16" from the bottom tip, in the web of the soldier beam pile beams? The purpose of the hole is to aid in securing the tail of the beam to the "dolly" that DND will use to raise the beams into a vertical position.					06/03/2011 - George Metzger		
					ARUP Response:		
					This is acceptable.		
T-0162	BSE - Buttress Concrete Test Cylinders	Closed	06/03/2011	06/13/2011	06/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 03 30 01 and attached summary of test results					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
BBII, Becho, Central Concrete, W/O, ARUP and Adamson Associates met on Tuesday 5/24/2011 to discuss the results of Buttress Primary Concrete Mix Trial Batches (please refer to the attachment for a summary of the test results). The 28-day test results for the 4x8 test cylinders were on average 57% of the core 4" diameter core test results. The 28-day test results for the 6x12 test cylinders were on average 88% of the 4" diameter core test results. The test samples were extracted from the same concrete batches, at the same time and cured in the same manner. BBII believes the difference in compressive strength between the test results may be attributed to the sample size & the resultant heat of hydration which drives the concrete cure rate. BBII also believes that the concrete cores may be more indicative of the actual in-situ concrete strength than the concrete test cylinders.					ARUP Response:		
The Specification Section 03 30 01 - 1.5 F Trial Batches references "concrete cylinders", however it does not specify 4x8 or 6x12 test cylinders.					Arup believes that there is insufficient information available at this time for the Contractor to draw the conclusions stated in the RFI.		
During the course of the meeting, it was generally agreed upon that 6x12 test cylinders appeared to be a more representative and consistent measure of the Primary Buttress Concrete strength relative to the core samples.					Regarding the question posed in the RFI: Arup's understanding is that there should be little difference between 4x8 and 6x12 cylinders cast, cured and tested under identical conditions and, therefore, it is not essential to limit the TJPA's Testing Agency to one particular cylinder size.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 791 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>BBII has confirmed through CTS that there should be no additional cost in sampling and testing a 4x8 cylinder relative to a 6x12 cylinder.</p> <p>Therefore, BBII proposes that the 6x12 test cylinders should be used as the basis of acceptance testing both for the Trial Batches and also for future Field Quality Control and Testing for the Primary Buttress Concrete; 4x8 test cylinders should only be used for informational purposes only. Please confirm.</p>						
T-0163	<p>BSE - Hazardous Material Removed From Site Zone 2</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p>	Closed	06/03/2011	06/13/2011	06/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Specification Section 00 03 35, 1.2</p> <p>During Investigation of Zone 2, BBII discovered potential lead based material existing on site. The specific area of concern is the pedestals on First Street.</p> <p>Please confirm that all contaminated material (specifically the referenced pedestals) as specified in the specification section 00 03 35 Article 1.2 has been removed and abated by the Demolition Contractor.</p> <p>BBII is scheduled to remove these pedestals next week and cannot proceed with this critical work until it is confirmed that the site is cleared of lead based materials as required by the Specifications.</p> <p>The TJPA's attention is directed to the following Section of the Specifications:</p> <p>SECTION 00 03 35 - EXISTING CONDITIONS: HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</p> <p>"1.2 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS REPORTS A. The TJPA's environmental consultants have surveyed the facility for the presence of various hazardous</p>						
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>						
	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>06/06/2011 - Kevin Chiu</p> <p>Hazardous material has been removed from site per the extent of demolition contract drawings for zone 2 - this does not include the "pedestals" in Zone 2. The building and above ground structures were demolished to the extent shown on Demolition contract drawings. Hazardous materials abatement scope was completed within the scope of demolition only. Refer to Demolition Drawings D-1050, D-1051 and D-1073 for representation of limits of structures (specifically the referenced pedestals) demolished and hazardous material abatement.</p> <p>BSE Contractor to handle remaining demolition and abatement in accord with BSE Spec 00-08-14 Health and Safety Criteria Para 1.2 and 1.3 Lead hazards, BSE Spec. 02-41-01 "Demolition" and BSE Spec. 01-13-50 "Hazardous Materials Procedures."</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 792 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>materials. Materials investigated may include asbestos, lead, PCB ballasts, mercury containing lamps, contaminated soils, underground storage tanks, and other hazardous materials. The demolition contractor for the Demolition project (Evans Brothers Inc.) is responsible for removing and abating products containing asbestos, lead, or PCB ballast, and mercury-containing lamps."</p>							
T-0164	BSE - Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building South Zone 4	Closed	06/06/2011	06/16/2011	06/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference RFI@T-0146.1 [BBI 0104] and attached photo				06/06/2011 - Roger Rothenburger			
Per [RFI #T-0146.1] RFI 104 Response, BBII inserted a metal sheet behind the timber piles required to be removed, in the location between 199 and 181 Fremont. The sheet is to hold back the soil in the alley. Due to the close proximity of the timber piles, the sheet location is too close to the timber piles required to be removed from the CDSM Wall Location. The sheet is too close for the pile extractor to attach to the tops of the pile. See Attached Photo.				The practice of removing the sheet pile was approved by TJPA in the "181 Fremont test" done on Friday June 3rd. The Contractor can remove the metal sheet and expose the piles as necessary with as steeply a sloped excavation that allows the vibrator pile puller to be attached. The work should be done in as reasonably a short duration as possible. All equipment, manpower, materials should be at hand when the metal sheet is pulled and the piles are exposed for extraction.			
Please Advise in detail.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 793 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0165	BSE - High pH Water Found In Zone 3 Pre-Trenching	Closed	06/07/2011	06/17/2011	06/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 00 08 13, 1.9.C BBI found high pH water while digging an exploratory hole in the Fremont St. side of Zone 3. This was confirmed by Peter Cusack from Treadwell & Rollo. Specification Section 00.08.13.1.9.C states that "Should the existing wastewater be contaminated, or should it be uncontaminated but subsequently become contaminated as a result of conditions other than the Contractor's operations, a Change Order will be issued..". Please consider this as a Notice of Existing Contaminated Wastewater as defined by SS00.08.13.1.9.C. Please advise on how to proceed.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued for the chemicals to treat the water per specification section 00 08 13 (1.9.B).		
T-0166	BSE - Unknown Concrete Structure at 199 Fremont Zone 4 (Gridline 33-30)	Closed	06/07/2011	06/17/2011	06/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0144 (BBI RFI 0103), Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached Turner Field Condition Report 056 and photos BBII demolished the Unforeseen Concrete Structure along 199 Fremont St., and associated curb per RFI #103 [RFI#T-0144] response. During the process, due to the previous contractor's construction means, the curb inadvertently damaged the metal flashing, and possibly the waterproofing beside it. Along with the curb, the fence panel was built on top of the Unforeseen Concrete Structure, so when the structure was removed, the fence came down too. See attached pictures and Turner Field Condition Report (5/24/11) BBII requests immediate direction from the TJPA on this issue.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Instructions for this were orally transmitted in the field and complied with by the BSE Contractor. The fence between the buildings 199 Fremont and 181 Fremont has been reinstalled. Repair of the curb and flashing can wait until work in the area is complete or at a point that no further damage is possible. The Contract requires that the BSE Contractor repair damage to any building damaged during construction activity for the site and this Contract.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 794 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0166.1	BSE - Unknown Concrete Structure at 199 Fremont Zone 4 (Gridline 33-30)	Closed	07/20/2011	07/30/2011	07/26/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0144, RFI #T-0166 and Specification 31 56 13 Per the response to RFI#T-0166 (BBI RFI 103.1), please provide an acceptable repair procedure for the 199 Fremont building. Also, please confirm that the repair work will be included in CR T-010.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No action is required by the contractor at this time. The specific damage to 199 Fremont Street has not been listed in the RFI. TJPA is aware of minor damage to the metal flashing along the curb at the bottom of 199 Fremont St and the removal of the unreinforced "curb" that ran along the base of the cinder block wall. As stated previously repairs to 199 Fremont will be made at a much later date. The damage that occurred to the flashing and unreinforced concrete curb resulted from using breaker on the unreinforced foundation wall and pulling the sections out and repairs will not be done until the project is further along in progress where no more likely damage will occur.		
<hr/>							
T-0167	Survey Grid Control Documents	Closed	06/08/2011	06/10/2011	06/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell To: Transbay Joint Powers Authority Edmond Sum			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference RFI T-0112.1 and drawing GT-0100 As requested by Ed Sum in today's (6/8/11) OAC meeting we submit the following question: Please confirm that gridlines as established from the GT-0100 and as confirmed on Chaudhary & Associates Survey Grid Control Documents (Ref: RFI T-0112.1) can be used for all future construction elements (i.e., CDSM wall, etc). Please confirm by 6/10/11.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: For the purpose of laying out the work shown in the BSE package, the layout drawing provided by Chaudry (included in RFI T-0112.1) is acceptable.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0167.1	Survey Grid Control Documents	Closed	07/01/2011	07/11/2011	07/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please provide City Survey of property lines with a translation to grid for our use.			ARUP Response:				
			The City's property line survey has been provided to the Contractor and GT-0100 ties the building grid to the survey.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 796 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0168	BSE - Soil Classification Data	Closed	06/08/2011	06/18/2011	06/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Roger Rothenburger	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Specification Section 01 13 50							
The Class 1 and Class 2 Disposal site does not want to use the old "PSI for Caltrans" Reports in the Soil Profile, due to the lack of necessary tests, missing pages in the report, and age.							
The Disposal site recommends the use of the Treadwell & Rollo reports from 2008 and 2009, and to dismiss the "PSI for Caltrans" reports.							
Please Advise.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0169	BSE - Disposal of Drilling Spoils	Closed	06/09/2011	06/19/2011	07/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Roger Rothenburger	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification Section 01 13 50							
BBII is concerned of the close proximity of the differently classified layers within the Buttress Area of Zone 4. The concern is during Drilling & Shaft Excavation, cross contamination of the material could potentially lead to Class 1 Material inadvertently going to a Class 2 Disposal site, or even a clean waist site. The class 1, the class 2, and the clean material layers are described below:							
Surface to GL-11 ft --- Land fill (clean material except for Equipment Pad Concrete)							
GL-11 ft to GL-13 ft --- Class II (based on Spec 01 13 50/APA)							
GL-13 ft to GL-16 ft --- Class I (based on Spec 01 13 50/APA)							
GL-16 ft to bottom ---Clean Material							
BBII is concerned that due to the process of excavating the soil out of the Buttress Shaft with large amount of water and the use of a clam shell digging attachment, that the soil layers have a high opportunity of mixing within the casing. Presumably the mixed the soil layers will make it difficult to distinguish between the class 1, the class 2, and the clean materials.							
BBII requests the engineer to provide a revised stratum classification that is better for the actual shaft excavation methods being used, that will prevent cross contamination.							
Please Advise.							
		Contract Specification 01 13 50 Part 1.1.C (General Summary - Sil Management) requies the Contractor to use the Treadwell and Rollo March 24, 2010 "Site Mitigation Plan, Transbay Tranit Center" and April 2009 "Environmental Site Characterization, Transbay Terminal" reports for managing existing soil disposal.					
		Only the March 24, 2010 Treadwell and Rollo report is a Contract Document in Appendix A of Section 01 13 50 and only data from April 2009 Treadwell and Rollo Report is included as Contract information even though both reports contain much of the same language. The April 2009 report is 600 pages and the March 2010 report is considerably shorter and condensed.					
		Section 01 13 50 requires the Contractor to submit a material handling plan for each type of excavation operation on the site and includes the buttress piles as well as CDSM overflow materials, pre-trench excavation material, bulk excavation material, etc.					
		Both the April 2009 and March 2010 Treadwell and Rollo report give the expected ground condition classifications as:					
		5~16 feet (below grade) fill material composed of loose to medium dense silty sand with varying amounts of brick, wood, tar, and glass fragments.					
		15~18 feet (below grade) fill material composed of medium dense to very dense sand with variable amutns of silt					
		18~55 feet (below grade) Bay Mud					
		Under Section 01 13 50 Part 1.5.G the Contractor is resonsible for develeoping a plan that reduces the amount of hazardous waste generated. This plan also includes (Part 1.4.C Submittals - Excavation Handling) methods, means, equipment, sequences that segreegates the material to reduce cost of hazardous material disposal.					
		Since the buttress pile area was excavated to remove piles and backfilled with a combination of existing clean material (fine sand with silt) and crused concrete debris and poured concrete (top 2 feet buttress pile					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i><u>Number</u></i>	<i><u>Subject</u></i>	<i><u>Status</u></i>	<i><u>Date Created</u></i>	<i><u>Date Required</u></i>	<i><u>Date Answered</u></i>	<i><u>Cost Impact</u></i>	<i><u>Proceed</u></i>
T-0170	BSE - Existing 3" minus Concrete Rubble	Closed	06/20/2011	06/30/2011	06/29/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Nhi Tran Ural Yal	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams		
REQUEST: Reference Drawing Sheets GT-1303, D-5100, D-5101, D-5102, D-5103, response to Pre-Bid RFI #TG0300-014, and attached drawing Contract drawings GT-1303, D-5100, D-5101, D-5102, and D-5103 along with the response to Pre-Bid RFI #TG0300-014 describe the finish grades and subsequent quantities of crushed 3" minus concrete to be left on site for the BSE package. In summary, Zone 4 was to be left with a depression as shown on GT-1303 and Zone 1-3 were to be left no higher than existing ground elevations. Previous discussions between BBII, W/O, EBI and TJPA were made to accommodate BBII's early access into Zones 1-3 for pre-trenching. At the time of these discussions EBI indicated they were short approximately 7000 cy of balancing the site and that they would not be able to get that remaining 7000 cy until the existing ramps were demolished. As a result of the short term shortage and in exchange for access to zone 1-3 BBII agreed to: - Allow EBI to leave Zone 3 low of the Existing elevations - Allow EBI to set up Crusher in Zone 2 for ramp demolition - Allow EBI to leave the 7000 cy shortage in a stockpile in Zone 2, for our later use. BBII appreciated the partnering agreement however the current size of the stockpile is far greater than BBII ever expected. BBII surveyed the stockpile and the Zone 3 depression on 6/7/11 after they completed their export to zone 4 and BBII estimates the size of the concrete stockpile to be in excess of 11,000 cy (this does not include the asphalt stockpile that was created after the survey). Based on BBII's calculations (see attached topo) Zone 3 was left approximately 2000 cy short of existing grade and 5000 cy were taken from the stockpile to Zone 4. As a result BBII requests the current stockpile be removed in its entirety from the site, as it is in excess of the contractual amount to be removed by the BSE contract. However, If acceptable to TJPA, BBII would be interested in taking 2000 cy of the crushed concrete if it could be		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Intent of the demolition project is to retain processed construction demolition concrete onsite for use as buttress fill material and provide a working platform for construction of new terminal perimeter wall. Contract drawings state" Subsequent to placement of CDSM wall perimeter shoring remove all onsite crushed/processes demolition concrete backfill." REF: D-2200-2203 inclusive, and D-1001 Note 2. The amount of crushed concrete (and asphalt) is from the demolition contract is in accord with Demolition Contractor drawings and specs. REF: Demo Spec. 02-42-00.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 800 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
<div>delivered and stockpiled in an mutually agreeable staging area. BBII suggests Lot S. This material would then be used as need for excavation stabilization throughout the BSE contract.</div>							
T-0171	BSE - Concrete Section Protruding Into CDSM Shoring Wall Area Zone 4	Closed	06/13/2011	06/23/2011	06/17/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Roger Rothenburger
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference attached photo				The void should be filled with 2000 psi concrete after surfaces of the opening are cleaned. In addition grouted anchorage of #3 rebar hooks at 12" c.c around the opening in the existing concrete basement wall and mesh is required before placing repair concrete through a "bird's mouth" form for a complete filling. A sketch is attached showing the desired configuration of the repair patch.			
While excavating a pile next to 181 Fremont Street, a section of concrete that was protruding into the CDSM shoring wall area fell from the foundation wall of 181 Fremont. Please advise on how to proceed.				Cost to be tracked under CRT#10.			
<hr/>							
T-0172	LEED Submittal Requirements	Closed	06/13/2011	06/23/2011	06/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Joanne Filipas	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref Spec Section 01 81 13 Section 1.5:				We agree with your proposal to combine the data.			
According to spec section 018113.1.5, LEED submittals shall be submitted in addition to other submittal requirements specified elsewhere. If a submitted item is identical to an item submitted to comply with other requirements, a duplicate copy is to be submitted. In effort to minimize duplicate submittals, please confirm it is acceptable to issue one submittal package to cover both the technical spec. and LEED spec section requirements.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 801 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0173	BSE - Enhanced Trial Batch Testing	Closed	06/13/2011	06/23/2011	06/15/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 03 30 01, 2.2.E and attached mix designs BBII, Becho, Central Concrete, W/O, ARUP and Adamson Associates met on Tuesday 5/24/2011 to discuss the results of Buttress Primary Concrete Mix Trial Batches. Based upon the preliminary results of the 2nd Trial Batch, BBII proposes to submit the following three mixes for approval for use on the Buttress Primary Shaft Concrete: 1. Mix 1: 85AEC3B6 2. Mix 5: 86AEC3A6 3. Mix 7: 87AEC3A6 BBII believes that having additional mixes available for use as the Buttress Primary Concrete would be of great benefit to the Project. BBII proposes "enhanced testing" of these three mixes as well as three additional hybrids of each mix for a total of nine mixes (please see attached for mix designs). The intent of the enhanced testing is to further refine the information we currently have on all three of the above three mixes, as well develop additional mixes for future use as Primary Shaft Concrete. One of the concerns of 1st and 2nd Trial Batches was potentially accelerated curing due to the Styrofoam insulated boxes in which the trail batch "cubes" were cast. BBII proposes a 3rd trial batch using all of the same methodology of the approved trial batch method placing, the only exception being that the concrete will be cast into +/- 5'x5'x4' deep excavations in lieu of the Styrofoam insulated forms. Each mix would be placed in an individual excavation, lined with plastic to retain moisture. All other aspects of the proposed trial batch methodology would be as previously submitted & approved. The results of the "enhanced testing" would be evaluated and possibly submitted for approval as additional Buttress Primary Shaft Concrete Mixes. Please confirm that this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: This is acceptable.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 802 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0174	301 Mission Wall - New Curb Detail	Closed	06/14/2011	06/24/2011	06/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: Attached sheet C-5000				New concrete curb shall be placed on top of topping slab and shall extend 9 inches above top of pavers. See attached detail for reinforcement. Concrete mix used for new concrete curbs shall be according to RFI T-0176.			
The required curb details are not clearly defined. Is new curb set atop finish pavers, onto topping slab, or set all the way down to structural slab. Additionally, provide all applicable rebar details to match condition.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 803 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>																					
T-0175	301 Mission Wall - Concrete Mix for Curb Around Existing Manhole Covers	Closed	06/15/2011	06/25/2011	06/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>																					
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: URS Corporation		David Fye																							
Co-Author:																												
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>																								
Reference drawing C-2000				New concrete finish shall match existing concrete finish. Contractor shall provide concrete mix designs for curb(s) and walkway(s) based on specification as follows;																								
The existing curb around the manholes at the east and west ends of the 301 Mission Wall is unknown. Design documents do not provide information as to the specs of this concrete mixture. The existing concrete appears to have a color added to the mix design. Please provide a mix design and color specification (if necessary) to use at these locations.				Concrete Mix, Design and Testing: Design the mix to produce standard weight concrete consisting of Portland cement, aggregate, air-entraining admixture and water to produce the following properties:																								
				Compressive Strength: except as noted below, four thousand five hundred (4500) psi, minimum at twenty-eight (28) days, with a water cement ratio not to exceed 0.45 by weight. Slump Range: Two (2) inches to Four (4) inches. Air Content: Five (5) to seven (7) percent. Mixed shall be design to provide concrete with the following properties:																								
				<table><tr><td>Location</td><td colspan="2">Maximum Size of Aggregate</td></tr><tr><td>Min. 28 Day Strength (psi)</td><td colspan="2">Min Sacks of</td></tr><tr><td>Cement/cu. Yd.</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr><tr><td>Concrete Curb</td><td>¾"</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3000</td><td></td><td>6</td></tr><tr><td>Concrete Walkways</td><td>¾"</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2500</td><td></td><td>5-1/2</td></tr></table>				Location	Maximum Size of Aggregate		Min. 28 Day Strength (psi)	Min Sacks of		Cement/cu. Yd.			Concrete Curb	¾"		3000		6	Concrete Walkways	¾"		2500		5-1/2
Location	Maximum Size of Aggregate																											
Min. 28 Day Strength (psi)	Min Sacks of																											
Cement/cu. Yd.																												
Concrete Curb	¾"																											
3000		6																										
Concrete Walkways	¾"																											
2500		5-1/2																										
				Integral Color: Sidewalk shall be constructed of a dark grey, Hi-Con at 5 lbs. per cubic yard carbon black based concrete finish, with 25 to 30 lbs per 100 square feet of silicon carbide sparkle grains.																								
				Contractor shall submit mix design (including integral color) for review and acceptance by the TJPA Representative prior to placing concrete.																								
				Contractor shall provide sample of new concrete to ensure that it matches with existing concrete prior to placing new concrete.																								



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 804 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0176	301 Mission Wall - Fill Pour Back and New Curbs	Closed	06/15/2011	06/25/2011	06/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:URS Corporation	David Fyfe
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Should the concrete mix design for the fill pour back and 9"x12" curbs along the north side of the 301 Mission wall be the same mix that is used for the new curb around the manhole? The mix design for curbs around the existing manhole was requested in RFI T-0175. Please advise.				Concrete mix design for new concrete curbs shall be as specified in RFI T-0175.			
				Finished concrete curbs shall match existing concrete curb finish.			
				Contractor to submit concrete mix design to TJPA Representative for review and acceptance prior to placing concrete.			
T-0177	BSE - Alternate Method Of Pile Removal Along 181 Fremont	Closed	06/15/2011	06/25/2011	06/16/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference attached procedure, photos, and sketch				Confirmed - Method of pile removal is acceptable. CR T-010 is used to document work.			
During the extraction of unforeseen piles along 181 Fremont, two piles located inside the proposed CDSM wall broke and are now too deep to extract under using the current extraction method. During the attempted extraction of pile 151, the pile continued to break. The top of this pile is approximately 9' below the base of the foundation wall. Considering the length of the adjacent removed piles, there is approximately 6' left to be removed. Pile 105 is approximately 6' below the base of the foundation wall leaving approximately 12'-14' to be removed. Further excavation to expose these piles is not reasonable. BBII proposes to drill the remainder of each pile out. See below the proposed procedure as per committee meeting and consultation with Viking Drillers Inc. on 6-15-11. It was agreed that this work will be charged to CR T-010. Also attached are photos and a drawing indicating the location of both broken piles (105 and 151).							
Please provide direction.							
T-0178	BSE - Connector Wall Layout	Closed	06/16/2011	06/26/2011	06/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
T-0180	BSE - CDSM Wall Tolerance	Closed	06/22/2011	07/02/2011	06/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC			Roger Rothenburger
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal						
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference Specification Section 31 56 13				TJPA did not request this RFI. TJPA stated that if the Contractor was concerned about meeting the tolerances for top horizontal position of the CDSM shoring wall that the Contractor should submit an RFI and TJPA would support such a request in order to avoid any encroachment of the CDSM shoring wall with the Transit Box concrete structure which would be difficult to remediate.				
As requested by the TJPA, DND submits this request to modify the horizontal tolerance for the CDSM shoring wall. The new goal is to set the wall 2" outside of the original planned centerline of shoring wall. This solution has been proposed by the TJPA in order to not encroach into the structure at the bottom of the train box.				TJPA has no objection in the horizontal setting of the CDSM shoring wall if the horizontal tolerance is 0" towards the TTC box structure and 4" away from the box structure. The verticality tolerances of 1/150 (CDSM wall) and 1/200 (steel beam) remain in place.				
DND respectfully requests the maximum soldier pile & CDSM wall tolerances be revised to 0 inches into the trainbox & up to 5 inches outside the trainbox.				The 4" top horizontal tolerance away from the wall will allow at 1/150 in 55 feet a near 0" clearance at the invert level with the CDSM wall and will allow at 1/200 the steel beam to be clear of the structural outline by 0.70".				
There will be no additional excavation and/or bracing costs associated with this increase in tolerance from BBI. However; there may be future additional cost impacts to the Structural Concrete & Waterproofing that are to be handled in future trade packages.				It is understood that there is no cost or time associated with this change for the BSE Contractor work and that TJPA accepts the additional overbreak concrete generated by this small adjustment in the top horizontal placement in exchange for a better chance of avoiding structural encroachment issues at the final invert level.				
Please confirm, if this is acceptable.				It is also understood that the use of the increased top horizontal tolerance is contingent on actual field physical property line clearances for the CDSM shoring wall.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0180.1	BSE - CDSM Wall Tolerance	Closed	06/24/2011	07/04/2011	07/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Transbay PMPC	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal				Roger Rothenburger	
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference Response to RFI#T-0180				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please delete the first sentence "TJPA did not request this RFI" of the response for RFI T-0180, because it is the wrong statement.				It depends on how "request" is defined. TJPA did "request" the RFI for expanded tolerances but only if the CDSM shoring wall subcontractor felt that they needed more tolerances and wished to have TJPA confirm that it would accept a larger set back (4") than allowed in the Specifications (2"). This is the same understanding held my Emilio Cruz.			
Emilio Cruz, PMPC, requested to submit this RFI at the Schedule Review Meeting on 6/14/2011 at W-O JV Office Conference Room, 183 Fremont St.				TJPA has allowed a 4" set back while maintaining the verticality specifications for the steel soldier piles (1/200) and the CDSM (1/150). The CDSM shoring wall subcontractor has initially selected a 2" setback for placing the steel soldier beams. At 1/200 for a depth of 55ft there could be as much as 1.3" of encroachment (1/200x55x12 - 2" = 1.33").			
				At the very least it would seem that a 3" setback would minimize further the possibility for encroachment since the 1/200 is still a difficult specification to achieve as TJPA understands it from the CDSM subcontractor.			
				Since encroachment can be very problematic with the concrete structural wall TJPA supports the larger setback to avoid difficult encroachment problems while maintaining the specifications on verticality. The issue of who requested what and when is immaterial. TJPA has accepted the potential for additional concrete from allowing a larger setback and the BSE Contractor has accepted any impact to the bracing system from a larger impact.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 808 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0181	BSE - CDSM Pile Tolerance Measurement Location	Closed	06/22/2011	07/02/2011	07/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference Specification Section 31 56 13			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
BBII's subcontractor DND would like to confirm the exact location of the soldier pile, where the pile tolerance is to be measured. Please find below DND's question:			ARUP Response:				
"It is our understanding that the tolerance of the soldier pile beams is to be measured at the plan top of pile elevation. Is this correct?"			We confirm that the tolerance refers specifically to the location of the CDSM wall and soldier pile centerlines.				
Please confirm that DND's interpretation of the pile tolerance measurement is correct.			Section 31 56 13 3.3 A. states: "The location of the CDSM wall centerline relative to that shown on the Drawings is 0" toward the excavation and 2" away from the excavation." This refers to the location at the ground surface ("original grade") at the start of drilling.				
			Section 31 56 13 3.13 B. 8. states: "Acceptable construction tolerance for the location of the soldier pile centerline relative to that shown on the Drawings is 0" toward the excavation and 3" maximum away from the excavation." This refers to the location at ground surface ("original grade") at the start of pile installation.				
			Please also refer to 31 56 13 3.4 A and 31 56 13 3.13 B 2 which stipulates respectively the vertical alignment of the CDSM wall and soldier piles.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 809 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0181.1	BSE - CDSM Tolerances	Closed	07/21/2011	07/31/2011	07/26/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFIs #T-180, #T-0180.1, #T-0181 and Specification Section 31 56 13 Previous RFIs T-180, T-180.1, and T-181 have all addressed CDSM shoring wall tolerances. Below is BBII's interpretation of the responses: 1. Horizontal Tolerance: a) CDSM Columns: 0" in towards the train box, 2" maximum away from the train box - measured relative to the "plan" CDSM shoring wall centerline located at the ground surface (original grade) at the start of drilling (W/O comment - Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, 3.3.A) b) Steel Soldier Pile: 0" in towards the train box, 4" maximum away from the trainbox - measured relative to the "plan" CDSM shoring wall centerline located at the ground surface (original grade) at the start of drilling (W/O comment - Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, 3.13.B.8) 2. Vertical Tolerance: a) CDSM Columns: Inclination deviation no more than 1:150 (horizontal to vertical) (W/O comment - Same as stated in Specification Section 31 56 13, 3.4.A) b) Steel Soldier Pile: Inclination no more than 1:200 (horizontal to vertical) (W/O comment - Same as stated in Specification Section 31 56 13, 3.13.B.9) Please confirm this is acceptable		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Using the numbering in the RFI: 1 a. 0" in towards the train box, 4" maximum away from the train box is acceptable everywhere along the alignment except at wall segments A/26-30 and A/30-33.5. 0" in towards the train box, 2" maximum away from the train box is acceptable at wall segments A/26-30 and A/30-33.5. 1 b. 0" in towards the train box, 4" maximum away from the trainbox is acceptable everywhere along the alignment. 2 a. Confirmed 2 b. Confirmed			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 810 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0182	BSE - Inclinator Locations Within The CDSM Wall	Closed	06/23/2011	07/03/2011	06/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Sheets GT-1301, GT-1302, Specification Section 31 56 13, and Transmittal No. 140-01802 (attached)				ARUP Response:			
Please refer to the Instrumentation Plan within the contract drawings GT-1301 & GT-1302, which depicts the rough locations of the 15 inclinometers (IW-1 through IW-15) that are to be installed through the CDSM shoring wall. Please notify BBII of the exact locations of those inclinometers by utilizing the soldier pile numbers 1 through 681, sent in Transmittal No. 140-01802 (attached).				Provide pipes at the piles (beams) in accordance with detail 13/GT-5101 in the following fourteen beam numbers: 46, 97, 138, 226, 306, 325, 340, 443, 458, 478, 497, 556, 641, 730. Refer to the plan submitted with the RFI for the beam numbers.			
				As noted in 13/GT-5101, wood block shall be used at the bottom of the pipe. The top of the pipe shall be covered with duct tape to prevent filling with soil cement.			
T-0182.1	BSE - Connector Wall Inclinator Locations	Closed	06/30/2011	07/10/2011	07/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference RFI#T-0182, Transmittal No. 140-01802, and Specification Section 31 56 13				ARUP Response:			
BBII is in receipt of the Engineer's response to RFI T-0182, which lists the fourteen pile numbers where the inclinometers will be installed. Please note that pile # 443 was already installed on 06/18/2011, as part of the CDSM test panel.				The inclinometer casing shall be installed in pile number 440 rather than number 443.			
Can the inclinometer casing be installed at pile # 446, instead of pile # 443?							
T-0183	BSE - Connector Wall Shift	Closed	06/23/2011	07/03/2011	06/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference RFI#T-0178, Sheets GT-2201, GT-5101, and attached sketch				ARUP Response:			
Per the Engineer's response to RFI T-0178, it is				Provided there is no additional cost to the TJPA, it is acceptable to shift the connector columns and add			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 811 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
acceptable to shift the CDSM Connector Columns to the east and to add additional columns to provide CDSM material for the full width of the Buttress. Please confirm that it is acceptable to shift the lower three rows of the CDSM Connector Columns approximately 3'-6" to the east and add two more columns to the top row. Additionally, please confirm that the CDSM Shoring Wall between Gridlines 26 and 30 can still be installed per GT-2201 and Table 16/GT-5101.		columns as proposed and shown on the sketch.					
		The CDSM Shoring Wall between Gridlines 26 and 30 shall be installed per GT-2201 and Table 16/GT-5101.					
T-0183.1	BSE - Connector Wall Shift	Closed	06/30/2011	07/10/2011	07/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference RFI#T-0151, RFI#T-0178, RFI#T-0183, Specification Sections 31 63 29 and 31 56 13, and attached drawing				ARUP Response:			
Please refer to the Engineer's response to RFI # T-0151, which accepted the expansion of the Buttress 4'-4" to the east. Please also refer to the Engineer's response to RFI No. T-#0178, where the designer required the connector columns be shifted and/or supplemented with additional columns to provide CDSM material for the full width of the buttress. BBII suggests to revise the connector column layout per the attached drawing and install two additional connector columns at Grid "A" and "30" intersection.				The locations of the CDSM connector columns shown on the sketch accompanying the RFI are acceptable. The locations of the buttress shafts shown on the sketch accompanying the RFI have been revised. Please see the marked-up sketch attached to this response.			
Please confirm, if the proposed revision of the CDSM connector columns according to the attached drawing fulfills the design requirement.				A revised GT-2201 will not be issued.			
Also, please issue revised construction drawings that would reflect the changes made to the Buttress and the CDSM connector walls.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 812 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0184	BSE - CIDH Pile Rebar Cage Hoop Size	Closed	06/27/2011	07/07/2011	06/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-5202, Specification Section 03 20 01, attached sketch, and approved Shop Drawings from Package TA2010-032001A05 Drawing 12/GT-5202 shows 5" clearance between the hoop OD and the inside diameter of a 7' +/- 2" shaft. Per discussions with Becho, at least 3" of clearance is needed between the rebar spacers and the ID of the casing to facilitate proper installation of the rebar cages inside the casing. BBII would like to propose 7 1/4" minimum clearance in lieu of the 5" clearance (shown on 12/GT-5202) between the hoops and the inside diameter of the hole. Changing the clearance from 5" to 7 1/4" would give Becho the 3" of clearance that they need between the spacers and casing ID. Note that the approved rebar shop drawings show 5" clearance to the hoops as per 12/GT-5202. BBII will submit for your records only revised shop drawings showing the proposed 7 1/4" minimum clearance.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Changing the clearance from face of reinforcing steel to the soil face from 5" to 7 1/4" is acceptable.				
T-0185	Division 01 specifications issued for the TG08.1 package	Closed	06/29/2011	07/09/2011	07/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author:			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau				
REQUEST: Confirm if any of all of the Specification Sections 00 01 10, 00 01 15, 00 01 16, 00 03 50, 01 10 20 / APH, 01 10 30, 01 10 30 / APA, and 01 80 50 issued for the TG08.1 bid documents are to be incorporated into the overall project specifications. If so, the specifications should be issued to W/O by Field Order or Change Order.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the revised Divisions 00 & 01 sections will be officially issued to W/O by maens of Add Amendment or Field Order, as appropriate.				
T-0186	BSE - Hazardous Materials Removed From 564 & 568 Howard Street	Closed	06/30/2011	07/10/2011	07/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Co-Author:			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Final Pre-Demolition Hazardous Materials Assessment: Asbestos & Lead Survey (564 & 568 Howard St) - June 2011, prepared for ERM-West by Millennium Consulting Associates</p> <p>Please confirm that all the hazardous materials identified in the Final Pre-Demolition Hazardous Materials Assessment: Asbestos & Lead Survey (564 & 568 Howard St) - June 2011, will be removed by the demolition contractor.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Haz Mat abatement will include the materials identified in this report, however removal will be to the extent of demolition drawings issued for Demolition.</p>			
T-0187	<p>BSE - Connector Wall Inclinometer Locations - SEE RFI 182.1</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</p>	Closed	06/30/2011	07/10/2011	08/23/2011	<p>Potentially <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</p>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference RFI#T-0182, Transmittal No. 140-01802, and Specification Section 31 56 13</p> <p>BBII is in receipt of the Engineer's response to RFI T-0182, which lists the fourteen pile numbers where the inclinometers will be installed. Please note that pile # 443 was already installed on 06/18/2011, as part of the CDSM test panel.</p> <p>Can the inclinometer casing be installed at pile # 446, instead of pile # 443?</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>SEE RFI T-0182.1.</p>			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0188	BSE - Timber Piles Minna Street	Closed	07/01/2011	07/11/2011	07/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Masashi Kojima	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal					
REQUEST: Reference D-2211 and D-5101. During the pre-trenching operation on Minna Street between Gridlines 9-17, BBII discovered unknown timber piles. The timber piles are not shown on the BSE drawings. See attached BSE drawing D-2211, D-5101. The attached pictures indicate timber piles to be approx 2ft from the centerline of the CDSM wall. These piles meet the general conditions set out in article 3.05A.2. The piles encountered were not outlined in the bid documents. Please confirm the removal of the "unforeseen" timber piles, tracking and paid under a Force account contract change order similarly as done for Zone 4 pre-trench obstructions.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to note on Drawing D-2212 which states, "In areas where (N)CDSM wall conflicts with the existing pile caps and piles, remove (E) pile caps and/or piles prior to construction of (N) Transit Center Building CDSM perimeter shoring wall (see Note 3 and 6)." Please refer to note on Drawing GT-5103 which states, "Width and Depth as required to remove obstacles" This includes all piles within the CDSM wall footprint. "Unforeseen Conditions" are covered in Section 00 07 00 (General Conditions) Article 3.05.A.2 and 3.05.A.3 (Unforeseen or Changed Conditions). Article 3.05.C states, C. Differing Site Conditions shall not include: 1. All that is indicated in or reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents; 2. All that could be seen on Site 3. Conditions that are materially similar or characteristically the same as those indicated or described in the Contract Documents or Reference Documents. Since Section 31 56 13 discusses both pre-trenching and the removal of timber piles and Bid Item #6 is for the removal of timber piles before the CDSM shoring wall is installed TJPA believes that this work was indicated and will provide payment for it under Bid Item #2, #4, #6, and #7. There will be no additional payment for the removal of timber piles for the CDSM wall.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 815 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0188.1	BSE - Timber Piles Minna Street	Closed	07/07/2011	07/17/2011	07/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI T-0188, Drawing D-2211 and D-5101. Further to the TJP A response RFI # 188, this response did not address the mentioned timber pile removal method. Please see the attached cross section showing timber pile location in relationship to the existing utilities and structures. Due to the pile location, in relation to the shoring box BBII proposes direct extraction as done on A line in Zone 3. Please confirm this removal method is acceptable for the entire length of Minna Street.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Arup recommends that the procedure for removing these piles follow the procedure described in Arup's response to RFI T-0146.4.			
T-0188.2	BSE - Timber Piles Minna Street	Closed	07/13/2011	07/23/2011	07/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference response to RFI#T-0188.1 and RFI#T-0146.4 As discussed at the TG03 BSE Design Team meeting on 7/13/2011, sand shall be used for back fillings instead of the low strength material described in RFI#T-0146.4. Also, TJPA representative shall observe the extraction and instruct the extraction method in the field, if necessary. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TJPA Representatives and Arup will observe the method in practice Thursday July 14, 2011 at 10am to observe the method using sand described above for final verification that this method will be acceptable and suggest any changes to the method at that time.			
T-0188.3	BSE - Timber Piles Minna Street	Closed	07/18/2011	07/28/2011	07/26/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0188.2 and attached photos BBII has concerns for the integrity of the adjacent street and utilities, as a result of the pile extraction being performed on Minna Street in accordance with the response to RFI#T-0188.2. BBII has observed		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor's concern for the integrity of the adjacent street and utilities is as a result of the shoring method used - not the result of the pile extraction being performed on Minna Street in accordance with the response to RFI#T-0188.2.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>undermining and adjacent settlement during the extraction process (see attached photos).</p> <p>Please advise an acceptable method of pile extraction that will allow this work to continue</p>						<p>The observed undermining and adjacent settlement during the extraction process is to be restored to prevent damage to Utilities installed in Minna Street. The methods allowed in RFI T-0188.2 are to be followed by the Contractor.</p> <p>Section 31-56-13 Part 3.2.C (CDSM Wall - Pre-trenching) also references Section 32-12-17 (Street Excavation & Restoration) for pre-trenching "...within and or adjacent to the public right of way." In addition Section 31-56-13 Part 3.2.D requires the Contractor to "Comply with all regulatory requirements regarding trench shoring." Both Section the Street Excavation and Restoration Specification 32-12-17 and the regulatory requirements for trench shoring require a shoring system designed by a Professional Engineer and submitted to TJPA as well as the SFDPW. OSHA requires for all trenches deeper than 5 feet and not sloped according to OSHA standards be designed by a Professional Engineer.</p> <p>Given the above it is the Contractor's responsibility to select the means and methods and to design pre-trench shoring meeting the above requirements.</p> <p>TJPA observations of the Minna Street pre-trenching operations showed that the "trench shield" method of support where excavation below the trench shield required for both sinking the shield and exposing "obstructions" allowed the loose fill sand at the bottom of the excavation to slough into the excavation. This loss of ground led to settlement of the street and potential settlement of the adjacent water line and sewer.</p> <p>TJPA notes that the Contractor has commenced using near-flat sheet piles in combination with the trench shield bracing to achieve the depths required. However, no submittal of a design done by a professional engineer has been submitted to TJPA in accordance with the requirements from the Specifications stated above.</p> <p>An acceptable method of pile extraction includes a suitable trench shoring method and plan that meets</p>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 817 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
					</		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 818 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0190	BSE - Connector Wall Daily As Built Requirement	Closed	07/01/2011	07/11/2011	07/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 31 56 13 1.4F. To satisfy the Section 31 56 13 1.4F requirement, BBII will continue to submit the "DND Daily Construction Report" on a daily basis along with the attached as-built drawing within 24 hours of column installation. Please confirm that this will satisfy the Section 1.4F requirement: "submit as-built drawings within 24 hours of column installation."			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The attached daily report lacks required information (i.e. surveyed as-builts, column diameter, etc.) and therefore does not satisfy the documentation requirements of spec 31 56 13 (1.4, 3.5, 3.11, 3.13, etc.).				
T-0191	BSE - Connector Wall Final As Built Requirement	Closed	07/01/2011	07/11/2011	07/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 31 56 13 3.3B. To satisfy the Section 31 56 13 3.3B requirement, BBII proposes to submit as built drawings prepared by a California licensed surveyor at the approximate completion of each Zone. Please confirm that this will satisfy the Section 3.3B requirement: "Following CDSM wall construction, the Contractor shall submit as-built drawings prepared by a California licensed surveyor indicating the location of the CDSM walls relative to the excavation alignment."			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Contractor to submit as-built drawings within 24 hours of column installation. The drawings shall be prepared by a licensed surveyor and shall indicate the CDSM wall relative to excavation alignment.				
T-0191.1	BSE - CDSM Connector Wall Final As Built Requirement	Closed	07/27/2011	08/06/2011	08/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0191 and Specification Section 31 56 13 BBII disagrees with TJPA's interpretation of the			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Submitting as-built drawings prepared by BBII/DND's				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>requirements of the Specifications in its Response to RFI T-0191.</p> <p>Article 1.4F, Section 31 56 13 of the Specifications state: Record Documents 1. Submit as-built drawings within 24 hours of column installation. 2. Note and submit immediately to the TJPA's Representative unusual conditions encountered, including amounts of cement grout overpours during construction.</p> <p>Article 3.11D2, Section 31 56 13 of the Specifications state: The Daily Quality Control Report shall include as a minimum the results of the following QC parameter monitoring for each column: a. Rig number b. Type of mixing tool c. Date and time (start and finish) of column construction d. Column diameter e. Column top and bottom elevations f. Grout mix design designation g. Slurry specific gravity measurements (obtained from the Testing Agency) h. Description of obstructions, interruptions, or other difficulties during installation and how they were resolved i. Surveyed as-built of previous day's work in relation to grid</p> <p>Article 3.3B, Section 31 56 13 of the Specifications state: (emphasis added) Following CDSM wall construction, the Contractor shall submit as-built drawings prepared by a California licensed surveyor indicating the location of the CDSM walls relative to the excavation alignment.</p> <p>Article 3.3B of the above provides the only requirement for a survey performed by California licensed surveyor. BBII's proposal in RFI T-0191 exceeded the requirements of Article 3.3B by proposing to submit as-built drawings prepared by a California licensed surveyor at the completion of the CDSM wall at each Zone, rather than at the completion of the entire CDSM scope as the Specifications require.</p>						
							<p>project staff within 24 hours of installation is acceptable.</p> <p>As-built drawings prepared by a licensed surveyor shall be submitted as each of the following sections of wall are completed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A-line inside Zone 4 2. J-line inside Zone 4 3. Beale and N-lot 4. Fremont Street 5. First Street 6. A-line inside Zone 3 7. J-line inside Zone 3 8. A-line inside Zones 2 and 1 9. J-line inside Zone 2 to Grid 10 10. J-line inside Zone 1 from Grid 10 to Grid 1 and gridline 1 <p>The drawings for a given section shall be submitted within 14 calendar days of completing that section.</p>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please confirm that submitting as-built drawings prepared by BBII/DND's project staff within 24 hours of installation and as-builts of each zone at the completion of the zone by a licensed surveyor is acceptable. BBII will perform additional survey by a licensed surveyor if necessary at areas of concern, to ensure conformance with the project requirements.</p>							
T-0192	BSE - Unforeseen Tank on Gridline 35	Closed	07/06/2011	07/16/2011	07/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Masashi Kojima	To: Turner Construction Company		Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Transbay PMPC	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal	Roger Rothenburger				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
BBII discovered an unforeseen tank structure during the pre-trenching operation along Gridline 35 between Gridline A-J that is not shown on the contract plans. The tank contains liquid substance; the odor from the excavation around the tank, it is assumed this is a fuel liquid. This tank needs to be removed to allow the continuation of the pre-trenching operation. Please advise as soon as possible.		TJPA environmental consultant has contacted Golden Gate Tank Removal Co and removal is being scheduled. The TJPA has not yet received the paperwork from the Golden Gate Tank Removal Co. to schedule the date. TJPA will discuss further with W/O - BBI regarding handling.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 821 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0192.1	BSE - Unforeseen Tank on Gridline 35	Closed	07/11/2011	07/21/2011	08/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Turner Construction Comp. Kevin Chiu			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference RFI#T-0192 and attached photo		See attached test reports					
The unforeseen tank discovered during the pre-trench operation on Beale Street contains liquid. The liquid has spilled and is present in the surrounding soil, visible from the surface. The response to RFI#T-0192 does not address the soil surrounding the tank. BBII suspects this soil is contaminated with hydrocarbons in excess of the current approved Class 1 profile.		Report Completed By - Title - Date - Work Order - Number of Pages					
Please advise on the classification, limits and disposal methods for the contaminated soil surrounding the tank.		McC Campbell Analytical, Inc. - Analytical Report - July 20, 2011 - 1107352 - 8 McC Campbell Analytical, Inc. - Analytical Report - July 25, 2011 - 1107352 A - 8					
		----- ----- 07/15/2011 Roger Rothenburger					
		TJPA has had their environmental consultant,Treadwell & Rollo (Peter Cusack) arrange for the underground storage tank (UST) and its contents to be removed, test samples of the material, determine the extent of the contamination, and the proper disposal of the soil around the tank. The following response has been reviewed by Mr. Cusack.					
		1. Soils in the area of the UST were orginally classified as Class I from 0~6ft below grade and Class II from 6~22 feet below grade (Soils Management Plan figure 4 & 7.					
		2. Remove and stockpile contaminated soils in the immediate area of UST including 2 feet along the sides of the UST and 2 feet below the UST.					
		3. If soils beyond this area still have a strong gasoline or petroleum odor then remove those soils as well.					
		4. The samples taken by TJPA environmental consultant Peter Cusack on Thursday July 14, 2011 will be chemically tested for different contaminants.					
		5. The results of these tests will not be available for approximately 2 weeks (July 28, 2011).					
		6. Maintain the contaminated stockpiles covered until classification is complete and further directions are given by TJPA at that time.					
		7. Backfill the open trench/hole from which the contaminated material described above has been removed with clean suitable material as defined in the Specifications.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0192.2	BSE - Unforeseen Tank on Gridline 35	Closed	08/02/2011	08/12/2011	08/15/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference RFI#T-0192.1			Treadwell and Rollo Response -				
The Analytical Report for the sample taken from the soil around the Underground Storage Tank (UST) has been sent to BBII. The soil classification that has been determined was not listed in the response, nor the Analytical Report. Please advise on the classification of the soil.			Based on the attached analytical results, the soil excavated from the tank removal activities is considered Class II material and should be disposed of as Class II material using the established soil handling procedures.				
T-0193	BSE - CDSM Buttress Connector Wall	Closed	07/07/2011	07/17/2011	07/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Specification Section 31 56 13			ARUP Response:				
DND is refining the CDSM Shoring Wall mix design based upon the initial results of the Zone 4 Test Section in order to meet the specified compressive strength and permeability. DND is currently planning on trying 2 new mixes / methods in the CDSM Buttress Connector Wall:			Arup will review the strength tests from the connector columns and make a determination of acceptable in-situ strength based on these.				
1) Single Phase (down and up with grout only) - 275 kg/m3 cement treatment, 220% water/cement, specific gravity ~1.4							
a. Based on Japanese experience							
2) Two Phase (down with water, up with grout) - 265 kg/m3 cement treatment, 70% water/cement, specific gravity ~1.7							
a. Based on US experience							
DND is currently proceeding with the installation of the CDSM Buttress Connector Wall. Per BBII's July 5, 2011 meeting with the Engineer, BBII believes that this approach is acceptable for the CDSM Connector Wall and the CDSM Buttress Connector Wall will not have to be re-mixed in the event that it does not achieve the specified compressive strength of 90 psi at 28 days and 120 psi at 90 days. Please confirm.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0194	BSE - Unforeseen Buried Obstructions at CDSM Connector Wall in Zone 4	Closed	07/12/2011	07/22/2011	07/19/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, attached sketches, and photo During the installation of the CDSM Connector Wall at Zone 4, DND's drill rig hit unidentified buried obstructions at approx. 14' - 15' below the original grade (El. 0 ~ -1). Please see DND's attached sketch for further details. The exact location and composition of the obstructions are yet to be determined but BBII's preliminary findings indicate that they are timber piles that were neither shown on the original contract plans nor found during buttress area pile extraction. Find attached the as-built drawing that depicts the locations and the top elevations of the timber piles that BBII extracted at that location. Please note that the top elevations of the extracted piles range between 2.40 to 3.11 feet. BBII has just been informed by DND Construction that the other rows of the connector wall cannot be installed while these obstructions are being removed per the committee meeting on 07/11/2011, due to the proximity of the obstruction removal trench to the next two rows. The CDSM connector wall installation has currently ceased until further notice. BBII is currently seeking drill rigs capable of removing these obstructions also as discussed at the committee meeting. Please direct BBII on how to proceed.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TJPA and its Representative agreed that the reasonable approach for removal of the obstructions as encountered was to mobilize an auger drill rig similar to the Viking drill rig used for the dewatering wells and removal of broken off piles along 181 Fremont street to drill out the area. A 36" diameter casing was used in this application. This meeting was held on Monday July 11, 2011 at approximately 12:30pm. The drill rig arrived on site mid Thursday morning July 14, 2011 (3 work days after the site meeting) and drilled until 7pm exploring the CDSM connector piles in the remaining rows. The material removed was some wood (volume less than a 5 gallon bucket - photos attached) and a number (approximately 15 pieces) of chunks of unreinforced concrete 3" to 10" in size. At this time without more evidence TJPA believes that this material was inadvertently left behind in the backfilling of the timber pile removal zone. BBI should prepare a formal claim as to why TJPA should pay for this work or delay. TJPA will give it fair consideration but needs to have this filed as a claim outside the RFI process. BBI did perform the work in accordance with specifications and site agreements made as to means and methods for the way forward. The drill rig requiring 3 work days to mobilize was at the choice of BBI to use their subcontractor Malcolm-DND.				
T-0195	BSE - Unknown Utility on Beale Street West Side	Closed	07/13/2011	07/23/2011	07/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference attached photos and drawing BBI discovered an 8" utility line during the installation of the wheel wash on the west side of Beale Street. The utility indicated in the attached pictures is not shown on the BSE contract drawings. The alignment (North to South			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Remove the obstruction in accordance with the best means and methods. Maintain records of labor, equipment, materials for removal. Inform TJPA Representative of the methods chosen before starting work.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 824 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>direction) of this utility appears in conflict with the CDSM wall. On 7/12/2011, BBI was able to confirm that this utility is not active. This utility will need to be removed during the pre-trenching operation, to avoid conflict with the CDSM.</p> <p>Please advise on the method for removal of this utility line.</p>							
T-0196	BSE - CDSM Shoring Wall Installation Sequence Zone 4 North of A-Line	Closed	07/20/2011	07/30/2011	07/26/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 56 13 See Note 1 on Sheet GT-2201. DND is concerned that if the row of buttress connector columns (A/26.5 - A/30) immediately adjacent to the shoring wall is installed prior to the shoring wall, the shoring wall will not meet verticality and tolerance specifications due to a difference in strength of the soil on one side and the CDSM on the other side. BBII believes that it will be possible to install the buttress connector columns after the shoring wall without hitting the shoring wall beams. Is it acceptable to install the shoring wall prior to the immediately adjacent buttress connector columns?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: This is acceptable. Contractor to exercise care to prevent the auger from hitting the soldier pile while achieving the column overlap shown on 9/GT-5101.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0197	BSE - Maximum Allowable Vibration	Closed	07/20/2011	07/30/2011	08/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification Sections 31 09 13 and 01 35 65				The table reportedly from the FEIS/EIR included in the RFI appears to be in error. This shall be addressed by others.			
According to the Final FEIS/EIR, specified in the Specification 01 35 65 as the reference document, the Vibration Impact Criteria, which is the base criteria for the analysis, is shown in the table 5.21-8 (refer to BBI RFI for table).				The Action Trigger Level and Maximum Allowable peak particle velocities listed in Table 1 in specification section 31 09 13 are for separate, transient vibration events rather than continuous construction vibration. It is not known if the values shown in the FEIS/EIR table are intended for transient or continuous events.			
The vibration impact criteria used in the Final FEIS/EIR contradicts the Maximum Allowable Movement for the vibration (PPV) specified in Specification 31 09 13. In this specification section, the maximum allowable movement for vibration and the action trigger level is described in Table 1 (refer to BBI RFI for table).				The Action Trigger Level and Maximum Allowable peak particle velocities listed in Table 1 in specification section 31 09 13 apply to all structures around the site where vibration monitoring will occur. In drawing up these values we have taken into account the types of plant likely to be employed in construction and the very low probability that the natural frequency of the input vibrations will approach those of the surrounding buildings and utilities.			
Please clarify where within the project site the vibration impact criteria for fragile structures are applicable (according to Specification 01 35 65), and where the maximum allowable movement for vibration of 1 inch per second is applicable (according to Specification 31 09 13).				The RFI question regarding the identification of "fragile structures" shall be addressed by others. ----- URS - Response by Alana Callagy 8/11/2011			
				The table in the FEIS/EIR included in the RFI is in error. The table cites the FTA as the source of the potential impact thresholds for vibration. However, the table used in the FEIS/EIR appears to have reversed the FTA's threshold levels. The RFI should cite Table 12-3 (page 12-13) of the FTA's Noise and Vibration Manual (www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf).			
				FTA Table 12-3 is for potential structural or architectural building damage, which is generally a function of Peak Particle Velocity (PPV), not a time-averaged level. These criteria should be applied to both transient and continuous construction events. Furthermore, the PPV value should be presented/evaluated as the vector sum of the PPV values in the three orthogonal coordinate directions			

[illegible]



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 828 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0197.1	BSE - Maximum Allowable Vibration	Closed	07/20/2011	07/30/2011	09/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Nhi Tran		Answered By:Turner Construction Com Kevin Chiu			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Refer to RFI #T-0197		Table 5.21-8: Construction Vibration Impact Criteria in the Project EIS / EIR has a number of typos. Refer to Table 12-3: Construction Vibration Damage Criteria in Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (FTA document # FTA-VA-90-1003-06) for the corrected version. For the avoidance of doubt, these values shall be considered Action Trigger Levels as defined in Section 31 09 13 of the Specification. All the buildings within 25 ft of the site boundary shall be considered to be Category I with the exception of the following buildings that are to be considered Category III:					
		177/181 Fremont Street					
		530 Howard					
		540 Howard					
		580 Howard					
		594 Howard					
		133 Second St					
		141 / 143 / 145 Second					
		163 Second					
		171 Second st.					
		90 Natoma					
		92 Natoma					
		83 Minna					
		46 Minna					
		In accordance with the recommendations at Section 12.2.1 of FTA(2006) , we expect BBI to assess quantitatively the potential groundborne vibration impact from site operations on adjacent buildings using the formula:					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

(PPVequip)=(PPVref) x (25/D)**1.5.

Where PPV ref is the reference peak particle velocity for a given item of equipment in Table 12-2 of FTA(2006) and D is the shortest distance between the operating location of the equipment and the building to be assessed.

Where the item of plant is not listed in either FTA(2006) or Caltrans (2004), BBI should carry out calibration measurements at ground surface in order to provide equivalent (PPV ref) values.

BBI should carry out vibration monitoring inside buildings when (PPV equip) is calculated to lie within 90% of the values given in Table 12-3: Construction Vibration Damage Criteria in Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment in FTA-VA-90-1003-06. The Action Trigger and Maximum Allowable movement level for vibration given in Table 1 of Section 31 09 13 is for Category I buildings only.

T-0197.2	BSE - Maximum Allowable Vibration - VOID	Closed	09/12/2011	09/22/2011	09/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company	Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP	Marina Rosso		
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.	Ural Yal						
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference RFI #T-0197, Specification Section 01 35 65 & 31 09 13, and attached map		(Can't find answer in Constructware)					
BBII recognizes and agrees Table 5.12-8 is in error, and BBII will refer to FTA Table 12-3 as the correct table. However, BBII believes the TJPA's response provides information that is in conflict with the specifications as well as between the two separate responses provided. BBII requests the following clarifications and confirmations:							
1. BBII has applied FTA Table 12-3 per [RFI #T-0197]							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 830 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>(BBI RFI 147) to the attached map. The attached map indicates PPV values for continuous construction events, based on the surrounding buildings. Please review and verify this interpretation. Please note that this table, as also indicated in ARUP's response, applies to "continuous construction events".</p> <p>2. As also stated in ARUP's response, BBII's interpretation of Section 31 09 13 is that the limits provided in this section apply to "transient construction events". Therefore, contrary to URS' response, the values provided in this section are applicable to transient construction events.</p> <p>In addition, BBII will apply Table 1 in Specification Section 31 09 13 for transient construction events to all structures around the site. Table 1 indicates the Action Trigger Level for vibration (PPV) is 1/2 inch per second and Maximum Allowable Movement for vibration (PPV) is 1 inch per second.</p> <p>Please confirm the vibration Peak Particle Velocity (PPV) values indicated above are acceptable for continuous and transient construction events.</p>						
T-0198	<p>BSE - Demolition Drawings in South-West Corner of Zone 1</p> <p>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Nhi Tran</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Specification Section 02 41 01</p> <p>BBII is requesting a copy of the added scope demolition drawings issued to EBI, for the South-West corner of Zone 1.</p>	Closed	07/28/2011	08/08/2011	08/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
						Answered By:	Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu
						ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
							See attached Transmittal 140-02181, sent to W/O on 8/25/2011.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0199	BSE - Pile Extraction Method For Grid Line 35.2	Closed	08/01/2011	08/11/2011	08/15/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0188.2 After exposing piles at grid line 35.2 east of Beale Street, BBII intends on extracting these piles as per the method described in RFI#T-0188.2 (BBI 0139.2). This involves backfilling any voids with sand. Please confirm this method is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Arup did not respond to RFI T-0188.2. As noted in our response to RFI T-0188.1, we recommend that the procedure for removing the piles east of Beale Street follow the procedure described in our response to RFI T-0146.4 with the exception that backfilling with sand is acceptable.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0200	BSE - Unforeseen Buried Obstructions - Zone 4 A Line (Gridline 27-34)	Closed	08/02/2011	08/12/2011	08/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, attached photos, and sketch					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
On Saturday, July 30th 2011, DND's CDSM drill rig encountered unidentified buried obstructions during the installation of the CDSM Shoring wall panel identified by the pile numbers 285-286 at Zone 4 "A" line between Grid "27 & 28". The newly found obstructions are deeper than the previously excavated timber piles.					Per Contract Spec. 31-56-13 Shoring wall by CDSM Method Para 3.2 Pretrenching and removal of Obstructions, Contractor is to "remove any obstructions that might be encountered along the alignment of the walls. The depth and width of trench shall be that required to remove the obstructions from the path of the shoring wall."		
DND construction initially attempted to drill through the buried obstructions without success. The drill rig was subsequently moved to further east to drill the next available panel. Between 10:30 am and 3:30 pm, DND made eight drilling attempts along the "A" line between pile numbers # 285 and # 300. All eight drill attempts failed due to the similar obstructions encountered within the 13' - 17' depth range below grade. Consequently, the CDSM shoring wall installation along grid line "A" at Zone 4 had to be suspended. DND is able to provide a drill rig to drill out these obstructions and currently this rig is scheduled to arrive Tuesday morning, August 2, 2011.					This area was to be Pretrenched per Spec and should have been cleared. The Spec calls for fill the voids from pile removal with 300psi CLSM, However; the area in question had CLSM installed of between 1000psi and 1600psi which may be causing this condition.		
These obstructions constitute a differing site condition in accordance with Article 3.05 of Section 00 07 00 of the Specifications.					"Unforeseen Conditions" are covered in Section 00 07 00 (General Conditions) Article 3.05.A.2 and 3.05.A.3 (Unforeseen or Changed Conditions).		
Please provide confirmation and/or direction regarding the following:					Article 3.05.C states,		
- BBII is to proceed with drilling out these obstructions on 8/2/2011, so CDSM installation in this area can continue.					C. Differing Site Conditions shall not include:		
- These obstructions constitute a differing site condition.					1. All that is indicated in or reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents;		
					2. All that could be seen on Site		
					3. Conditions that are materially similar or characteristically the same as those indicated or described in the Contract Documents or Reference Documents.		
T-0201	BSE - Buttress Shift To South	Closed	08/02/2011	08/12/2011	08/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet GT-2201, RFI#T-0151, and attached sketch					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					ARUP Response:		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 833 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Per response to RFI T-0151, the Buttress can expand to the east as long as it doesn't shift to the south. Per discussions with Arup in last week's TG03 BSE Design Team Coordination Meeting (7/27/2011), it is acceptable for the Buttress to shift to the south per the attached sketch. Please confirm.</p>						<p>The shift shown on the sketch is acceptable.</p>
T-0202	BSE - Pile Extraction Method For Grid Line 33.5	Closed	08/04/2011	08/14/2011	08/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p>		<p>Answered By:Turner Construction Company Jack Adams</p>					
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference RFI#T-0146.2</p> <p>After exposing 5 piles at gridline 33.5 west of Beale Street, BBII intends on extracting these piles as per the accepted method described in RFI # T-0146 2,</p> <p>"6. BBII will extract the wood piles with vibratory hammer, with the same stroking procedure without steel casing. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile.</p> <p>7. BBII will backfill the void with low strength material Central Concrete Mix FOA100CX (RFI #T-0138.1).</p> <p>8. BBII will backfill the piles.</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Per Brian Dykes, this work is authorized to proceed. Allowable work hours will be established after 199 Fremont pile extraction begins."</p> <p>This involves backfilling any voids with 1 sack sand. The attached drawing indicates the location and quantity of piles to be extracted. Please confirm that this method is acceptable.</p> <p>Also, please advise if any work hour restrictions apply.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Contractor may wish to consider placing the steel sheet prior to excavating to retain the material under Beale Street to keep it from sloughing into the excavation.</p> <p>Extract the wood piles with vibratory hammer, with the same stroking procedure without steel casing. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile.</p> <p>Option: Backfill the void with CLSM low strength material Central Concrete Mix FOA100CX (RFI #T-0138.1).</p> <p>Option: Back fill the pile voids using a tremie pipe of minimum length 20ft attached to the concrete bucket. The tremie shall be inserted as far into the pile hole as possible prior to pouring the concrete, and the concrete shall be placed using normal tremie techniques. BBII will make efforts to pour the material into the void as possible, but BBII is not responsible to eliminate void completely."(RFI 146.4)</p> <p>Recommends that the procedure for removing these piles follow the procedure described in Arup's response to RFI T-0146.4. Optional is to use method from RFI 188.2. Sand can used for back fillings instead of the low strength material described in RFI#T-0146.4.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 834 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0203	BSE - Clearance From Verticals For CSL Tubes	Closed	08/04/2011	08/14/2011	08/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-5202, Specification Section 31 63 29, and attached photo In the Phase 1 DFOV Buttress Rebar QC Meeting at Harris-Salinas Rebar's yard in Livermore on 8/01/2011, ARUP suggested moving the adjacent vertical bars away from the CSL tubes to allow for approximately 4" of concrete cover along the entire length of the shaft. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The longitudinal bars on each side of each CLS tube shall be shifted so that the clear distance between a given bar and the CSL tube is 3" minimum, 4" maximum. The total number of bars which will be shifted is 8.		
T-0204	BSE - Tie Backs Along 535 Mission Street - Vacant Lot	Closed	08/04/2011	08/14/2011	08/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference GT-2102 & Detail 8 - GT-5103 BBII cannot locate the tie backs in the area of the vacant lot on Minna St. described in the Detail 8 on Contract Drawing GT-5103. The BBII crew went to a depth of 17 feet along the Pre-Trench and was unable to locate the tie backs. This was an additional foot more than the specified 15'-0" +/- 1'-0" depth. BBII believes the tie backs do not extend into the Pre-Trench limits and plans to move forward. Please advise if there is information to the contrary.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> BBII is to continue plans and specs (Ref: Dwg. Detail 8 GT-5103). Subsequent to this RFI BBII did locate and sever a tie back in Minna Street trench from the 535 Mission St. Project . BBII was directed to be cautious when installing sheetpile shoring to ensure the Tie Backs are cut back sufficiently to prevent interference with CDSM Drill/Wall installation. ----- ----- 2011-08-09 George Metzger ARUP Response: No additional information is available. Turner or PMPC to provide answer to this RFI.		
T-0205	BSE - Testing Weld On Hoops	Closed	08/05/2011	08/15/2011	08/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 835 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>Reference Sheet GT-5202 and Specification Section 31 63 29</p> <p>Per SS03.20.01.3.3.B.4, "Inspect welding as required by Code for compliance with AWS D1.4."</p> <p>Per AWS D1.4.2, "Other welding processes may be used when approved by the Engineer, provided that any special qualification test requirements not covered here are met to ensure that welds are satisfactory for the intended application will be obtained."</p> <p>As of this writing, the AWS does not cover Resistance Welding which is the type of welding that Harris-Salinas Rebar is using for the hoops. Caltrans has a written specification for Resistance Welding. Per Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 52, four (4) samples out of a lot of one hundred fifty (150) are taken to the lab for testing. If three (3) or more samples comply with the requirements, the whole lot is accepted. If only two (2) samples comply, one (1) additional test of four (4) samples out of the same lot is allowed. If any of the four (4) fail, the whole lot is rejected.</p> <p>It was agreed upon in the DFOw meeting this week (8/1/2011) that it is acceptable to test the lots per Caltrans Standard Specifications. Please confirm.</p>						<p>This is acceptable.</p>
T-0206	BSE - Smart Hoops For CSL Tubes	Closed	08/05/2011	08/15/2011	08/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Sheet GT-5202, Specification Section 31 63 29, attached photo and sketch				The 23 degree CSL spacing is required. The added "smart hoop" CSL alignment bars are acceptable.			
Drawing GT-5202 shows four (4ea) 4" CSL tubes equally spaced around the perimeter of the shaft tied to reinforced steel.							
Approved rebar shop drawing shows a square spider							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>designed to serve two purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. To allow the tremie pipe to pass through.2. To keep the CSL tubes equally spaced around the perimeter per Drawing GT-5202. <p>In subsequent discussions the engineer suggested orientating the CSL tubes at a 23 degree angle from the longitudinal center of pile. In the Phase 1 DFOW Buttress Rebar QC Meeting on 8/1/2011 Harris-Salinas Rebar suggested using "smart hoops" to keep the CSL tubes in place and symmetrical around the perimeter at 23 degrees since the square spider could no longer be utilized for CSL tube alignment. This suggestion was well received by meeting attendees. Please confirm that the 23 degree CSL spacing is required. If so, please advise if the added "smart hoop" CSL alignment bars are acceptable?</p>						
T-0207	BSE - Unknown Fiber Optic on Fremont Street	Closed	08/09/2011	08/19/2011	08/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch					Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	
	Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal						
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 02 41 01	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
	<p>PG&E was scheduled to have all the utilities and structures confirmed dead on the East side of Fremont Street 8/07/2011 as part of the phase 1 PG&E relocation work. On 8/08/2011, W/O and PG&E conducted a USAR walk-through on Fremont Street to sign off and confirm that all PG&E utilities and structures have been confirmed de-energized and abandoned. PG&E discovered a live fiber optic cable between vaults 1675-1670. This fiber optic cable is in conflict with and causing delays to the CDSM wall and Buttress work commencement.</p> <p>Please provide a date this fiber will be confirmed de-energized.</p>					Fiber was confirmed de-energized on 8/12/11.	
T-0208	BSE - Long Term Seismic Loading	Closed	08/09/2011	08/19/2011	08/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 837 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-1110 and Specification Section 31 55 00 Note 7 on sheet GT-1110 states that "Seismic Increment Loads shall be considered to be long term loading." Per conversation at the 8/03/11 TG03 Design Team Coordination meeting, BBII understands that this note applies only to the lower level struts at the 301 Mission buttress case. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We refer to Comments and Corrections provided by DBI to TJPA in a document dated July 27, 2011 at item G 23. With reference to Drawing GT-1110 we clarify that Note 7 applies strictly to the incremental strut loads in Table 7 (301 Mission buttress case shaking analysis) and consequently apply to calculations for the lowest level of struts and walings between Gridlines 26 and 30. The incremental strut loads given in Tables 5, 6 and 8 can be considered as transient, rather than long term, loads on the bracing system.			
T-0209	BSE - Abutment Bearing On CDSM Wall	Closed	08/11/2011	08/21/2011	08/19/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification 01 53 13 During previous discussions with URS, ARUP, and DPW it has been expressed that the temporary bridge abutments should not bear on the CDSM shoring wall. The temporary bridges spec section 01 53 13, however, specifically states that "abutments for bridges shall be supported by the CDSM shoring wall." Please advise if this statement still applies.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, statement still applies.			
T-0209.1	BSE - Abutment Bearing On CDSM Wall	Closed	09/02/2011	09/12/2011	09/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0209, Specification Section 01 53 13, and attached sheets Included with this RFI are loading conditions for CDSM supported abutments. Please confirm that the shoring wall as currently designed can accommodate the loading.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Contractor to provide calculations demonstrating the adequacy of the shoring wall to support the loads from the bridges.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0209.2	BSE - Abutment Bearing On CDSM Wall - Follow-Up	Closed	09/13/2011	09/23/2011	09/16/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0209.2, Specification Section 01 53 13, and attached sheets As requested by ARUP, please see the attached loads placed on each individual CDSM soldier beam beneath the proposed temporary bridge abutment. The loads include both the bracing self weight and the combined dead and live loads of the temporary bridges. BBII requests confirmation from the CDSM shoring wall EOR that these imposed loads do not exceed the assumed vertical loads used during original design analysis.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The results of the analysis reported in the table "SUMMARY OF LOADS ON CDSM SOLDIER PILES AT BRIDGE ABUTMENTS" indicates that, for a number of locations, the load per soldier pile is too great and that the pile spacing will need to decrease from 4'-0" o.c. to 2'-0" o.c. to reduce the load per pile. Subsequent analysis by the Contractor shall demonstrate the structural adequacy of the pile shape and the adequacy of the pile embedment.		
T-0209.3	BSE - Abutment Bearing On CDSM Wall - Follow-Up	Closed	09/13/2011	09/23/2011	09/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0209.2, Specification Section 01 53 13, and attached sheets As requested by ARUP, please see the attached loads placed on each individual CDSM soldier beam beneath the proposed temporary bridge abutment. The loads include both the bracing self weight and the combined dead and live loads of the temporary bridges. BBII requests confirmation from the CDSM shoring wall EOR that these imposed loads do not exceed the assumed vertical loads used during original design analysis.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: 1. The CDSM wall cannot accept the widely varying point loads as implied by the submitted tables of imposed loads from the cross-lot bridges. We recommend that a spreader beam arrangement is provided for each bridge abutment and is connected to the all the affected W21x201 soldier piles in the CDSM wall. A vertical spring constant of 1150 kips/inch can be used to calculate the pile reactions under such a spreader beam arrangement for the range of loads given. 2. The allowable loads from the bridge deck for the soldier piles on the basis of 1 above is 90 kips/pile at an excavation of 10 feet below grade and can be taken to fall linearly to 60 kips/pile at 60 ft elevation depth. 3. It follows from 2 above that the ability of the CDSM wall to carry the maximum load, the construction crane condition, will reduce as excavation proceeds. This may require disassembly of the construction crane		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 839 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
into smaller components in order to remove it from site at the later stages of excavation.							
4. The load pathway, from the bridge deck at the abutment into the ground, is in direct shear transfer across 2 interfaces: steel/soil mix and soil mix/in-situ ground. The shear transfer across the steel/soil mix interface cannot be estimated with accuracy, in the absence of an embedded soldier pile test in compression or tension. If the early excavations, down to 10 feet below grade at the bridge abutment, show that soil mix falls away easily from the face of the W21 steel soldier pile, the bond/interface shear is likely to be very low indeed and the allowable capacity of the soldier piles will need to be re-evaluated.							
T-0209.4	BSE - Abutment Bearing On CDSM Wall - Follow-Up	Closed	01/09/2012	01/19/2012	01/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference T-0209.3, Specification Section 01 53 13							
Contrary to RFI response T-0209.3, subsequent to the test pile loading CR T-025 during which there was little to no movement please confirm the revised direction to install the bridge abutment atop the CDSM wall at all streets pursuant to specification section 01 53 13.1.2.A.							
Arup cannot provide a response to this RFI without seeing the revised design of the bridge bearing on the soldier piles and the revised calculations.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0210	BSE - Pile #498 Top Of Pile Elevation Issue	Closed	08/16/2011	08/26/2011	08/19/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference W/O NOTICE0010 (attached), Sheet GT-5101, and Specification Section 31 56 13 Please address the following information request from BBII's subcontractor DND: "The specifications do not specify an allowable tolerance with regard to the vertical position of the beam tip relative to the plan drawings (GT-5101, Note 16). Please clarify the allowable tolerance for the beam tip elevation. For example, beam 498 (BBII ID #287) was set slightly high. The beam was measured prior to setting to be 97'-5 1/2" long. It was set to a top elevation of approximately +16'-11" which calculates a tip elevation of approximately - 80.63'. Specified tip elevation is -81'-0" in this wall section (J/27-33.5)."			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The acceptable variation in bottom of pile elevation (shown on 16/GT-5101) is +/- 1'-6". In order to verify this using the top of pile elevation as the measure, the Contractor shall provide Turner with the length of the piles.				
T-0211	Easement Information	Closed	08/11/2011	08/21/2011	08/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Email "Fencing Plan at CDSM Wall Radius R2-1 and X1-1" from Turner on 8/10/2011 and attached documents W/O received the enclosed email "Fencing Plan at CDSM Wall Radius R2-1 and X1-1" and it's attachments from Turner on 8/10/2011, listed below: - 3192 OR 151 easement.pdf - Parcel F BNDY-ALTA_AB3721_15A_Rev 1.pdf - CASFRA_2007 00369409.pdf - Eminent Domain Fencing Plan .pdf The information contained in the above documents differs from and/or does not exist in the current contract documents. Please provide a direction on what W/O and our Trade Subcontractors are to do with this easement information. In addition please indicate what requirements the TJPA expects Webcor Obayashi to now comply with.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The information contained in the above documents is provided for information. WO and our Trade Subcontractors are to ensure the 540 Howard has 24 hour access to their easement. The current location of the CDSM wall and protection fencing will accomodate this access.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0212	BSE - Unforeseen Timber Piles At Grid Line 33.5 J	Closed	08/15/2011	08/25/2011	08/16/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0148.1, Sheet D-2213, attached photos and sketch BBII exposed 24 piles at gridline 33.5 J close to Beale Street in Zone 4, as shown in the attached photographs. However, drawing D-2213 indicates five piles inside the CDSM wall limits. BBII intends to extract these piles using the method approved in RFI # T-0148.1. Please confirm that it is acceptable to continue tracking this unforeseen work as CR-T-010, as was practiced in this area previously.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFIs shall be used for interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents (01 10 40) and a change request (CR) is not a Contract Document as defined by the General Conditions. Questions related to construction means, methods, techniques, sequences, procedures and non Contract Documents will not be replied to by the TJPB and will be rejected (01 10 40). Refer to the procedures of previously issued CR T-010 for further direction.				
T-0213	BSE - Pile Extraction Method For Concrete Piles Between GL 5-10 at Natoma St	Closed	08/15/2011	08/25/2011	08/19/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0188.1, Specification Section 02 41 19, and attached sketch BBII intends on extracting the existing concrete piles located between gridlines 5 and 10 on the south side, using the method approved in RFI#T-0188.1. This involves extracting piles using the vibratory hammer without a steel casing and backfilling the void with structural pre-trench sand. Attached is a drawing indicating the locations of the piles obstructing the CDSM wall. Please confirm that this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable for concrete piles which are 16" x 16" square or less and which are located 16 ft or greater from the nearest face of an adjacent building.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 842 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0214	BSE - Instrumentation Protection Slab Zone 4	Closed	08/16/2011	08/26/2011	08/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-5102 and attached shop drawing and BBI sketches BBII is proposing to pour a 2' thick instrument slab per the attached BBII drawings in lieu of the 1' thick concrete slab shown on Drawing GT-5102 to match the overall thickness of the Buttrass Temporary Work Platform Concrete Cap. Approved 6000 psi Central Mix #960PC3Z3 (Submittal Item #TZ1010-033001A10) will be used for the instrument protection slab. Please confirm that this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Pouring a 2' thick instrument protection slab in lieu of the 1' thick concrete slab shown on Drawing GT-5102 is acceptable. Central Mix #960PC3Z3 is acceptable for use in the instrument protection slab. The reinforcing steel configuration shown on Section A is acceptable. The bars may be shifted to clear the soldier piles and the instrument locations. Block-outs shall be placed in the slab for the instruments as noted on GT-5102. Contractor to coordinate locations of block-outs with Arup field staff. The protection slab shall be extended as noted on the attached sketch.				
T-0215	BSE - Diagonally Cut Unforeseen Piles at Grid Line 33.5 J	Closed	08/17/2011	08/27/2011	08/17/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-2103, Specification Section 02 41 19, and attached photos BBII has extracted four (4) unforeseen piles at GL 33.5 J. Three (3) piles had an average length of 45' long. However, one (1) of these piles appeared to have 20' diagonally cut out of it at the bottom (see attached Photo 3). Another pile was only 23' long and appeared to have broken off underground (see attached Photo 1). BBII has concerns that lengths of pile may still remain in ground and will be an obstruction to the CDSM shoring wall installation. Please advise on how to proceed.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to specification 31 56 13, 3.2, A, which states, "The Contractor shall construct a trench along the entire alignment of the shoring wall and the cut-off walls and remove any obstructions that might be encountered along the alignment of the walls. The depth and width of the trench shall be that required to remove the obstructions from the path of the shoring wall."				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 843 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0215.1	BSE - Diagonally Cut Unforeseen Piles at GL 33.5 J	Closed	08/23/2011	09/02/2011	08/30/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0215 and RFI #T-0177, Sheet GT-2103 and Specification Section 02 41 19 As the top of the broken pile is 33' below ground, further trenching to remove this pile is not practical. BBII proposes following the procedure approved by RFI T-0177 (BBII 0126) to extract this pile. In the future, BBII proposes this to be the standard procedure when a broken or lost pile presents an obstruction to the CDSM Shoring Wall installation and needs to be extracted. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Arup takes no exception to the use of the method described in RFI T-0177 for this pile.				
T-0216	BSE - Revised Buttress Shop Drawings For Record Only	Closed	08/18/2011	08/28/2011	08/19/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference attached revised CIDH Rebar Shop Drawings, RFI#T-0184, T-0203, T-0205 and T-0206 Per discussions at the TG03 BSE Design Team meeting on 8/17/2011, it was agreed by Adamson and ARUP to confirm the finalized buttress rebar cage shop drawings via RFI because the shop drawings have already been approved in a previous submittal TG0300-320 / TA1020-032001A05. Attached are the revised shop drawings that incorporate all the changes that were agreed upon in the referenced RFIs. Please confirm that these shop drawings accurately reflects all changes made.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Arup takes no exception to the shop drawings included with the RFI. Note that review is only for general conformance with the design concept of the project and general compliance with the information given in the contract documents. Contractor is responsible for quantities and dimensions which shall be confirmed and correlated at the job site; checking for deviations between the field, submittal and the contract documents alerting Arup of same; fabrication processes and techniques; the means and methods of construction; coordination of its work with that of all other trades; and performing all work in a safe and satisfactory manner. This review does not modify contractor's duty to comply with the contract documents and any action shown is subject to requirements of plans and specifications. This review does not increase Arup's standard of care or scope of services and contractor shall immediately notify Arup of any intent to make a claim based on this submittal.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 844 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0217	BSE - Buttress Shift To The East	Closed	08/24/2011	09/03/2011	08/30/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0183.1, Sheet GT-2201, Specification Section 31 63 29, and attached sketch The sketch that was included in the Engineer's response to RFI T-0183.1 shows Buttress rows S, T, U, V, and W, shifting 4" to the west. Per discussions with the Engineer in the 8/17/2011 TG03 BSE Design Team Meeting, all parties agreed that the 4" shift is not needed. Please confirm that the 4" shift is not necessary and that it is acceptable to install the Buttress shafts per the attached drawing.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The proposed northings and eastings shown are acceptable.		
T-0217.1	BSE - Maximum Allowable Spacing Between Buttress Shafts	Closed	03/23/2012	04/02/2012	03/23/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Becho requests for ARUP to provide the maximum allowed spacing between the tangent shafts East of P-Line and West of C-Line. Allowing such changes could possibly help mitigate Buttress Shaft schedule.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The tangential spacing of the buttress shafts may be increased from 4 inches to 8 inches east of PLine and west of C-Line. Contractor to verify that this does not impact the trestle pile locations / design. Contractor to verify tht there is adequate equipment clearance at 301 Mission. Contractor to provide revised northing and easting coordiantes in a sketch similar to that incuded in RFI 217 for tie-down location coordination.		
T-0217.2	BSE - Increased Spacing Between Buttress Shafts east of P-line	Closed	04/12/2012	04/22/2012	04/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference: BBII Spacing Sketch</p> <p>Per the Engineer's response to RFI T-0217.1, "The tangential spacing of the Buttress shafts may be increased from 4" to 8" east of P-line and west of C-line." Please confirm that the revised Buttress footprint and coordinates shown on the attached sketch is acceptable.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>ARUP Response:</p> <p>Confirmed except that the coordinates for shafts A1 and A3 do not appear to reflect RFI 217.1.</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			
T-0218	BSE - Timber Lagging Underneath Instrument Protection Slab	Closed	08/29/2011	09/08/2011	08/31/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>		<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference RFI #T-0214, Sheet GT-5102, and Specification Section 31 56 13</p> <p>Contract drawing GT-5102 indicates timber lagging being installed underneath the 2' section of the concrete instrumentation protection slab between grids 27 and 30. The original construction sequence foresaw the instrumentation protection slab being installed prior to the adjacent buttress work platform. BBII is planning on pouring the instrumentation slab and the adjacent buttress work platform monolithically on Wednesday 8/31/2011, which makes the timber lagging support redundant.</p> <p>Please confirm that the timber lagging shown on contract drawing GT-5102 is not required to be installed. Your prompt response is highly appreciated.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>ARUP Response: It is acceptable to omit the lagging below the protection slab as proposed. Contractor to take appropriate measures to keep any loose material below the slab from falling into the excavation.</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 846 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0219	BSE - Abutments At Temporary Bridges	Closed	08/29/2011	09/08/2011	09/15/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and Submittal TG0300-201 Item TZ1030-015313A09 response comments (attached) DPW review comment #40 on the temporary bridge submittal (TZ1030-015313A09, package TG0300-201) calls for BBI to "provide concrete approach slabs similar to Caltrans." URS comment #32 on the submittal states that "Approach slabs are recommended. After seismic event, it is important that emergency vehicles still have access to these temporary bridges." Concrete approach slabs are not included as a requirement in the temporary bridge specifications. Please advise if approach slabs must be added to the scope of the temporary bridges.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per spec 01 53 13 and David Fyfe's response included herein, approach slabs are necessary items required to provide a coordinated design and a completely functional temporary bridge. ----- 2011-09-14 - David Fyfe SF DPW requires approach slabs.				
T-0219.1	BSE - Approach Slabs At Temporary Bridges	Closed	11/04/2011	11/14/2011	11/16/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0219 and Specification Section 01 53 13 On 11/3/11 W/O was informed by PMPC during a temporary bridge coordination meeting that contrary to RFI response T-0219 approach slabs were not required at the (3) temporary bridges. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Comments made by PMPC in across the table discussions shall not be considered as modifying the response to RFI# T-0219. As an added clarification to RFI# T-0219, please note that the permitting agency, SF DPW, has expressed the potential need for use of approach slabs to achieve a package which can be approved by the agency. It is recommended that requirements concerning approach slabs be addressed between the contractor and the permitting agency during the building permit submission of the Temporary Bridges Package.				
T-0220	BSE - Pile Extraction Method For The Remaining Timber Piles At GL 33.5 J	Closed	08/29/2011	09/08/2011	09/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI#T-0188.1, Specification Section 02 41 19,			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We recommend that the procedure for removing the				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 847 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	and attached sketch						
	BBII intends on extracting the remainder of the existing timber piles located at gridline 33.5J/Beale St., using the method approved in T-0188.1, as the piles are located a considerable distance from the 199 Fremont building. This involves extracting piles using the vibratory hammer without a steel casing and backfilling the void with structural pre trench sand. Attached is a drawing indicating the locations of the piles obstructing the CDSM wall. Please confirm that this is acceptable.			piles east of Beale Street follow the procedure described in our response to RFI T-0146.4 with the exception that backfilling with sand is acceptable. See also answer to RFI T-199.			
T-0221	BSE - Salvage Steel At Temporary Bridges	Closed	08/29/2011	09/08/2011	09/30/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: URS Corporation	Carolina Aguilar			
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and Submittal TG0300-201 Item TZ1030-015313A09 response comments (attached) DPW review of the temporary bridges submittal (TZ1030-015313A09, package TG0300-201) includes comment #8 that states "salvage materials are not acceptable to be used as structural members for the bridges. The temporary bridge specifications do allow for the use of salvage material as follows: "2. Steel, Salvage Material: Submit coupon tests for mechanical properties and chemical tests for determination of weldability. For steel materials which are recycled from prior Projects (salvaged materials) and are to be incorporated into temporary works, testing shall be performed on a random sampling basis as follows: a. Where material properties relied upon for design corresponding to minimum yield strength fy=30,000 psi, sampling shall be performed on 5% of each major series of structure element type. b. Where material properties corresponding to minimum yield strength fy=36,000 psi, sampling shall be performed on 10% of each major series of structure element type.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	In order to evaluate compliance, additional information is required. Please submit list of all structural steel members that will be used on each of the three temporary bridges. For each structural steel member listed: 1). Indicate whether the structural steel member consists of new or salvaged material 2). Provide the exact location along the bridge that the steel member is located 3). Provide information on the salvaged material, such as its current condition, when and where it may be inspected by a TJPA Representative, and what its prior use was 4). For each complete temporary bridge, provide the total weight of salvage steel, summarized by element type and usage. Finally, please provide the weight of total salvaged steel material that will be used at each temporary bridge.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 848 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>c. Where material properties corresponding to minimum yield strength fy=42,000 psi or 50,000 psi is used, sampling shall be performed on 20% of each major series of structure element type.</p> <p>d. Testing performed per subparagraphs above at sampling rates of 5%, 10%, and 20%, respectively, shall be reported to the Owner's Representative in writing. Testing results must satisfy all samples meeting 100% of materials strength requirements for acceptance of salvage materials. If less than 100% of materials tested meet this requirement, then the sampling rate shall be increased. In this event, the sampling rate for retesting shall be subject to review and approval by the Owner's Representative."</p> <p>Please advise if salvage material is still acceptable per the project specifications.</p>						
T-0222	BSE - Temporary Bridge Pier Locations	Closed	08/29/2011	09/08/2011	09/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and Submittal TG0300-201 Item TZ1030-015313A09 response comments (attached)				Thornton Tomasetti Response: The piers shall not be in conflict with the mat foundation chamfer (chamfer shown in plan and section S1-3201). Minimum clear distance from face of pier to bottom edge of chamfer shall be 2'-0."			
Temporary bridge review comments (Submittal TZ1030-015313A09, package TG0300-201) call for the end piers on all three bridges to be relocated to avoid interrupting chamfer rebar (see attached markups). With the information provided to BBII in the plans and specifications, there was no indication that this reinforcement must be avoided, nor was there a required clear zone from the shoring wall to the first pier. Please advise if these piers absolutely need to move, or if their current locations can be accommodated. Increasing the span between the abutments and the first pier will have commercial impacts.				----- 8/31/2011 George Metzger ARUP Response: Arup takes no exception to the referenced pier locations that are shown in the submittal.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 849 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0223	BSE - Temporary Bridge Pedestrian Barrier Height	Closed	08/30/2011	09/09/2011	09/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:URS Corporation David Fyfe				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and Submittal TG0300-201 response comments (attached)			Response to RFI No.T-0223 is provided herein and on attached sketch titled, "Sketch - RFI Nos.T-0223 and T-0228." This attached sketch is a mark-up of BBII's traffic plan figure, "Non-Working Hours, Temporary Bridge Traffic Plan" (submittal package TG0300-204, submittal item TZ1030-015313, page 3 of 6) because this is the latest presentation of the Contractor proposed product.				
DPW review of the temporary bridges includes comment #42 that calls for the pedestrian barrier to be designed as a combination railing with a minimum height of 4'-6" while the specifications only call for a 3'-6" barrier. Please advise if the minimum height must be increased to 4'-6".			This attached sketch shows an installation in conformance with current coordination comments completed between the Project and CCSF DPW and SFMTA. Where the handrail/guardrail system occurs separating pedestrian and vehicle traffic, required height equals 3'-6" measured from the top of pedestrian walking surface.				
			Note, these comments provided on this attached sketch pertain only to RFI Nos.T-0223 and T-0228, a full review and response of Traffic Plan Submittal Package TG0300-204 will be finalized and transmitted at a later date.				
T-0224	BSE - Temporary Bridge Deflection and Suspended Utilities	Closed	08/30/2011	09/09/2011	09/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and attached cut sheets			Please provide information on the predicted movement and hanger support system such that the condition can be assessed.				
Where utilities transition from direct bury to hanging under the temporary bridges, BBII believes there must be some allowance for deflection to prevent damage to the conduits during a seismic event. Attached are cut sheets for an expansion fitting and deflection fitting that BBII has seen used in combination at bridge transitions. Watertight flexible steel conduit may be an option as well.			Movement direction; lateral or longitudinal?				
Please confirm that all Phase 2 utilities to be suspended below the temporary bridges will include some means of handling bridge deflection.			How much movement is being predicted and at what location?				
			Are the steel conduits rigidly connected to the hanger supports? Please provide the hanger support design for review.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 850 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0224.1	BSE - Temporary Bridge Deflection and Suspended Utilities	Closed	09/23/2011	10/03/2011	09/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0224, Specification Section 01 53 30, and attached e-mails The response to RFI T-0224 requested additional information about bridge movements. This information was provided by email to AECOM on 9/9/11. Follow on questions were answered on 9/15/11. Please see the attached email string. Please provide the make, model, location and quantity per conduit run for all the utilities supported by the bridge			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> In reference to the request in RFI T-0224, it has been confirmed that all Phase 2 utilities (Verizon and PG&E) to be suspended below the temporary bridges will include means of handling bridge deflection. Verizon has indicated the use of O-Z/GEDNEY expansion fittings for rigid steel conduit type EX, or equal. One fitting is proposed on each conduit located along the supported section staggered such that no two are aligned. This design element will be incorporated into construction documents being prepared by Verizon. PG&E has indicated the use of O-Z/GEDNEY Expansion fittings for rigid steel conduit type EX, or equal. One fitting is proposed on each conduit located along the supported section staggered such that no two are aligned. This design element will be incorporated into construction documents being prepared by PG&E.				
T-0224.2	BSE - Temporary Bridge Deflection and Suspended Utilities	Closed	10/05/2011	10/15/2011	10/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI T-224, 224.1, CR T-017 and Specification Section 01 53 30 The response to RFI T-0224.1 The 4" EX model is not readily available (8 week lead time), however the very similar AX is. Please see the attached data sheets for each model and advise if this revised material is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response from PG&E (attached) is as follows: The type AX expansion fitting for 4" steel conduits is an acceptable substitute for the type EX expansion fitting. Type BJ external bonding jumper will still be required.				
T-0224.3	BSE - Temporary Bridge Deflection and Suspended Utilities	Closed	10/24/2011	11/03/2011	11/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 851 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference CR T-017R1 and Response to RFI#T-0224.2</p> <p>BBII have been advise that only 1 deflection fitting is required on per rigid conduit run, between gridline A and J.</p> <p>The PG&E construction drawings attached, indicate (highlighted in yellow) 2 locations A and J line; request expansion fitting to be used.</p> <p>It is not clear from the drawings attached if PG&E require 1 deflection fitting per conduit run as previous stated in RFI # T-0224.2. Please confirm only 1 deflection fitting per conduit run between GL A-J is required by PG&E.</p> <p>Please provide a drawing showing, the deflection fitting configuration for individual conduit runs.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1 deflection fitting per conduit run as described in RFI # T-0224.2 is required.</p> <p>Submit proposed configuration of deflection fittings coordinated with temp bridge supports and other bridge elements for review.</p>		
T-0225	BSE - CDSM Alignment Conflict With Existing Utilities GL 1-J	Closed	08/31/2011	09/10/2011	08/31/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran</p> <p>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>		<p>Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol</p>			
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Sheet D-2231, Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached photo</p> <p>BBII laid out centerline of the CDSM on Gridline 1 and Gridline J. The centerline of the shoring indicates that the existing utilities PG&E/Water is in direct conflict with the location of the CDSM shoring wall. These utilities appear to be capped east of the centerline.</p> <p>Drawing D-2231 BSE contract states "Unless specified otherwise all utilities have been cut and capped outside the limits of the work by Transbay Transit Centre program relocation of utilities"... Please see photos attached.</p> <p>Please confirm the status on the relocation of these utilities.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Shoring wall changed per the response to BSE RFI-0017. Basis of the AECOM Plans is the pre RFI-0017 shoring wall. We are planning to issue revisions to TJPA early next week to address the shoring wall change.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0225.1	BSE - CDSM Alignment Conflict With Existing Utilities GL 1-J	Closed	08/31/2011	09/10/2011	09/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference RFI#T-0225					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The response received for RFI #T-0225 does not provide the requested information.					Status is as follows, RUP ASI-015 has been created to address the relocation of utilities impacted by the change to the CDSM shoring wall resulting from BSE RFI-0017. ASI-015 was issued for pricing and implementation on 9/8/11.		
----- Question from RFI#T-0225							
Reference Sheet D-2231, Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached photo							
BBII laid out centerline of the CDSM on Gridline 1 and Gridline J. The centerline of the shoring indicates that the existing utilities PG&E/Water is in direct conflict with the location of the CDSM shoring wall. These utilities appear to be capped east of the centerline.							
Drawing D-2231 BSE contract states "Unless specified otherwise all utilities have been cut and capped outside the limits of the work by Transbay Transit Centre program relocation of utilities"... Please see photos attached.							
Please confirm the status on the relocation of these utilities.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0225.2	BSE - CDSM Alignment Conflict GL 1-J - PG&E Vault Utility Conflict on Natoma	Closed	09/12/2011	09/22/2011	09/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0017, #T-0225.1, Sheet U-1110, and Specification Section 31 56 13 Please refer to RFI No. T-0017, which revised the southwest corner of the CDSM shoring wall alignment. Your attention is also directed to the utility drawing U-1110, which depicts the utilities to be abandoned and the ones to be protected in place with respect to the old CDSM wall alignment. According to U-1110, the PG&E vault on Natoma Street shall be protected in place. However, based on the field layout, the PG&E vault on Natoma St. is in conflict with the southwest corner of the CDSM wall alignment, which was revised per RFI No. T-0017. Based on BBII's field measurements, the clearance between the PG&E vault on Natoma St. and the centerline of the CDSM wall is 29", which is less than the 36" typical distance required by the contract plans as the minimum clearance between the demarcation lines and the CDSM wall alignment. BBII requests the PG&E vault on Natoma St. to be relocated to a safe distance outside the work limits of the revised CDSM wall alignment.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Based on provided field information, the existing PG&E MH is located 11" clear of the CDSM shoring wall revised per response to RFI T-0017, please clarify what/where the conflict is. If safety is of concern while working in close proximity to a live PG&E MH, coordinate with PG&E through TJPA's Representative to de energize the existing MH prior to and during CDSM wall construction. Existing PG&E MH 1348 exists to provide power to 90 Natoma. 90 Natoma is owned by the TJPA and is currently vacant. The 36" demarcation line mentioned in the RFI is an arbitrary scope division line established between the RUP and BSE packages to differentiate abandon utility removal between the two packages.				
T-0225.3	BSE - CDSM Alignment Conflict GL 1-J - PG&E Vault Utility Conflict on Natoma	Closed	10/03/2011	10/13/2011	10/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0225.2, Sheet D-2231 and ASI-015, Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached photos and sketch BBII in discussions with DND will be able to work adjacent to PG&E vault #1348, referenced in RFI #T-0225.2. BBII is currently considering removing the concrete over pour on the vault, de-energizing the power in the vault and installing CDSM Shoring Wall without relocating the vault.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is noted that prior to receiving the response to this RFI, the contractor installed CDSM panel #W0001 adjacent PG&E vault 1348 without chipping away the concrete over pour. A PG&E standby crew was present and observed the installation. It is understood that during this work the outside tooth of auger may have broken off during install of piles in this area. W/O to confirm there is no damage to Vault #1348 due to CDSM work				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 854 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please confirm it is acceptable to remove any concrete over pour within 20" from the centerline of CDSM wall.</p> <p>Also, please confirm it is acceptable to install CDSM Wall at the location close to the PG&E vault #1348 without potential damages.</p> <p>Please refer to the attached photos</p>							
T-0226	BSE - Revised Instrument Protection Slab	Closed	09/02/2011	09/12/2011	09/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Gary Krutsch		
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference RFI #T-0214 and attached sketch		ARUP Response:					
Per discussion with the engineer, it is acceptable to install the Instrument Protection Slab per the attached sketch and the following revisions to RFI T-0214:		This is acceptable.					
1. W-beams cut so that the top mat will be resting on them.							
2. #6 rebar thru the W-beam, tie-wired to the top mat in lieu of Nelson Studs.							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 855 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0227	BSE - Buttress Anti-Washout Admixture	Closed	09/02/2011	09/12/2011	09/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 03 30 01 and attached Rheomac product data Per the recommendations from both Becho and Central Concrete, BBII would like to propose the use of an Anti-Washout Admixture, Rheomac UW 540 in all submitted and approved Buttress Primary and Secondary Shaft Concrete. Please review and confirm that this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: This is acceptable.				
T-0228	BSE - 6-inch Sidewalk At Temporary Bridges	Closed	09/02/2011	09/12/2011	09/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and attached sketches During a temporary bridge traffic coordination meeting on 8/29/11, SFMTA suggested the use of a 6" elevated sidewalk curb in lieu of the crash rated pedestrian barrier. The crash rated barrier would be relocated to the outside edge of the temporary bridge. BBII believes this layout has numerous advantages and resolves some concerns as well: - SFMTA brought up the obvious concern of damage to side mirrors with tall barriers directly adjacent to the traveled lanes. To compensate for this, drivers will shy away from barriers in already tight lanes. Moving the barrier alleviates this problem on one side of the road. - A barrier between the sidewalk and traveled lanes has a blunt ends that pose a hazard (see sketch). Relocating the barrier eliminates this hazard. - The area formerly occupied by the pedestrian barrier (approx 14" in width) can be used as extra traveled width for vehicles (distributed per SFMTA's discretion) - An elevated sidewalk curb will make trestle crossings feel like a typical street crossing, especially for the visually impaired. As such, pedestrians will be more likely to treat the trestle intersection as a true signalized intersection.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response to RFI No.T-0228 is provided herein and on attached sketch titled, "Sketch - RFI Nos.T-0223 and T-0228." This attached sketch is a mark-up of BBII's traffic plan figure "Non-Working Hours, Temporary Bridge Traffic Plan," (submittal package TG0300-204, submittal item TZ1030-015313, page 3 of 6) because this is the latest presentation of the Contractor proposed product. This attached sketch shows an installation in conformance with current coordination comments completed between the Project and CCSF DPW and SFMTA. As shown on attached Sketch - RFI Nos.T-0223 and T-0228, a handrail/guardrail providing separation of pedestrian and vehicle traffic is required. Note, these comments provided on the attached sketch pertain only to RFI Nos.T-0223 and T-0228, a full review and response of Traffic Plan Submittal Package TG0300-204 will be finalized and transmitted at a later date.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>SFMTA has indicated that the elevated sidewalk is preferred over a pedestrian barrier. Attached are several sketches of the proposed layout - please confirm this is acceptable.</div>							
T-0229	BSE - Concrete Time of Discharge Requirement	Closed	09/06/2011	09/16/2011	09/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Ural Yal					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification 03 30 01				ARUP Response: This is acceptable.			
Per SS 03 30 00, 3.3.D, "Discharge of concrete shall be completed within 1½ hours or before the drum has revolved 300 revolutions, whichever comes first, after the introduction of the mixing water to the cement and aggregates or the introduction of the cement to the aggregates."							
Per ACI 301 (Section 4.1.2.9), "Time of discharge - When it is desired to exceed the maximum time for discharge of concrete permitted by ASTM C 94C/ 94M, submit a request along with a description of the precautions to be taken."							
BBII is planning for discharging concrete with the following precautions: As concrete hydration can be controlled for a maximum of 10 hours, BBII suggests discharge of concrete shall not be restricted to 1½ hours. In order to sustain the requirements of Becho, BBII purposes to replace the 1½ hour time restriction to 3 hours with an 80° F maximum temperature requirement.							
Please confirm that this discharging plan is acceptable for Buttress Concrete per ACI 301.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 857 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0230	BSE - Concrete Sampling Location	Closed	09/12/2011	09/22/2011	09/16/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu				
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 03 30 01 Per the Pre-Construction Buttress Shoring Phase 1 DFOW Meeting on 8/30/2011, BBII proposes to conduct concrete sampling of Central Concrete Trucks in Lot P in lieu of Zone 4 due to site congestion and safety concerns. In order to sustain the requirements of Becho and to provide safe disposal of concrete for sampling, BBII purposes Lot P for all concrete sample inspections. Please confirm that this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Contractor shall bear all additional costs associated with changing the concrete sampling location from Zone 4 to Lot P (including, but not limited to, additional inspectors) ----- 2011-09-15 George Metzger ARUP Response: Arup takes no exception to sampling the trucks in Lot P provided the concrete is sampled and tested in accordance with the ASTM Standards. For example, in accordance with the Standards, sampling of the concrete shall be obtained after 10 % and before 90 % of the batch has been discharged from the truck.				
T-2031	BSE - 24-Hour Inspection of Buttress Shoring Shaft	Closed	09/12/2011	09/22/2011	09/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu				
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 03 30 01 Per the Pre-Construction Buttress Shoring Phase 1 DFOW Meeting on 8/30/2011, Becho requests that a TJPA representative be available to observe the 24 hour Buttress Shoring drilling operation and to perform any/all specified inspections. This includes: verticality of shaft, shaft cleanliness, verification of bed rock, concrete and rebar. In addition, Becho requests that a TJPA representative be available 24 hours of the day to provide Becho/BBII with full support and contact information of all available representatives. Please confirm that this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TJPA Representatives will be available to inspect the work as specified in 31 63 29 (referenced in 03 30 01).				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project


<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0232	BSE - Buttress Red Color Concrete	Closed	09/15/2011	09/25/2011	09/16/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 03 30 01 and Sheet GT-2201 Per discussion with the Engineer, it is acceptable to place red color concrete in Secondary Buttress Shafts C3 and C5 in lieu of Primary Buttress Shafts C2, C4, and C6. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: This is acceptable.		
<hr/>							
T-0233	BSE - Internal Bracing Design Coordination with Structural Design	Closed	09/20/2011	09/30/2011	09/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 31 55 00 The BSE submittal TG0300-542.1 Internal Bracing Design was approved by TJPA and the fabrication will start as soon as permission is issued by the City. Please confirm the design was acceptable to permanent structural designer (Thornton Tomasetti) and incorporated into their design for future trade packages.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti's response is pending receipt and review of revised internal bracing submittal.		
<hr/>							
T-0233.1	BSE - Internal Bracing Design Coordination with Structural Design	Closed	09/23/2011	10/03/2011	10/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0233 and TJPA Transmittal No. 140-02321 The SFDBI-approved Internal Bracing drawings and related calculations was sent to W/O on 9/22/2011 as TJPA Transmittal No. 140-02321 - Approved Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall Permit Drawings, and available in Constructware. -----			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TT is currently reviewing the Internal Bracing Design Documents, which was received by TT on 09/29/2011. TT's comments to this document will be marked up on the Internal Bracing Design Document.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 859 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>RFI #T-0233 Question:</p> <p>The BSE submittal TG0300-542.1 Internal Bracing Design was approved by TJPA and the fabrication will start as soon as permission is issued by the City.</p> <p>Please confirm the design was acceptable to permanent structural designer (Thornton Tomasetti) and incorporated into their design for future trade packages.</p>							
T-0233.2	BSE - Internal Bracing Design Coordination with Structural Design	Closed	10/05/2011	10/15/2011	10/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference RFI #T-0233, T-0233.1, Submittal TG0300-542 and TJPA Transmittal No.140-02321.				Thornton Tomasetti will be issuing comments to Transmittal #140-02321.			
W/O is in receipt of TJPA Submittal Package #TG0300-542 for the internal bracing from which W/O is proceeding per specification section 01 13 00.							
W/O is aware the design team did not review and comment on Transmittal #140-02321 (DBI's comments) to Submittal Package #TG0300-542.							
Please confirm no design team changes or comments will be made to Submittal Package #TG0300-542 rather future trade packages.							
----- RFI #T-0233.1 Response -----							
TT is currently reviewing the Internal Bracing Design Documents, which was received by TT on 09/29/2011.							
TT's comments to this document will be marked up on the Internal Bracing Design Document.							
----- RFI #T-0233.1 Question -----							
The SFDBI-approved Internal Bracing drawings and related calculations was sent to W/O on 9/22/2011 as TJPA Transmittal No. 140-02321 - Approved Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall Permit Drawings, and available in Constructware.							
----- RFI #T-0233 Response -----							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Thornton Tomasetti's response is pending receipt and review of revised internal bracing submittal.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233 Question ----- The BSE submittal TG0300-542.1 Internal Bracing Design was approved by TJPA and the fabrication will start as soon as permission is issued by the City. Please confirm the design was acceptable to permanent structural designer (Thornton Tomasetti) and incorporated into their design for future trade packages.</p>							
T-0233.3	BSE - Internal Bracing Design Coordination with Structural Design	Closed	10/10/2011	10/20/2011	10/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>			<p>Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference RFI #T-0233, T-0233.1, T-0233.2, Submittal TG0300-542 and TJPA Transmittal No.140-02321.</p> <p>This RFI shall not be closed until the information / confirmation received from the Design team.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.2 Response ----- Thornton Tomasetti will be issuing comments to Transmittal #140-02321.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.2 Question ----- W/O is in receipt of TJPA Submittal Package #TG0300-542 for the internal bracing from which W/O is proceeding per specification section 01 13 00. W/O is aware the design team did not review and comment on Transmittal #140-02321 (DBI's comments) to Submittal Package #TG0300-542. Please confirm no design team changes or comments will be made to Submittal Package #TG0300-542 rather future trade packages.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.1 Response ----- TT is currently reviewing the Internal Bracing Design Documents, which was received by TT on 09/29/2011. TT's comments to this document will be marked up on the Internal Bracing Design Document.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This RFI contains a statement, not a question and is inappropriate for the RFI process. RFI T-0233.2 will remain closed but unresolved until the requested information is provided.</p>			




Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 861 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>----- RFI #T-0233.1 Question ----- The SFDBI-approved Internal Bracing drawings and related calculations was sent to W/O on 9/22/2011 as TJPA Transmittal No. 140-02321 - Approved Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall Permit Drawings, and available in Constructware.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233 Response ----- Thornton Tomasetti's response is pending receipt and review of revised internal bracing submittal.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233 Question ----- The BSE submittal TG0300-542.1 Internal Bracing Design was approved by TJPA and the fabrication will start as soon as permission is issued by the City. Please confirm the design was acceptable to permanent structural designer (Thornton Tomasetti) and incorporated into their design for future trade packages.</p>						
T-0233.4	BSE - Internal Bracing Design Coordination with Structural Design	Closed	10/10/2011	10/20/2011	10/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Turner Construction Comp. Kevin Chiu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0233, T-0233.1, T-0233.2, Submittal TG0300-542 and TJPA Transmittal No.140-02321.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Comments will be returned by 14 October 2011.			
When will the Design team provide the information / confirmation for RFI #T-0233?							
<p>----- RFI #T-0233.3 Response ----- This RFI contains a statement, not a question and is inappropriate for the RFI process. RFI T-0233.2 will remain closed but unresolved until the requested information is provided.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.3 Question ----- This RFI shall not be closed until the information / confirmation received from the Design team.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.2 Response -----</p>							





<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference RFI #T-0233, T-0233.1, T-0233.2, T-0233.3, T-0233.4, Submittal TG0300-542 and TJPA Transmittal No.140-02321.</p> <p>Per response to RFI#T-0233.4, comments from the design team were to be received by October 14, 2011.</p> <p>Please provide the design team comments and confirmation for RFI #T-0233.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.4 Response -----</p> <p>Comments will be returned by 14 October 2011.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.4 Question -----</p> <p>Reference RFI #T-0233, T-0233.1, T-0233.2, Submittal TG0300-542 and TJPA Transmittal No.140-02321.</p> <p>When will the Design team provide the information / confirmation for RFI #T-0233?</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.3 Response -----</p> <p>This RFI contains a statement, not a question and is inappropriate for the RFI process. RFI T-0233.2 will remain closed but unresolved until the requested information is provided.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.3 Question -----</p> <p>This RFI shall not be closed until the information / confirmation received from the Design team.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.2 Response -----</p> <p>Thornton Tomasetti will be issuing comments to Transmittal #140-02321.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.2 Question -----</p> <p>W/O is in receipt of TJPA Submittal Package #TG0300-542 for the internal bracing from which W/O is proceeding per specification section 01 13 00.</p> <p>W/O is aware the design team did not review and comment on Transmittal #140-02321 (DBI's comments) to Submittal Package #TG0300-542.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments have been sent to W/O previously, see attached transmittal.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 864 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please confirm no design team changes or comments will be made to Submittal Package #TG0300-542 rather future trade packages.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.1 Response ----- TT is currently reviewing the Internal Bracing Design Documents, which was received by TT on 09/29/2011. TT's comments to this document will be marked up on the Internal Bracing Design Document.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.1 Question ----- The SFDBI-approved Internal Bracing drawings and related calculations was sent to W/O on 9/22/2011 as TJPA Transmittal No. 140-02321 - Approved Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall Permit Drawings, and available in Constructware.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.0 Response ----- Thornton Tomasetti's response is pending receipt and review of revised internal bracing submittal.</p> <p>----- RFI #T-0233.0 Question ----- Reference Specification Section 31 55 00 The BSE submittal TG0300-542.1 Internal Bracing Design was approved by TJPA and the fabrication will start as soon as permission is issued by the City.</p> <p>Please confirm the design was acceptable to permanent structural designer (Thornton Tomasetti) and incorporated into their design for future trade packages.</p>						
T-0234	BSE - Buttress Shaft Post Pour Settlement	Closed	09/20/2011	09/30/2011	09/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29				ARUP Response:			
Please be informed that an uncontrolled settlement was				The Contractor shall place concrete (or CLSM, where specified) up to the gound surface as specified in the			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 865 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>observed at Buttress shaft C2, which was poured on Sunday 9/18/2011. The settlement led to the formation of a 13' deep unstable hole on the buttress working pad. After consulting with ARUP representative and W/O's field personnel, BBII/Becho Inc. decided to fill the newly formed hole with concrete to mitigate the settlement risk of the working pad. Additional concrete was poured into the 13' deep hole on Monday 9/19/2011.</p> <p>Please confirm that pouring additional concrete/CLSM will be considered as an acceptable method, if such settlements will occur during the future installation of the upcoming buttress shafts.</p>						
T-0235	BSE - Unforeseen Reinforced Concrete Slab at GL 7.5 J	Closed					
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch					
	Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal						
	REQUEST: Reference Sheet D-2210, Specification Section 31 56 13, attached photos and sketch While excavating a pre trench at gridline 7.5J close to Natoma Street, BBII uncovered an unforeseen reinforced concrete slab. This slab is 3ft thick, uncovered at grade and a section of it is in the direct line of the proposed CDSM wall. Indicated at this location in drawing D-2210 are grade beams and pile caps which BBII assumes will be encountered under this mat slab. However, this slab is not indicated on contract drawing D-2210. The concrete shown in contract survey sheet 5 appears to be a concrete driveway and it does not indicate the 3ft thick concrete slab that BBII are encountering. Measurements taken in the field also indicate a larger area than this. The attached photos and drawing indicate the scale of this obstruction. It is required to be removed. Please advise if this is acceptable.	SUGGESTION:					
			09/20/2011	09/30/2011	09/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Transbay PMPC			Roger Rothenburger	
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			This slab is a Cal Trans slab and is located within TJPA property limits. The slab is not unknown and is shown in the set of Drawings listed in Section 00-03-31 Part 1.2.D.6 (Existing Condition: Buildings and Improvements - Drawings "Project Plans for Construction from Figh Streeet to Beale Street, 2000" (168 pages). Removal of the slab is acceptable.				
			----- 9/22/2011 - George Metzger				
			ARUP Response:				
			It is Arup's understanding that the slab encountered is a remnant of the Caltrans seismic retrofit work of the previous, now-demolished bus ramps. Therefor, removal of the portion of the slab within the shoring wall alignment is acceptable, but ownership of the property on which the slab is located should be confirmed by the PMPC / TJPA.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 866 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0236	BSE - Unforeseen Concrete Section Found at Grid Line 1E	Closed	09/22/2011	10/02/2011	09/26/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet D-2210 (attached), Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached photos While DND were drilling at panel 28 and 29 on grid line 1E at the locations of piles 839-843, an unknown section of concrete was encountered. The concrete was found at a depth of 9.5ft. The quantity of concrete is unknown at this point. The concrete is not indicated on contract drawing D-2210. It is in direct conflict with the CDSM shoring wall and must be removed. Shown below [attached] are photos of the debris removed from the excavation. Please advise on how to proceed.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Contract documents require obstacles that may interfere with installation of the CDSM wall to be removed by pre-trenching. The concrete shall be removed.		
T-0237	BSE - Bridge Welding Code	Closed	09/26/2011	10/06/2011	10/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification 01 53 30 Temporary Bridge Specification 01 53 13 (1.6H) requires the welding qualifications for the bridges to be in accordance with AWS D1.5 "Bridge Welding Code", however BBII's design was based on AWS D1.1 "Structural Welding Code" as specified in General note 3.2-A4.2 of Sheet SH-0100. BBII and their designer felt AWS D1.1 is more applicable for the temporary bridge structure for the following reasons: - The members that make up BBII's temporary bridge consists of readily available standard grade mill rolled shapes, comprised of a variety of base metals (A36, A53, A572, A992, A500, and A252) which are joined by simple prequalified joints (fillets). D1.1 provides the flexibility to weld all of these base metals in any combination utilizing prequalified procedures, since they are all in the same base metal group. D1.5 only allows prequalified welding of A709 plate material only. - BBII's temporary bridge structure contains structural tubing (piers and rails), which D1.5 does not cover tubing			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ISI Commentary: "We have been requested to provide a commentary/discussion regarding AWS D1.5-2002 Bridge Welding Code in reference to RFI #T-0237. The scope of our discussion is limited to an interpretation of D1.5 and not to the design/use of welded temporary steel bridges. The RFI's request by BBII is to accept WPSs/WQTRs to AWS D1.1 rather than to AWS D1.5. Base Materials: Although D1.5 specifies A709 as the approved steel, it also states that other steels may be approved by the Engineer [D1.5 Section 1.2.2]. Fillet Welding: The RFI states all welding to be fillet welds (mostly single pass). D1.5 state fillet welding may be performed, within given limitations, without performing WPS qualification tests [D1.5 Section 2.8.1]. Welder Qualifications: We note that the qualification requirements for both groove and fillet welds are		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 867 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>	
	<p>- The bridge as designed has short spans and very simple welded connections. All welds shown are fillet welds (mostly single pass). Additionally there are no complete penetration welds as are typically seen on steel plate girder bridges.</p> <p>- The life span of these temporary bridges are less than 5 years</p> <p>- The temporary bridge's intended use and the site specific geometry restraints led to a steel framing design much more similar to a structural steel building than to a typical Highway bridge. The steel columns with angle cross-bracing, and the girders and cap beams as detailed are similar to building with columns and floor beams.</p> <p>The submittal review did not take exception to the general note specifying D1.1. therefore please confirm it is acceptable to submit weld procedures and welder qualifications per AWS D1.1 as specified by the bridge's Engineer of Record.</p>			<p>similar between AWS D1.1 and D1.5 with exception of base metal restrictions.</p> <p>Engineer's Discretions: See Commentary Sections C1.1.2, C1.2.1 and the "Forward" section of D1.5 Pgs. vii and viii."</p> <p>----- ----- 9/26/2011 - David Fyfe</p> <p>See Specification Section 01 53 13, 1.6H;</p> <p>Welding Qualifications: Qualify procedures and personnel according to the following:</p> <p>1. AWS D1.5/D1.5M, "Bridge Welding Code - Steel."</p> <p>2. AWS D1.4/D1.4M, "Structural Welding Code - Reinforcing Steel."</p> <p>This does not allow use of AWS D1.1. Comply with paragraph 1.6H requirements.</p>				
T-0237.1	BSE - Bridge Welding Code	Closed	10/03/2011	10/13/2011	10/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu					
Co-Author:								
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0237 and Specification Section 01 53 30 RFI #T-0237 was returned to W/O with two responses regarding the temporary bridge welding. Please clarify which is the governing response or provide one coordinated response.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response provided in RFI T-0237 by David Fyfe, dated 9/26/2011, is the governing response.		
T-0238	BSE - Zone 1 CDSM Crossing Over Existing Wall	Closed	09/26/2011	10/06/2011	09/29/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 868 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div><div>Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference Sheet GT-5101, Specification Section 31 56 13, attached photos and sketch</div><div>Please address the following information request from BBII's sub contractor DND:</div><div>"The new CDSM shoring wall crosses an existing CDSM wall at 2 locations. Following CR T-005B, both of these crossings are perpendicular to the existing CDSM wall, as shown in Note 1 on GT-5101. Note 1 shows the new wall making a jog to avoid hitting the beams of the existing CDSM wall. The detail shown on contract plan GT-5101 is constructible only if the existing CDSM wall was built exactly as shown, without any room for construction tolerances for both the new and existing wall. Instead of trying to install this section of the CDSM wall according to the detail shown on GT-5101, which would potentially cause damage to the CDSM equipment, DND proposes to remove the existing CDSM beams that are in conflict. The contract plan GT-5101 shows two CDSM panels to jog around the existing beam and one offset panel parallel to the new wall.</div><div>DND's proposed solution would eliminate the 2 panels in the jog but still maintain the additional offset panel parallel to the wall line. This additional offset panel would act as insurance so a seal is maintained through any deflection caused by the hard in-situ soil mix. This would present a potential cost savings to the project (due to 2 less panels being installed), providing the conflicting beams can be successfully removed.</div><div>DND has mobilized a drill rig with an auger to this area to pre-drill the wall prior to the removal of beams. This will substantially reduce the amount of vibration that will be required to remove the beams. DND proposes to utilize the same method at the other wall crossing near Natoma Street. Is this proposed method of removing the existing beams and soil mixing through the existing CDSM wall acceptable?"</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>ARUP Response:</div><div>This is acceptable provided there is no additional cost to the TJPA.</div></div></div></div>							
T-0239	BSE - Rebar Cages for Deeper Buttress Shafts	Closed	09/28/2011	10/08/2011	10/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 869 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-5202 Detail 12, RFI T-0216, and Approved Rebar Shop Drawings The approved rebar cages per RFI T-0216 are sized for 241' deep shafts. Rebar cages for shafts C-1 and M-1 have already been released and fabricated. Note that the depth after airlifting of shafts C-2 and M-2 have been 247' and 252.7' respectively. Please advise on how to proceed with the installation of the cages for shafts C-1 and M-1 and with the fabrication of the rest of the cages assuming these shafts extend beyond planned depth.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Detail 12/GT-5201 requires the reinforcing steel to be placed up to 1'-0" below the top of the concrete. The top of concrete is shown on GT-5201. Longitudinal bar extensions shall be spliced as needed to achieve this. If the top of the fabricated cage is within 3'-0" of the top of the concrete, no bar extensions are required. The 24" tie spacing shown on the shop drawings at the setting cage (Drawing SC1) is acceptable at the bar extensions.		
T-0240	BSE - Demo AT&T Duct on Natoma at Second	Closed	09/29/2011	10/09/2011	10/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol		
REQUEST: Reference Sheets U-1110, D-2231, ASI-015, Specification Section 31 56 13, attached email and BBI RFI 222 It was discovered on 9/27/2011 while performing the utility demo for the revised shoring wall alignment (TG03 BSE CR T-005B) issued in ASI 15 that the abandoned AT&T line servicing the demolished buildings on Natoma was never fully abandoned by AT&T. According to the attached email from Huan Huynh of AT&T, AT&T was never notified that these lines needed to be abandoned due to the revised shoring wall alignment of the Transbay Project. Please confirm when CDSM Shoring Wall can be installed in the area. Currently, BBII is installing the CDSM Shoring Wall on line 1 and the confirmation of the line abandonment is required as quickly as possible to avoid any project delay. Please also refer to the attached BBI RFI 0222 for this issue			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AT&T has de-energized the abandon telecommunications lines referenced in the RFI. Proceed with CDSM wall installation at this location following demolition of existing utilities per RUP contract documents and execution of a USARs.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0241	BSE - Brick Wall at GL 2, J Line In Conflict With The CDSM Wall	Closed	09/29/2011	10/09/2011	10/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 31 56 13 and attached meeting minutes and photos The brick wall remaining from the 580 Howard building, at grid line 2 J, is protruding into the CDSM wall limits, as noted in BBII's previous RFI #203 (The question was responded by TCCO at the job site meeting on 9/6/2011. Refer to the attached meeting minutes). While attempting to remove, BBII has discovered that the fence and patio pavement are founded on this remaining portion of brick wall. This condition does not allow for the removal of the wall without damage to the fence and patio. Please provide direction on how to proceed.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The 580 Howard courtyard fencing can be removed from the corner because it is owned by TJPA and located on TJPA property. 2. After removal of this corner section of fence, a section of temp fence and signage shall be placed on TJPA property. 3. During demolition of this corner section the temp fence and signage will likely have to move in towards the 580 Property as a safety precaution. 4. The demolition and backfill shall be expedited so that the courtyard can be restored (preferably same day). 5. The temp fence section and signage shall be moved back on to TJPA property until CDSM wall is complete. 6. The permanent fence will be reinstalled on TJPA property as soon as possible after CDSM wall installation at the corner. CR T-5B excluded this scope. These costs will be issued under forthcoming CR.				
T-0242	BSE - Becho's Request For Rock Classification Data	Closed	09/29/2011	10/09/2011	10/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-2201, Specification Section 31 63 29, and attached letter from Becho Please find attached BBII's sub-contractor Becho's letter that requests the following information: "... during the drilling of buttress shaft M4 rock socket, at a depth of approximately 250 feet below ground level, Becho encountered rock formations of unmeasured hardness. At a depth of 250 feet, Becho's steel grab, used for rock drilling, fractured under the increased stress. Please see attached photos. The incident occurred between the hours of 9.30 am and 10.00 am on Wednesday, 09.28.11. BBII immediately notified W/O and called for an emergency meeting to discuss the hardness of the rock formation and			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Regarding the question: "Please advise, if shafts are to be drilled and excavated to new depths not indicated on plan GT-5201": the specifications note "Depth of piers shown on drawings may vary due to field conditions based upon TJPA's Representative assessment of actual conditions." The Geotechnical Data Report and the Prototype Test Report, included in the Contract Documents as references, provide sufficient information for the Contractor to plan and execute their work.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the status of drilling. During the meeting, Arup confirmed and accepted the 250 foot depth to be adequate and sufficient to stop the rock socket drilling. Immediately, following Arup's confirmation at 11.09 am, Becho proceeded to clean the remaining rock debris from the bottom of the shaft and prep for air lifting operation. The total down time recorded as a result of the incident is 68 minutes, not including adjustments of airlift, tremie pipe and repair of grab. Please advise, if shafts are to be drilled and excavated to new depths not indicated on plan GT-5201. Becho will need to mobilize additional non-conventional drilling equipment to successfully achieve depths currently being directed to drill to (255 ft). In addition, Becho requests that a soil report be generated containing borings pertaining to Zone 4 Buttress drilling operations which include rock classification, strength and location."</p>						
T-0243	BSE - Emergency Exit at 530 Howard GL 10 J	Closed	09/29/2011	10/09/2011	10/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch					Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu	
	Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal						
	REQUEST: Reference Specification Section 31 56 13 and attached sketch Pre-trenching and CDSM wall installation at the rear of the 530 Howard building will have an impact on the accessibility to the emergency exit at that location. In order for the pre trench and the CDSM wall installation to safely proceed past this location, the rear exit must be closed for 1-2 days for each operation. The attached drawing indicates the location of the emergency exit and its proximity to the CDSM wall. Please confirm if this is acceptable. BBII is available to meet with the property owner to coordinate this work.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
					Coordination with 530 Howard property management cannot be obtained without specific dates. Once the dates are known, coordinate through Jason Padavich (jpadavich@tcco.com 510-453-8598).		
T-0244	BSE - Request for Additional Geotechnical Data Pertaining To Zone 4	Closed	09/29/2011	10/09/2011	10/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 872 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29 Please address the following information request from BBII's sub contractor Becho Inc.: "... for each of the shafts completed and under construction, Becho has excavated deeper than the elevations shown for boring logs. Becho is requesting soil samples, boring logs, torque requirements, skin friction values, and rock strengths be provided for these depths. (Currently 254 ft below elevation +14.00). The requested information is similar to what was provided up to the depths of 234 and 237.5 feet in the "Final Geotechnical Data Report" prepared by Arup dated February 2010, and "Prototype Test Program and Monitoring During Construction of Drilled Shafts" prepared by Arup dated May 2010. Becho requests this information for drilling beyond the depths specified in the Geotechnical Report."		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: The elevation of the bedrock is highly variable as indicated by the contour plan in the Geotechnical Data Report. It is for this reason that the specifications include the requirement: "Excavation and drilling equipment: shall have adequate capacity, including power, torque, and down thrust to advance the temporary casing to the depths shown on the drawings, excavate a hole of both the maximum diameter and to a depth of 20 percent beyond the depths shown on the plans."			
T-0244.1	BSE - Becho Request for Buttress Field Logs	Closed	03/23/2012	04/02/2012	04/24/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: BECHO formally requests to obtain the Daily Field Logs from every ARUP field engineer/geotech/geologist, TJPA representative involved with the Buttress Shaft work. More specifically, field notes/logs from engineers and TJPA representatives involved with the field data collection, sample collection and inspection process. Becho requests the Daily Field Logs for the following dates: - September 12th 2011 through October 20th 2011 - February 22nd 2012 through Today		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The TJPA Representative Daily Field Logs are attached to the Field Observation Reports that are posted to and available in Constructware.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 873 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0244.2	BSE - Becho Request for Buttress Field Logs Follow-Up	Closed	04/18/2012	04/28/2012	04/24/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Turner Construction Comf Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: After reviewing Constructware as directed in RFI T-0244.1; W/O is unable to locate ARUP field reports for the dates between 9/12/11-9/30/11. Please advise as to the location of the aforementioned documents.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per Arup on 04/10/2012, "The first report begins on October 1, 2011. Prior to that, Arup was not documenting the project progress and deficiencies through these field reports."		
<hr/>							
T-0244.3	Becho's 3rd Request for Arup's Field Logs	Closed	07/24/2012	08/03/2012	08/01/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ernie Cortez To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Turner Construction Comf Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Becho formally requests to obtain any and all documentation Arup has for logging and documenting soil samples retrieved from the Buttress shafts starting 9/12/2011 thru 10/1/2011, including all documentation pertaining to quality control as specified in section 31.63.29.3.8.B. Reference attached Becho Letter BI-0244.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor is to refer to Constructware or the ISI special inspection website for the available field logs/test reports/field samples. All necessary parties have access to these sources.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 874 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0245	BSE - Ground Conduits detail for PG&E phase 2 works on First Street	Closed	10/05/2011	10/15/2011	10/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference CR No. T-017 - BSE - First Street Phase 2 Utility Relocation For the installation of the PGE 6" and PGE 4" GRS conduit between the CDSM walls, is grounding of the PGE conduits required? If so, please provide grounding details/requirements.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response from PG&E (attached) is as follows: Yes and at both ends of the conduits. As a suggestion, we would propose to tie into the bonding jumpers of the AX and EX expansion fittings with a bare copper solid stand #6 copper wire. The #6 wire can be either soldered or crimped to the bonding jumper. All the #6 ground wires would then be brought together and connected to a single bare #2/0 copper wire. The 2/0 copper ground wire would then be routed and cadwelded to the nearest I-beam that support the traffic bridge. If it is not possible to attached the #6 copper wire to the AX and EX grounding jumpers, we will require a separated bonding clamp that can be used in a wet or dry location. One grounding point is usually sufficient but I am asking for grounding at both ends of the steel conduits in case one ground is accidentally cut.				
T-0246	BSE - PG&E Sweep Radius Requirements	Closed	10/10/2011	10/20/2011	10/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: Reference CR T-017. (The attached drawings provided at the PG&E / BBII / Verizon Coordination Meeting on 9/29/2011) refer to 10ft radius elbows and bends. PG&E standards refer require 6ft radius elbows and bends. Please confirm radius requirements for 6" conduit installation for the Phase 2 utility on First Street.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per PG&E (see attached), the requirement is 10ft radius.				
T-0247	BSE - Proposed Corrective Action Plan for Sunken CDSM Soldier Piles	Closed	10/10/2011	10/10/2011	10/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 875 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

REQUEST:

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13

Please address the following information request from BBII's sub contractor DND:

"As of to date, the following three soldier piles have sunk below grade during their placement into the CDSM wall.

- Beam # 154 installed on 09.08.11
- Beam # 631, installed on 09.29.11
- Beam # 602, installed on 10.01.11

DND was unable to recover those piles and set them to their plan elevations without disturbing the adjacent beams that were already in place. To mitigate this issue, DND proposes to conduct the below course of remedial action:

1) Wait until mass excavation commences. Excavate with caution the locations, and determine the top elevation of the sunken beams.

2) Provide this information to the Engineer for evaluation.

3) Implement corrective action based on Engineer's evaluation. Possible corrective measures are:

- a. No action necessary. The strength of the CDSM material may be sufficient to support the unreinforced depth.
- b. Install lagging between the adjacent beams above the top of the sunken beam.
- c. Splice a beam on the top of the sunken beam and backfill with low strength concrete.

Please advise, if the proposed course of remedial action and/or any of the three possible corrective measures are acceptable."

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

ARUP Response:

The proposed sequence is not acceptable. The Contractor shall submit a corrective action plan at least four weeks prior to the start of excavation for evaluation by the TJPA's Representative. The plan shall assume a range of depths to the top of the sunken beam and shall describe the impact on the walling and strutting plan. The plan shall be location-specific and shall include a drawing indicating the location of the sunken beam.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 876 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0247.1	BSE - Proposed Corrective Plan for the following Sunken Solider Piles	Closed	01/10/2012	01/20/2012	01/12/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Attached Corrective Action Plan					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Message:					The written RFI above is not a clear question and is not acceptable. The content in the attached document should be provided in a submittal, not an RFI. GC to conform to comments in RFI 247.		
Please find attached BBII's proposed corrective plan for the following sunken solider piles:							
1. Pile #59, Notice #47, Vela Issue #J-00007.							
2. Pile #154, Vela Issue #J-00001.							
3. Pile #602, Vela Issue #J-00008.							
Please approve and or comment.							
T-0248	BSE - First St. Verizon Utilities Relocation	Closed	10/10/2011	10/20/2011	01/04/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 01 53 13					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Attached is an as-built sketch of Verizon utilities potholed and located along First St. on 10/4/10. These utilities were originally scheduled to be relocated during phase two to allow for CDSM installation and subsequently temporary bridge construction. BBII has learned that in an effort to save time, the TJPA is considering leaving the utilities in their current locations and working around them. As shown on the attached section of the First St. temporary bridge, the Verizon utilities will be in direct conflict with the temporary bridge structure. Please confirm these utilities will be relocated as planned to allow for installation of the CDSM shoring wall and temporary bridge.					"Yes, they will be relocated. This RFI was related to the lateness of Verizon relocation and the idea of installing CDSM wall with Verizon still in place. Due to delays in starting PGE is now taking longer than Verizon so that PGE work governs duration and we no longer have to install last CDSM wall with Verizon in place to save time on bridge installation on First Street."		
					Solcom has a start date of 1.03.2012 and a finish date of 2.29.2012.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0249	BSE - Pavement lights at the rear of 580 Howard	Closed	10/10/2011	10/20/2011	10/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 31 56 13 and CR T-005B.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
There are two lights located on the ground inside the boundary fence at the rear of 580 Howard. The lights are located 4ft away from the brick wall (which is due to be demolished) as shown the attached photos. A preliminary investigation indicates that the lights are de-energized. Please confirm that access to the property's electrical system will be available to confirm that the lights are de-energized.					Access to 580 Howard cannot be obtained at this time.		
					See attached, "RFI T-0249 Field Photos 11 Oct 2011," which shows that as of 2PM on 11 OCT 2011 the lights have been removed and wires capped by an unknown entity.		
					Contractor to verify status of electrical lines by alternate means.		
T-0250	BSE - Soil Classification of South West Area of the Work Site	Closed	10/13/2011	10/23/2011	11/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 01 13 50 and Treadwell & Rollo site maps (attached)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
BBII needs the soil classification listed and mapped for the lot between Natoma Street and Howard Street, and between Gridline A to Gridline 10. Please see the attached Treadwell & Rollo's Site Mitigation Map of the Soil Classification for the area in question.					Treadwell and Rollo response-		
					"See attached site plan, figure 1. Where encountered, up to 4' of State of California hazardous waste exists."		
T-0251	BSE - Drawings To Coordinate Trestle Pile Locations	Closed	10/13/2011	10/23/2011	10/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
During the 10/12/11 trestle submittal review meeting, statements were repeatedly made with regard to incrementally complete underground drawings in which to coordinate trestle pile locations. As of 10/13/11, W/O has not received any future package documents accompanied with the direction to coordinate with the TG03 documents. If such documents are available please make available the entire series to include, however not limited to, A, S, M, E,					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					The question being asked is unclear. Please rephrase the question and resubmit the RFI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 878 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
& P.							
T-0251.1	BSE - Drawings To Coordinate Trestle Pile Locations	Closed	10/14/2011	10/24/2011	11/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Nhi Tran			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
RFI T-0251 original inquiry: During the 10/12/11 trestle submittal review meeting, statements were repeatedly made with regard to incrementally complete underground drawings in which to coordinate trestle pile locations. As of 10/13/11, W/O has not received any future package documents accompanied with the direction to coordinate with the TG03 documents. If such documents are available please make available the entire series to include, however not limited to, A, S, M, E, & P.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti Reply: "See attached PDF files SKS-0130 through SKS-0137 for exclusion zones for trestle and pin pile locations, per requested additional TT review. W/O to review for constructability. Submit updated pile locations for review. Note: Penetrations through the Mat slab shall not intersect the hatched zones in the attached sketches. Note hatched zones at and near columns and at side walls. Any Lower Concourse level penetrations within 3'-0" on either side of primary column lines (e.g. 1.4, 2, ..., 35, V, W, X) will impact construction of primary concrete moment frame beam elements; coordinate with W/O. Block outs in moment frame beams shall not encroach into the hatched zones in the attached sketches. Coordinate interruptions of lower concourse slabs and secondary framing beam elements with W/O. 24" Diameter columns located 21'-3" west of GL 23 and 21'-3" east of GL 23 along GL D.8 and E.2, extending between mat level and lower concourse level. Verify construction sequence of Light Column at GL 23 in relation to cross lot bracing and re-bracing; coordinate with W/O.				
RFI T-0251.1 Clarification to RFI T-0251: The TG03 package was executed with limited documents in which to coordinate future packages with. Please provide all documents the TJPA requests BBII coordinate the TG03 package with and to.							
As it pertains to structural columns (round/pill/rectangle/ect.) please provide the minimum clear distance to trestle pile penetrations in the mat slab so BBII may coordinate.							
Should there remain any ambiguity in the inquiry above please indicate the nature of misunderstanding.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 879 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0251.2	BSE - Drawings To Coordinate Trestle Pile Locations - "No Pin Pile Zone" at Lower Level	Closed	11/04/2011	11/14/2011	11/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP To: Turner Construction Company			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
On 11/3/11 W/O was informed by PMPC during an Access Trestle Criteria Discussion meeting with URS and W/O that PMPC will request Thornton Tomasetti to provide "no pine pile zone" sketches for the Lower Concourse Level similar to the Sketches provided through RFI T- 251.1 response. Also, PMPC is requesting Thornton Tomasetti to provide criteria of concrete connection details around pin piles/trestle piles for the future Below Grade Concrete Package.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please confirm.			TT Response:				
			The response to RFI T-0251.1 and the associated sketches included criteria for Lower Concourse. As stated in the response, BBII is to coordinate the Lower Concourse framing elements with Webcor. Although the block out at the lower concourse level is a means and methods issue, TT further clarifies the implication of the block out if it affects the primary moment frames along the column grids as noted below:				
			The primary moment frame girders at the Lower Concourse level are to act as a brace when the Second level braces are removed as shown in the GT drawings. If a complete moment frame girder is not poured due to conflict with the trestle piles, those bracing elements immediately adjacent to that girder will need to remain in place until the blocked-out beam is re-cast and reaches its design strength. Alternatively, BBII shall establish another method of				
SUGGESTION:							
			Penetrations that interrupt Mat reinforcement shall not be placed closer than 3xDia clear spacing between penetrations, with Dia = larger diameter of two adjacent penetrations. Penetrations are those causing interruptions of mat reinforcement in the structure in its final condition. Note especially conflict between pin pile 22 and trestle pile 107 (GL 9), trestle piles 18 and 103 (GL 10), and temporary bridge piers close to pin piles 13 and 14 (GL 34)."				
			Adamson Associates Note: "The additional A, S, and MEP documents you requested are currently in design progress and the information is not available at this time."				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 880 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 881 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0252	BSE - Buttress Rebar Cage Length Adjustment	Closed	10/19/2011	10/29/2011	10/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference RFI #T-0216, #T-0239, Sheet GT-2201, Specification Section 31 63 29, and attached sketch			ARUP Response:				
Per the response to RFI T-0239, BBII needs to extend the length of rebar cages to accommodate buttress shafts that are deeper than 240'. The exact length of the rebar cage cannot be known until the drilling of the adjacent shaft. Due to this uncertainty, and the long lead time required to fabricate cages with varying lengths, BBII proposes to fabricate all rebar cages to a pre-extended length of 260'.			The proposal is acceptable with the following notes. Detail 12/GT-5201 requires the reinforcing steel to be placed up to 1'-0" below the top of the concrete. The top of concrete is shown on GT-5201. Longitudinal bar extensions shall be spliced as needed to achieve this (as noted on the sketch; attached). If the top of the fabricated cage is within 3'-0' of the top of the concrete, no bar extensions are required.				
Once the depth of the adjacent shaft is known, the final length of the rebar cage will be adjusted by cutting the top of the rebar cage and the CSL tubes to the desired length. The length of the bottom "structural cage" section that consists of 24 Ea. vertical rebars will remain unchanged at 186'. The length of the top "setting cage" section that consists of 8 Ea. vertical rebars will be adjusted as described above. Please refer to the attached documents and the original shop drawings for the "structural cage" and the "setting cage" details.			The 24" tie spacing shown on the shop drawings at the setting cage (Drawing SC1) is acceptable at the bar extensions.				
BBII proposes to accommodate this change at no additional cost to TJPA beyond the bid item quantity payment per drilled shaft lengths.							
Please advise, if it is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 882 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0253	BSE - Trestle Design Criteria Confirmation	Closed	10/19/2011	10/29/2011	11/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
REQUEST: Reference Attachment 3 of Exhibit A of the TG03 Bid Package and attached memo from PB&A Pursuant to the trestle design meeting held on October 12, 2011, Balfour Beatty Infrastructure Inc.' (BBII) requests clarification regarding their interpreted design criteria of the Temporary Access Trestle As the only Contract document regarding the Trestle, Attachment 3 of Exhibit A of the TG030 Bid Manual has the following instructions: In the second sentence of the second paragraph, the following statement is made, "For the design criteria for the Access Trestle, the Contract Documents and applicable standard shall be referred to." The next sentence states, "All requirements in the Temporary Bridge Specification in the Contract Documents, Section 01 53 13, shall apply to the Access Trestle." Attachment 3 goes on further to provide very specific design load conditions and structural elements (i.e. Deck & barrier) that contradict the requirements of the Temporary bridge Spec Section 01 53 13. Based on the more "Trestle Specific" requirements of Attachment 3 and the interpreted function, being for construction use and not public use, of this type of temporary works structure, BBII and its Engineering Team arrived at the criteria (basis of design) described in the attached memo from PB&A. This document was included with BBII's original design submittal; however for this RFI BBII has expanded some of the explanations. Please review the provided information and confirm whether or not BBII's design criteria is appropriate for the Temporary Access Trestle.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> PMPC response per Roger Rothenburger, 11/01/11: "1. The RFI process is not the appropriate venue to "review the provided information and confirm whether or not BBII's design criteria is appropriate." The RFI requested at the October 12, 2011 meeting was to request clarifying instructions to specific perceptions of conflict between Exhibit A - Attachment 3 and Specification Section 01-53-13 (Temporary Bridges) 2. As for the design criteria, the fourth sentence of "Exhibit A - Attachment 3" is explicit; "All requirements in the Temporary Bridges Specification in the contract Documents, SECTION 01 53 13, shall apply to the Access Trestle." This would include the requirement in Section 01-53-13 Part 1.3.A.1 (Temporary Bridges - Performance - Design Loads) stating the use of seismic design load for 475 year earthquake (earthquake with 10% probability of being exceeded in 50 years), 3. Among other criteria, wood decking material, "wheel stops, hand rails, special working access, etc listed in the balance of Attachment 3 modify the requirements in Section 01-53-13 and are not contradictory. 4. Attachment 3 does not address crash barriers or lateral bracing, among other criteria, which would defer to section 01-53-13. (Temporary Bridges) 5. PMPC recommends a small group meeting of the constructing parties to discuss the technical details to meet as many requirements as possible for BBI to get approval for Zones 1 and 2 and proceed with the Access Trestle work in a timely manner."				

T-0253.1	BSE - Trestle Design Criteria Follow-Up	Closed	11/21/2011	12/01/2011	12/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0254	<p>Reference RFI#T-0253, Attachment 3 of Exhibit A of the TG03 BSE Bid Package, Specification Section 01 53 13, and attached memo from PB&A</p> <p>Follow up to RFI T-0253 and the meeting held 11/16/11</p> <p>As noted in the 11/16/11 meeting, the cross lot bracing "struts" are supported by the Trestle substructure and analysis requires limiting trestle deformations to be compatible with the allowable strut deflections (approximately 2"). As a result the "push over" analysis as required by the AASHTO Seismic Design Criteria "SDC" (requirement of bridge spec 01 53 13) is not applicable. This was discussed in detail during the 11/16 meeting and it was concurred that due to unique structural configuration and deflection requirements, an alternate analysis method other than the SDC would be required. Discussions were had that a site specific elastic analysis using the 475 year seismic loads that is controlled by the deflection limits of the cross lot bracing would be necessary. Please confirm that a "push over" type analysis of SDC will not be required for the trestle and that the attached detailed Design Criteria (and analysis method) is acceptable.</p> <p>(W/O added clarification) BBII believes the site specific analysis would demonstrate the trestle substructure will not deform greater than 2" however the trestle superstructure will deform greater than 2".</p>	Closed	10/20/2011	10/30/2011	11/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>

If the Access Trestle is designed to resist the full 475 year earthquake design requirement with all response being elastic (R=1), then the Access Trestle system is not subjected to inelastic deformation for the design event. If the design is additionally shown to be capable of sustaining significant overload (no connection failures, no weld failures, no member failures, remaining stable under loading corresponding to at least two times the required design load, or corresponding to a ductility demand requiring R=2), then a pushover analysis is not necessary to verify performance. If there are questions raised regarding if this is sufficient, then the response could be demonstration that the system remains fully stable without connection or member failures at a load level corresponding to the deterministic earthquake load corresponding to the maximum event capable of being delivered by the earthquake fault system at the project location. If the design presented is in accordance with the above, then URS would be able to assist with technical engineering discussions to validate this design approach to the City of San Francisco during the building permitting process.

Further clarification: The procurement specification requires an integrated model capturing interaction between the Cross Lot Bracing and the Access Trestle, note the Cross Lot Bracing is not a component against which the trestle reacts but the Cross Slot Bracing delivers load to the Access Trestle. This behavior must be captured with sufficient accuracy and within all project criteria.

If another alternative is proposed that meets all required design criteria at all structure elements, including contractor teams identified maximum allowable deflection of 2 at the Cross Lot Bracing, URS takes no objection to the contractor pursuing this potential design alternative.

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 885 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>- Site meeting with Verizon representative to discuss Verizon configuration.</div>							
T-0256	BSE - CR T-018 Design Omissions	Closed	10/21/2011	10/31/2011	11/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch	Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference CR T-018				1. Emergency egress signage is not required by Contractor.			
Neither the original albeit incomplete CR T-018 dated 9/21/11 or the flurry of subsequent email clarifications furnished the following design omissions required to complete the CR T-018:				2. Lighting: Relocate the two portable street lights installed under EBi contract and connected overhead to the Streetlight circuit on Natoma as shown on EBi demolition drawing D-1084 (NOTE This circuiting was approved by BLHP (Robert Kawano and Roman Muros BLHP 415 - 554-1688. Light #1 install midway along the north south K Rail fence @ 540 Howard. Light #2 install midway of K Rail fence at 580 Howard. Owners of both properties have installed lighting at their exit doors.			
1. Emergency egress signage requirements?				3. Gates and Crashbars are no required at this time - install 10 foot saw horse barricade with signage Private Property - No Trespassing.			
2. Lighting: Location, lumen, schedule, and if emergency lighting is required?				4. Driveway curb cut for 540 Howard will be 12 feet wide, with the centerline placed midpoint between the Fire Hydrant and sidewalk fresh air vent. Curb cut per DPW standard.			
3. Gates & crash bar requirements?							
4. Although the driveway design was not provided until 10/20/11, no dimensions were provided and there are proximity conflict(s) with the fire hydrant relative to the vent & DI.							
Please provide and or remove from scope so the contractor may complete the work.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0257	BSE - Request to Sonic Caliper 20 feet from Projected Bottom of Rock Socket	Closed	10/24/2011	11/03/2011	10/31/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please address the following information request from BBII's sub contractor Becho Inc.:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
"... Becho would like to start performing Sonic Caliper analyses within 20 feet of the projected final bottom elevation of the shaft(s) to expedite the "Drill, Place, Pour" process. In order to continue the Buttress Drilling Operation without interruptions, Becho would like to utilize the hours between 1am - 6am to perform the Sonic Caliper test. For example, if Becho anticipates the completion of shaft at 10am, it would be beneficial to perform the Sonic Caliper test during the hours of 1am - 6am. This allows crews to prep, setup and perform the airlift process without having to wait for Becho engineers to test the shaft(s) during normal hours of operation, thus expediting the "Drill, Place, Pour" process.					George Metzger's response is limited to the first sentence of this RFI which states, "... Becho would like to start performing Sonic Caliper analyses within 20 feet of the projected final bottom elevation of the shaft(s) to expedite the "Drill, Place, Pour" process." Acceptance of permissible work activities between 1am-6am will come in the form of a TJPA Night Noise Permit. Please be sure to include the proposed work activity on the Night Noise Permit application.		
Please advise, if it is acceptable.					----- 10/27/2011 - George Metzger Arup Response: This is acceptable.		
T-0258	BSE - Demolition Status of Pile Cap at GL 33.5	Closed	10/27/2011	11/06/2011	12/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet D-2213 (attached) and Specification Section 02 41 19					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The underlined sections of Notes A and B state that pile caps have already been removed. This area clearly includes the pile cap at GL 33.5. However, Note C implies that the pile cap at GL 33.5 was not removed.					Existing pile caps at GL 33.5 have not been removed. CR to follow		
Please confirm that the existing pile caps have already been removed within the "triangle" line boundary shown on drawing D-2213.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 887 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0259	BSE - Request for approval of alternate backfill compaction inspection method	Closed	10/31/2011	11/08/2011	12/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification Section 32 12 17					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
With regard to the areas of non-conforming backfill compaction inspection i.e. FCR #TCB-00246: In lieu of contemporaneous compaction inspection by ISI, BBII has proposed the methodology described in attached letter #4225-000-00238. Please confirm the alternate methodology, assuming acceptable results, would suffice to meet the contract requirements.					The proposed methodology will be evaluated pending receipt of the test results.		
					Submit test results for review and evaluation.		
T-0260	BSE - D.I. Installation at Natoma Street and First Street	Closed	11/01/2011	11/11/2011	11/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3012 and attached sketch					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
BBII carried out an investigation of the active catch basin around the perimeter of the BSE project; and has a concern regarding the street elevation relative to the flow line on Natoma Street between GL 10-17.					The referenced decommissioned CB at the north west corner of Natoma and First streets was to be protected in place per RUP documents.		
The flow line directs surface water in a North East direction towards First Street. The only active catch basin at the intersection of Natoma and First Street is CB #305, which is approximately +8.5" higher than the currently decommissioned CB located at the intersection of Natoma St and First St (see sketch attached).					AECOM understands that the CB was decommissioned by BSE contractor in accordance with D-2230 Detail 1 and not RUP as claimed. D-2230 Detail 1 states (E) sewers, MH(s) and CB(s) are to remain active until construction of (N) CDSM perimeter shoring wall along northern end of site.		
Noted during the last rain fall, surface water was directed to the decommissioned catch basin at the North East corner of Natoma Street and First Street intersection, BBII recorded approximately 6" of standing rain water accumulating at First Street and Natoma intersection. Please note that existing catch basin was decommissioned during the new sewer installation on First Street (see attached mark up drawing).					The decommissioned CB is within the excavation site. In accordance with the specifications referenced in the Recommendation section (i.e. 011560 STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION, EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL) submit for review storm water control plans indicating contractor's method of addressing storm water entering the site in accordance with 011560 1.4.		
BBII recommends 2 options to control rain water from outside the BSE work area: A) modify the flow line on Natoma Street to direct the flow toward CB # 305,							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 888 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0260.1	B) Install a new catch basin and connect it to the existing lateral connection CB # 305 to the combine sewer system, or connect directly to the existing MH.						
	Please advise on TJPA method to prevent water collecting on First Street.						
	BSE - D.I. Installation at Natoma Street and First Street	Closed	11/28/2011	12/08/2011	12/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal				Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu		
	REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0260 and Sheet U-3012 (attached) RFI response T-0260 does not address the issue request information, to resolve the surface water from outside the BSE project. BBII recommend a catch basin should be installed at the corner of Natoma and First Street, as part of BBII storm water control. The catch basin will need to be installed at the low point of Natoma Street, across from CB #305. BBII request confirmation and approval to install a catch basin at the above location. Also confirm the lateral from the new catch basin can discharge directly into SSMH#305.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	The contractor shall control storm water in accordance with specification 01 15 61 and approved submittals. Per field walk by Turner on 12/02/11 and prior to return of this RFI, it was observed that the contractor had installed measures that appear to have resolved this issue.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 890 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Specification 31 63 33 RFI T-0262 Please provide the CAD file for Micropile "Exclusion Zones," if they differ from the exclusion zones subjected to RFI # T-262.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The exclusion zones provided in response to RFI T-262 do not apply to micropiles (detail 1/S1 - 3003). Please reference IFB - Below Grade package for coordination of micropile layout and submit micropile design and coordinated layout for review by design team via submittal process per Specifications.			
T-0263	BSE - Strut Conflicts to Thornton Tomasetti's comments on the approved Internal		Closed	11/09/2011	11/19/2011	11/17/2011	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference RFI #T-0251.1 and Transmittal No. 140-02329 Subsequent to W/O's receipt of an approved 100% internal bracing submittal and procurement, Thornton Tomasetti's comments in the plans transmitted via Transmittal #140-02329 added both columns & dimensions and revised column configurations relative to the location of the internal bracing struts not otherwise included in the base contract BSE documents. So as W/O may accurately coordinate strut locations in order to mitigate conflicts, please provide the minimum allowable dimension from column to strut.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TT's response to RFI No. T-0263: This is a means and methods topic. GC to coordinate clearance requirements.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0264	BSE - Bridge / Trestle Piles in Exclusion Zones	Closed	11/09/2011	11/19/2011	11/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			See the attached TT response.				
Reference RFI#T-0251.1 and Specification Section 01 53 13							
BBII is in receipt of the drawings included in RFI T-251.1 that illustrate trestle pile "exclusion zones" where piles cannot penetrate the mat slab. Of the 24 piles that are currently in conflict with the pile exclusion zones, 20 of them can be relocated with relatively minor member changes. The other 4 as indicated in the attached drawings will require significant redesign and re-procurement, especially at the bridges. Can an exception be made at these four locations?							
T-0264.1	BSE - Beale St Bridge Pile Conflict (Follow up to RFI T-264)	Closed	01/26/2012	02/05/2012	02/03/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			ARUP Response:				
Reference: BBI Marked-Up SKS-0135, SH-3103							
The previous response to RFI T-264 requested BBII move one of the Beale St. Bridge piles 3' west to avoid mat slab reinforcing congestion. BBII has investigated this request and found that the cap beam already has a significant cantilever on the east side of the pile in question. In order to comply with the request to move the pile, we would have to extend the cap beam and support it off the CDSM wall as shown on the attached sketch. Please advise if this is acceptable, otherwise the pile will need to remain in its current position.			This cannot be evaluated properly by Arup without more information regarding the loads on the shoring wall. Contractor shall submit calculations for review. Calculations shall include the load, if any, which will be imposed on the shoring wall due to settlement of the bridge supports.				
			Note that we have not yet seen the calculations and details for the bridge abutments at the north and south ends of the bridges.				
T-0264.2	Beale St Bridge Pile Conflict (Follow up to RFI T-264.1)	Closed	02/08/2012	02/18/2012	02/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:**REQUEST:**

The response to RFI T-264.1 requested BBII provide the loading that would be placed onto the CDSM wall. This response leads us to believe that the option to leave the pile in the current location was unacceptable. Please confirm that the pile must be moved and provide a detailed location of where the pile placement would be accepted. Upon receipt of this information BBII can accurately determine the load to be placed on the Wall for Arup's review.

SUGGESTION:**ANSWER:****Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The bridge pier near 35-E must be relocated. See attached SKS-0179 for acceptable range of pier shift.

T-0264.3**BSE -Bridge-Trestle Piles in Exclusion Zones Beale St****Closed****08/13/2012****08/23/2012****08/17/2012****Potentially****From:** Webcor Construction LP

Kirk Nielsen

To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger**Co-Author:****REQUEST:**

W/O in receipt of RFI response T-0264.2 (Exhibit-A). BBII is purporting any shift of the "bent-3" East pile West will cause excessive bridge cantilevering to the extent the Beale St. bridge must be reconfigured (less the sidewalk) and relocated (East) atop the CDSM wall.

Since the issuance of the TG03 package a third pit for an oil & sand interceptor appears to have been added in room B2761 reference:

1. TG06 4/P1-3006 (Exhibit-B) room B2761 floor plan
2. TG03 1/S1-2027 & C/S1-3004 (Exhibit-C) for original room configuration
3. TG06 1/S1-2057 & 2/S1-3007 (Exhibit-D) for revised room configuration

Please reference marked-up sheet S1-3007 (Exhibit-E). W/O is unaware of why the bridge pile could not be located 12" off the edge of the sump pit as depicted. The corner of the oil & sand interceptor pit which is shallow and could easily be formed, reinforced, and poured after the bridge pile is removed.

Please advise.

SUGGESTION:**ANSWER:****Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TT will allow the proposed location of the "bent-3" East pile along grid E as depicted in Exhibit E (pile is east of the sump pit and the edge of pile is 12" from the east face of pit). Note that a pile in this location will require the pile to be cut off at a lower elevation than the typical detail, which will involve a larger block-out. The mat shall be re-braced at the block-out by TG03. Acceptance of this pile location will result in a Change Order for TG06.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 893 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0264.4	BSE - Inquiries with Regard to Proposed Beale St Bridge Atop East CDSM Wall	Closed	08/22/2012	09/01/2012	08/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
On 8/22/12 Beale St. bridge submittal #TG0300-206 was returned to W/O marked not reviewed (Exhibit-A). Upon W/O's review of BBII's Beale St. bridge design W/O encountered the following inquiries relative to the CDSM wall:				VOID - SEE RFI T-0305			
1. BBII's bridge design relies on ARUP's RFI response #T-0209.3 (Exhibit-B). Please confirm ARUP's RFI response #T-0209.3 (Exhibit-C) is applicable as the basis of the design for the Beale St. bridge, given unlike First and Fremont Streets, the length of the Beale St. bridge is resting atop the East CDSM wall.							
2. The decision to allow the North and South bridge abutments to be located atop the CDSM wall was predicated on the CR #T-025 load testing reference RFI #T-0209.4 (Exhibit-D). Given the testing was performed on different soldier piles (by others) and differing soil conditions between Zone-1 and Zone-4, is the load capacity derived from the CR #T-025 testing applicable given the different bridge location and configuration?							
3. BBII's Beale St. bridge design relies on resting the length of the Beale St. bridge atop the East CDSM wall. As the designer of the CDSM wall, does ARUP endorse further loading of the East CDSM wall with the forces imposed by the Beale St. bridge?							
<hr/>							
T-0264.5	BSE - Inquiries Regarding Proposed Beale St Bridge Relative to Below Grade Stru	Closed	08/23/2012	09/02/2012	08/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: TG0300-206 Beale St. Bridge Structural Design				VOID- SEE RFI T-0305			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>On 8/22/12 Beale St. Bridge submittal TG0300-206 was returned to W/O marked not reviewed. In lieu of piers the proposed bridge relies on the eastern shoring wall for structural support along the bridge. As a result, the design utilizes the additional capacity of the internal bracing to restrain lateral loads imposed by the bridge.</p> <p>Upon W/O's review of BBII's Beale St. bridge design W/O encountered the following inquiries relative to below grade structure:</p> <p>-Do the below grade foundation walls as designed have the additional capacity required to support the lateral loads imposed by the proposed Beale St. bridge?</p> <p>-Will the below grade foundation walls be required to achieve additional strength prior to removal of re-bracing as a result of the additional laterals loads in which they are subjected by the proposed Beale Street bridge?</p>						
T-0264.6	BSE - Pedestrian Connection Across the Construction Excavation at Beale St.	Closed	08/23/2012	09/02/2012	08/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: TG0300-221 BBI - Temp Bridges - Civil and Drainage Plan - Beale St				VOID - SEE RFI T-0306			
Contrary to specification section 01 53 13.1.2.A BBII's proposed Beale St. bridge utilizes an on-grade sidewalk for pedestrian travel though the parcel "Lot-N". Please confirm this is acceptable and that no other pedestrian connection across the construction excavation at Beale St. will be required for the entire required life of the bridge.							
<hr/>							
T-0264.7	BSE - Beale Street Bridge Layout	Closed	10/03/2012	10/03/2012	10/11/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 895 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<div><div>REQUEST:<p>Per TCCO Request RFI being submitted in lieu of a submittal:</p><p>Based on the response to Webcor Submittal No. TG0300-206.1, BBII has shifted the bridge superstructure west between the grid lines 34 and 34.8 beams as directed. This necessitates the installation of 2 rows of 5 bridge columns as shown in the attached drawings. The west row will be located 7' east of GL 34 and the east row will be located a further 25' east as shown. All 10 columns have been positioned clear of the internal bracing. The sidewalk will be located in Lot N.</p><p>There are two options for the location of east bridge column 3 as shown in the attached layout drawing.</p><p>- Option 1 is the preferred option. This is located on E line 10'-6" west of Grid line 35 (Pile exclusion zone penetration approved via response to RFI 264.3).</p><p>- Option 2 is located a further 5' west of option 1 to the location on the TG-06 drawing. The impacts of option 2 to the superstructure are not known at this time. The irregular alignment of the eastern row of piles in option 2 will create local stress concentration in both the diaphragm and superstructure in the longitudinal seismic analysis. This is not a preferable configuration.</p><p>Please confirm the location of the superstructure and the piles. Advise on the location of east bridge pile 3.</p></div><div>T-0265 BSE - TG03 BSE CDSM Cut-off Wall From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: REQUEST:<p>Reference Drawings GT-2102, GT-2103, QBD TG0300-0098</p><p>Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. (BBII) is planning to start dewatering and excavation without installing cut-off walls</p></div><div>Nhi Tran</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER:<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p><p>Note that for Option 1, the accepted location in RFI 264.3 was based on an edge of a sump pit, which locates the centerline of bridge pier 10'-1 3/4" west of grid line 35 (not 10'-6"). However, the response for RFI 264.3 is still applicable for a centerline of pier location 10'-6" west of grid line 35.</p><p>The Option 2 location (15'-6" west of grid line 35) has been accepted via RFI 264.2.</p><p>Please notify Design Team of selected option.</p><p>Any cost impact for the two proposed locations shall be reviewed with TJPA prior to moving forward with the work.</p></div></div>	<div><div>Closed</div><div>11/09/2011</div></div>	<div><div>11/19/2011</div><div>11/17/2011</div></div>	<div><div>Potentially</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>	<div><div><input type="checkbox"/></div></div>	
	<div><div>REQUEST:<p>Reference Drawings GT-2102, GT-2103, QBD TG0300-0098</p><p>Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. (BBII) is planning to start dewatering and excavation without installing cut-off walls</p></div><div>Co-Author:</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER:<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p><p>ARUP Response:</p><p>These cut-off walls were shown on the drawings at the request of the Contractor during preconstruction review. The installation of these, or not, is at the</p></div></div>	<div><div>Closed</div><div>11/09/2011</div></div>	<div><div>11/19/2011</div><div>11/17/2011</div></div>	<div><div>Potentially</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>	<div><div><input type="checkbox"/></div></div>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 896 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0266	BSE - Moratorium Conflict With Phase 2 Utilities In 1st Street	Closed	11/23/2011	11/23/2011	12/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams					
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Jeff Molloy							
REQUEST: BBII is in receipt of the moratorium waiver expire date of 12-09-2011. BBII/PEC will not be able to complete the Phase II utility work by 12/9/11 without accelerating the schedule. Our original request for extension was December 19, 2011. A 12/9/11 completion date may be achievable if PEC is allowed to work 10 hr shifts during the day beginning 11/28 through 12/2 as well as working on 12/3 and 12/4. In addition, we propose to have a separate night crew to work near / around the Minna Street intersection to alleviate impacts to heavy demand of day traffic. The majority, if not all, of the demolition can occur during the dday to mitigate noise at night. The night work would need to begin on 11/28 and run through 12/2. Please keep in mind that implenting an accelerated schedule may also impact PG&E. We have no control over their work and the completion of the utility tie-ins and Mandral testing is contingent on PG&E's availability per the new adjusted completion date. In summary we are requesting direction for the following items to meet the 12/9/11 moratorium deadline: 1) W/O to permit BBII / PEC to work the extended hours, and night shift i.e. 10 Hours Days and Night work operations, 2) Permit from MTA to extend working hours (closure times) during the day 3) Permit from MTA and DPW to work at night within lane closures 4) Permit from TJPA to work in Zones 1 & 2 at night 5) Agreement / Approval for compensation of additional		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Holiday Moratorium waiver is extended to 12/21/11 by SFMTA. BBII/PEC work can continue on day shift Monday-Friday in accord with SFMTA Special Traffic Permit 11-7786 issued on 12/2/11.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 897 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>cost (premium time and or shift rate) BBII will have magnitude of cost for the Monday morning discussion</p> <p>We respectively request a meeting with W/O on Monday morning (11-28-2011) to discuss direction regarding the above items.</p>							
T-0269	BSE - Mass Excavation Pile Extraction Clarification	Closed	12/13/2011	12/23/2011	12/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		David Fields	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Dean Wallahan					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: 31 00 00 1.4 C.2 and Attached Sketch							
31 00 00 1.4.C.2 Pile Extraction - To occur in two (2) stages per Zone.		ARUP Response:					
Stage 1 extraction will remove the piles within the footprint of the trestle the middle 60' of the work zone, dewatering wells and piles that are in conflict with the bracing pin pile locations. Piles will be removed using a non ground deformation control method and be removed full length to be utilized for offsite LEED projects and to help achieve sustainability for this material.		The method described is not in accordance with the Contract Documents which require the existing piles to be removed using Ground Deformation Control Methods (as defined in 02 41 19) except where Non-Ground Deformation Control Methods are allowed and noted as such on the drawings.					
Trestle piles will be installed after Stage 1 pile extraction and concurrently with Stage 2 pile extraction.		The method described is acceptable with the following notes: this is acceptable for timber piles only, and if they are longer than 30 feet, Arup may re-evaluate the methods used. If the density of existing piles exceeds 30 piles per 1000 square feet, Arup may re-evaluate the methods used. If excessive ground movements are observed, the Contractor shall switch to using a Ground Deformation Control Method.					
Stage 2 extraction will remove the piles within the 50' +- area adjacent to the CDSM walls along A and J lines. Piles will be extracted using a ground deformation control method as per Section 02 41 19 - 3.1.B of the specifications utilizing both casing and backfilling of the void or removal by means of cutting the pile off at the grade of each level of excavation as the work proceeds.							
Please reference the attached drawing for details of the above procedure.							
The 80 Natoma shoring wall will be removed in stages coinciding with the stages of excavation.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 899 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0269.2	BSE - Zone 2 Free Pull Pile Extraction Test Section	Closed	05/01/2012	05/11/2012	05/04/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: BBII 4/30/12 Ground Deformation Control Drawing			The test set-up and monitoring are acceptable. Since they differ from that used in the area of the buttress, Arup will draw conclusions on the suitability of free pulling outside the trestle zone after we evaluate the test results.				
BBII are proposing to perform "free pull" pile extraction on a "test section" in Zone 2. The proposed piles will be extracted near GL14, close to CDSM wall on the north side using a "non ground deformation control method" by free pulling each pile without using steel casing. Inclinometer (I-011) located close to GL 14 will be monitored during the test. This test section will give the information needed to determine: 1) If free pulling the piles using a non ground deformation control method affects the CDSM wall by causing movement. 2) If it is a suitable method to adopt for removing the remainder of the piles in Zone 2 located outside the "trestle area". The attached drawing conveys the test section in green. Please advise on the suitability of this test to determine if free pulling can be used outside the trestle zone.							

T-0269.3	BSE - Zone 2 Pile Extraction Test Section	Closed	06/15/2012	06/25/2012	06/21/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
BBII completed the timber pile extraction test section in zone 2 on 06/12/2012. Based on the data recorded by ARUP inclinometers, please advise if BBII can continue with the timber pile extraction in Zone 2 using non ground deformation control methods ("free pull").			See attached memo for Arup's review of the Contractor's test program and proposed method of removing piles, and actions required by the Contractor going forward.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0269.4	BSE Zones 3/4 Pile Extraction Methodology	Closed	09/27/2012	10/07/2012	10/05/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please confirm ARUP's 9/25/12 verbal revision to RFI response T-0269.3, to employ the originally specified ground deformation control method (not free pull) when pulling timber piles between: Soldier piles 251 and 276 & between A-line and the north edge of the access trestle.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Arup confirms this verbal revision.		
					The Contractor shall employ the originally specified ground deformation control method (not free pull) when pulling timber piles in the portion of Zone 3 and Zone 4 which is defined by soldier pile 251 to the west and soldier pile 276 to the east, and A-line to the north and the north edge of the trestle to the south.		
					Additionally, due to the excessive movements caused by the timber pile pulling in the southwest corner of Zone 3, the Contractor shall revert to using the original timber pile pulling as specified in the construction documents for removal of any piles within 30 feet of the CDSM shoring wall.		
T-0269.5	BSE Zone 3 & 4 Pile Extraction Methodology	Closed	10/10/2012	10/20/2012	10/12/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Dean Wallahan To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Specification Reference: 02 41 19 Drawing Reference: GT-2102 / GT-2103					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The response to RFI # T-0269.4 says to revert to using timber pile pulling as specified in the contract documents.					Arup confirms this verbal revision.		
Per notes on GT-2102 and GT-2103, non-ground deformation control methods (free pull) can be used between Grid Lines 20 and 24.					The Contractor shall employ the originally specified ground deformation control method (not free pull) when pulling timber piles in the portion of Zone 3 and Zone 4 which is defined by soldier pile 251 to the west and soldier pile 276 to the east, and A-line to the north and the north edge of the trestle to the south.		
Upon field conversations, please confirm BBII's interpretation of the designer's intent is correctly shown on the attached drawing.					Additionally, due to the excessive movements caused by the timber pile pulling in the southwest corner of Zone 3, the Contractor shall revert to using the original timber pile pulling as specified in the construction documents for removal of any piles within 30 feet of the CDSM shoring wall.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 901 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0269.6	BSE Zone 3 & 4 Pile Extraction Methodology	Closed	10/15/2012	10/25/2012	10/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Specification Reference: 02 41 19 Drawing Reference : GT-2102 & GT-2103					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm that the direction is to excavate and cut timber piles for all remaining timber piles.					Refer to the Specification 02-41-19 Pile Removal. Due to contractors inability to control settlement and increased vibration levels using the non ground deformation control methods contractor is directed to use Spec Paragraph 3.1B. Refer also to SPEC 01-35-65 MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING.		
T-0269.7	BSE - Timber pile extraction method in the footprint of the Zone-4 trestle	Closed	04/11/2013	04/21/2013	04/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: GT-2102, GT-2103					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm ARUP's 4/10/13 verbal comment that the contractor may the use non-ground deformation method (free pulling) for Zone-4 timber piles in the footprint of the trestle.					In Zone 4, timber piles which are in the footprint of trestle piles may be extracted using non-ground deformation method (free pulling).		
T-0270	BSE - Clarification for Existing Ground Water Elevation	Closed	12/28/2011	01/07/2012	12/30/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Arup Kevin Clinch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Jeff Molloy							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 31-23-29 and Attached Document					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
As discussed during the meeting on 12/22/11, to help obtain an accurate dewatering model, BBII is requesting the recent piezometer data for Zones 1 and 2. In addition, BBII has reviewed the data for piezometers 1182, 1229 and 1255 located adjacent to 301 Mission St (see attachment) and would like to clarify the initial ground water level to use in the model for Zone 4. Based on our review, the existing natural groundwater condition fluctuates between 1.6 E.L and -8.1 E.L in this area. BBII would like to agree upon a starting groundwater elevation of -5.0 E.L for Zone 4.					ARUP Response:		
Also, BBII would like clarification as to the base					Available piezometer data for zone 1 and 2 has been recently transmitted through an email to Turner dated 12/28/2011.		
					The baseline water level for piezo P-06F (aka 1262) is +1.6 ft NAVD88.		
					The baseline water level for piezo P-06MS (aka 1182) is +1.1 ft NAVD88.		
					The baseline water level for piezo P-07MS (aka 1229) is +1.0 ft NAVD88.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 902 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	groundwater level to use for Zones 1, 2 and 3 based on the project data.						
						Additional baseline data will need to be collected in the piezometers in Zone 1 and 2 prior to establishing a baseline datum.	
T-0271	BSE - CRT-021 Gate Fence Clarifications	Closed	01/05/2012	01/05/2012	01/10/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields	To: Turner Construction Company Gwynne Powell	Answered By:	Turner Construction Comp	Jack Adams		
	Co-Author: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams						
	REQUEST: In regards to the Proposed Driveway shown on the CRT#021 drawing and outlined in Bullets #1 and #2 in the Scope of Work, please clarify the following: -Per the location of the 18ft Gate, a 10ft fence would need to be constructed to connect the existing 9ft tall fence to the Proposed Driveway gate location (see 1/4/12 Photo attached). Please confirm the 10ft fence should be included in this CRT-021. -Should the 24'-10" section of the existing 6ft tall fence (see 1/4/12 Photo attached) be replaced? Confirm Howard St shown on the CRT#021 attached drawing should read "Folsom St" Confirm that Bullet #3 under the "Scope of Work" refers to Gate #1 in the CRT#021 attached drawing.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Proposed Driveway, Gate and Fence shown on the CRT#021 drawing: -Not Confirmed. The location of new gate and curb cut is where the Contractor is currently driving trucks and equipment over city sidewalk and curb north of this light pole. Contractor has misinterpreted the locations of curb cut and gate provided by TJPA. The location of proposed driveway curb cut and new gate is to be north of existing light pole as shown - dimensions were provided only as guidance. - Confirmed the added fence cost should be included in this CR T-021. Contractor to add small section of fence as required to install new gate (fence added both north and south side of gate). Fence can be nine foot and align with top of existing Parcel P'-P" fence and/or step down to align with existing 6 foot fence. Note: green slats are to be eliminated at both gate and fence in this area to assist Truck Drivers and pedestrian vision. -Not Confirmed. Section of the existing 6ft tall fence up to AC Transit Fence corner is acceptable as is. - Confirmed. "Howard St" shown on the CRT#021 attached drawing should read "Folsom St" . - Confirmed. Bullet #3 under the "Scope of Work"	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 904 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0272.1	BSE - D1 Casing Recovery Inquiries	Closed	01/27/2012	02/06/2012	01/27/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen		To: Arup	Kevin Clinch		Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
BBII is requesting the following to complete its D1 casing retrieval plan:		ARUP Response:					
1. Condition specific engineering calculations to mitigate earth and water heave from the bottom of the casing.		Arup is in receipt of the Contractor's Buttress Shaft D1 Casing Retrieval Plan (Constructware Transmittal item 140-03134). Designing and executing the plan to retrieve the casing is the Contractor's responsibility. The Contractor shall provide calculations for Arup to review which demonstrate that the method does not lead to ground loss beneath and around the casing. Arup will not provide calculations in support of the Contractor's plan.					
2. Condition specific engineering calculations to substantiate no casing buckling.							
3. Condition specific plan engineering calculations for dewatering, specifically expected water quantity.							
Note - This RFI is high priority and an expedited review/response is necessary.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 905 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>installed within compliance with the DPW and ADA standards. DPW/Tumer/W/0 and BBII discussed various solutions to bring the driveway into confmmance with ADA and DPW standards at the field meeting held on January 17th 2012 and again 01/24//2012. Pursuant to the field meeting and direction of CRT-018R2, BBII is requesting detailed plans to allow for construction of a compliant driveway at 540 Howard Street. BBII has been directed in the field by W /0/Tumer, to complete modification to the driveway at 540 Howard Street. Per our field meeting please refer to the attached drawing, indicating BBII understanding on the modifications required. Please confirm the modification per the attached drawing is compliant with City and ADA driveway standards.</p>						
T-0274	BSE - Conflict between CDSM & Dewatering specification	Closed	02/10/2012	02/20/2012	02/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Arup		Kevin Clinch		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>Section 31 56 13.3.12.F.1 states "The performance of the shoring wall shall be such that the groundwater levels around the excavation are maintained within (3.0) feet from the pre-excavation levels." The section further states "In the event the water levels begin to drop below the specified limit, the Contractor shall be responsible to implement appropriate measures to control groundwater levels within the specified limits."</p>			ARUP Response:		<p>Recharging wells may be used at the Contractor's discretion pending Arup's review of the well details.</p> <p>These wells shall be at no additional cost to the TJPA</p>		
<p>Section 31 23 19.1.5.B.10 states "Include description of emergency procedures to follow when system failure or other problems arise."</p>							
<p>In the event the CDSM wall fails to mitigate the effects of the dewatering within the excavation should not previously drilled recharge wells be ready to recharge the affected area outside the excavation?</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0275	BSE - Request for relief from 1" deep dimension of CDSM cavities	Closed	02/15/2012	02/25/2012	02/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Fields				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Section 31 00 00.3.8.L states "On vertical surfaces of CDSM shoring walls, scarify high areas and fill in cavities exceeding 1" deep with patching cement to provide a reasonably uniform surface over which protection board, installed in a later contract, will span without buckling." The trade subcontractor is seeking relief from the 1" deep requirement. Please advise as to: 1. Acceptance. 2. Revised dimension.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI does not comply with the RFI definition in Spec 00 07 00 Section 6.02. WOJV must comply with Spec 31 00 00 Section 3.8.L.		
T-0275.1	BSE - Request for relief from 1" deep dimension of CDSM	Closed	02/16/2012	02/26/2012	02/17/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Section 31 00 00.3.8.L states "On vertical surfaces of CDSM shoring walls, scarify high areas and fill in cavities exceeding 1" deep with patching cement to provide a reasonably uniform surface over which protection board, installed in a later contract, will span without buckling." The trade subcontractor is seeking relief from the 1" deep requirement. Please advise as to: 1. Acceptance. 2. Revised dimension.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> WOJV must comply with Spec 31 00 00 Section 3.8.L.		
T-0276	BSE - Request to Change Buttress Concrete Slump Requirements	Closed	02/16/2012	02/26/2012	02/17/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Emre Erzen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Arup Kevin Clinch				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 31 63 29 Currently, the primary and the secondary shafts utilize a superplasticizer to achieve slump as the water content of the mixes is low. Typically, mixes that utilize a					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 907 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0277	BSE - Request for Buttress Shaft Design Documentation	Closed	02/16/2012	02/26/2012	02/23/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Emre Erzen			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
REQUEST: Please address the following information request from BBII's sub contractor Becho Inc.: " ... Becho requests to obtain all and any documentation used in the design of the Buttress Shafts. Documentation should include, but is not limited to, submitted and approved calculations, sketches, preliminary designs and calculations, conceptual drawings, all site investigation, and all other work documents and work papers that were utilized to develop the buttress shaft design in addition to what's provided in the contract documents and specifications. " Please advise, if it is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The request for documents contained in this RFI is rejected as overly broad, burdensome and seemingly unrelated to any legitimate enquiry relating to the contract or the required work. This is not the proper use of an RFI.				
T-0277.1	BSE - Becho's 2nd Request for Buttress Design Doc	Closed	03/23/2012	04/02/2012	03/28/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
REQUEST: Becho requests to obtain all work documents, sketches, preliminary calculations and approved calculations which show how the designer arrived the final skin friction values used in the design of the buttress shafts as well as the buttress shafts minimum 10 feet embedment into bedrock.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per the TJPA, refer to response given in RFI T-0277.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0277.2	BSE - Request for Buttress Shaft Design Documentation	Closed	04/04/2012	04/14/2012	04/11/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Transbay PMPC Douglas Jacobson	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per the agreement at the 4/4/12 TCCO Progress Meeting BSE Buttress Shoring and Excavation please find Becho's Request for additional design documentation below:			We are able to reply to a more specific information request. Per Contract Spec 00 03 20 - GEOTECHNICAL DATA, sections 1.2 A.1 and 1.3 A.1 and A.2, three documents (listed below) are available for the Contractor to review. Please specify which report is requested.				
Becho is in receipt of RFI # T-0277.1 regarding the Buttress Shaft Design Documentation. As per the TJPA response, Becho more specifically requests the Reference Shoring Design work documents pertinent to zone 4.			00 03 20 1.2 A.1 Transbay Transit Center, Final Geotechnical Data Report, Volumes 1, 2, and 3. Transbay Joint Powers Authority. Prepared by Arup North America Limited, February 2010.				
			00 03 20 1.3 A.1 Final Report, Results of Prototype Test Program, Installation of Shoring Walls Using the Cement Deep Soil Mixing Method. Transbay Transit Center, Prepared by Arup North America Limited, May 2010.				
			00 03 20 1.3 A.2 Final Report, Results of Prototype Test Program and Monitoring during Construction of Drilled Shafts. Transbay Transit Center, Prepared by Arup North America Limited, May 2010.				
T-0278	BSE - Access Trestle Bump Out Coordination	Closed	02/16/2012	02/26/2012	02/24/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: Attached BII Sketch Due to the deletion of the "Natoma Finger" portion of the access trustle BBII is proposing to install additional "bump outs" (per the attached sketch). For coordination purposes, please provide "no fly" zone information for these locations.			Arup understands that the design team's response to RFI-251.1 shows the "no-fly-zones". Contractor shall refer to the RFI-251.1 response for this information. Regarding the addition of the "bumpouts", Arup will review the geotechnical aspects of the revised design when they are submitted.				
T-0279	BSE - Trestle Welding Code Compatibility	Closed	02/27/2012	03/08/2012	03/20/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:URS Corporation David Fyfe	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 909 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference:
ASHTO/AWSS D1.5M/D1.5:2008
SH-0200

The Temporary Access Trestle Design submitted in December specified AWS 01.1 as the required welding code. During the review process the reviewers requested that the welding code be changed to AWS 01.5- Bridge Welding Code. This request was complied with by revising general note A5.2 on the conformed trestle drawings.

Since issuing these documents, BBII has been informed by both our shop and field welding inspectors that a compatibility discrepancy exists between the 01.5 welding code and base metals/ member shapes originally specified in the trestle design.

D1.5 is specifically intended for use on bridges and it is not intended for use on "structures composed of structural tubing" as noted in section 1.1.1 attached. This causes a discrepancy because unlike most bridges, our trestle contains a substructure completely comprised of structural steel tubing. (ie Pipe pile, lateral and longitudinal X-bracing).

In addition to the pipe incompatibility, there is also an incompatibility between the specified base metals. 01.5 requires base metals to be ASTM A709 and the trestle design specified a variety of different base metals depending on their structural shape as shown in general note 2.28 also attached. Since Article 1.1.1 of 01.5 permits the Engineer to choose to reference an alternate applicable welding standard when fabrication or structure components are not specifically addressed within its sections, BBII proposes keeping AWS 01.1 as the specified welding code because of its base metal compatibility, but adding a supplemental trestle specific welding specification written by the EOR that increases the quality control to a level equal to that of 01.5. This supplemental specification will include applicable portions of 01.5 section 3 "Workmanship" and section 3 "Inspection" when the requirements are greater than that of 01.1. (ie: fit-up tolerances, NOT frequency, etc).

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

URS Response to RFI No. T-0279 Trestle Welding Code Compatibility:

A series of typographic errors occur within the RFI, referencing the AWS documents D1.1 and D1.5 as 01.1 or 01.5. References to AWS documents should be correctly identified by the correct AWS document numbers to avoid any future confusion within the project documentation. This RFI should be corrected or annotated to reflect these typographic errors.

No exception has been taken to use tubular steel elements as components within the trestle structures.

Note AWS D1.5 section 1.2.2 Approved Base Metals: This AWS section provides a list of approved base metals, and prefaces this with Unless otherwise specified, and furthermore specifically states Other steels may be approved by the Engineer. We understand other steels have been recommended for approval by the Engineer (EOR = Pirooz Barar of PB&A) as they are included for use in the set of contract drawings for the Access Trestle. With the recommendation by the EOR and concurrence by the Peer Reviewer that the base metals proposed for use are suitable for the intended usage including an assessment of fatigue and potential for cracking of welding for the required service loading an service life, URS takes no exception to the use of the alternate base metals.

Use of AWS D1.5 is a requirement of the procurement specification, not simply a request made by technical reviewers. Reference 01 53 13 Rev 1.

Where materials within the trestle structure are not addressed by AWS D1.5, then use of AWS D1.1 is approved for connection of these elements where D1.5 is not applicable as follows:

Where preapproved joint geometry for welding is required, geometry in accordance with preapproved welding procedures per AWS D1.1 are approved for use;

Page: 910 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 911 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0279.1	BSE - Trestle Welding Code Compatibility	Closed	03/28/2012	04/07/2012	04/09/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: BBII Demarcation Sketch PB&A Trestle Welding Inspection Plan			Use of AWS D1.1 and AWS D1.5 for superstructure and substructure as indicated on bridge cross section figure prepared by BBII and attached to this RFI No. T-0279.1 is acceptable.				
The response to RFI T-279 provided a method of dealing with the trestle welding code compatibility issues that would be difficult to enforce, track and document. BBII proposes making a clear demarcation line at the bottom the cap beam that will clearly differentiate the two welding codes.			Submission of the Trestle Welding Inspection Plan (by PB&A and attached to this RFI No. T-0279.1) for review and acceptance via the RFI process is not an acceptable method, therefore we have no comment on it.				
Additionally the RFI response appears to infer that the Temporary Bridge Specification 01-53-13 requires full compliance with AWS D1.5 as described in the third and last paragraph. 01-53-13 Paragraph 1.6.H (revB) only requires Welding Qualifications (procedures and personnel) to be performed in accordance with AWS D1.5.			For clarity we respond to the welding inspection plan with the following: All requirements, including inspection, of AWS D1.1 apply to AWS D1.1 areas. All requirements, including inspection, of AWS D1.5 apply to AWS D1.5 areas.				
Therefore in order to comply with the project specifications and the appropriate welding codes, BBII will Perform all welding below the demarcation line (substructure) with weld procedures and welder qualifications in conformance with AWS D1.1 since the members are predominately comprised of tubular material.							
Perform all welding above the demarcation line (superstructure) with weld procedures and welder qualifications conformance with AWS D1.5 since the main members are Wide flange beam.							
Inspection will be performed by the project special inspector in accordance with recommendations of the EOR attached.							
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
<hr/>							
T-0280	BSE - Request to shorten depth on shaft D/1	Closed	02/29/2012	03/10/2012	03/02/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 912 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Ref - Attached RFI from BBI/Becho</p> <p>Due to the blowout conditions previously encountered on Buttress Shaft D1, BECHO requests to install Shaft D1 to a depth of 180 feet as previously proposed by ARUP. BECHO believes the blowout condition still exists and thus would like to proceed with caution to prevent another occurrence. Alternatively, if ARUP feels this is no longer an option, BECHO requests that ARUP increase the maximum spacing allowed between the tangent shafts, in event to mitigate possible schedule delay, and/or re-break of casing while advancing D1. By allowing such changes will help mitigate Buttress shaft schedule.</p> <p>W/O acknowledges that BBII has yet to demonstrate that a "blowout" condition has in fact occurred. W/O would request the design team consider short pouring D-1 due to drilling difficulties encountered. Alternatively, W/O would request the spacing revision described above.</p>						
T-0281	BSE - Survey Site Drawing and Certificate Submittal	Closed	03/06/2012	03/16/2012	03/09/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Danny Walsh To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
BBIII is unclear on what is required for the "site drawing and certificate" submittal listed in section 01 10 50 1.3B. As the first contractor working on the construction of the terminal, no previous work is in place. Please confirm that the requirement is intended for future trade packages (to verify the work already completed by previous trade subcontractors), or provide additional clarification on what is required of BBII to complete this submittal requirement.				The Contractor with certification of the GC's surveyor is to provide items specified in Division 01 10 50 1.3B for the purpose noted in the specification: to certify "the elevations and locations of the Work are in conformance with Contract Documents".			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0282	BSE - News/Advertisement Stand Removal	Closed	03/16/2012	03/26/2012	03/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The unused news/advertisement stand on the Westside of Fremont Street needs to be removed to accommodate the Buttress drilling on shafts A & B. BBII intends to modify the sidewalk at this current location to provide 3 - 11ft lanes on Fremont Street per specification section 01-15-70. (see attached sketch) Please provide direction to relocate or remove these stands.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per Jack Adams of Turner, at no cost to the owner the Contractor may remove the news/advertisement stand and store in Parcel M		
<hr/>							
T-0283	BSE - Backfill Material For Pre-Trench	Closed	03/15/2012	03/25/2012	03/20/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Jeff Molloy			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Proposed 1 sack sand mix design BBII is not able to achieve the required compaction per SFDPW requirements due to inclement weather conditions. We have been advised from suppliers that the sand backfill material is saturated, and from past experience will not achieve the required compaction. If the weather persists as forcasted BBII is proposing to backfill with 1 sack sand as a substitute to dry material. This will allow us to maintain the scheduled CDSM wall installation on 3/23/2012, and maintain the DPW compaction standards. Note sand slurry is only required in the street or public right of way. Note: According to BBII this will not impact DND/Malcolm in the installation of the CDSM wall.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> BBII has requested use of sack sand slurry mix design FOA100CX. This use of sand/slurry is specied in Section 31 23 10, 2.2, H of the utility relocation spec. See also RFI U-0156. This use is acceptable per SFDPW requirements due to inclement weather conditions. Also, this use of slurry is important for the upcoming CDSM wall at the pretrench locations. Per correspondence attached from Webcor-Obayashi the CM/GC, they state that their Trade Subcontractor "BBII has considered and coordinated with DND/Malcolm in this regard." (see uploaded document under 'Supporting Documents') Substituting this slurry versus soils compaction and testing is acceptable. However this sand slurry use is a Contractor scheduling decision and will be at no additional cost to the TJPA from WOJV, BBII, and/or Malcolm-DND.		
<hr/>							
T-0283.1	BSE - Backfill for Pretrenching	Closed	03/29/2012	04/08/2012	03/30/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 914 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: As a supplement to RFI 283 regarding the use of a CDF mix for backfill of the pre-trench at A-line across First Street, BBII is submitting the attached mix design for review and acceptance. The previously submitted mix design was not pumpable and due to the nature of the pile extraction and backfill operation a pumpable mix is required so backfill compaction can be achieved. The attached mix will allow us to achieve the DPW compaction requirements and also allow for the installation of the CDSM wall. The use of this mix design is scheduled for this afternoon in order to maintain the CDSM installation schedule for this weekend. BBII would much appreciate an expedited review and acceptance of this mix design.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> CDF mix for backfill of the CDSM pre-trench locations is acceptable. CM/GC Webcor-Obayashi to confirm with their Trade Subcontractor such that "BBII has considered and coordinated with DND/Malcolm in this regard. Substituting this mix versus soils compaction and testing is acceptable for the upcoming CDSM walls at the pretrench locations First and Fremont Streets. However, again this use is a Contractor scheduling decision and will be at no additional cost to the TJPA from WOJV, BBII, and/or Malcolm-DND				
T-0284	BSE - Request to Borehole Coordinates TTB-07 TTB-09	Closed	03/21/2012	03/31/2012	03/23/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Fields			
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: After further review of the Geotechnical Report produced by ARUP it has come to BECHO's attention that Boreholes TTB-07 and TTB-09 were not surveyed. BECHO respectfully requests to obtain Northing and Easting coordinates for TTB-07 and TTB-09.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> These boreholes were not surveyed. The approximate coordinates are listed in Table 3 in the Geotechnical Data Report.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0285	BSE - Buttress Rebar Cage Length Adjustment	Closed	03/21/2012	03/31/2012	03/26/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please refer to RFI T-0252, where the Engineer accepted BBII's proposal of fabricating the buttress rebar cages to a pre-extended length of 260' in order to accommodate the buttress shafts that are deeper than 241'. In RFI T-0252, BBII had suggested to extend the overall length of all rebar cage assemblies to 260' by increasing the length of the top "setting cage" 19 feet more. In this proposal, the lengths of structural cage segments were to remain unchanged. BBII's proposal of extending the length of the setting cage by 19' got accepted with the added requirement of splicing vertical rebar extensions on the job site. BBII takes exception to the added requirement of splicing vertical rebar extensions on the job site, which would lead to an increase in durations of the rebar cage installations. In order to eliminate splicing, BBII now proposes to fabricate the setting cage segments up to 9 feet longer than shown on the plans. The structural rebar cage segment lengths will remain unchanged. The top of the structural cage sections will be within up to 9 feet proximity from the top of concrete. This proposal will accommodate the rebar cages with a maximum total length of 250' (241 '+9'=250'). If the rebar cage assembly needs to be longer than 250 feet, BBII will direct the rebar cage manufacturer to also extend the bottom structural cage segment by an added distance equal to the required total length of the rebar cage assembly less 250 feet.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 12/GT-5201 requires the reinforcing steel to be placed up to 1'-0" below the top of the concrete. The top of concrete is shown on GT-5201. Longitudinal bar extensions shall be spliced as needed to achieve this, or the cage shall be fabricated long to achieve this. However, if the top of the fabricated cage is within 9'-0" of the top of the concrete, no bar extensions nor extended cages are required.	

T-0286	BSE - Use of Actual Utility Weights	Closed	03/26/2012	04/05/2012	03/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Douglas Jacobson	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Marked-Up SH-3101 Marked-Up SH-3102 Utility Weight Calculations PG&E Weights Email			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to RFI 286.0 Use of actual utility loads versus 3000lb per lf in Specifications RFI T-0286.0 regarding the use of actual weight of	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Verizon Weights Email						
	Temporary Bridge specification 01-53-13 (1.3B) requires the bridge design to include a 3000 lb/lf allowance for hanging utilities below the bridge. Extensive coordination between the RUP designers and the utility owners, BBI has attained the exact location and actual weight of the utilities to be supported by the bridge structures. These weights are shown in the attached document and have been used in the design of the bridge structure as well as the utility hangers. Through our coordination efforts we also know that future utilities will not be added until the temporary bridges are removed. Please confirm that use of the actual utility weights in our design is acceptable.						
					utilities versus the nominal 3000 lb/lf required in Specification Section 01-53-13 Part 1.3.B (Temporary Bridges - Performance Requirements) first requires the correct actual weight of the utilities and the application to each of the streets, First, Fremont, and Beale respectively..		
					First Street Utility Unit Weights		
					The BBI/PBA temporary bridge design for First Street shows the following utilities suspended from the bridge:		
					Girder #3 & Girder #4 (Counting from left to right facing north)		
					PG&E (6) each 6" diameter steel ducts (17.7 lb/lf) + cable (8.2 lb/lf) @ 25.9lb/lf = 155.4 lb/lf under 2 girders #3 & #4 (counting left to right)		
					Girder #5 & Girder #6 (Counting from left to right facing north)		
					PG&E (9) each 6" diameter steel ducts @ 25.9lb/lf = 233.1 lb/lf under 2 girders #5 & #6)		
					PG&E (1) each 4" diameter steel duct @ 25.9lb/lf = 25.9 lb/lf under 2 girders #5 & #6)		
					Verizon (6) each 4" diameter steel duct @ 11.59lb/lf = 69.54 lb/lf under 2 girders #5 & #6		
					Subtotal utility load used by BBI/PBA for girders #3 & #4 = 155.4 lb/lf		
					Subtotal utility load used by BBI/PBA for girders #5 & #6 = 328.54 lb/lf		
					Total utility load used by BBI/PBA for all girders #3~#6 = 483.94 lb/lf		
					There are several slight errors in this BBI/PBA calculation:		
					Verizon has incorrectly used the weight of 4" diameter PVC duct rather than steel duct used in the temporary bridge crossing (4" diameter steel @ 10.3lb/lf duct + 3lb/lf fiber cable x 6 each lines = 6ea x 13.3 lb/lf = 79.8 lb/lf versus 69.54 lb/lf)		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
girders Demand over Capacity ratio is 67% (Safety Factor 1.5:1)							
T-0287	BSE - Drain Inlet at the Northwest Corner of Minna and First street	Closed	04/04/2012	04/14/2012	04/12/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:URS Corporation David Fyfe		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference: TG0300-210.1 TG0300-205.2 City Planning/KCA Emails				Submission of the storm water inlet detail (attached to this RFI No. T-0287) for review and acceptance via the RFI process is not an acceptable method, therefore we have no comment on it.			
In order to comply with city standards BBII intended to install a standard city drain inlet on the north west corner of the Minna and First street intersection as required by our site civil drainage plan (submittal TG0300-205.2, TZ1030-01513A08.2 see also submittal TZ1030-015313A04.1 package TG0300-210.1 for product data). When potholing where this drain inlet is to be located, it was discovered that it would be in conflict with an existing gas line. BBII's design engineer KCA contacted the city planning department and got pre approval of the attached catch basin per the attached email and details. Please confirm that it is acceptable for us to install this catch basin in lieu of what was submitted in the aforementioned submittals.				In an effort to help expedite resolution of this conflict the following questions/requests are provided below: What is the location (depth of cover and horizontal offsets to existing and proposed features) of the existing gas line (and electrical conduits/conductors) relative to the proposed storm water inlet? The proposed storm water inlet appears to extend approximately 41" deep from top of rim/grade. From review of RUP sheets U-3409 and U-3410/Section T, it appears that there could be as little as 36" of cover over top of the existing PG&E gas line. If PG&E gas line is located within limits of proposed storm water inlet (plan view), there does not appear to be sufficient vertical clearance to install the proposed storm water inlet? Specify engineered base material that is to be placed beneath proposed storm water inlet. Provide a detailed sketch (plan and section) with submittal illustrating location of proposed storm water inlet and adjacent existing/proposed features. Has PG&E reviewed and approved the proposed storm water inlet location? Provide confirmation that the proposed storm water inlet is in compliance with PG&E separation requirements			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 919 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0288	BSE - Request to Relocate Rathole to D9	Closed	04/05/2012	04/15/2012	04/10/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Attached please find Becho's request to relocate existing rathole to Shaft D9 where it will remain until Buttress work is complete. Below is Becho's exact wording:			ARUP Response:				
"Due to the upcoming bridge construction on Fremont Street, Becho will be losing the existing location of the rathole. Becho requests that the existing rathole be relocated to Shaft D9 where it will remain for the duration of the Buttress Shaft Work. Becho proposes to pour Shaft D9 30 to 35 feet short from grade to accommodate the new rathole. Please advise if this is acceptable."			Arup understands there was no attachment, only the one page RFI.				
			Provided the hole remains cased at all times, or backfilled with CSLM (or an approved equal) whenever the casing is removed, this is acceptable.				
T-0289	BSE - Becho Requesting 9-20-2011 Meeting Minutes	Closed	04/11/2012	04/21/2012	05/08/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
"On September 20th, 2011 a meeting was held in the TJPA's office to discuss Noise Issues, Coring thru the Concrete Slab and Buttress Work. Present in the meeting where the following key representatives: Brian Dykes, Maria Ayerdi-Kaplan, Rebecca Armenta, and Steven Rule. Please request the meeting minutes for the meeting on 9/20/2011."			No meeting minutes were taken during this meeting.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 920 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0290	BSE - Stabilization of Unimproved Soil Conditions Along the Interior Face of the C	Closed	04/11/2012	04/21/2012	04/18/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP David Fields	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: 31 56 13 3.7 C BBII Photo of CDSM Wall J-Line			The quality of the CDSM wall is dependent upon the Contractors' chosen means and methods. If the Contractor has concerns regarding the integrity of the wall, the Contractor shall provide a remedial plan to the TJPA for consideration.				
BBII is requesting direction for a method to stabilize the unimproved soil conditions along the interior face of the CDSM wall.			Conformance with the criteria within a sample does not relieve the Contractor of their responsibility that the entire wall meet the specifications.				
The current condition of the CDSM wall includes unimproved soil conditions that have the potential to become detached from the wall and create large voids at the face of the wall. Please reference attached photo for visual details.							
Based on our records, the CDSM wall met all the specification requirements for uniformity and improved soil as per section 31 56 13 of the contract specifications. Please note: Section 31 56 13 3.7 C's requirements (10% and 6") are satisfied by during the TJPA's Representative inspection of double-tube samples at the time of installation.							
<hr/>							
T-0290.1	BSE - Relevance of Unimproved Soil Pockets in CDSM Wall as it Relates to Waterp	Closed	05/28/2012	06/07/2012	06/05/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Neither section 31 00 003.8.L or 07 12 10.3.2.C anticipated +1" cavities in the surface of the CDSM wall. However there are +6" cavities in the surface of the CDSM wall the result of unimproved soil pockets although BBII would contend the CDSM wall was installed in accordance with section 31 56 13.3.7.C. On 5/25/12 W/O spoke with Jonathan Lawrence President of Laurenc Systems (888) 321-3338 specified per section 07 12 10.2.1. Sections 31 00 00.3.8.L and 07 12 10.3.2.C speak of "buckling" due to cavities of the face of the CDSM wall. Mr. Lawrence was not concerned over the cavities in the face of this project's CDSM wall for two reasons:			Per specification section 31 00 00 / 3.8 L: "On vertical surfaces of CDSM shoring walls, scarify high areas and fill in cavities exceeding 1" deep with patching cement to provide a reasonably uniform surface over which protection board, installed in a later contract, will span without buckling." Repair wall as required in the contract documents.				
1. Subsequent to his review of the bid documents the substrate for the waterproofing is the INS-1, depicted on 4/A1-8710, rather than the CDSM wall.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 921 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>2. Due to the thickness of the substrate system:</p> <p>a. ¼" Protection board</p> <p>b. 3/16" (2) plys #15 felt</p> <p>c. ¼" Drainage composite panel.</p> <p>d. ½" INS-2</p> <p>1-3/16" thick in total Mr. Lawrence was not concerned over a CDSM cavity less than</p> <p>1'- 0" x 1'-0" x ½" deep.</p> <p>When asked why he thought section 07 12 10.3.2.C was included in the below grade waterproofing section, if in fact the CDSM was not the substrate for the waterproofing, Mr. Lawrence responded that section 07 12 10.3.2.C was part of the Laurenco's template boiler plate specification really inapplicable to this application.</p> <p>Please confirm that given the CDSM wall is not the waterproofing substrate system, rather items a-d above, and in light of the frequency of unimproved soil pockets, the project needn't infill the unimproved soil pockets less than 1'- 0" x 1'-0" x ½" deep.</p>						
T-0290.2	BSE - Waterproofing preparatory work on CDSM wall	Closed	09/27/2012	10/07/2012	10/01/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Specification Reference: TG06 BGP 07 12 10.3.2C		CM/GC to respond.					
Please confirm that any preparatory work of filling cavities within the CDSM wall for stabilization of the waterproofing board is the sole responsibility of the TG06.0 Trade Subcontractor							
W/O comments in follow up to 9/27/12 TCCO / W/O meeting:							
1. TG06 package is independent of the TG03 package.							
2. BBII should refer to Earthwork specification section 31							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 922 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
00 00.3.8.L 3. BBII should refer to RFI response #T-0290.1 forwarded to BBII 6/5/12							
T-0291	BSE - Arup Requesting Exploratory Cores on Buttress Shaft D1	Closed	04/16/2012	04/26/2012	04/24/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Arup is requesting exploratory core samples at Buttress Shaft D1. Please provide direction on depths, sizes, and locations of cores.	SUGGESTION:				ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Shaft D1 is, so far, non-conforming. It is in the Contractor's best interest to perform exploratory drilling to ascertain why they are unable to reach the required depth. Arup recommends that the Contractor do so, and that a plan be developed based on the observations made during the two previous attempts to place the shaft.		
T-0291.1	BSE - Arup Requesting Exploratory Cores on Buttress Shaft D1 Follow-Up	Closed	04/25/2012	05/05/2012	05/04/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Arup has requested to revise the response to RFI T-0291 in which the following question was presented - "Arup is requesting exploratory core samples at Buttress Shaft D1. Please provide direction on depths, sizes, and locations of cores."	SUGGESTION:				ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: There has been further discussion regarding this proposal. Arup retracts the request to core within the footprint of buttress shaft D1.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 923 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0292	BSE - First St Bridge Pier 1 Relocation	Closed	05/02/2012	05/12/2012	05/03/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch				
REQUEST: Reference: Revised Drawings and Calculations for Revised Pier 1 Location The western Pier 1 CIDH pile was rejected due to an anomaly. The corrective action is to replace it with a new pile 6'-0" south. Attached is the revised Bridge Drawings and the revised calculations. This package was emailed to the Bridge Design reviewers on 4-24-12 for expedited review. Please confirm that the new pier 1 location does not cause conflicts with the future structure.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The attachments are not appropriate for an RFI, they should be submitted through the submittal process. Resubmit RFI with pertinent information only		
<hr/>							
T-0292.1	BSE - First St Bridge Pier 1 Relocation	Closed	05/03/2012	05/13/2012	05/04/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference: SH-2100 SH-2101 Detail: The western Pier 1 CIDH pile was rejected due to an anomaly. The corrective action is to replace it with a new pile 6'-0" south. Attached are the revised Bridge Drawings showing new pile locations. Please confirm that the new pier 1 location does not cause conflicts with the future structure. Please note the revised design documents were emailed to the Bridge Design reviewers on 4-24-12 for expedited review.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 2 northernmost First Street temporary bridge piers to be shifted as depicted in this RFI is acceptable. ARUP Response: Arup takes no exception to this.		
<hr/>							
T-0293	BSE - First Street Natoma blind spot hazard	Closed	06/05/2012	06/15/2012	06/15/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: URS Corporation David Fyfe				
REQUEST: Regarding the temporary first street bridge. Contract specification section 01 53 13-1.3.A.4 requires us to provide a "8' -high solid barrier system" consisting of 1" plywood which does not allow viewing through the barrier.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative barrier system shall be provided for pedestrian protection to mitigate vehicle/driver sight line obstructions (such as chainlink or other similar product). Contractor to verify alternative barrier		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 924 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>This is creating a blind turn hazard for traffic entering First street from Natoma street on the south side of First street. Please advise on how you would like to mitigate/fix this hazard.</p>			<p>product meets visibility requirements. Required height of barrier system is not changed.</p> <p>Alternative barrier system system shall be designed by the temporary bridges design engineer of record and shall meet all code requirements including size of openings and resistance to all loading. Final product shall be continuous (including at transitions to other barrier systems), climb proof and topped with barbed wire. Contractor/engineer of record shall obtain all required approvals for alternate barrier system.</p> <p>Vehicle barrier system/guardrail(s) are not modified by this RFI response.</p>			
T-0293.1	BSE - First Street and Natoma blind spot hazard.	Closed	06/29/2012	07/09/2012	07/09/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>			Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Douglas Jacobson		
<p>Co-Author:</p>							
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please find attached sketch SK-0293 for proposed pedestrian barrier at the First st. bridge. Please confirm this is acceptable in lieu of previously installed plywood barrier.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Contractor to install 9 gauge galvanized chain link fence with 2" mesh along zone of previously installed plywood barrier on First Street Temporary Bridge. Secure to existing bridge posts MC6x18 with 1/2" diameter galvanized bolts 2' o.c. on each post with full-length 1" x 3/16" flat bar. Install 1/4" galv. top and bottom wire with 3/8" turnbuckles. Secure fence to wire with 11 gauge wire ties. Double twist ends of chain link mesh are on top. See TJPA Spec 32 31 13 Chainlink Fences and Gates. For barbed wire at the top, see 32 31 13 2.5 and 2.8 for requirements. Install barbed wire support arms at 45° tilted away from bridge.</p> <p>Temporary Bridge engineer of record shall verify that the loading from 1" thick plywood to chain link mesh is not detrimental to the Temporary Bridge design.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 925 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0293.2	BSE - Blind Spots at Fremont St. and Beale Street Bridges	Closed	08/13/2012	08/23/2012	08/21/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: RFI T-0293.1 RFI T-0293				Confirmed.			
Blind spots similiar to the those in RFI T-0293 at First street and Natoma street exist at the following locations:				Reference: CR T-043			
Fremont Street - Northwest & Southwest Corners (Cars exiting from 301 Mission and 400 Howard) Beale Street - Southwest Corner (Cars exiting from 199 Fremont and 301 Mission)							
Please confirm that similiar fencing as per response to RFI T-0293.1 should be installed at these locations.							
<hr/>							
T-0293.3	BSE Blind Spots at Fremont St. and Beale Street Bridges	Closed	08/28/2012	09/07/2012	08/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: RFI T-0293.1 RFI T-0293.2				Confirmed. Install fencing (versus plywood) in the Northeast corner of the bridge to eliminate blind spot at 301 Mission driveway.			
In RFI T-0293.2 there was an error in requesting confirmation for fencing in the Northwest corner when it was meant to request fencing in the Northeast corner.							
Please confirm that fencing as per response to RFI T-0293.1 should be installed on Fremont Street on the Northeast corner rather than the Northwest corner.							
<hr/>							
T-0293.4	BSE - Blind Spots at Beale Street Bridge	Closed	04/08/2013	04/18/2013	04/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: RFI #T-0293.2				RFI T-0293.2 provided the fence vs. plywood locations on Beale Street Bridge and the Change Request			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 926 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0294	<p>Blind spots similar to what was alleviated at First & Fremont Streets, the result of the originally specified "8'-high solid barrier system", exist on Beale St. at the following locations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Making a right at the Southwest corner exiting 199 Fremont's garage.2. Making a right at the Northwest corner exiting 301 Mission's garage (the concern being if someone is coming down Beale the wrong way.) <p>Please confirm if and where chain link, similar to what was specified in RFI response #T-0293.1, is required and what CR # to reference.</p> <p>BSE - Expected CDSM wall deflection</p> <p>From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>BBII requests the anticipated deflection values for the CDSM wall obtained in ARUP's design of the shoring wall and used to determine appropriate action trigger levels specified in section 31 09 13.</p>	Closed	06/14/2012	06/24/2012	07/02/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>number (CR No. T-043A).</p> <p>Install fence in lieu of plywood at both 199 Fremont and 301 Mission ends of the Beale Street Bridge - west side only. Fence should replace plywood from the end (@ A line and J line) and be installed midway to the construction gate - verify in field.</p>				
			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The request for information contained in this RFI is rejected as overly broad, burdensome and seemingly unrelated to any legitimate enquiry relating to the contract or the required work. This is not the proper use of an RFI. Please follow the requirements specified in section 31 09 13 regarding maximum allowable movements and corrective action trigger levels.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0295	BSE - 301 Mission drive way	Closed	06/19/2012	06/29/2012	06/24/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per conversation in previous coordination meeting between Balfour Beatty Webcor, Turner, TJPA and 301 Mission's management. We are confirming direction to extend the sidewalk past the limits shown in our grading and drainage submittal through the limits of the 301 Mission drive way. It is also our understanding that we are directed to match the color of the existing black sidewalk in this area. Please confirm.				The work BBII has proceeded with at the 301 Mission driveway is in general conformance with the 6/8/12 TCCO, W/O, BBII, Millennium Mgmt. meeting. The direction however is from, to include however limited to, base contract specification section: 00 08 13.1.8.E, 0115 40.1.4, and or General Excavation Permit #12E-0181. The TJPA is not anticipating added cost the result of this issue.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 928 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0296	BSE - Clarification of Soil Segregation and Disposal per spec. section 01 13 50/SM	Closed	06/27/2012	07/07/2012	06/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
On 6/26/12 BBII clarified their desired method / location of disposing of the Zone-3 concrete rubble was to deliver it to Brisbane.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Section 01 13 50 / 5.2.1 of the SMP states:					Roger Rothenburger 6/28/2012 Section 01-13-50 Part 1.1.C (Hazardous Materials Procedures - Summary) references "Site Mitigation Plan, Transbay Transit Center, Treadwell & Rollo, March 24, 2010" report and states,		
"TJPA shall be provided documentation from the excavation contractor that the accepting landfill for the soil from Transbay Terminal project has been provided with and has reviewed all analytical data collected from the Site."					"Contractor's work shall include the management of existing soils in a manner consistent with the requirements of the Contract Document including the following reports, "Site Mitigation Plan, Transbay Transit Center, Treadwell & Rollo, March 24, 2010", appended to this Sectin as 01 13 50/APA, and Section 00 03 35 ..."		
Brisbane has refused to provide the aforementioned documentation.					Section 5.2.1 (Soil Segregation and Disposal) of the Treadwell & Rollo Site Mitigation Plan, 01-13-50/APA states, "Before any excavation activities begin at the Site, TJPA shall be provided documentation from the excavation contractor that the accepting landfill facility for the soil from Transbay Terminal project has been provided with and has reviewedall analytical data collected from the Site. TJPA shall approve all off-site disposal facilities and soil transportation contractors, including, without limitation, available insurable coverge, and prior to the shipment of any soil or other waste materials (emphasis added)."		
In order to facilitate BBII's desired method / location of disposing of the Zone-3 concrete rubble W/O requests that the TJPA clarify, exclusively for the subject Zone-3 rubble, that the documentation required by the TJPA consists only of standard shipping tags and invoices.					TJPA in the interest of facilitating disposal of material to Brisbane and other disposal sites removes from Site Mitigation Plan Section 5.2.1 by Treadwell & Rollo, the highlighted words, "with and has reviewed" .		
					The only requirement is that some documentation from BBI (the "excavation contractor" that the "analytical data collected from the Site" has been provided to the disposal site.		
T-0296.1	BSE - Clarification of Soil Segregation and Disposal per spec	Closed	07/02/2012	07/12/2012	07/02/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp. Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 929 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>	
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>RFI response T-0296 was overly broad and failed to conform to previous conversations between TJPA, TCCO, & W/O.</p> <p>RFI T-0296 Inquiry:</p> <p>On 6/26/12 BBII clarified their desired method / location of disposing of the Zone-3 rubble was to deliver it to Brisbane.</p> <p>Section 01 13 50 / 5.2.1 of the SMP states:</p> <p>"TJPA shall be provided documentation from the excavation contractor that the accepting landfill for the soil from Transbay Terminal project has been provided with and has reviewed all analytical data collected from the Site."</p> <p>Brisbane has refused to provide the aforementioned documentation.</p> <p>In order to facilitate BBII's desired method / location of disposing the Zone-3 concrete rubble W/O requests that the TJPA clarify, exclusively for the subject Zone-3 rubble, that the documentation required by the TJPA consists only of standard shipping tabs and invoices.</p> <p>RFI T-0296.1 Inquiry:</p> <p>Please confirm, in order to facilitate BBII's desired method / location of disposing the Zone-3 concrete rubble W/O requests that the TJPA clarify, exclusively for the subject Zone-3 rubble, that the documentation required by the TJPA consists only of standard shipping tabs and invoices.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>						
			<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>7/2/2012 Confirmed - exclusively for the subject Zone-3 rubble, the documentation required by the TJPA consists only of standard shipping tabs and invoices.</p>			
T-0297	BSE - Phase 3 Utilities on Beale Street	Closed	06/28/2012	07/08/2012	07/10/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:								
	<p>REQUEST:</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 930 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	Reference attached sketch. The BSE subcontractor is proposing to relocate the Beale Street temporary bridge to the east; similar to the attached sketch. Please confirm if this will impact any future utilities, i.e. PG&E phase 3 on Beale Street.						
T-0297.2	BGP - Injection Hose Testing Criteria	Void	02/18/2014	02/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per conference call with design team, please confirm that it is acceptable to test the waterstop injection hoses with water as recommended by manufacturer.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-0298	BSE -Timber Pile Extraction at grid line 19 to 20 and 24 to 25	Closed	06/29/2012	06/29/2012	07/02/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: BBII completed the timber pile extraction test section in zone 2 on 06/12/2012. Based on the data recorded by ARUP inclinometers, please advise if BBII can continue with the timber pile extraction at grid line 19 to 20 and grid line 24 to 25 using non ground deformation control methods ("free pull"). The attached drawings (D-21 02 and D-21 03) for reference. Please advise.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 6/29/2012 ARUP Response: This is acceptable.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 931 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0299	Micropile Performance Testing	Closed	07/16/2012	07/26/2012	07/30/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Part 3.2 "Performance And Proof Testing" of Specification Section 31 63 33				Specification section 31 63 33 3.2 A states: The contractor shall conduct performance tests and proof tests consisting of tension load testing on micropiles. The tests are to be done on piles installed from the bottom of the excavation.			
In order to expedite the Micropile Performance Testing review period, BBII is requesting to conduct the performance testing of micropiles prior to excavating Level 5, at approximately -32' Elevation, concurrent with the installation of Level "0" struts. See attached sketch for details.Please confirm that it is acceptable.				The Contractor's proposal is not acceptable as the testing methodology and the acceptance criteria in the Project Specifications have been developed assuming the piles used for the performance tests will be installed and tested in conditions matching those of the production piles. The performance of the piles installed and tested as proposed will differ due to the higher effective stresses in the soil.			
<hr/>							
T-0300	Micropile Performance Test Pile Relocations	Closed	07/17/2012	07/27/2012	07/26/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Yuriy Stryzheus		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Arup		Kevin Clinch	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please refer to BBII's micropile layout submittal and RFI T-262 that references IFB- Below Grade package for coordination of micropile layouts.				Arup takes no exception to the proposed locations			
Based on the information provided within BBII's Micropile layout drawing and Below Grade package drawings S1-2023 through S1-2027, the four micropiles subjected to performance testing are labeled as: W411, W396, E383, and E401.							
BBII requests to conduct the performance test in Zone 1 at pile No. W604 instead of pile No. W411, which is located underneath Struts No. 6 & 7.							
Similarly, BBII requests to test the piles numbered as W473, E477, & E599, instead of the piles numbered as W396, E383, & E401, which are located underneath the trestle.							
Please confirm that it is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0301	Trestle Piles in Exclusion Zones (Zone 4)	Closed	07/23/2012	08/02/2012	07/30/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Review comments on submittal package TG0300-284 directed BBII to shift two trestle piles (#69 & #72) out of pile exclusion zones (provided by Thornton Tomasetti in response to RFI T-0251.1). BBII worked to avoid these zones to the extent possible. However, in zone 4 the additional buttress shafts created further limitations on trestle pile locations and it was infeasible to completely avoid both the permanent structure and buttress. BBII is aware of the possibility of eliminating some of these additional buttress shafts but this will not resolve these specific conflicts. Due to the congestion in Zone 4 with both the pile exclusion zones and added buttress shafts, BBII requests an exception for trestle piles #69 and #72.					Requested exceptions will be granted for locations of trestle piles #69 and #72 in submittal TG0300-284. Prior to proceeding the GC is to confirm this has no cost impact to the TJPA or impact on other trades.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 933 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0302	ISI Low Compression Strength for CLSM	Closed	07/31/2012	08/10/2012	08/10/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm the low compression strengths for the CLSM, in the ISI test results (attached), are acceptable. The CLSM was used for pre-trench backfill on Gridline A, First St. and Fremont St.			There is no compressive strength requirement for the pre-trench backfill Slurry(CLSM) chosen by the Trade Subcontractor in lieu of compaction of soils. This was confirmed with ARUP and per RFI 283/RFI 283.1.				
Please see attached ISI Test reports: 55606 Compression Test Report on A line between 18-19 lines, sampled 3/29/2012 55607 Compression Test Report on A line between 19-20 lines, sampled 3/30/2012 55608 Compressive Test Report on A line between 19-20 lines, sampled 4/4/2012 51399 Compression Test Report on A line between 19-20 lines, sampled 3/28/2012 56162 Compressive Test Report on A line between 25.2 - 25.5 lines, sampled 4/2/2012			1. TJPA Spec. 31-00-00 Earthwork requires pre-trenching to be backfilled and compaction with satisfactory materials, i.e., sand / soil. 2. These Slurry(CLSM) materials were allowed for backfill as a weak CLSM per RFI 283. 3. There is no project design/specification of ultimate compressive strength for these pre-trench backfill Slurry(CLSM). 4. The purpose of sampling the CLSM mix is to document the Slurry(CLSM) strength data only A review of the ultimate strengths (attached and below) are consistent with the strength of compacted soils used for temporary backfill areas prior to completing the CDSM wall processes. Lab ID No.: 51396 TG03/IR 917 Mix FOA100CX Central 35 Days 170psi Lab ID No.: 51399 TG03/IR 933 MIX 400FLO Bode 90 Days avg. 180psi Lab ID No.: 55600 TG03/IR 913				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
				Mix FOA100CX Central			
				39 Days avg. 130psi			
				Lab ID No.: 55606			
				TG03/IR 934			
				MIX 400FLO Bode			
				90 Days avg. >160psi			
				Lab ID No.: 55607			
				MIX 400FLO Bode			
				TG03/IR 935			
				90 Days avg. >160psi			
				Lab ID No.: 55608			
				TG03/IR 949			
				MIX 400FLO Bode			
				90 Days avg. >160psi			
				Lab ID No.: 56162			
				TG03/IR			
				MIX 400FLO Bode			
				120 Days 160psi			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 935 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0303	BSE - Verizon Duct Bank at the First St Bridge	Closed	08/07/2012	08/17/2012	08/08/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Photo Despite providing Verizon surveying, staking, and cutsheets, the Verizon duct bank at the North side of the First St. bridge was installed by others at the incorrect elevation (too low). Please confirm if additional utility supports will be required of TG03 or if others will be performing the additional utility supports required for the Verizon duct bank.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 8/8/2012 Per Steve Cunningham, TCCO - Review attached drawing provided by BBLi: 1. PB&A; First, Fremont, and Beale Street Temporary Bridges, Detail 1/SK 3105. Horizontal layout is provided, but not vertical layout for the PGE duct banks. 2. BBLi letter number 4225-000-0316, dated 1/9/12, provided bottom elevation for Verizon duct bank at 12.57' and 13.40'. Please provide as built elevations of all duct banks. Confirm PGE Phase 2 duct banks were installed with higher elevation at center of bridge.				
T-0304	BSE - Inquiries with Regard to Proposed Beale St Bridge Atop East CDSM Wall	Closed	08/23/2012	09/02/2012	08/27/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: On 8/22/12 Beale St. bridge submittal #TG0300-206 was returned to W/O marked not reviewed (Exhibit-A). Upon W/O's review of BBLi's Beale St. bridge design W/O encountered the following inquiries relative to the CDSM wall: 1. BBLi's bridge design relies on ARUP's RFI response #T-0209.3 (Exhibit-B). Please confirm ARUP's RFI response #T-0209.3 (Exhibit-C) is applicable as the basis of the design for the Beale St. bridge, given unlike First and Fremont Streets, the length of the Beale St. bridge is resting atop the East CDSM wall. 2. The decision to allow the North and South bridge abutments to be located atop the CDSM wall was predicated on the CR #T-025 load testing reference RFI #T-0209.4 (Exhibit-D). Given the testing was performed on different			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Arup's response to RFI T-0209.3 may be used as one part of the Contractor's basis of design. Arup will review the design for conformance with these recommendations. Note that our review is only for conformance with the geotechnical recommendations; review for constructability, pedestrian impact, OCS pole locations, impact (or lack of) on extension of the trainbox, etc. are by others. 2. Our design recommendations were not informed solely by the load testing results. 3. Arup does not endorse any design decisions made by the Contractor. We will review the design for conformance with our recommendations				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 936 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>soldier piles (by others) and differing soil conditions between Zone-1 and Zone-4, is the load capacity derived from the CR #T-025 testing applicable given the different bridge location and configuration?</p> <p>3. BBII's Beale St. bridge design relies on resting the length of the Beale St. bridge atop the East CDSM wall. As the designer of the CDSM wall, does ARUP endorse further loading of the East CDSM wall with the forces imposed by the Beale St. bridge?</p>						
T-0304.1	BSE - Inquiries with Regard to Proposed Beale St Bridge Follow-Up	Closed	08/29/2012	09/08/2012	08/31/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
In follow-up to RFI T-0304:				Arup's recommendations in RFI T-0209.3 may be applied to the east CDSM shoring wall.			
- From the response to question #2 of RFI T-0304 it is understood that ARUP's design recommendations were not informed solely by the load testing results. However the original question remains, is the load capacity derived from the CR #T-025 testing applicable given the different bridge location and configuration?				The CDSM wall was not designed to support vertical loads, but we have estimated its vertical load carrying capacity and outlined this in our response to RFI T-0209.3. If the bridge bears on the wall, we recommend that the Contractor monitor the wall for movements.			
- So the contractor can understand the parameters of what we are submitting, was the Shoring Wall Designed to withstand the loads imposed by the proposed Beale St. bridge?							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0305	BSE - Inquiries Regarding Proposed Beale St Bridge Relative to Below Grade Structure	Closed	08/23/2012	09/02/2012	08/27/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: TG0300-206 Beale St. Bridge Structural Design			The Contractor shall demonstrate, through calculations and drawings, that the seismic load from the bridge has a complete load path from bridge to ground.				
On 8/22/12 Beale St. Bridge submittal TG0300-206 was returned to W/O marked not reviewed. In lieu of piers the proposed bridge relies on the eastern shoring wall for structural support along the bridge. As a result, the design utilizes the additional capacity of the internal bracing to restrain lateral loads imposed by the bridge.							
Upon W/O's review of BBII's Beale St. bridge design W/O encountered the following inquiries relative to below grade structure:							
-Do the below grade foundation walls as designed have the additional capacity required to support the lateral loads imposed by the proposed Beale St. bridge?							
-Will the below grade foundation walls be required to achieve additional strength prior to removal of re-bracing as a result of the additional laterals loads in which they are subjected by the proposed Beale Street bridge?							
<hr/>							
T-0306	BSE - Pedestrian Connection Across the Construction Excavation at Beale St	Closed	08/23/2012	09/02/2012	08/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: TG0300-221 BBI - Temp Bridges - Civil and Drainage Plan - Beale St			It is acceptable to install an on-grade sidewalk for pedestrian travel though the parcel "Lot-N" during the required life of the Beale Street Temporary Bridge.				
Contrary to specification section 01 53 13.1.2.A BBII's proposed Beale St. bridge utilizes an on-grade sidewalk for pedestrian travel though the parcel "Lot-N". Please confirm this is acceptable and that no other pedestrian connection across the construction excavation at Beale St. will be required for the entire required life of the bridge.			Lot N is available for CM/GC use until the completion of Transit Center construction per Spec. 01-14-19.				
<hr/>							
T-0307	Re - Bracing Drawings	Closed	08/23/2012	09/02/2012	08/24/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 938 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0308	From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	SUGGESTION:	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference: Spec. Section 31 55 00 Drawing S1-1112 In order to design the re-bracing BBII requests drawings for the Below Grade Package. Please provide these drawings on a CD in AutoCAD and PDF format.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reference Specification Section 01 10 40, 1.6 C This RFI has been rejected.				
T-0308	BSE - Phase 2 Extension During the Service Life of the Beale St. Bridge	Closed	08/27/2012	09/06/2012	08/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	SUGGESTION:	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: On 8/22/12 Beale St. Bridge submittal TG0300-206 was returned to W/O marked not reviewed. In lieu of piers the proposed Beale St. Bridge relies on the eastern shoring wall for structural support. As a result of this configuration the eastern shoring wall located along grid line 35.25 will have to remain in place throughout the entire life of the bridge. Multiple contract documents including S1-2027 (Exhibit-A) elude to a "Phase 2" which extends the underground portion of the structure to the east of the existing shoring wall. Please confirm the verbal direction that the "Phase 2" package will not be constructed during the life of the Beale St. bridge.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The TJPA confirms that the phase two train box extension will not be constructed during the life of the Beale Street temporary traffic bridge.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 939 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0309	BSE - Traffic Control During the Construction of the Beale St. Bridge	Closed	08/27/2012	09/06/2012	08/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
At the 8/27/12 TJPA Traffic Coordination meeting Balfour Beatty presented a construction plan for the proposed Beale St. bridge. In violation of Specification Section 01 15 70-2 the construction plan included reducing Beale St. down to two available traffic lanes for an approximately six week duration. Please confirm if this is acceptable.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Contractor can temporarily reduce traffic lanes (including up to a full street closure) if they comply with Spec and SFMTA Blue Book requirements. Per Spec 01-15-70 TRAFFIC ROUTING WORK the Contractor would have to:		
					1. Submit a traffic control and detour plan.		
					2. Submit a STP Request - Special Traffic permit Request.		
					SPEC Section 01 15 70 TRAFFIC ROUTING WORK		
					Paragraph 3.5 SPECIAL TRAFFIC PERMIT		
					A. Contractor shall apply for a Special Traffic Permit from the SFMTA, if any deviation from the traffic lane requirements (time, width, etc.), as shown in these Specifications, is required. If SFMTA approves the issue of the Special Traffic Permit, the Contractor shall pay the required fee to SFMTA, as specified in the Blue Book, and obtain the necessary permit.		
					The STP request would need to be reviewed and may be approved by TJPA Reps and SFMTA/MUNI.		
T-0310	Clarification on Sump Pit Location	Closed	08/28/2012	09/07/2012	09/07/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Authority Edmond Sum				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
RFI Ref: T-0251.3 Spec. Ref: 31 00 00 Drawing/Detail Ref: GT 2101, 2102, 2103					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The current coordination drawing for sump pit locations, received in RFI response T-0251.3 (12/13/2011) do not correspond with the BSE contract drawing GT 2101, 2102, 2103. Please confirm the correct sump pit location.					Refer to ASI 97. Coordinate with the CMO for transfer of electronic files		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0311	Subgrade French Drains Along CDSM Wall	Closed	08/31/2012	09/10/2012	09/07/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Spec. Reference: 31 00 00				Installation of these drains is acceptable with regards to geotechnical engineering as long as it does not incur any additional costs to the owner.			
In order to control surface water at final subgrade, Balfour Beatty would like the option of installing (a) trench drain(s) per the attached drawing as necessary around the perimeter of the excavation just prior to or once final subgrade is established. These trench drains will be filled with ¾" drain rock in accordance with specification section 31 00 00-3.16.A. These trench drains will be left in place during micro-pile installation and remain below the mud slab. Water will be pumped out of these trench drains using sump pumps and/or routed to dewatering wells in accordance with specification section 31 23 19. Please confirm that this is acceptable.				Installation of these drains is not an appropriate mitigation for CDSM walls which are not watertight as specified in Section 31 56 13 Chapter 3.12 ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA, Item F. "Watertight" is defined in this same specification section as "no continuous running or seeping water from the shoring wall."			
				We have not reviewed this with regards to conflicts with non-geotechnical subgrade features.			
<hr/>							
T-0311.1	Modified French Drains Zones 3 and 4	Closed	03/04/2014	03/14/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Due to the varying dimensions between the edge of mud slab and the face of the CDSM wall, WOJV requests that the currently specified width (24 inches) of the French drain be maintained as a minimum at all locations for Zones 3 and 4. As a result, the width of the drain may be up to 30 inches at the widest locations.							
Please confirm this is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 941 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0312	Proximity Inquiry as to Beale St. Bridge Pile Location	Closed	09/19/2012	09/29/2012	09/20/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: BBII's sheet 1/SH-2105 (BBII submittal TZ1030-015313A31.1) calls for the 48" diameter CIDH column to be located 21'-6" off 35-line along E-line. As per sheet A1-2817 (TG06) the proposed location would obstruct, requiring redesign of the reinforcement, the construction of the structural wall separating the (2) deep pits depicted on 1/S1-3007 (TG06) in room B2761. The location of the pits and the wall separating the (2) pits were always depicted on S1-2027 (TG03). May the aforementioned CIDH column be located as proposed?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFI will not be responded to per submittal response TG0300-206 Temp Bridges- Beale Street Structural Drawings and Calculations.		
T-0313	Micropile Layout	Closed	09/13/2012	09/23/2012	09/20/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Documents Specification Section: 31 63 33 Drawings: ASI #0097 Per 9/12/12 Turner BSE Progress Meeting, Adamsons Associates(AA) requested BBII to submit a RFI requesting distance tolerances for the proposed micropile layout relocations. Please see BBII's verbage below in response. The response comments provided to submittal TA1020-316333A12.2 (TG0300-622.2) for micropile stated that the submitted micropile layout was unacceptable, but that the micropile locations shown in the TG0600 (ASI 0097) documents are acceptable. The attached marked up coordination drawings show the locations of the TG0600 documents micropile locations compared to various overhead horizontal and vertical obstructions. The obstructions considered in this comparison include trestle pile and bracing; internal bracing struts, supports, and pin piles; bridge piles; and the buttress walls. The submitted micropile locations are also shown. The equipment that will be used to install the micropiles require 2.5 feet clearance from the center of the micropile hole to surrounding obstructions. The circles and arrows on the attached drawing indicate which micropiles do not			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to use the first contractor-proposed approach (number 1), that of using the TG0600 documents for micropile layout and shifting the micropiles up to 4 feet, however such shifts will be subject to design verification and SEOR approval following our receipt of final proposed locations. Note that the shifting of micropiles shall adhere to submittal notes 2 and 3 on sheet ML-1 of Submittal TG0300-622.2 (TA1020-316333A12.2). Micropiles shall not be installed in the buttress shafts. The alternative contractor-proposed approach (number 2), that of using the submittal (TG0300-622.2) layout and applying submittal notes 2 & 3 is not acceptable as the approach does not consider submittal note 1 (which addresses the density of micropile layout).		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 942 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>have the required clearance and which direction of shift is preferred. The maximum shift is 4 feet, which occurs when a micropile is located directly below an internal bracing strut.</p> <p>Please confirm that the micropile locations shown on the TG0600 documents are to be used for the micropile layout, and that a shift of up to 4 feet in the directions shown on the attached drawings is acceptable.</p> <p>As an alternative, BBII would prefer to use the submitted layout which has fewer conflicts. Micropiles would be eliminated or added per notes 2 and 3 respectively on sheet ML-1 of the returned submittal. The submitted micropile layout contains 1858 each micropiles. The TG0600 documents contain 1860 each micropiles. By eliminating piles per comments 2 and adding piles per comment 3, the total quantity would be approximately the quantity in the TG0600 documents.</p> <p>Please confirm which of the two alternative approaches to micropiles layout is acceptable, or if both approaches are acceptable.</p>						
T-0314	Permit Clarification	Closed	09/14/2012	09/24/2012	09/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 01 14 10 - 2 1.2A		This RFI is based on an incorrect reading of the Specification by the Contractor. Paragraph 1.2 states ¿ Application for permits, regulatory permissions, approvals, and request for compliance inspections shall be performed as follows and in accordance with Appendix A of this section (01 14 10/APA) and as stipulated in Section 00 07 00, General Conditions.¿					
Pursuant to specification section 01 14 10 - 2 1.2A, the Contractor is directed to obtain permits from the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection(DBI) for work including, but not limited to: Excavation, Structural, Architectural, Mechanical, Plumbing, and Electrical.		- Refer to specification 01 14 10/APA regarding application for permits.					
To date TJPA has been acting as the permitting authority, and has distributed permits for work contracturally required to be authorized by the DBI.		- Specification section 01 14 10 Paragraph 1.2A					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 943 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>depressions while maintaining 24" of depth, and offset where required around Micropiles and Trestle Piles.</p> <p>BSE Drawing D-5100 dictates a specific demolition depth of - 41.5' for the Drilled Shaft Prototype and - 44.5' for the 80 Natoma shoring wall.</p> <p>Given the disparity above and the revision to pit locations within FO-00010 R2 W/O has detected the following conflicts to Geothermal Piping Loops:</p> <p>- 80 Natoma Shoring wall with Pit location at Gridline H-2 (- 44' - 9' Final Subgrade Elevation)</p> <p>- Drilled Shaft Prototype (- 41' - 5" Final Subgrade Elevation)</p> <p>Please specify a specific grade to demolish the aforementioned obstructions in order to avoid the GHEx piping loops and advise as to any additional conflicts.</p>						
T-0317.2	BSE - Buttress Demolition Limits Relative to Sub Grade Elevations	Closed	10/15/2012	10/25/2012	10/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Joe Chapman	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Arup			Kevin Clinch	
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Please confirm that the demolition elevation limits within the response to RFI T-0317.1 also apply to the Zone 4 buttress shafts.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: This is correct.	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0317.3	BSE - Demolition of 80 Natoma Wall and Prototype Buttress Shafts	Closed	12/19/2012	12/26/2012	01/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Specification Reference: 02 41 01 Drawing Reference: D-2210			No. The excavation limits for BSE contractor 80 Natoma/Buttress prototype and CDSM prototype are to be demolished to a depth of -44'.5 in their entirety.				
Demolition of the prototype shafts and the 80 Natoma CDSM wall are required in order to allow clearance for the geothermal piping. BBII proposes to only demolish portions of these structures which would interfere with the geothermal piping. The prototype buttress shafts would be demolished to elevation -41.42 with depressions cut out where the piping crosses. The 80 Natoma CDSM wall would be demolished to allow the piping to be installed. The CDSM piles would be otherwise cut off 4" below mud slab subgrade. See attached sketches.			The demolition limits for BSE contractor are to be per contract. REF: BSE Drawing D-2210 and RFI 317.3 response.				
Please confirm this is acceptable.			CSM Prototype shoring wall -44'.5 +/- See D-2210 Note 10 for the entire length CDSM 80 Natoma shoring wall -44'.5 +/- See D-2210 Note 11 for the entire length 80 Natoma Piles -44'.5 +/- See D-2210 Note 11 for the entire length Buttress prototype shafts -44'.5 +/- See D-2210 Note 9: This is CHANGED from -41.5' (CR forthcoming) and is now to be demolished to a depth of -44'.5 for the entire length per this RFI series.				
			Additional Costs associated with ASI No. 0099 Field Order 08-04-CMGC-000-T-00014 which updated pit depths and locations impacting the Mat Slab (Transmitted to WOJV on 12/12/12) are a separate issue than this RFI.				
			REFERENCES:				
			BSE Drawing D-2210 and RFI 317.3 response. BSE RFI 317.3 response. BSE Drawing set Detail 5/S1-3003.Tolerances of final subgrade is +/- 0.5" per BSE Spec. 31-00-00 Para 3.17 ASI No. 0099 was issued to WOJV on 12/12/12 as Field Order 08-04-CMGC-000-T-00014 with updated pit depths and locations impacting the Mat Slab. BGP Contractor Submittal Geothermal Piping TG0601-009 and BGP Trenching Spec. 31-23-34				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 947 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0317.4	BSE - Zone 4 Demolition and Excavation Associated with Sub Grade	Closed	06/18/2013	06/28/2013	07/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference RFI: T-0317.1, T-0317.2					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm that demolition and excavation in areas of buttress shafts in Zone 4 shall be at the final subgrade elevation of 41' - 5". The Geothermal Subcontractor shall provide demolition and excavation for their geothermal piping in accordance with specification section 31 23 34.					ARUP Response:		
					Confirmed that Zone 4 Buttress removal area final subgrade elevation of 41' - 5" per BSE Contract drawing GT-2103.		
					Which Subcontractor provides "demolition and excavation for geothermal piping" is a CM/GC coordination issue.		
					NOTE:		
					1. Subgrade elevation of pits is per BSE Contract drawing GT-2103 as modified by FO T-00010 R2.		
					2. Demolition and excavation depths for geothermal piping is not found in specification section 31 23 34.BGP Contract drawing 4/M1-5002 and notes on BGP Contract drawing M-0006 provide detail on geothermal piping depths.		
T-0318	Verification of Sump Pit and Elevator Pit Locations and Dimensions	Closed	09/24/2012	10/04/2012	09/25/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Jeff Molloy To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification 31 00 00					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The Below Grade Package drawings identify the depression required in the sub grade for future construction of elevator pits and sump pits. The below grade package drawings do not correspond with the Buttress, Shoring and Excavation (BSE) contract drawings for the location depth and size of the elevator and sump pits.					The intent of releasing TGO600 drawings to the CM/GC was solely for coordination purposes between the Below Grade and Buttress/Shoring/Excavation trade packages.		
Please confirm the TG06 drawings supersede the TG03 drawings and should be used for construction.					Please proceed accordingly		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 948 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0318.1	Verification of Sump Pit and Elevation Pit Locations and Dimensions	Closed	10/03/2012	10/13/2012	10/03/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Jeff Molloy To: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Previous response to RFI 309 does not provide the information required for BBII to proceed. It is BBII intent to commence excavating sump and elevator pits per the initial Buttress, Shoring and Excavation contract drawings, unless clearly directed otherwise. Please provide most current drawings that indicate elevator and sump pit locations.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Refer to Field Order 10R2.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-0319	CDSM Connection to Waler Breaks	Closed	09/25/2012	10/05/2012	10/01/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Dean Wallahan To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp; Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Pursuant to 9/25/12 2:34pm W/O / TCCO telephone conversation, please find attached BBII's RFI-314 Project RFI T-0319 CDSM Connection to Waler Breaks.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Due to file size response is attached.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-0319.1	Request for evaluation of necessity of Northwest corner channels levels C&D.	Closed	10/10/2012	10/20/2012	10/11/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: During the 10/10/12 MRP meeting ARUP indicated channels, pursuant to RFI response #T-0319, were not required at the Northwest corner levels C&D. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: This is correct.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-0320	BSE - Ground Level Structural Beams at Gridlines 34 and 34.8	Closed	09/25/2012	10/05/2012	10/02/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 100% Superstructure Package Drawings S1-2307, 1/S1-3206		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: S1-2307 calls out beam elevations on 1/S1-3662 and 1/S1-3663. Beam sections with dimensions are included on these elevation sheets.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 949 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	To coordinate the location of the Beale St. Bridge with future work please provide the dimensions for the Ground Level structural beams located at Gridlines 34 and 34.8.						
T-0321	Additional Excavation and Bracing Constraints at A Line and 301 Mission	Closed	09/26/2012	10/06/2012	10/05/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Dean Wallahan		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Pursuant to discussions with ARUP at the Turner weekly meeting held on September 12, 2012, BBII is requesting the following information regarding the additional excavation and bracing requirements along the A line adjacent to the western and eastern edges of 301 Mission:			Due to file size please find the response attached.				
-Limits of the work							
-Sequence of demolition, excavation and bracing (waler and struts). ie .. do we excavate for installation of one strut or waler at a time or can we expose more than one strut or waler location concurrently.							
-Wall support details, for example there were discussions as to maintaining a soil berm between different stages of the work. Please provide the width, height and length of berm or other support needed.							
-Length of exposed wall area and duration of exposure							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0321.1	Additional Excavation and Bracing Constraints at A Line and 301 Mission	Closed	10/10/2012	10/20/2012	10/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Dean Wallahan To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
BBII would like to confirm the following direction received at TCCO's weekly meeting on October 10, 2012 in regards to the limits of the berm and sequence of work referenced in the response to RFI T-0321.					The sequencing of activities proposed by the Contractor adequately addresses our concerns regarding the Contractor's means and methods which in the other portions of Zone 3 have caused over 1.5 inches of lateral movement into the excavation at locations where excavation has not even progressed past the first level.		
The following work will take place between CDSM beams 251 and 276 along the A-Line and the southern edge of Zone 3's trestle.					Additionally, as discussed in the Movement Review Panel Meeting the morning of October 17, 2012, Arup asked the Contractor to consider excavation under the Fremont Street bridge to progress from south to north. The Contractor agreed that this would be beneficial and possible.		
Demolition: Upon completion of the demolition and removal of the basement walls and footings BBII is to place an earth berm to elevation +10.00, extending 25 feet from the face of the CDSM wall into the excavation and having a 3:1 slope at the southern hinge point of the berm.							
Bracing: Walers 24 and 48 as well as Struts 49 and 50 will be installed within a 6 working day window to address ARUP's concern of overexposure from the Millennium's Building's foundation pressure on the CDSM wall. During the installation of these walers and struts the berm as described in the demolition section above will remain between CDSM beams 260 and 271 until completion of the bracing of walers 24 and 48 and struts 49-50. The sequence will be repeated for installation of walers 25 and 49 as well as struts 51 and 52 with the exception of the earth berm easterly limit will be CDSM beam 276 (centerline of buttress A line pile).							
<hr/>							
T-0321.1R	Additional Excavation and Bracing Constraints at A Line and 301 Mission REVISIO	Closed	10/26/2012	11/05/2012	10/26/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Dean Wallahan To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
BBII would like to confirm the following direction received at TCCO's weekly meeting on October 10, 2012 in regards to the limits of the berm and sequence of work referenced in the response to RFI T-0321.					Confirmed.		
The following work will take place between CDSM beams 251 and 276 along the A-Line and the southern edge of					This direction is consistent with the base contract documents and is solely the result of the action trigger levels experienced in Zone 3 as a result of BBII's excavation methods. Additionally, as discussed in the 10/17/12 MRP meeting, BBII agreed the excavation beneath the Fremont Street bridge was to progress		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 951 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Zone 3's trestle.</p> <p>Demolition: Upon completion of the demolition and removal of the basement walls and footings BBII is to place an earth berm to elevation +10.00, extending 25 feet from the face of the CDSM wall into the excavation and having a 3:1 slope at the southern hinge point of the berm.</p> <p>Bracing: Walers 24 and 48 as well as Struts 49 and 50 will be installed within a 6 working day window to address ARUP's concern of overexposure from the Millennium's Building's foundation pressure on the CDSM wall. During the installation of these walers and struts the berm as described in the demolition section above will remain between CDSM beams 260 and 271 until completion of the bracing of walers 24 and 48 and struts 49-50. The sequence will be repeated for installation of walers 25 and 49 as well as struts 51 and 52 with the exception of the earth berm easterly limit will be CDSM beam 276 (centerline of buttress A line pile).</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 952 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Assuming the dewatering pipes will be cut and capped at 8" below Top of Mat Slab elevation: Is it acceptable to have a void space in the abandoned dewatering pipes between the grout terminating 36" below subgrade elevation to the Bentonite at 14" below top of mat slab?						
T-0322.1	BSE - Dewatering Pipe Termination at System Removal Follow-Up	Closed	10/08/2012	10/18/2012	10/10/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
In follow up to RFI T-0322:				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Upon dewatering system removal BSE Specification 31 23 19 3.9 requires that abandoned piping be filled with grout to an elevation of 36" below subgrade elevation consistent with the originally specified cut and cap elevation. Below Grade Drawing A-8711 does not specify a grout requirement for the dewatering pipes.				No, a void space is not acceptable. The abandoned dewatering pipes are to be grout filled per specification 31 23 19. Follow detail 6/A1-8711 for dewatering pipe steel sleeve, waterproofing and mat slab block out. When the dewatering system is removed, the dewatering pipes are cut off, fully grouted to bottom of the block out and bentonite installed for the last 4" to the top of the sleeve. The a steel cap assembly is welded to the top of the sleeve and the mat slab block out grouted.			
Is it acceptable to have a void space in the abandoned dewatering pipes between the grout terminating 36" below subgrade elevation to the Bentonite at 14" below top of mat slab consistent with the current contract documents?							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0323	Modification of E-line Due to Shortened Shaft E3	Closed	10/03/2012	10/13/2012	10/03/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ernie Cortez To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Arup		Stephen McLandrich		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference attached Becho Letter BI-0282.			The plan outlined in Becho Letter BI-0282 is acceptable.				
An obstruction, believed to be the abandoned D3 casing was encountered during the excavation of Buttress Shaft E3. Please see attached proposal from Becho. We are requesting an expedited response, preferably by 3:00PM 10/3/12.							
<hr/>							
T-0323.1	BSE - Modification of E-line Due to Shortened Shafts	Closed	10/22/2012	11/01/2012	10/24/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Due to Buttress Shafts D1, E1, and E3 all being installed prior to Bedrock please confirm what if any further action is required.			ARUP Response:				
			Install "E4" with the 18" overlap on shaft E3. Place 6000 psi mix (#960PC3Z3).				
			Additional instruction regarding shaft D1 and possible augmentation of shaft E1 will be forthcoming pending analysis				
<hr/>							
T-0323.2	Modification of E-Line Due to Shortened Shaft E3	Closed	10/25/2012	11/04/2012	10/26/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Per discussion at 10/25/12 Daily Buttress Meeting, please verify as to whether or not rebar needs to be installed in shaft E4.			Rebar does not need to be installed in shaft E4.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 954 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0323.3	Modification of E-Line Due to Shortened Shafts	Closed	10/25/2012	11/04/2012	10/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: GT-2201 Reference Specification: 31.63.29 Per RFI T-0323.1 Shaft E4 has been added with an 18" overlap on Shaft E3. BBII considers drilling E4 tangent to E3 in order to avoid casing left in D3. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Install shaft as previously directed.		
<hr/>							
T-0323.4	BSE - Confirmation of Buttress E-4 Installation	Closed	01/17/2013	01/27/2013	01/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: GT2201 Please confirm the verbal direction given after the 1/17/13 8:30 Buttress Meeting that shaft E-4 is to be tangential rather than secant as described in RFI response #T-0323.1.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Supplemental shaft E-4 shall be install tangential to shaft E-3, with full penetration into bedrock, and with 6 ksi concrete.		
<hr/>							
T-0324	BSE - Field Order T-00010R2 - Clouded Revisions	Closed	10/04/2012	10/14/2012	10/15/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comf Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Field Order T-00010R2, TJPA CADD Standards Manual dated 15Nov10 and Sheet A1-8711 attached. Field Order T-00010R2 included the TG06 Below Grade IFC drawings and specifications. It is unclear what revisions are to be incorporated by the TG03 contractor as the revised drawings do not included revision blocks and clouds consistent with the TJPA CADD Standards. For example, sheet A1-8711 (attached) was Issued For			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Issued For Construction drawings and specifications adhere to the TJPA CADD standards. Revision blocks and clouds are not used between Issued for Construction and Issued for Bid drawings. Furthermore, [For Reference Documents] may not require revision blocks and clouds; refer to Figure 6-1 of the TJPA CADD standards manual regarding SD and DD revision sets as an example. Contact the TJPA engineering staff regarding proper interpretation and use of the TJPA CADD standards. A workshop		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Construction with the TG03 BSE package. The revisions to this drawing through the design development and issuance with the TG06 bid/construction set are not clouded and the revision block does not include all previous revision descriptions. The revision block on the final Issued for Construction drawing should read as follows and all changes from the Rev 0 IFC issuance should be clouded in accordance with the TJPA CADD Standards:</p> <p>No Date Description Ä0 12/10/2010 Issued For Construction - Buttress/Shoring/Excavation ÄA 4/18/2012 Issued for Bid - Below Grade Package ÄB 8/17/2012 Issued for Bid - Below Grade Package - Addendum #2 Ä1 8/30/2012 Issued for Construction- Below Grade Package</p> <p>Please confirm any previously issued IFC drawings that have since been revised will be re-issued consistent with the TJPA CADD standards. Also, please confirm all packages going forward will be in accordance with the TJPA CADD standards revision provisions.</p>						
T-0324.1	Field Order T-00010R2 - Clouded Revisions	Closed	10/17/2012	10/27/2012	10/23/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Turner Construction Comç Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
In follow up to RFI response #T-0324 and the 10/17/12 BSE meeting it was clarified by AAI that what W/O was requesting in RFI #T-0324 was actually a "revision set for TG03". Please provide.			Per Ed Sum, TJPA: "No"				
<hr/>							
T-0325	BSE - Excavation Sequence Relative to Installation of Struts 10 & 11	Closed	10/05/2012	10/15/2012	10/11/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 956 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>In an effort to expedite the installation of struts 10 & 11 at level D to help reduce eastward movement of the A-line wall, BBII proposes the following:</p> <p>Excavate to level D for struts STD-10 and STD-11, and notch along the wall so that waler WD-05 may be installed, leaving the berm present beyond the notch. Excavate on the south side to the end of waler WD-67. Excavation to install strut STD-12 will proceed once enough struts have been installed at level C to advance the level D excavation to strut STD-12 per the specifications.</p> <p>A sketch has been attached for reference. Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>We cannot respond to this RFI as the sketch shows an unsafe slope at the excavation.</p>		
T-0326	Available Power Source for First Street Traffic Signal	Closed	10/15/2012	10/25/2012	10/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams			
Co-Author:							
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>First Street Bridge Temporary Traffic Signal is due to be activated on 10/24/2012. The traffic signal controller cabinet requires electrical power to activate the signal. Being that BBII will not be drawing power off site temporary power (Skids 3 and 4), please advise and provide direction for the use of an available power source.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Specification 01-53-13 for Temporary Bridge does not require Traffic Signals at Trestle/Bridge intersection.</p> <p>Existing Traffic Control (Cristy Box) infrastructure available in the north sidewalks of both First and Fremont Street. These are the closest traffic control infrastructure from the Temporary Bridges with conduit/boxes that contained previous traffic control signal wiring. There is also existing Traffic Control (Cristy Box) infrastructure available at the intersection with Howard Street.</p> <p>First Street Bridge: WOJV Contract (RUP Project) did remove and salvage traffic signaling equipment and protected the infrastructure (boxes, conduits under sidewalk). Refer to RUP Drawing U-3301. Therefore believe it is in Webcor/BBII's scope to determine the best available power source.</p> <p>Fremont Street Bridge: WOJV Contract (RUP Project) did remove and salvage traffic signaling equipment and protected the infrastructure (boxes, conduits</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 957 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0327	GRD - Ground Rod Placement	Closed	10/16/2012	10/26/2012	10/31/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: BASS Electric Jerry Brys		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: There are no dimensions shown for placement of the ground rods. Should we scale off the drawings or will a drawing be produced reflecting dimensions?				The placement of the ground rods and the ground ring does not require exact dimensioning. The ground rods are regularly spaced around the building perimeter at the building column lines approximately forty five feet on center. The rods are shown approximately two feet inside the foundation wall, but they can be closer to the foundation wall if the layout is coordinated with the geothermal system piping, micropiles and foundation wall supports.			
				Per Section 26 05 01, provide Contractor's Coordination drawings for review.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0328	BSE - Re-Bracing Elevations	Closed	10/17/2012	10/17/2012	11/01/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Drawing GT-1112 stage 13 shows a maximum of 16' or 17' between level B struts and the lower level of rebracing. For Case West, level B supports are at elevation -3 ', resulting in the lower level of rebracing supports at elevation -20'. Internal bracing drawing sheet SH-4000 shows W21 strut support members on the underside of level C bracing. In order to install the lower level rebracing and accommodate the existing level C bracing, the lower level bracing will need to be installed at elevation -22'.</p> <p>Similarly, the top level of rebracing is called out in stage 15 to be 3' below level A bracing. Top level rebracing will need to be 5' below level A bracing in order for struts to be clear of the overhead strut supports.</p> <p>Please confirm that the 17' and 16' maximum dimensions in stage 13 and 3' maximum dimension in stage 15 will not be required if the rebracing design calculations show that it is acceptable.</p>				<p>Constructructability issues shall be reviewed by Webcor / Obayashi. This is acceptable pending review of submittal.</p>			
<hr/>							
T-0329	BGP - Proposed Construction Joint Layout	Closed	10/24/2012	11/03/2012	10/31/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Reference sketches: SCCI #1, SCCI #2 Reference Drawing: S-0007 Reference Specification: 03 30 20</p> <p>Per note CJ-2 on sheet S-0007 No horizontal construction joints will be permitted unless specifically shown in the drawings or approved in writing. Please confirm that the longitudinal construction joint shown between gridlines G and K is acceptable as it follows the micropile construction sequence and it will help the schedule with re-bracing in the Southwest Corner.</p>				<p>Proposed construction joint between gridlines G & K (assumed to be along grid J) is acceptable for the mat and Lower Concourse slab, however, please note the following comments:</p> <p>1. Proposed construction joint(s) is not a horizontal joint.</p> <p>2. Mat Pour Layout: a) Per spec 03 30 20 3.2.B.1, joints in slabs "...shall be located within the central third of the span." b) Per spec 03 30 20 3.2.A.4 "Foundation wall, lower concourse floor slab, and ground floor construction joints shall align with the location of the mat slab joint below."</p> <p>3. Lower Concourse Pour Layout:</p>			
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 959 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0330	BSE - Mud Slab Vapor Retarder	Closed	10/30/2012	11/09/2012	11/09/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:		Vapor Retarder is not required for the Mud Slab.					
Reference Drawing : A1-8711 S1-3003							
Reference Specification: 03 30 00							
Specification 03 30 00.3 .I.E, Vapor Retarder Placement::							
See Division 7, Thermal and Moisture Protection,							
describes installation of vapor retarder. Specification 03 30							
00.3 .4.A.13 states "Place vapor retarder directly below							
slabs on grade as specified in contract documents."							
Vapor retarder is not referenced on Detail 5, Mud Slab							
Detail, on sheet S1-3003, or on any of the slab penetration							
details on sheets A1-8711 and S1-3003 .							
Please verify whether or not vapor retarder is required.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 960 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0331	BGP - Geothermal Maximum Horizontal Loop or Ground Loop Zone Length	Closed	10/31/2012	11/10/2012	11/05/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 23 57 34					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm that there is no restriction on GHEX Horizontal Loop or Ground Loop Zone length.					There is no maximum length for the headers. Most headers should be roughly the same length, the headers are set up in reverse return fashion to allow for self-balancing of the loops. All headers will ultimately be balanced at the entrance to building allowing for some variation in header length to accommodate building entrance locations.		
					All loops on a single header should be the same length. The number of loops attached to a single header has been limited to 10.		
<hr/>							
T-0332	BSE - Micropile W203 Relocation	Closed	11/01/2012	11/11/2012	11/02/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Micropile 203 as laid out is too close to a piezometer well. BBII proposes moving pile W203 East 4'-9.5" and South 1 '-.75". See attached sketch.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm this is acceptable.					Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving Micropile 203 as proposed.		
<hr/>							
T-0333	BSE - Utilization of the Mat Slab for Re-Bracing Reactions	Closed	11/01/2012	11/11/2012	11/07/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Is utilizing the mat slab for re-bracing reactions (via rackers) acceptable provided it meets the provisions set forth within 31 55 00 1.5 Q in regards to connections, penetrations, imbeds, and restoration?					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Structurally, it is acceptable to utilize the mat slab for re-bracing provided provisions in specification article 1.5.Q are met as well as specification article 1.5.R, which shall also apply for the mat (i.e. reactions shall not exceed capacity of mat). Submit re-bracing for review per submittal process, including calculations that show reactions onto permanent structure do not exceed capacity of permanent structure.		
					Contractor shall outline to TJPB if there will be a cost		



This statement implies that the utilization of the mat slab for rebracing reactions is a deviation from what is required by contract. Please identify the primary method the rebracing design is to employ in order resist gravity, seismic, or other additional loading to be resisted and/or provide restraint against buckling, torsion, or other function as necessary per the design to provide required capacities of elements.



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0333.2	BSE - Utilization of the Mat Slab for Re-Bracing Reactions Follow-Up	Closed	11/09/2012	11/19/2012	11/20/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
RFI T-0333 inquired if utilizing the mat slab for re-bracing reactions was acceptable provided it meets the provisions set forth within 31 55 00 1.5 Q in regards to connections, penetrations, imbeds, and restoration.					TT Response: As stated in the original RFI T-0333 response, "...specification article 1.5, which shall also apply for the mat (i.e. reactions shall not exceed capacity of mat). Submit re-bracing for review per submittal process, including calculations that show reactions onto permanent structure do not exceed capacity of permanent structure."		
The response stated that structurally it was acceptable provided the contractor outline if there will be a cost and schedule reduction pursuant to the specification requirements for "Proposed Alternatives". W/O is unable to locate a specification provision for "Proposed Alternatives" in the TG03 or TG06 contract documents.					URS Response: If the load capacities to be provided by re-bracing elements are less than the design loading for bracing elements removed, then specifically identify this in the re-bracing submission. Any reduction of this loading requires specific explanation and specific review and approval.		
Is utilizing the mat slab for rebracing reactions acceptable pursuant to the TG03 or TG06 contract documents?							
If acceptable, please identify the specification section for "Proposed Alternatives" within the TG03 or TG06 documents so cost and schedule reduction proposals can be provided pursuant to the applicable requirements.							
Additionally, please identify the TG03 and/or TG06 contract requirements for secondary bracing (31 55 00 1.3D) geometry.							
T-0334	BGP - Catch Basin Elevation at Gridlines 14 and B.3.	Closed	11/01/2012	11/11/2012	11/02/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: A1-2814					At gridline 14 and B.3, Catch Basin Elevation is TOC - 37'-8" and the adjacent Sump Pit Elevation is TOC - 39'-8".		
Please provide the elevation for the catch basin located along gridlines 14 and B.3.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 963 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0335	BGP - Contract Bury Bar for Support	Closed	11/05/2012	11/15/2012	11/10/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 03 30 00 Please confirm it is acceptable to displace a top mat 4th layer contract reinforcing bar and a bottom mat 2nd layer contract reinforcing bar one bar diameter every 6' - 0" +/- oc to support the mat reinforcing. A sketch is attached for reference and to graphically represent the proposed bar configuration.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is not acceptable to displace/deviate mat rebar from contract layout. NOTE: The RFI sketch does not graphically represent the orientation of mat reinforcement. See "Mat Bottom Rebar Notes" on S1-2022 and "Mat Top Rebar Notes" on S1-2052 as well as detail 3/S1-3005 for orientation of layers of mat reinforcement.		
T-0336	BGP - Wall Dowels Standard Hooks	Closed	11/05/2012	11/15/2012	11/10/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 03 20 00 Reference Drawings: S1-3201 Contract drawing S1-3201, Section 1 depicts the #11 vertical wall dowels with a terminator, typ. embedded into the mat foundation rather than a standard hook. Shimmick is requesting the option to utilize a #11 standard hook (1' - 7") orientated inward or a terminator as shown at these locations. Please verify that either option is acceptable for use.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor-proposed #11 standard hook for wall vertical bars is not acceptable as the inside wall bar would need to be hooked towards the outer bar and would result in congestion. Please provide vertical wall bars with terminators per contract drawing.		
T-0337	BGP - Bottom Mat Reinforcing Clear Cover to Edge	Closed	11/06/2012	11/16/2012	11/12/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 03 30 00 Reference Drawings: S1-3201 Contract drawing S1-3201 depicts the clear cover to the mat reinforcing as 6" along the edge. Please verify it is acceptable to extend the bottom mat reinforcing closer to the edge such that the clear cover along the edge is 2", the same as it is for the vertical wall reinforcement.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor - proposed modification to clear cover at mat edge is not acceptable as it would result in a congestion condition. Please provide contract drawing clear cover.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 964 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0338	BGP - Mat Reinforcing Clear Cover, Exterior Face Wall Vertical Clear Cover.	Closed	11/06/2012	11/16/2012	11/10/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert KjomeTo: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 03 20 00 Reference Drawing: S1-3001 / S1-3201				The 3" clear cover listed in detail 5/S1-3001 is for "concrete cast against and permanently exposed to earth", which does not apply to the mat. Bottom mat reinforcement clear cover is confirmed to be 3" per "Mat Bottom Rebar Notes" (note 7) on S1-2022.			
Please confirm the clear cover to the bottom mat reinforcing is 3" as called out on contract drawing sheet S1-3001, typical detail 5. Additionally please verify if the outside face vertical reinforcing bars can be lifted such that clear cover to this bar is 6" from the concrete below as it is for the inside face vertical bar as depicted on contract drawing S1-3201.				The outside face vertical reinforcement bars may not be lifted. Provide contract drawing clear cover.			
T-0339	BGP - Wall Reinforcing Clear Cover	Closed	11/06/2012	11/16/2012	11/15/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert KjomeTo: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 03 20 00 Reference Drawing: S1-3201				The 2" clear cover to the vertical wall reinforcement on S1-3201 is confirmed.			
Contract drawing sheet S1-3201 depicts extent lines showing the 2" clear cover to the vertical wall reinforcing bars. Please confirm that the cross ties will infringe on the 2" clear cover and that the design intent is to maintain the clear cover to the main vertical reinforcing.				The cross ties do occupy space within the 2" clear cover as depicted in section 1 and 4 on S1-3201.			
T-0340	BGP - IDEA Machine	Closed	11/06/2012	11/16/2012	11/15/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert KjomeTo: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 03 20 00 Reference Drawings: N/A				It will be acceptable to use contractor-proposed use of machine-welded holding wires to column ties and beam stirrups only provided the following conditions are met:			
Shimmick would like to request the use of the Schnell IDEA Machine. The IDEA Machine pre-assembles grade beam, columns or other "boundary" type elements by a process of resistance welding three (3) 1/4" ASTM 82 wires to the ASTM A706 reinforcing ties. This process provides a more secure and accurate tie configuration with				1. Column ties and beam stirrups must be ASTM A706.			
				2. Holding wire bars shall conform to ASTM A82 or			

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	a more effective and timely installation. Attached is CRSI's engineering data report #53 which provides an in-depth explanation of the process as well as their acceptance of the same. Also attached is a reference list of recent projects where this process has been approved and utilized as well as a testing report from Christensen Materials Engineering. Please confirm if this is acceptable.						
			A496.				
			3. Holding wires are only allowed to be welded to column ties and beam stirrups #5 or smaller.				
			4. Holding wires are not to eliminate any longitudinal bars or interfere with flow and placement of concrete.				
			5. Verification tests: Contractor shall submit results of verification tests conducted during the month of tie/stirrup production from a Certified Testing Laboratory for review. Tests shall be performed on 3 samples of bar sizes to match project conditions. Samples shall have a gage length of 24 bar diameters with the holding wire weld located in the middle quarter of the length. Test the samples in tension and report elongation of the sample at fracture, the location of the fracture and the type of fracture. Test and production bars to be welded shall be ASTM A706.				
			6. Production tests: If verification tests are acceptable, production tests will be required only if there is deviation from the accepted process or if the inspector identifies potential defects.				
			7. Fabrication shall conform to the following:				
			a.) Holding wire welds shall be located a minimum of 2 tie/stirrup diameters away from bends and/or cold-worked regions of stirrups.				
			b.) Maintain a minimum clear cover from the face of the concrete to the ties/stirrups as noted on the drawings and maintain clear cover to holding wire as required by ACI 318.				
			c.) If field installation requires adjustment of tie/stirrup locations due to mis-coordination or mis-placement, adjustments/corrections shall be responsibility of Contractor.				
			d.) Holding wires shall be located a minimum of 2 inches clear from main longitudinal bars.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 966 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0341	BGP - One Piece Ties	Closed	11/06/2012	11/16/2012	11/10/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Shimmick would like to request the use of the "one-piece" or "serpentine" ties at this project. These ties are made by an automatic bender that bends a column or boundary element tie from one continuous piece of rebar. The end result is the same perimeter and cross tie configuration as the design in the contract documents. Please confirm if this procedure is acceptable.				The contractor-proposed approach to use "one-piece" / "serpentine" ties is acceptable as long as contract document rebar configuration is provided. Submit per reinforcement submittal process			
				e.) Longitudinal steel may NOT be welded to ties/stirrups.			
				8. Submit this weld procedure with applicable concrete reinforcement submittal.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0341.1	BGP - Type D8 Column Serpentine Ties	Closed	12/04/2013	12/11/2013	12/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please refer to drawing S1-3305 and RFI T-0341.			George Metzger 12/9/2013				
The response to RFI T-0341 accepted the use of one-piece/serpentine ties for the columns as proposed by Gerdau. Gerdau has found that the fabrication of a single piece serpentine tie for the type D8 column could pose safety risks. Therefore, Gerdau is proposing to fabricate the type D8 column ties with two pieces of serpentine ties. See the attached Gerdau sketch SK- T-0341.1 for details.			RESPONSE: Proposed serpentine tie configuration for Tie Type D8 will conflict with anchor bolts for the steel column above. Refer to Sheet S1-3305 for the design tie configuration for Column C7 (Tie Type D8). However, proposed Serpentine tie configuration can be used up to an elevation within the column where anchor bolts are not present. Where anchor bolts are present, loose ties that confirm with the design configuration shall be used to clear the anchor bolts. Note the following anchor bolt embedment lengths for different anchor bolt configurations: - For Column C7 with Type T anchor bolts, anchor bolts are embedded 3'-8" from the top of the Lower Concourse Moment Frame beam. - For Column C7 with Type TT anchor bolts, anchor bolts are embedded 6'-8" from the top of the Lower Concourse Moment Frame beam. - For Column C7 with Type TTT anchor bolts, anchor bolts are embedded 20' from the top of the Lower Concourse Moment Frame beam. See Sheet S1-5051 for further information on anchor bolts. Also, per RFI T-0924, it is acceptable to eliminate/lower column cross ties that interfere with the shear key block out. (Ties and hoops that do not interfere shall remain.) This information should also be considered in finalizing the detailing/fabrication of the column ties near the top of the concrete columns.				
Please confirm the alternate serpentine ties as shown in the attached sketch is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 968 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0342	BGP - Mat Slab Reinforcing and Lap Ratio	Closed	11/06/2012	11/16/2012	11/20/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: In follow up to the 10/31/12 Value Engineering prosal meeting, please confirm it is acceptable to change the grade 60 #11 bars to grade 75 #10 bars in the mat slab reinforcing. Please provide the increased lap ratio required for the change in grade and bar size.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is structurally acceptable to change the grade 60 #11 bars to grade 75 #10 bars for the mat slab reinforcement. Tension lap splice length for #10, grade 75, category 1*, top bars*, f'c 5 ksi = 115 in. Tension lap splice length for #10, grade 75, category 1*, other bars*, f'c 5 ksi = 89 in. (* = See 1/S1-3001 for notes/definitions) Per discussion at 11/16/12 VE meeting, CR for VE items will be issued in the future.		
T-0343	BSE - Micropile W072 Relocation	Closed	11/09/2012	11/19/2012	11/12/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Micropile W072 as laid out is too close to overhead strut support BA-29. BBII Proposes moving pile W072 East 1' to provide adequate clearance See attached sketch. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving Micropile 072 as proposed.		
T-0344	Micropile W073 and W074 Relocation	Closed	11/12/2012	11/22/2012	11/13/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Micropiles W073 and W074 as laid out are too close to overhead strut support BA-28. BBII proposes moving pile W073 West 2' and North 0.5' and pile W074 East 2' and South 0.5' to provide adequate clearance. See attached sketch.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving Micropile 073 and Micropile 074 as proposed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-0345	BSE - CDSM Wall Parallel Stiffness for Bridge Design	Closed	11/13/2012	11/23/2012	11/15/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Specification Reference: 01 53 13.1.3D		Refer to Note 5 on GT-1111 which requires the Contractor to analyze the soldier piles if the soldier piles are subjected to loads other than those shown on the drawings. Refer to the Contract Documents for the design strength of the CDSM material.					
BBII has recently received information in a non bridge design related correspondence that could impact the already designed, permitted, and constructed First and Fremont St. Bridges. In an ARUP memo dated October 5th, 2012 bullet #2 states:							
"The Contractor has verbally attested that they designed the diagonal corner braces using an interpretation of Note 11 on sheet GT-1111 which yielded a key assumption which is that the CDSM wall is infinitely strong and infinitely stiff. This assumption is an inaccurate and unreasonable interpretation of this note and in no way does the note infer this".							
Although this comment is in reference to the internal bracing design, it also relates to the temporary bridge design. As noted on page 156 of the First and Fremont St Bridge structural calculations (attached), this same interpretation of note 11 on GT-1111 was used for the abutment shear key design. The Bridges have been designed, reviewed and approved by DPW under with the assumption that no additional deformation occurs at the base of the abutments. If in fact the CDSM wall is truly NOT infinitely strong or infinitely stiff parallel to the wall, BBII requests a value from the CDSM engineer of record that can used in our re-evaluation of the First and Fremont Bridges to ensure the existing design remains in compliance with the design criteria. Additionally this value would be used in the re-design of the Beale St. Bridge.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0346	BGP - Mat Slab Maximum Aggregate Size	Closed	11/15/2012	11/25/2012	11/21/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specification Reference 30 30 20 Shimmick is requesting approval of 1 inch nominal maximum aggregate size in lieu of the 3/4 inch nominal maximum aggregate size for the Mat Slab concrete. Shimmick's backup data indicates that concrete made with larger aggregate size (1 inch instead of 3/4 inch) produces lower drying shrinkage values mainly due to a reduction in the water consumption of the mix and a reduction in paste content.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor-proposed use of 1" nominal max aggregate size for the mat slab concrete is acceptable. Submit mix designs through submittal process. Jeff Thiel Per discussion at 11/16/12 VE meeting, a CR for VE items will be issued in the future.			
T-0347	Trim Steel Requirements for the Mud Slab	Closed	11/19/2012	11/29/2012	11/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 03 20 01 Reference Drawing: S1-3003 Please confirm that trim steel will not be required. If trim steel is required, provide the details for trim in the 4" mudslab where the #4 bars @ 18" are interrupted. Please reference the attached sketch.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFI question is not clear and is inconsistent with the referenced documents. Revise and resubmit the RFI with a clear question. The mud slab is scope for Package TG03 in which the rebar shop drawing (TG0300-340.0, Item TZ1020-032001A06.0) has already been approved. The referenced specification does not apply to the mud slab.			
T-0347.1	BSE - Mud Slab Trim Rebar	Closed	12/12/2012	12/22/2012	12/18/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Submittal: TG0300-340 Reference Sketch: 12B035_SK-1 Upon further review of contract requirements subsequent to the approval of the mud slab rebar shop drawings (TG0300-340) it does not appear that trim steel is required for penetrations in the mud slab.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Trim steel at penetrations in the mud slab will not be required.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0348	BSE - Micropile W235 Relocation From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome Co-Author: REQUEST: Micropile W235 as laid out cannot be effectively installed from the Trestle. BBII proposes moving pile W235 North 2' to provide adequate clearance. See attached sketch. Please confirm this is acceptable.	Closed	11/20/2012	11/30/2012	11/20/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving Micropile 235 as proposed.				
T-0349	BGP - Construction Joint Layout From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference Specification: 03 30 20.3.2.A.3 Per specification 033020.3.2.A.3 the maximum construction joint spacing in the mat slab is 120 feet (E/W direction), 3.2.A.4 maximum construction joint spacing in the foundation wall, lower concourse slab, ramp slab, interior walls,and the ground floor concrete slab is 60 feet. Foundation wall, lower concourse floor slab, and ground floor construction joints shall align with the location of the mat slab joint below and 3.2.B.1 construction joints in floor slab shall be located within the central third of the span. Due to the moment frames along grid lines V, W, and X being angled Shimmick see's the attached drawings as the only viable contruction joint layout to comply with all set forth specifications. Please advise if the mat slab, foundation wall, and lower concourse construction joint layout is acceptable?	Closed	11/20/2012	11/30/2012	11/21/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Compy Jeff Thiel				
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFIs shall be used for interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents. RFIs requesting acceptance of items required to be submitted through the submittal process are inappropriate for the RFI process and will be rejected.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0349.1	BGP - Construction Joint Layout	Closed	11/26/2012	12/06/2012	12/07/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per specification 03 30 20.3.2.A.3 the maximum construction joint spacing in the mat slab is 120 feet (E/W direction), 3.2.A.4 maximum construction joint spacing in the foundation wall, lower concourse slab, ramp slab, interior walls, and the ground floor concrete slab is 60 feet. Foundation wall, lower concourse floor slab, and ground floor construction joints shall align with the location of the mat slab joint below and 3.2.B.1 construction joints in floor slab shall be located within the central third of the span. Due to the beam configurations at the South West radius of the train box the following deviations from the aforementioned requirements will be required: 1.) A construction joint will need to pass through a Moment Frame Beam along Grid Line X near Grid Line H in the attached sketch. 2.) Slab construction joints at two locations will not align with the mat slab or wall construction joints along the radius wall between Grid Line Wand Grid Line 5. Please confirm these proposed deviations would be acceptable pending evaluation of a full contract joint location submittal.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Q1.) Contractor-proposed construction joint through the Lower Concourse MF beam is acceptable provided it is located in the middle third of beam span. Q2.) Construction joints shall align with mat slab and wall construction joints. Additional comments: A.) The mat construction joint at GL 1-J shall align with a wall construction joint. B.) Include overlay of trestle pier layout in formal joint layout submittal.			

T-0350	BGP - Mat Slab Penetration Waterproofing	Closed	11/21/2012	12/01/2012	11/28/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specifiction Reference: 07 12 10 Drawing Reference: A1-8711 Please reference Drawing Sheet A1-8711, Laurenco E-Mail and Stamped Shop Drawing Details. Penetration details on drawing sheet AI-8711 call for 4 inch wide butyl tape to wrap around the mat slab penetrations prior to pouring of the mud slab. The specifications call for all shop drawings to bear the manufacturer's stamp of approval. Laurenco (manufacturer) has indicated that they require the butyl tape to extend 4 inches minimum past the		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As recommended by the waterproofing manufacturer's (Laurenco) specifications and written recommendation for the waterproofing system as you outline in the RFI question, the TJPA representative does not object to extending the butyl tape 4 inches minimum past the top of the mud slab.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 973 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
top of the mud slab. Please review and advise as this does not match the as bid details.							
T-0350.1	BGP - Mat Slab Penetration Waterproofing	Closed	12/06/2012	12/16/2012	12/13/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Robert Kjome	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification:07 12 10		For details 2, 3 and 5 on A1/8711 the butyl tape can extend 4" above the mud slab. However on details 4 and 6 on A1/8711 the butyl tape at the penetration does not 'tie off' on to the waterproofing membrane. For these details the waterproofing does not engage with the butyl tape at the mud slab penetration, the steel sleeve is in the same plane as the butyl tape, therefore the butyl tape cannot extend above the mud slab. The details will not be revised.					
Reference Documents: A1-8711							
Futher to the engineers response to RFI T-0350, the extension of the butyl tape conflicts with the casings that are required around the dewatering wells, trestle piles, bridge piles, and pin piles. Please provide revised details at each of the aforementioned locations to accommodate the extended butyl tape.							
		The Contractor's shop drawing submittal is to be revised to show the butyl tape's relationship to the waterproofing membrane and other elements of the assembly. Submit the revised shop drawing with manufacturer's recommended detail for the butyl tape for TJPA Representative review.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 974 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0350.2	BGP - Mat Slab Penetration Waterproofing	Closed	12/20/2012	12/30/2012	12/21/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: A1-8711 SCCI would like to confirm conversations concerning the Butyl tape and Mud Slab Penetrations. From the meeting held 12/19/2012, the design Engineer mentioned that the Butyl tape at the Mud Slab Penetrations does not serve as a waterproofing purpose, but rather a bond breaker between the concrete and the steel penetrating through the mud slab. Because of this, the Engineer stated the Butyl tape did not need to be extended above the Mud Slab and could stop at the penetration slab. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> With the exception of the tie down WP detail 2/A1-8711, the Butyl tape at the Mud Slab Penetrations does not serve a waterproofing purpose, but rather a bond breaker between the concrete and element penetrating through the mud slab. On 2/A1-8711 the butyl tape does engage the waterproofing and must extend above the mud slab.		
T-0351	BGP - Grace Eclipse Floor 200	Closed	11/26/2012	12/06/2012	11/26/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 03 30 20 Eclipse Floor and Eclipse Plus admixtures were replaced by a new generation of drying shrinkage reducing admixtures Eclipse Floor 200 and Eclipse 4500. This new family of admixtures is equivalent to BASF Tetraguard and based on our experience we should be able to achieve project specifications on drying shrinkage. CEMEX has been using the two new products for more than two years with excellent results. Attached, please find the communication from Grace Construction Products about the two new shrinkage reducing admixture products. Please verify these eclipse products are acceptable for use on this project.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It will be acceptable to use contractor-proposed Eclipse products pending acceptable strength test results. Submit substitution request for products not listed in specifications.		
T-0352	BGP - Commissioning of Ground Loop Heat Exchanger	Closed	11/26/2012	11/26/2012	11/30/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 975 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0352.1	BGP - Commissioning of Ground Loop Heat Exchanger Follow-Up From: Webcor Construction LP David Fields To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: REQUEST: In reviewing the issued for construction documents W/O is unable to locate specification section "01 91 00 General Commisioning Requirements" or "23 08 00 HVAC Systems Commisioning". Please advise.	Closed			11/30/2012 12/10/2012 12/07/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
					ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					To clarify, specification section 01 91 00 and 23 08 00 have not been issued and do not apply to this work. The answer to RFI T-0352 is superseded by this RFI reply. Specification section 23 57 34 shall be used by the Contractor to fully furnish, install and provide pre-functional testing and documentation to prove the design requirements prior to back-fill and post back-fill. A TJPA representative will review the results of the Contractor's commissioning efforts. All of the necessary pre-functional requirements for the below grade package are provided in specification section 23 57 34.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0353	BSE - Micropile W107 Relocation	Closed	12/04/2012	12/14/2012	12/11/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Micropile W107 as laid out is in conflict with Pin-pile #15.				Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving Micropile W107 as proposed.			
BBII proposes moving Micropile W107 North 0.5' and West 3' to provide adequate clearance. See attached sketch.							
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-0354	BSE - Sump Pit Location and Dimension	Closed	12/06/2012	12/16/2012	12/11/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Specification Reference: 31-00-00 Reference Drawings: S1-2022, S1-3006				The requested dimension is 4'-9".			
Drawing S1-2022 and S1-3006 do not have all necessary dimensions to properly excavate the Sump Pit on the North Side of Zone 1 between GL 4 and GL 5. Please provide the dimension to the eastern edge as indicated in blue on Drawing S1-2022.							
T-0355	BSE - Zone 4 Instrumentation Pad Demolition	Closed	12/11/2012	12/11/2012	12/18/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference section 10 on contract drawing GT-5102. The 1ft thick concrete instrumentation slab extending beyond the face of the A line CDSM wall into zone 4 will be demolishing with the tops of the buttress shafts during our excavation of the first level of zone 4. This will affect the sensors in the slab.				The instrumentation slab shall not be demolished. The slab shall remain in place as shown on the drawings.			
Please confirm that this is acceptable							
T-0355.1	BSE - Zone 4 Instrumentation Pad Demolition	Closed	01/30/2013	02/09/2013	02/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 978 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0356.1	BGP - GEOTHERMAL - Loop Soil Compaction Conflict in Specifications	Closed	01/22/2013	02/01/2013	01/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached excerpts from spec section 23 57 34, 31 23 34 and RFI response to T-0356. The RFI response to T-0356 (SCI-017) requires the backfill of the trenches to meet specifications section 23 57 34 and 31 23 34. However, the two sections are in conflict with one another. Section 23 57 34-3.1, D, requires geothermal loop trenches to be filled with loose soil and then apply water to settle the loose soil. Section 31 23 34, notes that flooding or jetting with water is not allowed. Therefore, the work sequence directed in RFI T-0356 to meet "...spec section 23 57 34 loose soil shall be used by the geothermal contractor to backfill the trenches where the HDPE ground loops are located to avoid any damage to the pipes during the process. Once the trenches have been backfilled per section 23 57 34 and the piping is protected the soil can be compacted as required by section 31 23 34..." are not feasible. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Wetting of backfill not required.	
<hr/>							
T-0357	BGP - Geothermal Stainless Steel vs. Galvanized Pipe Sleeves	Closed	12/11/2012	12/21/2012	12/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: A1-8712 Reference Drawing: 23 05 30 2.3B Detail 2 on Architectural Plan Sheet A1-8712 shows a 1 /4" Stainless Steel pipe sleeve where as specification section 23 05 30, Page 2, 2.3B references Std Wt. galvanized steel pipe sleeves. Please confirm which sleeves are to be used.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Utility Penetration Sleeves through the Foundation Wall are to be stainless steel as detailed on the architectural drawings.	



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0358	BGP - Geothermal Ground Temperature Probe Sleeve	Closed	12/11/2012	12/21/2012	12/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: M1-5002 Detail A on M1-5002 shows the 2" ground temperature probe sleeve terminating at grade. Detail 5 on M1-5002 shows the same pipe terminating at the same elevation as GLS/GLR piping. Please provide an elevation drawing for the temperature probe pipe sleeve.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Final elevation of 2" temperature probe sleeve is at same elevation as the GLS/R pipes in their final position as shown in detail #5 as shown on sheet M1-5002.			
T-0358.1	BGP - Geothermal Temperature Probe Elevations	Closed	02/25/2014	03/07/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per field conversations with the geothermal EOR(WSP) the elevation of the four(4) temperature probe stub outs has been revised. Please provide the revised elevations of these temperature probe stub outs. Note that two(2) of the temperature probes have already been installed to an elevation consistent with the response to seer RFI 18(T-0358).		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFI-0358 Response stated: "Final elevation of 2" temperature probe sleeve is at same elevation as the GLS/R pipes in their final position as shown in detail #5 as shown on sheet M1-5002." The header pipes were not installed tight to ground level the slab as shown on sheet M1-5002. Temperature probe piping shall be installed tight to the ground level slab as indicated on the design documents. Alternatively the probe piping may be installed at the elevation of the shut off valves in RFI-1167, RFI-1169 and RFI-1172.			
T-0359	BGP - Water Treatment for Geothermal	Closed	12/18/2012	12/18/2012	12/21/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification 23 57 34 Sub Section 3.4 During the TG06 IFB process section 3.4 was added to the Ground Loop Heat Exchanger specifications. We believe this requirement is intended for a future bid package during the commissioning of the system. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Water Treatment and cleaning of the system is required as part of the TG06 Scope of work.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0360	BSE - Mud Slab Welded Wire Reinforcement	Closed	12/21/2012	12/28/2012	01/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Specification Section: 03 20 01					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Regarding the concrete reinforcement within the mud slab, BBII would like the option of using Deformed Welded Wire Reinforcement (DWR) in lieu of rebar reinforcement. DWR strictly conforms to ACI 318 and offers multiple advantages to rebar reinforcement. Particularly, DWR will help reduce the risk of inclement weather damage to the subgrade, due to a quicker installation which will leave the subgrade exposed for a shorter period of time. Please see attached supporting documentation.					Albeit after the specified 10 days, W/O will consider this substitution request only subsequent to receipt of a completed Request for Substitution form found in specification section 00 04 40.		
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-0361	BGP - Slab Penetration Sleeve Slipsheets	Closed	01/03/2013	01/13/2013	01/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference S1-3003:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The existing piles are to be wrapped with a 10 Mil polyethylene (for 30" & 36" sleeves) or 112" compressible material (for 48") slipsheet between the sleeve and the piles. Because of the minimal distance between the sleeve weld and the existing pile, the slipsheet at the weld locations will be damaged from the heat of the welding. Is this acceptable?					It is acceptable to provide a 4" vertical break in the slipsheet at the sleeve joint to avoid burn damage.		
If the slipsheets cannot be damaged by the heat of the welding, can the slipsheets have a 3" or 4" vertical break in them at the locations of the vertical welds to avoid the bum damage? This would create two slipsheet breaks or gaps per pile penetration. Is this acceptable?							
T-0362	BGP - Wall Vertical Reinforcement at 3rd Level Bracing	Closed	01/07/2013	01/17/2013	01/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0364	BGP - WPM-1 ASTM 6769 & Blindside Waterproofing Application	Closed	01/15/2013	01/24/2013	01/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please refer to Specification 07 12 10 3.3 and Drawing 1/A1-8710.				1. Paragraphs 11.4.1.1, 11.6 and 11.7 are not applicable to the blindside installation.			
Section 3.3 of the specifications require that all work be performed in accordance with ASTM D6769 (Application of Fully Adhered, Cold-Applied, Prefabricated Reinforced Modified Bituminous Membrane Waterproofing Systems). The WPM-1 vertical application (071210-1.1, A.2) is a blind-side WP application; however, the ASTM D6769 is written to address positive-side WP application.				2. Paragraphs 11.4 1.1 through 11.4.1.4 relating to a one ply application are not applicable to the 2 ply vertical installation specified and indicated on this Project.			
1. Please confirm the blind -side WP application is covered under the ASTM D6769 requirement or provide the applicable ASTM requiriment to perform the blind-side application.				3. Paragraph 11.4.1.1, 11.7 is not applicable to blindside installation.			
2. Please confirm which section of the ASTM D6769 requirement is applicable to blind-side WP application.				All other paragraphs apply where they do not conflict with the Project Specifications or the manufacturer's printed recommendations and specifications. In those cases, the Project and manufacturer's specifications are to be followed.			
3. The ASTM D6769 section 11.7 requirement to "backfill vertical waterproofing installation within 24 h of protective board installation..." isn't feasible due to the extensive work sequence to install concrete reinforcement, form and place the foundation wall. Please confirm this section of the ASTM requirement is not applicable to blind-side WP applications.							
<hr/>							
T-0365	BSE - Micropile W127 Relocation	Closed	01/15/2013	01/25/2013	01/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref: Specification 31 63 33				The micropile shall not be eliminated. An acceptable relocation of micropile W127 is 13' to the north and 16' to the east (or contractor to propose a different relocation).			
Micropile W127 (5'-5 3/4" West of G.L. 3 and 74'-0 3/4" South of G.L. J) is located in an area that is not accessible to drilling equipment. BBII proposes to eliminate this micropile. Please confirm this is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 983 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0366	BGP - WPM-1 - Adhesive Between Bottom Ply Waterproofing Membrane and Mud 3 Closed		01/22/2013	01/22/2013	01/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please refer to attached Specification Section 07 12 10, Article 3.3.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per Specification Section 07 12 10-3.3, B, the bottom ply of the waterproofing membrane is to be installed dry with the polyethylene protection sheet facing the mud slab. Per Specification Section 07 12 10, 3.3, D, each polyethylene protection sheet is to be installed embedded in adhesive (wet) such that each sheet will have enough adhesive uniformly placed on it that it won't come into contact with the other sheet.					The bottom sheet is to be installed dry per 3.3, B.		
Is the bottom sheet to be installed dry per 3.3, B. or is it to be installed embedded in adhesive (wet) per 3.3, D? Please advise.							
T-0366.1	BGP - WPM-1 - Adhesive Between Bottom Ply Waterproofing Membrane and mud 3 Closed		02/01/2013	02/11/2013	02/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
The response to RFI T-0366 directs Shimmick to install the bottom waterproofing membrane without adhesive to the mud slab. If the membrane is installed dry or without adhesive, nothing will prohibit water from entering between the membrane and mud slab. This would cause the membranes to float or bubble. Per the manufacturer's recommendation, the waterproofing membrane is to be adhered to the mud slab with adhesive.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please advise.					The specification is correct. The method of installation, installing the first ply with the polyethylene protection sheet facing the mud slab, without adhesive, was recommended by the manufacturer.		
T-0367	BGP - REBAR - Vertical Pit - Two Piece Bar	Closed	01/17/2013	01/27/2013	01/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please refer to Specification Section 03 20 00-3.1, E, attached drawing S1-3004, S1-3006 and Gerdau sketch					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Contractor-proposed splice for vertical "Z" bars around pit edge in mat is acceptable.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 984 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	SK-RFI014.						
	Concrete reinforcement details around the mat slab pit sections shown on drawing SI-3004 and SI-3006 depict a continuous vertical "Z" bar around the pit slab edge. Please confirm the proposed lap splice detail and requirements as shown in the attached Gerdau sketch SK-RFI014 is acceptable.						
T-0368	BGP - Hub and Spigot Type Pipe Support Spacing	Closed	01/17/2013	01/27/2013	02/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Reference Specification: 22 13 01 , 3.2 Reference Drawings: P1-6001		The required support spacing for horizontal hub and spigot cast iron piping is the same as for the no-hub piping.				
	In Section 3.2 C, Supports, the support spacing for all horizontal cast iron no-hub pipe is specified to be 10 feet maximum, and within 6 inches at each side of each joint; however, the support spacing for all horizontal cast iron hub and spigot type pipe is not provided.						
	Please provide the required support spacing for the horizontal cast iron hub and spigot type pipe.						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0369	BGP - REBAR - Headed Steel Bar Shear Conflict in Mat Slab	Closed	01/21/2013	01/31/2013	01/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing S1-3005 and S1-2022. Detail 3 on sheet S1-3005 depicts the full size T-head bars as they interface with the mat reinforcement. The same detail includes additional reinforcement depicted at column locations. The reinforcement (open circles) is shown between the typical main mat reinforcement and others are aligned with above layers one and two of the main mat reinforcement as defined in note 4 and 6 on sheet S1-2002. As a result, the clearances created by the #10 main mat reinforcement being spaced at 8" O.C. and the 3" square heads at the ends of the #8 T-heads (refer 2/S1-3005) do not allow enough of a clearance to install the headed bars into position. Refer to the annotations in the attached drawings. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: Gerdau proposes to place the added reinforcement directly in line and above the main mat reinforcement in both directions as required. The suggested proposal may require several additional layers of steel to accommodate the total quantity of added bars at each column. Furthermore, it is unknown whether another conflict is created at the column dowel T-heads.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor-proposed placement of additional mat bottom rebar to an upper layer is not acceptable. Placement of the vertical headed bars is construction means and methods. However, it is acceptable to move the additional mat bottom rebar horizontally a maximum of 3/4", as required.	
<hr/>							
T-0370	BGP - WPM-1 - Mud Slab Finish for Waterproofing	Closed	01/22/2013	02/01/2013	01/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Specification Section 07 12 10, 3.2 The concrete surface profile (CSP) required by the waterproofing manufacturer Laurencos, ranges between a CSP level of 2 and 4 as defined by the International Concrete Repair Institute (ICRI) of technical guide "Selecting and Specifying Concrete Surface Preparation for Sealers, Coatings, and Polymer Overlays." The ICRI defines the levels of CSP as 1 (nearly flat) to CSP Level 9 (very rough). The Laurencos waterproofing system requires "a good wood screed or broom finish...often referred to as a 'sidewalk' finish..Do not use a steel trowel finish." See attached excerpt of the manufacturer specification. 1. Please confirm the ICRI CSP requirements as it relates to surface finish, flatness and levelness are to supersede the varying ASTM F-value requirements set forth in specification section 033000-3.6, B1 or provide a revised specification section 033000 incorporating the ICRI			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. ICRI CSP requirements are not appropriate for the mud slab. The mud slab in being poured, not repaired. The International Concrete Repair Institute CSP scale is used for existing concrete surfaces when they are being acid etched, ground or shotblasted. The appropriate finishing for the mud slab is described in the BGP Specification 03 30 00 Cast in Place Concrete 3.6 Concrete Finishes and calls for compliance with the American Concrete Institute concrete finish recommendations ACI 302.1R and ACI 304R, with dimensional tolerance limitations given by ACI 117. 2. Specification 03 30 00, 3.6 C stipulates: Finish for monolithic slab surfaces to be covered with membrane i.e. the entire mud slab is covered with membrane is to be a Float Finish. Note that 3.6 C. 1.d for Float Finish has the same finish surface values as 3.6 D. 3., which is the finish for Pedestrian Sidewalks and	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>requirement.</p> <p>2. Please confirm a wood screed or broom finish is accpetable for the mud slab.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 987 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0371.1	BSE - Micropile W154 & W236 Bent After Install	Closed	02/04/2013	02/14/2013	02/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: Specification Section 31 63 33 3.2.L BBII is in receipt of reply to RFI T-0371, which suggests that piles which have experienced an impact be rejected and re-drilled. Acceptance of piles is based on specification 31 63 33 3.2.L. Per the recommendation of the Micropile Engineer (Drill Tech's Steve McCullough) and the anchor bar manufacturer (DSI), the piles were bent back to plumb and retested on 02/01/2013. Attached are the passing proof test results for the piles in question. Please confirm that these piles are accepted.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The piles are confirmed to be Rejected and shall be replaced with new piles. The concerns include, but not limited to, the following: * de-bonding of bars and grout * cracking of the grout that may compromise its ability to provide corrosion protection of the bar * the ULTIMATE uplift capacity of the pile might have been compromised, which cannot be verified by the proof test Unless the contractor can provide sufficient evidence that addresses the concerns listed above and approved by TJPA, the piles shall remain as Rejected. It should also be noted that the contract documents call for a coupler at the mud slab level to allow the projected portion of the bars be dissembled to avoid the exact problem. If BBI cannot prevent the micropile from being hit again, BBI shall install the coupler as shown and take down the portion of the bar above the coupler as soon as the pile is proof tested and re-install the bars above the coupler at a later time.		
<hr/>							
T-0371.2	BSE - Micropile W154 & W236 Bent After Install	Closed	02/08/2013	02/18/2013	02/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: BBII is in receipt of reply to RFI T-0371.1, which confirms that piles W154 and W236 are rejected. Per response to RFI T-0371, BBII proposes piles W154R1 and W236R1 be drilled at the locations on the attached drawing. Piles W154 and W236 will be cut off at bottom of mud slab and the mud slab blackouts poured back. Please confirm that these pile locations and method of pile abandonment are acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to new locations of micropiles W154R1 & W236R1 as proposed, as well as the method of abandonment for piles W154 & W236 as proposed.		
<hr/>							
T-0372	BGP - WPM-1 - Filter Fabric in Waterproofing System	Closed	01/23/2013	02/02/2013	01/31/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 988 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specification Section: 07 12 10 2.5 D Specification Section 07 12 10 2.5 D requires filter fabric as an accesory to the Modified Bitumen Waterproofing System. After reviewing Shimmick's waterproofing shop drawings, and speaking with a Laurencio representative, it has been confirmed that filter fabric is not used in this waterproofing system. Please confirm that filter fabric as specified in section 07 12 10 2.5 D is not required.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Filter Fabric is not required.			
T-0373	BGP - Zone 1 Concrete Partition Wall Detail	Closed	01/24/2013	02/03/2013	01/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference A1-2812, S1-022 & S1-2052 Drawing A1-2812 shows concrete partition walls between Gridlines 1 and 2.3 and Gridlines D.4 to E.6; however, these same walls do not appear on drawings SI-2022 or S1-2052. Please confirm if the walls are required and which drawings are correct.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Walls are required. Layout per architectural drawings as noted on sheet note 7 on S1-2052. Note that walls are not intended to show on S1-2022 Mat Bottom Reinforcement Plan.			
<hr/>							
T-0374	BGP - Mat Slab Shear Wall Detail Clarification	Closed	01/24/2013	02/03/2013	01/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference A1-2820 and S1-2030 Contract drawing AI-2820 depicts a shear wall between GL 1.4 to 2 and K.5 to L that is discontinuous and contains a large opening; however, drawing S 1-2030 does not depict a discontinuous wall. Please confirm which drawing is correct and if the opening is required.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Structural drawings are correct. Opening in shearwall at mat level does not exist.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 989 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0375	BGP - Plumbing Drainage Invert Elevation	Closed	01/24/2013	02/03/2013	02/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference P1-2026			The invert elevation for drainage piping from the catch basins to sumps is -36'-10".				
Please reference attached contract drawing P 1-2026 and the drainage system at the SP B2-D-2. Referenced drawing shows 1% flow from the catch basin to the sump pit, however; the specified invert elevations call out the opposite. Please confirm that the invert elevations called out on P 1-2026 are correct, if not please specify new pipe invert elevations to be used for the drainage system specified herein.							
T-0376	BGP - Column Spiral Reinforcing in Lieu of Individual Ties	Closed	01/24/2013	02/03/2013	01/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference S1-3300 & S1-3304			The size/spacing proposed by the contractor does not meet the volumetric ratio of spiral or hoop reinforcement requirement in ACI 318 therefore the request is declined in current form. For columns C10 and C11, if the contractor prefers to use #6 spirals with the spacing specified for column ties in Sheet S1-3300, that is acceptable to the SER. The tightest spacing specified in S1-3300 along the column height shall govern.				
Gerdau is requesting the use of spiral reinforcing in lieu of the #6 individual stirrups/hoops that are shown on contract drawings SI-3300 and SI-3304 detail 1 for column types B1, B2 and B3. The spiral reinforcing would be #5 and maintain 3.5" pitch for the B1 column, 3" pitch for the B2 column and 4.5" pitch for the B3 column. Please confirm the use of spiral at the pitch indicated is acceptable.			If spiral reinforcement is used for Column C12, the size and pitch of the spiral shall be #5 and 3", respectively, for the full column height.				
			In addition, if spiral reinforcement is used, detailing requirements in ACI 318 Section 7.4 shall be fully met.				
T-0377	BGP - Two Piece Oval Hoop Columns A1, A2, & A3	Closed	01/24/2013	02/03/2013	01/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Reference S1-3304 Please confirm it is acceptable to use a two-piece oval tie in lieu of the single-piece oval tie, as depicted on contract drawing S1-3304, for columns A1, A2 and A3. Gerdau proposes to use a lap splice along the flat sides of the oval to connect either side of the hoop.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor-proposed lap splices are not acceptable.		
T-0378	BGP - Drainage Catch Basin Clarification	Closed	01/24/2013	02/03/2013	02/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference P1-2022 There are two (clouded) sump pits attached that are not connected to any of the drainage system called out on PI-2022. Please confirm that there are no drainage lines connected to these two sump pits.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no drainage piping connected to these two sump pits.		
T-0379	BGP - Geothermal Pipe Fusion Butt Weld	Closed	01/24/2013	01/24/2013	01/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference Specification: 23 57 34 The response to Submittal TG0601-008 commented that only socket fittings and electrofusion fittings are allowed. This insinuates that Butt Fusion welds are not allowable. However, per Specification Section 23 57 34, Butt Fusion welding does not seem to be precluded. The butt fusion method is acceptable per the IGSHP A. Please confirm that butt fusion welding is acceptable under this contract for the geothermal piping.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Butt Fusion is an Acceptable method of heat fusing ground loop piping.		

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0379.1	BGP - Geothermal Pipe Fusion Butt Weld	Void	05/13/2014	05/23/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached RFI T-0379 Please confirm it is acceptable to repair the punctured geothermal piping in geofield 14R Area 16 by using a fusion butt weld. The butt fusion method of heat fusing ground loop piping is acceptable per the IGSHPA.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-0380	BSE - K9 Buttress shaft CSL Tubes	Closed	01/28/2013	02/07/2013	02/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Reference attached sketch and spreadsheet. We were informed by Harris-Salinas that they are short of CSL tubes for the last rebar cage K9. Since K8/K9 interface will not be CSL tested, per the agreed upon list of shaft interfaces (generated by Arup and BBII), it is in BBII's opinion that it would be more beneficial to the shaft if it is installed without CSL tubes. The benefits include the following: There would be no need to grout the holes; no voids; and there would be more concrete in the shaft. If CSL tubes are required, we are proposing to install them per the attached drawing. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Contractor's proposal is acceptable.		
T-0381	BGP - PLUMBING Floor Cleanout Requirement	Closed	01/28/2013	02/07/2013	02/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 22 13 01 2.3 A.3 Reference Drawing: P1-0051, P1-2022 Drawing P1-0051 specifies a Fig. Number of "MIFAB C-100-R/S" with remarks of "STAINLESS STEEL COVER AND PLUG, HEAVY DUTY, ANCHOR FLANGE". This item differs from the floor cleanout required in Spec section			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The correct model no. is MIFAB C-1000-R/S (in the drains and cleanout schedule on drawing P1-0051).		

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
22 13 01-2.3.A.3	which calls for "Extra heavy duty cast iron cleanout with round adjustable galvanized cast iron top, vandal proof screws, plastic plug or bronze gasketed plug, spigot outlet; 'No. 4220-G Series' by J.R. Smith, 'No. ZI400-G-VP Series' by Zurn Industries, Inc., Mifab C1100-RI3-6 or equal."						
	Please confirm which type of floor cleanout is required.						
T-0382	BSE - Eliminate CSL Tubes from Shaft D1	Closed	01/31/2013	02/10/2013	02/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Robert Kjome	To: Turner Construction Company	Gary Krutcsch	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP	Lynn Kowallis		
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.	Ernie Cortez						
REQUEST:	Reference attached Arup email dated 1/29/2013.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm that Shaft D1 can be installed without the need for CSL tubes. At Arup's direction, and at no extra cost to the owner, BBII will provide a QC core hole that extends into native soil.			Confirmed. The added QC core shall be located in Shaft D1.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 993 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0383	BGP - Drainage Flow Lines	Closed	01/31/2013	02/10/2013	02/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 22 13 01 Reference Drawing: P1-2022 & P1-2030 Please reference contract drawings P1-2022 thru P1-2030. There is a discrepancy between the called out elevations of the pipe inverts and the flow grades between the sump pits and catch basins. All pipe inverts at the catch basins are to be set to El. -36.83' and pipe inverts at the sump pits are at either El. -37.50' or -37'-25'. At the long pipe runs the flow grade matches to 1% as called out on the plans. However, on the short pipe runs, this grade is up to 18%. Please clarify which details governs, and whether the 18% slope is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The pipe invert elevations at sumps were established as uniformly as possible. An 18% slope is acceptable for short runs (approx. 4 ft.).				
T-0384	BSE - Dry Excavation of Buttress Shaft D1	Closed	02/01/2013	02/11/2013	02/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ernie Cortez			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference attached Arup email dated 1/30/2013. Becho will proceed on excavating Shaft D1 dry as per Arup's email. Please confirm this is still acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: This shaft was placed on the day that this RFI was received. No further response from Arup is necessary.				
T-0385	BSE - Micropile Moves in NW Corner W013, W031, W047, W198.	Closed	02/05/2013	02/15/2013	02/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: Submittal Package TG0601-009.1 - 235734-003.1 Upon staking layout of micropiles in Northwest corner of Zone 1, BBII discovered two micropiles that require relocation.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving micropiles (W013, W198, W031, W047) as proposed.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>1. Pile W013 is too close to installed dewatering well. BBII proposes moving this pile 4' Southwest. This does not appear to conflict with Ghex shop drawings revision date 02/04/13.</p> <p>2. Pipe W198 is too close to overhead struts and strut supports. BBII proposes moving this pile 2' Northwest. This appears to eliminate the need for a "jog" in the Ghex piping as shown on Ghex shop drawings revision date 02/04/13.</p> <p>Upon drilling two piles in the NW corner of Zone 1, Drill Tech discovered unforeseen obstructions below grade (reference COM1741 sent 02/04/2013). Relocation of these micropiles is required.</p> <p>1. Pile W031 encountered an obstruction below grade which did not allow installation of the anchor bar in the drilled hole. After discovery of the obstruction, the pile was relocated 2' Northwest of its planned location. Installation of the micropile was completed on 02/01/2013. This does not appear to conflict with Ghex shop drawings revision date 02/04/13.</p> <p>2. Pile W047 encountered an obstruction below grade which did not allow the micropile hole to be drilled past approximately 12'. BBII proposes to relocate this pile 2.8' Southwest. This appears to conflict with Ghex piping shown in Ghex shop drawings revision date 02/04/13 and may require the addition of a "jog".</p> <p>Please confirm these changes are acceptable.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0386	BSE - Elevator Pit Dimensions	Closed	02/05/2013	02/15/2013	02/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPLynn KowallisTo: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: S1-2024 and Detail 3/S1-3008 The slab depression between Gridlines 15 &16 Between Gridlines B & C does not contain enough dimensions to construct. Detail 3/S1-3008 Note 2 states "For extent of thickened mat see plan." Plan sheet S1-2024 revision 2 dated 11/27/2012 provides width of the pit in the North-South direction, but does not provide the length of the pit in the East-West direction. Please provide these dimensions.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The west edge of the thickened mat as dimensioned in the RFI sketch is 7'-0" from gridline 15. The east edge of the thickened mat as dimensioned in the RFI sketch is 23'-1" from gridline 15.				
T-0387	BGP - Geothermal Loop Compaction Requirements	Closed	02/07/2013	02/17/2013	02/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPLynn KowallisTo: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 31 23 34 3.3 F Per Specification Section 31 23 34, Section 3.3, Part F, the trench is required to be compacted to 95% . To acheive 95% compaction, the surrounding soil must have an equal or greater compaction. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Achieving 95% compaction in the trenches is possible.				
T-0388	BGP - Temperature Probe Sleeve Penetration	Closed	02/08/2013	02/18/2013	02/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPLynn KowallisTo: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: TG06.1 Bid Package - 5/M1-5002 and TG06.0 - 5/M1-5002 The TG06.1 bid package, M1-5002 drawing does not show a temperature probe sleeve in Detail 5. Is the temperature probe sleeve to penetrate through the wall like it is shown in the TG06.0 M1-5002, Detail 5 or is it not to penetrate through the wall like the TG06.1 documents? Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Temperature probe piping should be installed as described in Note 6, of both packages, on sheet M-0006 within Below Grade package (TGO6) Mechanical Notes . Temperature probe piping was added to detail 5 in issue for construction set for clarification.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 996 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0389	BGP - Cast-in-place Concrete Shrinkage	Closed	02/11/2013	02/21/2013	02/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: Specification Section 03 30 20 1.7.F.3.i Please reference attached ACTM C 157, pages from SEONC San Francisco Bay Area Concrete Aggregate Report 2008, and Specification Section 03 30 20- 1.7.F.3.i. ASTM 157 section 4.3 states that if the condition of mixing, curing sampling and storage other than specified in the test method are required, they shall be reported but are not to be considered as standard conditions of this test method. In section 6. Sampling, it requires samples from batches made in the laboratory and the Note 2 states that field cast specimens can show up to twice as much drying shrinkage as laboratory cast specimens from the same materials and proportions. Furthermore, SEONC 2008 states that "actual shrinkage of the concrete in service and in field-cured tests will not necessarily correlate closely with the trial batch test results." For these reasons SCCI believes that shrinkage tests from samples at the job site can not verify the specified shrinkage limit and can not be compared with the laboratory tests. Please confirm that shrinkage results from the samples taken in the field will not be directly compared to laboratory tests, and consequently used as basis for rejection of material.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The project specification specified that the shrinkage tests shall be in accordance with ASTM C157 with modified SEONC Recommendations. It is recognized that the field sampled tests will not necessarily correlate closely with the trial batch test results, which should be anticipated before bidding. In accordance with SEONC, field sampled test will be used for the evaluation of the specified limits as specified. However, rejection of a concrete pour will not be based on shrinkage test of field samples alone.	

T-0390	BGP - Floor Drain FD-1 Clarification	Closed	02/12/2013	02/22/2013	02/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: P1-0051 The "Drains and Cleanout Schedule" on drawing P1-0051 calls Floor Drain FD-1 to be Mifab F-1000-S with a grate size of 6" in diameter. Per the manufacturer, F-1000-S has a square grate. 1. Is the floor drain grate to be round with a 6" diameter or square? 2. If it is square, then what are the dimensions of the			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The floor drain grate is square. 2. The square grate dimensions are 6"x6". 3. Yes. This floor drain will be used extensively throughout the project. The membrane clamp will be used where there is a membrane.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 997 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>square grate?</p> <p>3. The remarks for FD-1 specifies a "Clamping Device." Is the "Clamping Device" referring to a membrane clamp?</p> <p>Please advise</p>						
T-0391	BGP - Zone 2 Sump Pit Depth	Closed	02/13/2013	02/23/2013	02/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: A1-9215 and S1-3006		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please confirm in drawing AI-9215, the call outs "SP TOC -42'-4'" and "SP TOC -46'-4'" for the sump pits between grid lines C-D and 4-5 are referring to the elevation for the bottom of sump pits, as illustrated in the attached markup of SI-3006.			We confirm that callouts SP TOC -42'-4" and SP TOC 46'4", shown on A1-9215 at the Sewage Ejector Room (B2230), are referring to elevations of bottom of sump pits illustrated on S1-3006 details 1 & 2.				
<hr/>							
T-0392	BGP - CMU Partition Walls	Closed	02/15/2013	02/25/2013	02/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference A-2224 and A-0022		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Sheet A-2224 shows future CMU partition walls as type .6. Per the masonry partition schedule there is no .6 type.			We confirm these walls are partition type 6. Note for all CMU wall type tags on the drawings showing a dot prefix e.g. .6, the dot is to be ignored.				
Please confirm these walls are partition type 6.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 998 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0393	BGP - Reinforcement anchoring stagger and clearance for "addl bottom bars"	Closed	02/15/2013	02/25/2013	02/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference 3/S1-3006					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1. Confirm there is no stagger for the reinforcement anchoring.					1. Confirmed, no stagger for bottom of column vertical bars.		
2. Provide the minimum clearance for the reinforcement anchoring to the "addl bottom bars".					2. The column bars extend down to (sit on top of) the mat bottom bars (and "addl bottom bars").		
T-0394	BSE - Micropile Relocations at Beale Street	Closed	02/19/2013	03/01/2013	02/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification: 31 63 33					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Eight micropiles will be in conflict with the Beale Street Bridge Piles; BBII proposes relocating these micropiles to provide adequate clearance. See attached chart and drawings for proposed relocation information.					We assume the direction of each micropile move is per graphic sketch with arrows vs the table since the direction of move per table is not consistent with the graphics. Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving micropiles E845, E874, E842, E885, E834, E877, E831, E860 as proposed.		
Please confirm these relocations are acceptable.							
T-0395	BGP - Floor Sink FSK-2 Clarification	Closed	02/19/2013	03/01/2013	03/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: P 1-0051					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The "Drains and Cleanout Schedule" on drawing P 1-0051 calls for Floor Sink FSK-2 to be Mifab FS 1700-1 -FLC-5. This model is not available per discussions between SCCI and the manufacturer.					Refer to the attached cut sheet.		
Please confirm required floor sink model.							
T-0396	BGP - Curb Frame Steel and Anchor Clip Requirements	Closed	02/19/2013	03/01/2013	02/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1000 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0396.2	BGP - Drainage Pits Embedded Frame Grates	Closed	03/22/2013	04/01/2013	04/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 23 13 01 Reference Drawings: P1-6001 Reference RFIs: T-0396, T-0396.1 Detail 8 on CD P1-6001 does not provide enough details for assembly and fabrication of the embedded frames. SCCI's drawing attachment in the RFI 396 series provides such details. As per our discussion with the SER (Structural Engineer of Record) on 3/21/2013, see attached revised SCCI's drawings of the embedded grate assemblies. As discussed SCCI has revised the weld detail between the two angles to be used to fabricate the embedded frames. Weld is changed to T-joint, PJP double bevel groove weld per AWS D1.1 (references 8-56, table 8-2 from AISC Steel Manual 13th ED.) Is it acceptable to construct the embedded grate frames per attached detail?			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The construction of the embedded frame is clearly shown in detail 8/P1-6001 as a formed frame. The proposed assembly including two angles with double bevel groove weld is acceptable. Contractor to provide submittal for frames and grates.				
T-0397	BGP - RCW Dimension Clarification	Closed	02/21/2013	03/03/2013	02/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference A1-2123 and attached. Between gridlines 12-13 and G-H there appears to be two conflicting dimensions. Please confirm the 7'3" dimension is from gridline H to the work the point.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> On A1-2123, between gridlines 12-13 and G-H, we confirm the 7'-3" dimension from gridline H to the work point is correct. The dimensions are not conflicting. The 7'-1 3/8" dimension from gridline H is to the South West corner of the train platform knee wall. The platform is curved, which accounts for the slight difference in dimension between the corner and the work point.				
T-0398	BGP - Vehicle Ramp Concrete Corbel Dimension	Closed	02/21/2013	03/03/2013	02/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Reference A1-2310 and S1-2251 Please provide dimension for the continuous concrete corbel at the vehicle/bike ramp.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Refer to detail 7/S1-3205 which is referenced from plan S1-2251 for continuous corbel dimensions at vehicle/bike ramp on the exterior of the foundation wall. Top of corbel is 12" min from top of foundation wall.		
T-0399	BGP - Polystyrene Void Fill Material	Closed	02/21/2013	03/03/2013	03/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference A1-7404 and 03 30 20 Please provide the PSI and specification for the Polystyrene void fill called out in detail D on A1-7404.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					The void fill below the ramp is only required to the extent where regular formwork cannot be removed and is "Structural Polystyrene used as Typical Fill". For description of type refer to Superstructure Specification for Cast In-Place Concrete 03 30 02 2.9.B.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1002 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0400	BGP - Seismic Joint Detail	Closed	02/21/2013	03/03/2013	03/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference S1-3010, A1-8881, & A1-8882 The detail 4/S1-3010 does not appear to be coordinated with the details shown on A1-8881 and A1-8882. Please revise accordingly.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We have reviewed the structural and architectural details for the Seismic Joint on GL 35. Attached SKA-2594 and SKA-2595 show the coordination modifications made to drawings A1-8881 and A1-8882, which will be issued with the next Below Grade Package ASI. S1-3010 compared to A1-8881: 1. 4/S1-3010 does not include/detail part of the seismic joint below the 5' Mat Slab (these parts was shown on Architectural details). 2. 4/S1-3010 shows deformed bar anchors welded to the joint where as A1-8881 details shows different embeds. Embed anchors have been removed from the architectural drawings as anchoring / attachment is per the structural drawings. 3. 4/S1-3010 shows plate with hole to fully cover top of curb of gutter where as architectural details shows the plate with equal length same as other side of seismic joint, this has been adjusted. 4. Note that the water stop injection hose locations have been adjusted. S1-3010 compared to A1-8882: 1. Dimension on A1-8882 should be 3'-0" instead of 2'-11 5/8". I will adjust dimension on sheet.	

T-0401	BGP - Dimension Clarification between Column and Slab at Ramp	Closed	02/21/2013	03/03/2013	02/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 5/S1-3502 and attached. Please provide the dimension between the vehicle ramp and column.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Dimension between vehicle ramp and column is 1/2".	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1003 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0402	BGP - Dimension at slab and parapet wall footing detail	Closed	02/21/2013	03/03/2013	02/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference 4/S1-3210 and attached. Please provide dimension between the ground level slab and parapet wall footing.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The gap width dimension is specified on plan S1-2310.		
T-0403	BSE - Mud Slab Flatness and Levelness Testing	Closed	02/21/2013	03/03/2013	02/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: 03 30 00 3.6.C.1.d In follow up to the Turner's request, please confirm this specification section does not apply to the mud slab and no flatness or level testing is required.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Though flatness or levelness of all concrete pours is expected, FF and FL testing of the mud and protection slabs using special inspectors is not required. The mud slab is to have falls to drain, as suggested by Webcor, for water management during construction. Also, it is important that the mud slab does not have step-offs or alignment issues between pours that would create voids or cause the waterproofing membrane to tent.		
T-0404	BGP - Replacement of Lap Splice with Mechanical Couplers	Closed	02/22/2013	03/04/2013	03/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: S1/3201 Please verify that it is acceptable to replace a lap splice with an approved mechanical coupler (500 series coupler) as needed to support the means and methods of construction. The current location being considered is the outside face wall vertical lap splice between the dowel extending from the mat slab and the typical wall vertical reinforcing at the bottom of the wall. See attached plan sheet S1-3201 to reference the proposed location. Should this be acceptable please verify:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to replace the lap splice with an approved Type 2 mechanical coupler, however, the clear cover to the coupler shall not be less than 1.25" with a tolerance of minus 0".		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1004 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>1. The mechanical coupler can infringe upon the 2" clearance as the diameter of the coupler is greater then that of the actual reinforcing.</div> <div>2. Also verify that the couplers can be installed at one typical elevation similar to that of the other couplers depicted on the inside face wall curtain.</div>						
T-0404.1	BGP - Replacement of Lap Splice with Mechanical Couplers	Closed	02/22/2013	03/04/2013	03/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome</div> <div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>		<div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>					
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Ref: S1/3201</div> <div>Number 2 of the RFI T-0404 was not answered.</div> <div>Please verify that it is acceptable to replace a lap splice with an approved mechanical coupler (500 series coupler) as needed to support the means and methods of construction. The current location being considered is the outside face wall vertical lap splice between the dowel extending from the mat slab and the typical wall vertical reinforcing at the bottom of the wall. See attached plan sheet S1-3201 to reference the proposed location. Should this be acceptable. please verify.</div> <div>1. Answered in RFI T-0404</div> <div>2. Verify that the couplers can be installed at one typical elevation similar to that of the other couplers depicted on the inside face wall curtain.</div>		<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>1. Answer in RFI T-0404 confirmed.</div> <div>2. Inquired couplers can be installed at one typical elevation similar to the interior face couplers.</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1005 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0405	BSE - Required Percent of Maximum Dry Density Required at Areas of Over Excav: Closed		02/22/2013	03/04/2013	03/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Ref: Specification Section 31 00 00.3.15.C.1			ARUP Response:				
Specification Section 31 00 00.3.15.C.1 states. C.Percentage of Maximum Dry Density Requirements: Compact soil to not less than the following percentages of maximum dry density according to ASTM D1557: 1.Under structures, building slabs, foundations and steps, fill deeper than five feet, shall be placed in lifts as defined above and compacted to at least 95 percent dry density. Does the 95 percent dry density requirement apply only when fill is deeper than five feet and/or under structures, building slabs, foundations and steps?			The subgrade beneath the mat slab is required to be native undisturbed soil or compacted to 95% of maximum dry density.				
T-0406	BSE - Micropile W434 Relocation	Closed	02/22/2013	02/22/2013	02/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Ref: Submittal TG0300-622.4			Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving micropile (W434) as proposed.				
Micropile W434 as laid out is in conflict with a dewatering well. BBII proposes moving Micropile W434 North 5' to provide adequate clearance. See attached sketch.							
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-0407	BSE - Micropile W327 Installed 2' South	Closed	02/22/2013	03/04/2013	02/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Ref: Submittal TG0300-622.4			Thornton Tomasetti does not object to the as-installed micropile (W327) location.				
Micropile W327 was installed 2' South of original location. BBII proposes leaving the installed pile as is. See attached sketch.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1006 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-0408	BGP - Open Stirrup with a Cap for Frame Beam Sections	Closed	02/25/2013	03/07/2013	03/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Lynn Kowallis	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref: 5/S1-3600				The inquired stirrups are for beams that are not in the TG06 package. There is a note on the detail that states "This Detail For Reference			
Detail 5 on sheet S1-3600 depicts beam configurations Type SI through S5 all of which graphically depict a closed stirrup. Please confirm that it is acceptable to utilize an open stirrup with a cap. The cap would maintain a 135 degree hook on one side and 90 degree hook on the other and placed in an alternating fashion.							
T-0409	BSE - Micropile W226 Relocation (Due to Overhead Obstruction)	Closed	02/27/2013	03/09/2013	03/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Robert Kjome	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 31 63 33 Reference Dwg: Attached sketch				Shifting W226 north 12' as proposed is acceptable provided W227 will also be shifted 2' north (otherwise W226 and W227 are too close together).			
Micropile W226 as laid out does not have adequate overhead clearance to be installed. BBII proposes moving Micropile W226 North 12' to provide adequate clearance. An alternate relocation position for Micropile W226 could be 4' East and 4' North.				Shifting 4' East and 4' North (5.66' Northeast) is not acceptable as this proposed location would conflict with the mat shear reinforcement.			
W/O recommends relocating the micropile North in order to avoid conflict with geothermal.							
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-0409.1	BSE - Micropile W226 Relocation (Due to Overhead Obstruction)	Closed	03/04/2013	03/14/2013	03/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Robert Kjome	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
	<div>REQUEST: Specification Reference: 31 63 33 Specification Drawings: Attached BBII sketch Micropile W226 as laid out does not have adequate overhead clearance to be installed. BBII previously asked to move the pile 12' North. BBII understands that this location would be too close to pile W227 which is already installed. BBII now proposes to move the pile 10' North and 1' West. This does not appear to conflict with geothermal piping. Please confirm this is acceptable.</div>	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Thornton Tomasetti does not object to relocating micropile W226 as proposed (10' North and 1' West).							
T-0410	BGP - Lower Concourse Top of Slab between Gridlines 3-9	Closed	02/27/2013	03/09/2013	03/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
	<div>REQUEST: Reference Drawings: S1-3201 (BSE Drawings) S1-2202 (BGP Drawings) S1-2203 (BGP Drawings) 12/10/10 Issued for construction BSE drawing S1-3201 shows lower concourse top of slab to be 8'-8" between gridlines 3-9. 11/27/12 Issued for construction per ASI 100 BGP Drawings S1-2202 and S1-2203 shows lower concourse top of slab to be 5'-5" between gridlines 3-5 & 8-9. Gridlines 5-8 shows top of slab at 5'-10". Please verify the elevation of the lower concourse top of slab between gridlines 3-9.</div>	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The lower concourse top of slab is per BGP Drawings. Note that the depressed slab extent is between gridline 6-8 and not 5-8 as the RFI states.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1008 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0411	BGP - Welding for Penetration Sleeves	Closed	02/28/2013	03/10/2013	03/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 05 50 10 Reference Submittal No: TG0600-036 Per the Submittal TG0600-036 comments, the intermediate ring, 3" horizontal weld must have a removable backer bar. Is it acceptable to have a double beveled groove weld replace the single bevel groove with a back bar? Eliminating the backer bar in this weld and having a double beveled groove instead is more efficient. Secondly, the Submittal TG0600-036 comments address the field welding of the penetration sleeve collars to be conducted after the trestle pile is to be removed. Is it acceptable to weld a full collar with cap in the shop? The assembly would arrive onsite to be welded in place as originally intended by the designer. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. At intermediate ring, for 3" horizontal weld, contractor may substitute double beveled groove weld to replace single bevel groove with back bar, as proposed. 2. However, the contractor's proposal to pre-assemble the collar ring and the cap plate in the shop is not acceptable. The contract documents indicate that the collar ring and cap plate are two separate pieces to be sequentially field-welded into place. The collar ring is first field welded to the sleeve, and then secondly the cap plate is field welded to the collar ring. The contractor's proposal to pre-assemble the collar and cap into one unit makes it impossible to field weld the collar/cap assembly onto the sleeve because there will be insufficient clearance for welding (mat rebar will already be placed and the mat concrete poured with only a small blockout surrounding each sleeve, making it impossible to weld any pre-assembled collar/cap onto the sleeve from the outside). While this construction sequence is ultimately a construction sequence and means and methods issue that should be commented by W/O, it is the opinion of the design team that contractor's proposal is not feasible.				
T-0412	BGP - Dewatering Well & Piezometer Penetration Sleeve Anchors	Closed	02/28/2013	03/10/2013	03/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Specification Section: 05 50 10 Specification Submittal: TG0600-036 Per the Metal Fabrication Submittal for the pipe/pile penetration sleeves, TG0600-36, the number of anchor holes per ring were arbitrary for the submittal. Is it acceptable to have 4 equally spaced 1/2" holes to fit 3/8" wedge anchors for the anchorage of the dewatering well & piezometer penetration sleeves? Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. It is acceptable to have 4 equally spaced 1/2" holes to fit 3/8" wedge anchors for anchorage of the dewatering well and piezometer penetration sleeves.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1009 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0413	BGP - Bulkhead Formwork Material	Closed	02/28/2013	03/10/2013	03/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Specification: 031000					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Drawings: Sketches attached					Upon cursory review, the proposed Stayform product appears to be acceptable to use. Please confirm that it is compatible with the installation and performance of adjacent waterstop materials. Please submit formal substitution request and adhere to submittal requirements.		
SCCI is planning to use Stayform for the construction of various bulkheads and blockouts in concrete structure. Reference attached sketches of the Mat slab bulkhead forms as an example. Stayform material shall be kept within 1.5" of all exposed concrete surfaces. Is it acceptable to use Stayform?							
<hr/>							
T-0414	BGP - Cast Iron Supports	Closed	02/28/2013	03/10/2013	03/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: 7/P1-6001					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference attached drawing and Detail 7 on Contract Drawing P1-600I. Detail 7 does not specify any imensions of the pipe support assembly. SCCI interprets that detail 7 is purely conceptual and proposes that the pipe support assemblies ("goal posts") to be constructed per the attached drawings.					The attached detail is acceptable with the following comments:		
Is this acceptable?					Penetrating through the protection slab is not acceptable. Contractor shall submit information to TJPA Representative describing how the installation will occur to ensure the attachment system and work method will not penetrate the protection slab and impact the waterproofing system.		
Please note that the RFS (request for substitution) for attached product is forthcoming.					Provide plates for the vertical supports and additional support as needed.		
<hr/>							
T-0414.1	BGP - Cast Iron Support	Closed	04/09/2013	04/19/2013	04/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: RFI T-0414					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
7/P1-6001					This is acceptable for 4" thick protection slab. However the protection slab slopes and from 4" max. the thickness becomes much less at lower points. In this case, the drilled hole is getting too close to the membrane and a pipe support with a grouted plate at		
Per the response to RFI T-0414 (SCCI RFI #55), the EOR states the following:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>"Penetrating through the protection slab is not acceptable. Contractor shall submit information to TJPA Representative describing how the installation will occur to ensure the attachment system and work method will not penetrate the protection slab and impact the waterproofing system."</p> <p>SCCI proposes the following: The pipe support assembly will be anchored to the Protection Slab with the use of 2 ea- 1/2" diameter Hilti KWIK Bolt TZ or Hilti KWIK Bolt 3 expansion anchors. Holes will be drilled to the manufacturer specified minimum required hole-depths of 2-5/8". In order to prevent over-drilling through the 4" Protection Slab and damaging the waterproofing membrane, SCCI will use roto-hammers equipped with depth-gauges (see attached information for Hilti TE-50 manual). The depth-gauges will be set prior to drilling and checked periodically during drilling operations.</p> <p>Please confirm if this is acceptable. If this is not acceptable, then please provide complete design details for Detail 7 on P1-6001</p>						
T-0414.2	BGP - Cast Iron Pipe Support	Closed	05/02/2013	05/15/2013	05/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: RFI T-0414 and T-0414.1				The proposed attachment method is acceptable.			
<p>Per the response to RFI T-0414.1, the Designer states that the protection slab will be sloped with a 4" maximum slab thickness. SCCI does not plan to pour the protection slab with a slope. SCCI plans to pour the protection slab level and keep the protection slab consistently 4" thick.</p> <p>The Designer suggests using a pipe support with a grouted plate for scenarios where the drilled holes may get too close to the membrane. It would appear that grouted plate would still require some type of embedded anchor. By adding the grout, the manufacturer's embedment depth</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1011 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>for the anchor is shortened and the tensile (pull-out) strength will be reduced.</p> <p>An alternative method to anchoring the pipe supports would be the use of 1/2" short drop-in anchors (see attached Red Head Multi-Set II information) which requires 1" of embedment into concrete. The holes would be drilled using a Depth Charge drill bit which is a 1" long bit with a shoulder to prevent over drilling.</p> <p>Confirm if this is acceptable.</p>						
T-0415	BGP - Wall and Coupler Modifications in Zone 1 Train Box	Closed	02/28/2013	03/10/2013	03/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Field Order T-00011 and SKA-2438 R2 attached SKA-2438 includes proposed relocations and additions of rooms at the train platform level, specifically between gridlines 1 and 3. 1. Please confirm these proposed locations are final. 2. Please provide dimensions for these rooms.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The proposed general arrangements for the Fire Pump Room, Emergency Electrical Room and Fuel Storage Room shown on SKA-2438 R2 are substantially correct. 2. Please find attached SKAs- 2604, 2605, 2606 and 2607, showing the plan dimensions for the new and revised wall layouts of this area. Note that we are continuing to coordinate Structural and MEP aspects for these revisions.				



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0416	BGP - Geothermal Loop Pneumatic Testing Pressure	Closed	03/01/2013	03/11/2013	03/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per specification 23 57 34, 3.2, C Per specification 23 57 34, 3.2, C, all individual loops shall be pressure tested at 100 PSI for 30 minutes before installation. The moisture content from the Hydrostatic test of the loop can compromise the fusion weld. As discussed in the DFOW meeting, S3H is recommending pneumatic testing of the pipe at 80 PSI. Upon complete installation of the loops and header piping, the complete sub group will be hydrostatically tested as specified. Please see attached documentation from Manufacturer regarding Pneumatic Testing and confirm pneumatic testing is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pneumatic Testing to 80psi is acceptable.		
T-0417	BSE - Micropile W434.5 Addition per Contract Drawings	Closed	03/04/2013	03/14/2013	03/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: S1-2031 and Submittal TG0300-622.4 Micropile W434.5 was installed on 2/28/2013 per contract drawing S1-2031. However, W434.5 was not included in approved submittal TG0300-622.4. Please confirm Micropile W434.5 is required.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Micropile W434.5 is required per the contract documents (S1-2031).		
T-0418	BGP - Revit CAD Files Confirmation	Closed	03/05/2013	03/15/2013	03/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Document: Email attached. Pursuant to the direction received from the TJPA, please confirm the CAD files which are to be extracted from the Revit model are consistent with the Contract Documents.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per Ed Sum, this RFI is being voided with the recommendation that the Contractor review Contract Specification Section 00 08 07.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1013 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0419	BGP - Foundation Walls Formwork Ties	Closed	03/07/2013	03/17/2013	03/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 03 10 00 2.2.B.7.E Reference Drawings: See attached sketches. Please reference attachments and Specifications Section 03 10 00 2.2 B.7.e: "when removed, ties shall not leave holes larger than one inch diameter in concrete surface". For the foundation walls formwork SCCI would like to utilize concrete inserts that will be used in subsequent concrete lifts. See attached sketches for conceptual/preliminary formwork design. Concrete inserts need to be rated for up to approximately 35 kips SWL (safe working load). As a result of this, the concrete ties need to have 1.5" to 2" outside diameter. For the formwork involved with the 3ft thick foundation walls SCCI requests variance from the specifications referenced above and be able to use these bigger form ties. For all other interior walls including the shear walls, SCCI will comply with the Specification referenced above. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The use of any type of form tie/insert for the foundation wall is prohibited per specification 03 10 00 B.5 and B.7.a.			

T-0419.1	BGP - Foundation Walls Formwork Anchors	Closed	03/14/2013	03/28/2013	03/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference RFI: T-0419 Reference Specification: 03 10 00-2.2 B.8.A, ACI Formwork Manual There has been a misinterpretation of the specifications that were used to classify the referenced RFI No. 419. Concrete inserts intended for use with wall formwork design depict Specification Section 03 1 0 00 2.2 B.8.A "Anchorages". Per ACI Formwork Manual: "A concrete form tie is a tensile unit adapted to holding concrete form secure		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It will be acceptable to use these contractor-proposed concrete formwork anchors. Form anchors are not to penetrate full depth of the concrete wall.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1014 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>against the lateral pressure of unhardened concrete, with or without provisions for spacing the forms to a definite distance apart, and with or without provision for removal of metal to a specified distance back from the concrete surface." (ACI Formwork Manual 4-35)</p> <p>"Form anchors are devices used to secure formwork to previously placed concrete of adequate strength; they are normally embedded in concrete during placement." (ACI Formwork Manual 4-36)</p> <p>To reiterate, SCCI intends to utilize concrete inserts/anchors per attachments to secure and anchor the wall forms in place. Use of concrete inserts/anchors will leave 2" hole that will be patched once the form system is removed.</p> <p>Is this acceptable?</p>						
T-0420	BGP -Geothermal Loop Air Pockets	Closed	03/06/2013	03/17/2013	03/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: M-0006		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> WSPFK Response: Air elimination devices are not feasible in a ground loop. Manual air vents will be provided inside the building in a future package.			
Per contract, the geothermal lines are to run below the elevator and sump pits. This will cause a difference in elevation across the a geothermal pipe loop. This will create high points in the loop for bodies of air to gather or get trapped. These air bodies or pockets can coalesce in stagnant water and potentially compromise the hydraulic stability. Typically air elimination systems are implimented at high points to remove these bodies of air after the initial flush/blowout.							
Please advise how to handles these bodies/pockets of air.							
T-0421	BGP- Geothermal CDSM Grout	Closed	03/06/2013	03/17/2013	03/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1015 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: Submittal pkg TG0601-010 Due to potential procurement issues with the submitted grout, S3H would like to confirm that the attached grout is acceptable as a backfill material for the CDSM wall excavation. This SupergROUT is a high thermal conductivity grout designed for geothermal systems. Please confirm it is acceptable as an alternate to the grout submitted.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable.			
T-0422	BSE - Micropiles W328, W344, W383 Relocation (Due to Overhead Obstruction)	Closed	03/06/2013	03/17/2013	03/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: Submittal TG0300-622.4 Micropiles W328, W344, and W383 as laid out do not have adequate overhead clearance to be installed. BBII proposes moving Micropile W328 North 7.7' & East 3.7', Micropile W344 North 3', and Micropile W383 North 5' to provide adequate clearance. All three of these Micropiles are located south of J-Line and the Geothermal piping area. See attached sketch. Please confirm these relocations are acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving micropiles W328, W344, and W383 as proposed.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1016 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0423	BSE -Subgrade pit dimensions per comments to TG0300-340.1	Closed	03/07/2013	03/17/2013	03/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference Drawings: S1-2024,S1-2027, 7/S1-3010, A1-2817			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Specificaiton: 31 00 00			1) Confirmed that BBII shall use the revised 20'-3 3/4" dimension, enlarging the pit equally to the north and south as stated on the submittal.				
Reference Submittal: TG0300-340.1			2) The dimensions noted for the GL35/C pit in returned submittal TG0300-340.1 are not new dimensions. Rather, they are the same dimensions as communicated on A1-2817 Revision 1 dated 11/27/2012 and 7/S1-3010 Revision 0 dated 08/30/2012. The sloping regions of the bottom surface of the thickened mat shall slope at a 1 to 1 slope, and remain 5'-0" MIN from the interior pit boundary as noted on 7/S1-3010. Thus, with these constraints the bottom of mat thickening dimension will be as marked up in the returned submittal (16'-9" from GL 35 to the western limit of the GL35/C depression). The 3'-0" dimension is the dimension from GL 35 to where the 1 to 1 slope turns vertical at the expansion joint/edge of mat. Returned submittal and contract documents do not conflict.				
The response to Mud Slab Rebar Shop Drawings Submittal TG0300-340.1/TA1020-32001A06.1 provided new dimensions for depressions in the trainbox subgrade. Per 00 07 00 Part 6.02.A, BBII would like to clarify which dimensions are to be used for construction.			3) Confirmed that BBII shall use the 3'-0" dimension to GL 35 as noted in returned submittal TG0300-340.1 for the eastern limit of the GL 34-35/E depression.				
1. Sheet MS-4 of submittal shows subgrade depression between Grid lines 18 & 19 between Gridlines B & C having dimension of 20 '-0' x 40'-4". This is consistent with the dimensions provided on sheet S1-2024 Revision 2 dated 11/27/2013. The review comment by TT revises the 20'-0" dimension to 20'-3". Please confirm which dimension is to be used.			4) The perpendicular dimension from the underside of the mat slab to the top of the mud slab is 4 1/2". This is 4" for the protection slab thickness, plus a 1/2" for the waterproofing zone.				
2. Sheet MS-7 of submittal shows subgrade depression at Gridline 35 between Gridlines B & C as having dimensions of 22'-1 3/4" x 18'-6 3/4". This geometry is base on the size of the pit shown on A1-2817 Revision 1 dated 11/27/2012 and 7/S1-3010 Revision 0 dated 08/30/2012. The Submittal response comments provided show a new overall dimension of 19' -9" and a specific offset to Gridline 35. Please confirm which dimensions are to be used.							
3. Sheet MS-7 of submittal shows subgrade depression between Gridlines 34 & 35 at Gridline E. TT comment calls out 3'-0" from eastern limit of depression to Gridline 35. This dimension was not provided on sheet S1-2027 Revision 2 dated 11/27/2012. Please confirm this dimension is to be used.							
4. BBII understands that dimensions provided on this submittal are to bottom of Mat Slab concrete, and that each dimension should be increased to account for thickness of protection slab and waterproofing. Please confirm that an additional 0'-7" is the correct dimension for this adjustment.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0424	BGP - Dewatering Wells / Monitoring Instrument	Closed	03/08/2013	03/18/2013	03/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: A1-8711 Reference Photo: Attached Per plan sheet A1-8711 , Detail 3 & 6, the dewatering well and monitoring instrument pipes are plumb coming out of the mud slab. Additionally, these details do not show couplers or varying diameters on the dewatering wells or monitoring instruments. Currently almost all of dewatering wells have varying diameters with couplers and are almost all out of plumb. The monitoring instruments also seem to be out of plumb. To avoid the plumbness and varying dewatering well pipe diameter issues, is it acceptable to cut the dewatering well pvc pipe at or close to the mud slab elevation to avoid conflict with the dewatering sleeves? How should SCCI handle the sleeves for the monitoring instruments that are out of plumb? Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No. It is not acceptable to cut the dewatering pvc pipe at or close to the mud slab elevation. The cut off must be well above the elevation of the waterproofing spiral wrap and ring plate. The varying diameters and plumbness of each of the penetrating devices / pipes will require field measurement and shop drawings prepared showing adaptation of the sleeve detail to each unique situation.				
T-0425	BGP -Geothermal Trench Methods	Closed	03/08/2013	03/18/2013	03/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 31 23 34 3.3 F Per Coordination Meeting March 6, 2013, S3H Inc. is looking to install the geothermal loop at a depth of 2' below the Mat slab. After the loop installation, the trenches will be back filled with 8" of loose native soil to protect the pipe. This 8" lift will be watered to settle the loose soil around the pipe. Upon watering and settling of the loose 8" lift, the remainder of the trench will be backfilled with native soil and compacted to the relative density of the surrounding soil per specification. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Item 1. F+K response: Depth of trench for geothermal piping shall be per mechanical drawings and specifications. Item 2. Arup response: 8" of loose satisfactory soil material is per specification 23 57 34 paragraph 3.1.D. Item 3. Arup response: The remaining backfill shall be compacted to 95% as required in the specifications.				
T-0426	BGP - Welded Wire Mesh in Sump and Elevator Pits	Closed	03/11/2013	03/21/2013	03/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0428	BGP - Geothermal Manifold Valves	Closed	03/11/2013	03/25/2013	03/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 23 57 34 2.1.B In addition to the keystone valves submitted for the geothermal manifold, S3H is requesting to also install Nibco valves (specification attached) as allowed under specification 23 57 34 2.1.B. There are currently procurement issues with the submitted Keystone valves. All manifolds will be installed with similar valves. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Nibco is an acceptable manufacturer. Submit proposed valves for review per specifications for product data submittals.			

T-0429	BGP - Contract Limit Lines	Closed	03/11/2013	03/25/2013	03/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: S1-3206, S1-3201 Contract Drawing Sheet S1-3206 Section 4 depicts an elevation of the knockout walls along the West end of the structure. Within this elevation the bold limit line for the contract TG0600 is shown well above the top wall CJ which does not align with Note 1 and the typical wall section on sheet S1-3201. Please clarify the proper location of the contract package TG0600 limit line on sheet S1-3206 Section 4.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The bold scope delineation line on Section 4/S1-3206 shall be at the top of +7.0' slab and the associated CJ. The only exception to this delineation would be at the southwest corner where the delineated ramp slab meets and overhangs the foundation wall above the +7.0" elevation. Refer to 1/S1-2251 for this area			

T-0430	BGP - Trainbox Shear Wall STD Hook	Closed	03/11/2013	03/22/2013	03/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: S1-3260 Detail 2 of S1-3260 depicts standard hook reinforcement between the horizontal ties in the shearwall above the lower concourse; however, it is not clear if the standard hooks are required in the shearwall below the lower concourse. Please confirm if standard hook reinforcement is required in between the center shear wall ties. If		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The standard hook reinforcement is required only at the edge of wall condition, and therefore, not required below the lower concourse at the center shearwall ties. For the center location, the horizontal bars are continuous when you are below the lower concourse level.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	standard hooks are required, please provide detail for the layout of the standard hooks in between the center shear wall ties.						
T-0431	BGP - Knockout Wall, Top of Wall T-Head	Closed	03/12/2013	03/26/2013	03/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon						
	REQUEST: Reference Drawing: S1-3206 Reference Specification: 03 20 00 Dwg. Sheet S1-3206 Section 4 depicts the vertical reinforcing at the top of wall without a T-headed bar. Please confirm that a T-headed bar is not required at the top of the vertical bars throughout the knockout wall area.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the T-head is not required at the top of the vertical bars throughout the knock-out wall area.				
T-0432	BGP - Shear Wall Layout	Closed	03/12/2013	03/26/2013	03/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon						
	REQUEST: Reference Drawings: S1-2250, S1-2030 The Northern-most shear wall when laid out based on the details (angle = 38.4 degrees from GL H) and dimensions (30'-5 7 /8") per contract drawing sheet S1-2030 do not conform with the dimensions provided on contract sheet S1-2250 Section 1. Please confirm which layout is correct and directions how to proceed.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The northernmost shearwall length is as defined by the edge of slab dimension on S1-2250. This wall does deviate from the typical length, however, note that a shearwall length is defined starting from the centerline of wall intersecting with the face of foundation wall and not as the RFI sketch has interpreted.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1021 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0433	BGP - Columns Within the Shear Wall	Closed	03/12/2013	03/22/2013	03/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
Reference Specification: 03 20 00 Reference Drawing: S1-2250, S1-3306			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The two columns C19 and column C38 depicted on contract drawings SI-2250, Section 1 all appear to be located adjacent to the opening and per the plan view are graphically represented as diamond shaped. When referencing contract drawing sheet S1-3306 these columns are graphically and dimensionally represented as square and not diamond shaped. Please confirm the geometry of these columns matches that as shown on S1-3306.			The inquired C19 & C38 columns are diamond shape in plan where the 3 sides match the shear wall geometry at the edge of opening below and the 4th side is 24" away from and parallel to the end of wall at opening below. Reinforcement & detailing of S1-3306 shall apply to this shape.				
T-0434	BSE - Micropile W603 Installed 1' South (Below ground obstruction)	Closed	03/13/2013	03/23/2013	03/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
Ref:Submittal TG0300-622.4			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Micropile W603 was relocated 1' South of original location after encountering grout from the adjacent pin pile. See attached sketch.			Thornton Tomasetti does not object to the relocation of Micropile W603 a distance 1' to the south as shown in this RFI.				
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-0435	BGP - Flame Cutting of Reinforcement	Closed	03/11/2013	03/25/2013	03/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcoran			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
Reference Specification: 03 20 00-3.1.6.A			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Project specification section 03 20 00-3 .1.6 states "Do not heat or flame cut bars;" however, this statement is a subpart to section 03 20 00-3.1.6. "Bend bars cold." It is unclear if the statement regarding to heating and flame-cutting of bars exclusively applies to bending of bars. Please confirm that heating and flame-cutting for purposes			Heating and flame-cutting of bars is prohibited unless approved by EOR				

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1023 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0436	BGP - Elevator Rail Support Width	Closed	03/13/2013	03/23/2013	03/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference Drawing: Section A of 4/S1-7630			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please confirm that the dimension from the left end of the 1/2" embedded plate to the center of the welded headed stud is 3".			Note that detail 4A/S1-7630 specifies the dimension of 1/2" from top of HSS12x6 to 5/8" plate and that the 5/8" plate is shaped with a top edge at a 1:1 slope. This slope starts at the side of the HSS. With the welded studs centered on the HSS and spaced at 1'-0" on center, that leave 3 1/2" from center of welded stud to edge of 1/2" embedded plate.				
T-0437	BGP - Geothermal Riser Conflict with Soldier Pile	Closed	03/13/2013	03/23/2013	03/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference Specification: 23 57 34			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
As laid out per the approved shop drawings, the GLS/GLR Riser for the geothermal loops is in conflict with the soldier pile in the field. Please confirm that the riser can be relocated to the next CDSM wall panel to the West.			The Geothermal riser shall be located to the East of Soldier Pile 36 (between 36 and 37).				
T-0438	BGP - Knockout Wall CJ	Closed	03/12/2013	03/26/2013	03/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1024 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Drawing: 4/S1-3206</p> <p>Reference Dwg. S1-3206 Section 4 - knockout wall section details. Since knockout walls are to be constructed independent of the rest of the structure, SCCI intention is to construct the knockout walls in two lifts. SCCI suggests eliminating bottom horizontal CJ of the knockout walls, as shown on the attached marked up drawing.</p> <p>Is this acceptable?</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Contractor-proposed elimination of bottom CJ in knock-out walls is acceptable.</p>		
T-0439	<p>BGP - Mat Slab Elevator Opening Embeds</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>	<p>Closed</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>	03/13/2013	03/23/2013	03/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Ref: Drawings S1-2052 through S1-2061, 1/S1-7004, 12/S1-7602, 3/S1-3006, S1-3004, S1 -3008.</p> <p>Please reference attached drawings of Mat Slab openings and Embeds. Drawings S1-2052 through S1-2061 show the locations of openings in the Mat Slab. At gridlines 1.8-E on drawing S1-2052 there is an elevator opening. Detail 1 on Drawing S1-7004 is the elevator opening from S1-2052 and shows the opening having two L8x4xl/2 full length embeds at the Mat Slab. See Detail 12 on attached drawing S1-7602 for embed. S1-2052 and detail 1 on S1-7004 both have cut lines referencing Detail 3 on S1-3006 showing the Mat Slab Pit details at this location. There are additional elevator openings on drawings S1-2054, S1-2055 and S1-2057. These" openings reference drawings S1-3004 and S1 -3008. Detail I on S1-7004 does not correspond to the openings on S1-2054, S1-2055 and S1-2057. Therefore, the only elevator opening that has L8x4xl/2 full length embeds on the Mat Slab is located at gridline 1.8-E.</p> <p>Please advise if this is correct.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Confirmed, the only elevator pit that gets embedded angles is the one located at gridlines 1.8-E, and as shown on 1/S1-7004.</p> <p>See the attached sketch SKS-0184, where the reference for the lengths of these embeds have been modified.</p> <p>The other elevator pits referenced in this RFI are not fully constructed as part of the Below Grade Package, and the tops of these elevator pits and additional embedded angles will be installed in a future package that includes the train platforms.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1025 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0439.1	BGP - Mat Slab Elevator Opening Embeds	Closed	03/29/2013	04/08/2013	04/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: RFI T-0439, SKS-0184 Please reference attached drawing. The response to WOJV RFI T -0439 modifies the continuous embedded assemblies to be four L8" x 4" x W' x 1 '-2" elevator post bases as depicted on Contract Drawing S 1-7600 Detail 11. The RFI response does not show the location and spacing of the embedded assemblies. Please provide locations and spacing.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The embedded angles are centered under each elevator post. Final elevator post locations shall be coordinated with elevator manufacturer. If an elevator provider is not awarded a contract in time for construction, the following alternate may be used. In lieu of the L8x4x1/2 x1'-2" embedded angles, a continuous L8x4x1/2 angle with welded studs at 12" may be used. The HSS guiderail post will be welded to the embedded angle in the field after an elevator provider has been selected.				
T-0439.2	BGP - Mat Slab Elevator Opening Embed Dimensions	Closed	05/10/2013	05/24/2013	05/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
REQUEST: Ref. RFI T-0439.1 TJPA's response to RFI T-0439.1 stated "Final elevator post locations shall be coordinated with elevator manufacturer." The response has a second option to use a continuous L8x4x1/2 in lieu of the 1'-2" base. Please provide the elevator post locations if an elevator manufacturer has been selected? If not, SCCI is requesting to use continuous embeds. Please advise if this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Can't find answer in Constructware				
T-0440	BGP - Glass Guardrail Embeds	Closed	03/12/2013	03/26/2013	03/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: 7/S1-3410, S1-2202-2207, S1-2210, S1-2211 Please reference attached drawings of Concourse Level			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The markups on the RFI sketches have interpreted the locations of glass guardrail embeds at openings correctly with the exception of GL 34 south opening where the west side of the opening does not have a				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1026 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	glass guardrail embeds and openings. Detail 7 on drawing S1-3410 is the typical PL 3/8x7 glass guardrail embeds for escalator and stair openings. The detail states that the guardrail embeds are continuous. It is unclear what the boundaries of the guardrail embeds are. SCCI has determined that no guardrail embeds are necessary at the opening locations where future CMU or concrete walls shall be constructed flush with the opening. Also, the guardrail embeds can be terminated at the escalator openings where the opening is reduced. Attached drawings SI-2202 through SI-2207, SI -2210 and S1 -2211 show the limits SCCI has determined the glass guardrail embeds shall be installed. Please advise if these locations are accurate and the only locations the guardrail embeds shall be installed.						
	future wall and will require a guardrail embed.						
T-0440.1	BGP - Glass Gaurdrail Embeds	Closed	08/05/2013	08/15/2013	08/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Drawings, RFI T-0440 Please reference attached drawings (SI-2204 through SI-2207, SI-3410), and RFI T-0440 response. Per ASJ 104, future walls addressed in RFI T -0440, have been revised. Per ASI 104, the attached drawings show the limits SCCI has determined the glass guard rails shall be installed. Please confirm these locations are correct and are the only locations the guardrail embeds shall be installed.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to the attached SKA's-2794, 2795, 2796, 2797 & 2798 for the locations of the glass guardrail embeds at the Lower Concourse Level.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1027 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0441	BSE - Micropile W638 Relocation (Dewatering Well Conflict)	Closed	03/14/2013	03/24/2013	03/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: Submittal TG0300 - 622.4 Micropile W638 as laid out is in conflict with a dewatering well. BBII proposes moving Micropile W638 East 2' to provide adequate clearance. This Micropile is located south of J-Line and the Geothermal piping area. See attached sketch. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to shifting Micropile W638 as proposed.		

T-0442	BGP - Geothermal Riser Bracket Details	Closed	03/14/2013	03/24/2013	03/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Arup Kevin Clinch				
REQUEST: As requested in the Geothermal Meeting with the TJP A and Turner, please confirm that the attached details for the geothermal pipe riser brackets are acceptable. These details clarify the offset from the face of the CDSM wall required to avoid conflict with the water proofing membranes.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable.		

T-0442.1	BGP - Geothermal Riser Bracket Details	Closed	03/21/2013	03/31/2013	03/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: As requested in the Geothermal Meeting with the TJPA and Turner, please confirm that the attached details for the geothermal pipe riser brackets are acceptable. These details clarify the offset from the face of the CDSM wall required to avoid conflict with the water proofing membranes.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The detail shown on the RFI sketch is acceptable.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0443	BGP - C Channel Confilct with Geothermal Pipe Riser	Closed	03/12/2013	03/26/2013	03/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Turner Construction Comꝑ Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Specification: 23 57 34 Reference Photo: Attached					These channels are part of the BSE TG03 Contractor's Internal Bracing System. Coordinate removal of these steel channels with the CM/GC.		
Shimmick plans to excavate the geothermal pipe risers in one lift up the CDSM wall. There is currently no clearance behind the C-Channels for Shimmick to excavate the geothermal pipe risers. Please confirm that the C-Channels will be removed from the shoring system prior to the geothermal riser installation or provide an alternative location for the risers.							
<hr/>							
T-0443.1	C-Channel Removal prior to Mat Slab and Re-bracing installation.	Closed	03/20/2013	03/30/2013	03/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Turner Construction Comꝑ Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The Geothermal Risers are to be installed up the CDSM wall to ground level in one sequence. Please confirm it is acceptable to remove the C-Channels prior to Mat slab and Re-bracing installation.					Refer to response issued for RFI T-0443. This is a CM/GC coordination issue.		
<hr/>							
T-0445	BGP - Mat Slab Pour Length	Closed	03/14/2013	03/28/2013	03/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Specification: 03 30 20 3.2 Reference Sketch: CJ-03 (Mat Slab pour S112)					Yes this is acceptable for pour S112.		
SCCI has revised the construction joint layout to address CJ submittal comments, and has modified locations of the CJ's to have all concourse CJ's line up with the wall CJ's, be under 60' long, and fall within center third of the span (as specified). As a result of trying to maintain the wall and concourse CJ's within the specified parameters one of the Mat slab pours (S112) will need to extend to 121', which is 1' over the specified length.					Provide updated Construction Joint Layout submittal reflecting these changes.		
Is it acceptable to have pour S112 (that falls between grid							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
lines 22 and 26) 121' long (East-West direction)?							
T-0446	BSE - Micropiles W390 & W393 Relocation (Overhead Obstruction)	Closed	03/18/2013	03/28/2013	03/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref: Submittal TG0300-622.4 and TG0601-009.1		Thornton Tomasetti does not object to shifting Micropiles W390 and W393 as proposed.					
Micropiles W390 and W393 cannot be installed as laid out due an overhead obstruction. BBII proposes moving W390 West 16" to provide adequate clearance. BBII proposes moving W393 West either 10" or 2'-10" to provide adequate clearance. The proposed location for Micropile W390 will be South of the geothermal area. The proposed locations for Micropile W393 will be within the geothermal area; however, the proposed locations do not appear to impact geothermal piping and the 12" minimum clearance between pipe and piling will be maintained (Note 4 on Geothermal Submittal sheet GT-Zone-02). See attached sketch. Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-0447	80 Natoma Shoring Beam in Sump Pit	Closed	03/18/2013	03/28/2013	03/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Kelly Phariss							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference RFI: T-0317.3 Reference Photo: attached		BBII IFC drawing D-2210 shows 80 Natoma Shoring wall to be removed to elevation -44'-6" also GT-2101 shows the Subgrade elevation of Pits to be -44'- 9" .					
BBII has confirmed that the 80 Natoma H pile (shown in attached photo) has been demolished to the -44.5 ft required per Sheet D-2210 and RFI T-0317.3. Please provide depth that BBII must demolish the attached 80 Natoma H pile so not to conflict with geothermal piping.		Deeper removal of the 80 Natoma wall beams are not required in order to allow clearance for the geothermal piping. The TG06 Contractor has taken these into account (Refer to Geothermal Loop Piping Submittals)					



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0448	CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment	Closed	03/19/2013	03/29/2013	03/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Documents: Exhibits A-H				It is acceptable to reduce the foundation wall thickness with reinforcement spacing reduction as proposed for the 5 inquired locations.			
In follow up to the 3/13/13 meeting with AAI and TT regarding the CDSM soldier pile (SP) encroachment WOJV's proposal for mat slab area #1 (Exhibit-A) is as follows:				Note that this is not a pre-approval for future conditions that may arise. W/O shall coordinate these approved modifications with shop drawing preparation.			
Marked up sheets SH-2000 (Exhibit-B) and SH-2001 (Exhibit-C) depict the location of the encroaching SPs and the degree in which they are encroaching.							
Predicated on SE stamped detail A/SLC.1 (Exhibit-D):							
A. At (4) SPs 753, 761, 765, & 787, WOJV is proposing to decrease the wall thickness to 34-1/2" with #11 rebar spacing to 6" o.c. between the centerline of the (2) adjacent piles. For example, as depicted in SK-T-0448.1 (Exhibit-E) SP #753 encroaches 1-1/4". WOJV would reduce the wall thickness while reducing the rebar spacing to compensate for the reduced wall thickness to clear the encroaching SP as depicted in SK-T-0448.2 (Exhibit-F).							
B. At SP 819 WOJV is proposing to decrease the wall thickness to 33 3/16" with #11 rebar spacing to 6" o.c. between the centerline of the (2) adjacent piles. Similar to above, as depicted in SK-T-0448.3 (Exhibit-G) SP #753 encroaches 2-3/16". WOJV would reduce the wall thickness while reducing the rebar spacing to compensate for the reduced wall thickness to clear the encroaching SP as depicted in SK-T-0448.4 (Exhibit-H).							
WOJV did review the possibility of cutting the W21x201 flanges to accommodate the encroachment however, this high risk remedy was ruled out as it could jeopardize the project shoring system.							
Please advise.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1031 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0448.1	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment, mat areas 1&2 all levels (Exhibit-A).	Closed	04/26/2013	05/06/2013	04/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: T-0448, SH-2001, SH-2000					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>Previous RFI response #T-0448 (Exhibit-A) only addressed the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SPs) on the first or bottom wall segments. This RFI address the encroaching SPs in mat slab areas 1&2 (Exhibit-B) at all levels of wall. This RFI shall supersede previous RFI response #T-0448.</p> <p>Marked up sheet SH-2001 (Exhibit-C) depicts the location of the encroaching SPs and the degree in which they are encroaching.</p> <p>1. SP #753 in mat area #2 encroaches 1-1/4" at elevation - 34.12. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34-3/4" to clear the encroaching SP. WOJV would reduce the wall thickness while compensating by supplementing the base contract #11 bars @ 8" o.c. with intermediate #7 bars (Option #3 Exhibit-D) exclusively at the level of encroachment.</p> <p>2. SP #761 in mat area #1 encroaches 7/8" at elevation - 34.12. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 35-1/8" to clear the encroaching SP. WOJV would reduce the wall thickness while compensating by supplementing the base contract #11 bars @ 8" o.c. with intermediate #7 bars (Option #3 Exhibit-D) exclusively at the level of encroachment.</p> <p>3. SPs #765-770, vary in the degree of encroachment the worst of which is SP #765 in mat area #1 which encroaches 1-7/8" at elevation 25.10. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34-1/8" to clear the encroaching SPs. WOJV would reduce the wall thickness while compensating by supplementing the base contract #11 bars @ 8" o.c. with intermediate #7 bars (Option #3 Exhibit-D) exclusively at the level of encroachment.</p> <p>4. SP #787 in mat area #1 encroaches 7/8" at elevation - 34.42. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 35-1/8" to clear the encroaching SP. WOJV</p>					Can't find answer in Constructware		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1032 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>would reduce the wall thickness while compensating by supplementing the base contract #11 bars @ 8" o.c. with intermediate #7 bars (Option #3 Exhibit-D) exclusively at the level of encroachment.</p> <p>Marked up sheet SH-2000 (Exhibit-E) depicts the location of the encroaching SPs and the degree in which they are encroaching.</p> <p>1. SP #819 in mat area #1 encroaches 2-3/16" at elevation -34.24.</p> <p>WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33-13/16" to clear the encroaching SP. WOJV would reduce the wall thickness while compensating by supplementing the base contract #11 bars @ 8" o.c. with intermediate #7 bars (Option #3 Exhibit-D) exclusively at the level of encroachment.</p>						
<hr/>							
T-0448.2	BSE - CDSM Soldier Pile Enchroachment	Closed	04/29/2013	05/09/2013	04/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: T-0448, SH-2001, SH-2000		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Previous RFI response #T-0448 (Exhibit-A) only addressed the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SPs) on the first or bottom wall segments. This RFI address the encroaching SPs in mat slab areas 1&2 (Exhibit-B) at all levels of wall. This RFI shall supersede previous RFI response #T-0448.		Can't find answer in Constructware					
Marked up sheet SH-2001 (Exhibit-C) depicts the location of the encroaching SPs and the degree in which they are encroaching.							
1. SP #753 in mat area #2 encroaches 1-1/4" at elevation - 34.12.							
WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34-3/4" to clear the encroaching SP. WOJV would reduce the wall thickness while compensating by							



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>supplementing the base contract #11 bars @ 8" o.c. with intermediate #7 bars (Option #3 Exhibit-D) exclusively at the level of encroachment.</p> <p>2. SP #761 in mat area #1 encroaches 7/8" at elevation - 34.12. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 35-1/8" to clear the encroaching SP. WOJV would reduce the wall thickness while compensating by supplementing the base contract #11 bars @ 8" o.c. with intermediate #7 bars (Option #3 Exhibit-D) exclusively at the level of encroachment.</p> <p>3. SPs #765-770, vary in the degree of encroachment the worst of which is SP #765 in mat area #1 which encroaches 1-7/8" at elevation 25.10. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34-1/8" to clear the encroaching SPs. WOJV would reduce the wall thickness while compensating by supplementing the base contract #11 bars @ 8" o.c. with intermediate #7 bars (Option #3 Exhibit-D) exclusively at the level of encroachment.</p> <p>4. SP #787 in mat area #1 encroaches 7/8" at elevation - 34.42. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 35-1/8" to clear the encroaching SP. WOJV would reduce the wall thickness while compensating by supplementing the base contract #11 bars @ 8" o.c. with intermediate #7 bars (Option #3 Exhibit-D) exclusively at the level of encroachment.</p> <p>Marked up sheet SH-2000 (Exhibit-E) depicts the location of the encroaching SPs and the degree in which they are encroaching.</p> <p>1. SP #819 in mat area #1 encroaches 2-3/16" at elevation -34.24. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33-13/16" to clear the encroaching SP. WOJV would reduce the wall thickness while compensating by supplementing the base contract #11 bars @ 8" o.c. with intermediate #7 bars (Option #3 Exhibit-D) exclusively at the level of encroachment.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1035 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0448.4	CDSM Soldier Pile Enchroachment	Closed	05/09/2013	05/19/2013	05/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Previous RFI #T-0448, Related RFI #T-0530. Previous RFI response #T-0448 only addressed the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SPs) on the first or bottom wall segments. This RFI addresses the encroaching SPs in mat slab areas 1&2 at all levels of wall. This RFI shall supersede previous RFI response #T-0448. Please see attachment SK-1 for RFI T-0448.4 questions.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Foundation wall modification proposals 1-10 are not acceptable. Comments are as follows: A.) This RFI supersedes RFI #T-0448. The proposed rebar scheme in this RFI differs from previously suggested solution without providing calculations that show proposed additional rebar compensates for reduction in moment and shear capacity of the foundation wall cross-section due to shoring encroachment. B.) Reinforcement for knock-out walls (west of mat slab area #1) differ from those in typical foundation walls (e.g., see S1-2060 for section call out). Provide solutions for knock-out walls. C.) Provide an elevation sketch that shows the proposed vertical extent and detail of added rebar. D.) Lap splices are not allowed in additional rebar. Use Type 2 mechanical couplers. E.) Provided generic cross-section detail is insufficient to show the actual location of the added rebar in plan. The extent of the applied options should be shown on plan for clarity. F.) Reference SK1 is not included in this RFI. G.) Maximum encroachment dimension provided for SP(s) #737-739 does not match maximum dimension provided in SK-2 and SK-3, please reconcile. H.) Do not refer to a superseded RFI (in SK-3 comments column for pile 819). I.) Coordinate all modifications with future shop drawings for TG06.				
T-0448.5	CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment	Closed	06/04/2013	06/14/2013	06/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1036 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference Documents: Exhibits A - G

This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the South wall in slab area 1 & 2 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 733 and 772. (Exhibit A)

Exhibit B & Exhibit C depict the location and degree in which the SPs are encroaching.

WOJV proposal: Between SPs 733 and 772 (which is the intersection of the South and West wall) WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 1/8" to clear all the encroaching SPs. WOJV would reduce the thickness while reducing the rebar spacing to compensating for the reduced wall thickness predicated on SE stamped Detail A/SLC.1 (Exhibit D) this modification would clear all the encroaching SP/steel plate issues between 733 & 772, See Exhibit E, F, & G.

This modification, if approved, would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.

Please confirm if this is acceptable.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

The proposed modification to foundation wall reinforcement is acceptable. W/O to coordinate these changes with TG06 contractor, including previously-approved mat rebar shop drawings for this zone.

T-0449

BGP - Pre-Installation Conference Meeting Minutes-Waterproofing

Closed

03/19/2013

03/29/2013

03/21/2013

Potentially

☐

From: Webcor Construction LP

Lynn Kowallis

To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch

Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams

Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon

REQUEST:

Ref: Specification Section 01 12 00 1.5.D, 07 12 10 1.3.B.2 and 00 07 00 1.05

There appears to be a conflict in responsibility and duration between Specification Section 01 12 00 - 1.5.D, Project Meetings and 07 12 10-1.3.B.2, Modified Bitumen Waterproofing- see the attached PDF.

"Project Meetings" states the TJP A is responsible for preparing the meeting minutes and then distribute them with 2 days after the conference while the "Modified

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

There is no conflict. The meeting minutes will be prepared and submitted by the Contractor within 3 days after the meeting per Spec. 07-12-10 Modified Bitumen Waterproofing. Preinstallation meeting minutes are the responsibility of the Contractor per Spec. 07-12-10 Para 1.3 Administrative Requirements which states; "The following requirements are in addition to the provisions of Spec. 01-12-00 and 01-14-00." "The minutes of the conference shall be submitted by the Contractor to all attendees and interested parties no less than 3 days after the



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1037 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Bitumen Waterproofing" section seems to indicate the Contractor/Trade Subcontractor is to prepare the minutes and distribute them no less than 3 days after the conference.</p> <p>Based on General Conditions 00 07 00-1.05, entitled Precedence of Contract Documents, confirm the TJPA will prepare and distribute the Modified Bitumen Waterproofing Pre-Installation Conference Meeting minutes per Section 01 12 00-1.5.D.</p>			conference."			
T-0450	BSE - Dewatering Casing Tolerances	Closed	03/19/2013	03/29/2013	03/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Specification Section: 31 23 19				Plumbness of the dewatering well is not explicitly mentioned in the specifications. However Dewatering Specification section 31 23 19 1.11 C states "Coordinate work to avoid clashes with....and other items to be installed as part of the permanent structure" and detail 6 / A1-8711 shows the Dewatering Pipe drawn plumb and fitting snug within the steel sleeve.			
Please confirm the TG03 contract documents tolerance for the plumbness of the dewatering well casings.							

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0451	BGP - Mat Slab Construction Joint Dimensions	Closed	03/19/2013	03/29/2013	03/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Reference Specification:031000 Reference Drawings:S1-3001 Please reference attached sketches of mat slab construction joint (CJ), and detail 2 on S1-3001. Detail No. 2 on CD S1-3001 shows CJ for the mat slab 5 thick section, however, the contract drawings do not provide details/dimensions for the thickened portion of the mat slab at the pits (sump pits, elevator pits, etc.), and the 3 ft chamfer. SCCI suggests maintaining mat slab keyway at 1'-8" wide and 10" deep (as shown on detail 2 on S1-3001) for all mat slab CJ's, and as shown on attached sketch.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to maintain the 1'-8" wide by 10" deep key for the mat slab construction joint at thickened mat and chamfer areas as shown on the RFI sketch. Although not inquired about, note the foundation wall key h/6 dimension on section c-c should be 6" and not 5" as detailed on sketch.	
<hr/>							
T-0452	BGP - Concrete Beam Under Slab	Closed	03/19/2013	03/29/2013	03/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 033020 Reference Drawing: S1-2251, S1-3205, S1-3400 Please reference the Vehicle/Bike ramp framing plans on S1-2251. Detail 1 calls for a 36" x 48"concrete beam below the ramp slab. However, this concrete beam is not indicated in section detail 7 on S1-3205. The beam size and specifications as described on S1-2251 does not match a beam listed in the beam schedule on sheet SI-3400. The plan on SI-2251 does not clearly show where this beam begins and ends. Please provide additional information and clarification regarding this 36" x 48" concrete beam.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 7/S1-3205 is not intended for the beam but for the ramp slab over foundation wall with corbel condition. The inquired concrete beam is cantilevered from the face of the foundation wall. Although this beam is not marked as a scheduled beam, the info required for detailing is provided. Longitudinal bars and stirrup info is called out. Typical detail 2/S1-3401 shall apply for a cantilever condition and the longitudinal top bars shall extend minimum LTE into the foundation wall.	
<hr/>							
T-0453	BGP - Angle Steel Beam Connections	Closed	03/19/2013	03/29/2013	03/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Reference Specification:032000 Reference Drawings:S1-3411, S1-2251</p> <p>Please reference the Vehicle/Bike beam end support detail 1 on S1-3411. The L8x8 connections appear to be shown to be fabricated at a 90 deg angle between the foundation wall and the Vehicle/Bike beams. Per Detail 1 on sheet S1-2251, the beams are shown to be intersecting the foundation wall at varying angles. SCCI requests further clarification/details at the beam locations for the fabrication of the L8x8 connections.</p>						
T-0453.1	<p>BGP - Vehicle/Bike Beam End Supports</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon</p> <p>REQUEST: Ref: RFI T-0453, AI-7401, SK-115</p> <p>Please reference attached drawings. RFI T-0453 stated that the L8x8x1 1/8" shall be bent to match the angle at which the Vehicle/Bike ramp beams meet the wall. At the western most beam the acute angle at which the beam meets the wall is 56 degrees and the obtuse angle is 124 degrees. See attached marked up Contract Drawing AI-7401 for angle measurements. Bending the 1 1/8" thick legs of the L8x8 is not feasible and would structually stress the member. SCCI proposes to weld two 1 1/8" plates together to fabricate the angles. See attached drawing SK-115 for details. The additional two beam members shall be fabricated per the measured angles.</p> <p>Please advise if this is acceptable.</p>	<p>Closed</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>04/11/2013</p> <p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>	<p>04/21/2013</p>	<p>04/22/2013</p>	<p>Potentially <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
					<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>It is acceptable to weld two 1 1/8" plates together to create the (2) angles for the western most beam, provided a complete-joint-penetration (CJP) weld is used.</p>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0453.2	BGP - Clarification of Vehicle/Bike Beam End Support	Closed	10/02/2013	10/12/2013	10/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please refer to attached drawing S1-2251, S1-3411. A1-7401 and SCCI sketch SK-115.				George Metzger 10/14/2013			
Per RFI response T-0453.1, it is acceptable to weld two 1 1/8" plates together to create the (2) angles for the western most beam indicated on drawing A1-7401.				RESPONSE: Confirmed			
Please confirm the Vehicle/Bike Ramp end support acute angle is 56-degrees and obtuse angle is 124-degrees as shown in the attached SCCI sketch SK-115.							
T-0454	BGP - Steel Cap Collar Weld Location	Closed	03/19/2013	03/29/2013	03/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 055010 Reference Drawings: S1-3003, A1-8711, Submittal No. TG0600-036				Provided the sleeve and collar are welded together (in the shop) before the mat is poured, the location of weld in the shop drawing is acceptable. If instead the collar must be installed onto the sleeve in the field after the mat is poured, then weld access will be a limiting factor that will require the weld to occur as shown on S1-3003.			
Please reference attached Contract Drawing SI-3003 and AI-8711 along with approved as noted dewatering pipe sleeve shop drawing. The 3 dewatering sleeve drawings depict conflicting weld locations for the 5/16" fillet weld of the steel cap collar to sleeve connection (see highlighted drawings).							
Please clarify/confirm the location of this weld.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0455	BGP - Out of Plumb Dewatering Casing	Closed	03/19/2013	03/29/2013	03/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 055010-3.2.C Reference Drawings: S1-3003 Reference Photo: attached Please reference Sheet S1-3003 of the Contract Drawings and Spec Section 055010-3.2.C SCCI spot checked two of the existing dewatering wells for plumbness and found them both to be approximately 3/4" over 48" out of plumb (see attached photos). With this existing condition, SCCI can not adhere to the plumbness tolerance (1/16") for installation and maintain the required 1/2" maximum gap between sleeve and casing per Section 2 of Sheet S1-3003. SCCI suggests increasing the diameter of the sleeve and granting a variance on the 1/2" gap tolerance per Sheet S1-3003. SCCI will maintain adherence to the installation tolerances in Spec Section 05 50 10.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the existing dewatering wells, we will not object if the maximum gap between sleeve and dewatering well casing exceeds 1/2" for those dewatering wells found to be out of plumb.				
T-0455.1	BGP - Dewatering Well Above Grade PVC Pipe	Closed	03/29/2013	04/08/2013	04/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: A1-8711 Per discussion in the pre-installation and preparatory DFOW meetings for the metal fabrication penetration sleeves, the PVC dewatering casing above the mud slab can be cut just above or at top of mud slab elevation to avoid varying diameter issues. Without the dewatering casing present above mud slab grade, the varying casing diameter issues and plumbness issues are solved. The to avoid debris entering the dewatering casing, the casing would not be cut until the penetration sleeve is to be installed. Please confirm per the discussions in the meeting that cutting the casing is acceptable. Please note that the grouting back of the dewatering casing shortly after the decommissioning of the dewatering pump will be uniform (without segregation) for both below mudslab elevation and above.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The description contained in RFI T-0455.1 is acceptable. Note that dewatering casings that require to be cut, should be cut above the top of mud slab (not at the top of mud slab).				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0456	BGP - Mass Concrete Temperature Monitoring Equipment Installation in MAT Slab	Closed	03/25/2013	03/25/2013	04/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 03 30 20 (3.11.A & 1.3.A.8) Per Specifications 03 30 20 (3.11.A & 1.3.A.8), SCCI will install temperature monitoring devices at specified locations and depths. These instruments use RFID Tag technology for communication with the data logger. The RFID transmitter, which is wired to the temperature monitoring device, will be elevated out of the concrete. SCCI will tie a 1/4" diameter fiberglass, or similar non-corrosive, rod to the reinforcing mat. The temperature monitoring RFID transmitter will then be elevated clear of the Mat Slab. Once Thermal Monitoring activities are complete, this non-corrosive rod and cable will be cut flush with slab. Reference attached brochure and SCCI sketch. Is this method acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to proposed method presented in RFI. GC to coordinate waterproofing requirements with waterproofing subcontractor and submit proposed waterproofing details in the shop drawings.		
T-0457	BGP - Mat slab changes per Field Order 11 (Future ASI 102)	Closed	03/25/2013	04/04/2013	04/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Reference RFI: T-0415 Reference Field Order No. 11 (Future ASI 102) Field Order No.11 (Future ASI 102) is still in the design stage, and without the Contract Drawings incorporating the field orders SCCI cannot plan the work. More specifically, are there any changes to the foundation (Mat slab) resulting from Field Order 11 (Future ASI 102)? For example: If there are changed/added drainage pits in the SCCI's Area 3 (Mat slab pour # S103; GL A thru J, and 1 thru 3.5), geothermal work cannot begin until such changes are incorporated. Please confirm that Field Order No.11 (Future ASI 102), or any other forthcoming Field Order has no changes in the Mat slab drainage system (drainage pits, thickened sections, etc.), that would impact the subgrade work.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Regarding ASI 102 For the Mat slab GL A thru J and 1 thru 3.5 drainage pits are not expected change, with the exception of the small sump pit in the elevator pit GL 1.4 to 2, E.6 which was shown on the attachments responding to RFI T-0415 BGP. Within the mat slab (not affecting slab thickenings) floor drains and floor sinks have been relocated at the Fire Pump and Domestic Booster and Irrigation Pump Rooms and a floor drain will be added at the electrical room located GL 1.4 to 2, B to C.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1043 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0458	BGP - Concourse Slab CJ Layout	Closed	03/26/2013	04/05/2013	04/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 03 30 20 Reference Drawings: CJ-05 and CJ-22				The second option (that will result in a larger mat pour) is acceptable.			
<p>In order to meet the Joints in Concrete specifications (03 30 20-3.2), SCCI's revision of Construction Joint (CJ) Layout Submittal requires the CJ between concourse slabs D116 and D117 (see attached reference drawing CJ-22) to be 2'-10" outside of the required center third of the span (reference 03 30 20- 3.2.B.1). Please advise if this is acceptable.</p> <p>If the above is not acceptable, then SCCI proposes to move the CJ line (between D116 and D117) 2'-10" to the East. Since mat slab S108 (see attached reference drawing CJ-05) is currently 120'-0" wide, it will be increased to 122 '-1 0" wide. This would be wider than the maximum width of 120' -0" as specified in 03 30 20- 3.2.A.3. Please advise if this alternative is acceptable.</p>							

T-0459	BGP - Waterproofing and CJ Concourse Slab Layout Conflict	Closed	03/27/2013	04/06/2013	04/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 07 12 10 Reference Drawings: A1-2203 and S1-3201				This is a contractor coordination issue. CM/GC to coordinate this work between their sub-contractors and show the proposed solution in the coordinated shop drawings.			
<p>Please reference A1-2203 and SI-3201 of the Contract Plans and the attached drawings. The current elevation at the bottom of the 2nd level bracing lookouts is at approximately -5.13, WEST of Grid 9 (see concourse slab drawing). The proposed top of concourse slab elevation is to be -5.42, WEST of Grid 9. Per the WPM-1 waterproofing system, the minimum overall tie-in dimension needed for the succeeding lift is approximately 1 '-11" (see attached waterproofing drawing).</p> <p>The current elevation at the bottom of the 2nd level bracing lookouts is at approximately -6.15, EAST of Grid 9 (see concourse slab drawing). The proposed top of concourse slab elevation CJ is to be -7.67, EAST of Grid 9. Per the WPM-1 waterproofing system, the minimum</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1044 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>overall tie-in dimension needed for the succeeding lift is approximately 1 '-11" (see attached waterproofing drawing).</p> <p>In both locations, the minimum required dimension (1 '-11") to tie-in to the next lift of waterproofing can not be reached with the current location of the 2nd level bracing lookouts and the proposed concourse slab elevations. SCCI is restricted in location for the CJ due to the absolute concourse slab location and elevation.</p> <p>Furthermore, a similar conflict exists in the 1st foundation wall lift and the 3rd level of bracing lookouts (see 1st wall lift drawing). With SCCI's current location of the CJ, there is virtually no room to allow for the waterproofing overlap to occur. SCCI fully understands its freedom to manipulate the location of the CJ's by lowering it approximately 2'. This will potentially change BBII's rebracing plans.</p> <p>Please advise.</p>						
T-0460	BGP - Waterproofing and CJ at Mat Slab Conflict	Closed	03/27/2013	04/06/2013	04/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Ref: S1-3201		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please reference S1-3201 of the Contract Plans, RFI #T-0459, and the attached drawings. The current elevation at the bottom of the 4th level bracing lookouts is at approximately -31.56 (see mat slab drawing). The proposed top of mat slab elevation CJ is to be -32.37. Per the WPM-1 waterproofing system, the minimum overall tie-in overlap dimension needed for the succeeding lift is approximately 1'-11" (see attached waterproofing drawing).			This is a contractor coordination issue. CM/GC to coordinate this work between their sub-contractors and show the proposed solution in the coordinated shop drawings.				
The minimum required dimension (1'-11") to tie-in to the next lift of waterproofing can not be reached with the current location of the 4th level bracing lookouts and the proposed mat slab chamfer elevations. SCCI is restricted							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1045 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>in location for the CJ due to the absolute mat slab with chamfer location and elevation.</p> <p>Please advise.</p>						
T-0461	BSE - Cross - Lot Rebracing	Closed	03/27/2013	04/06/2013	04/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>	<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Ref: S1-3201 and Field Order 10R2 -S1-3201</p> <p>Base contract detail A/S1-3201 gave the contractor the option to utilize an internal concrete waler or an external steel waler for rebracing. The FO #10R2 version of detail 1/S1-3201 appears to have eliminated one of the two original rebracing options, leaving only the external steel waler option. Please confirm it was the designer's intent not to use an internal concrete waler for rebracing.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The contractor may use either a steel waler or internal concrete waler as in base contract detail A/S1-3201 (It was the design team's understanding from previous communications with the contractor that a steel waler would be used, thus the FO #10R2 version of detail 1/S1-3201 only graphically shows the steel waler option). FO #10R2 shall not be used to prohibit the contractor from designing and installing all necessary aspects of a rebracing system utilizing the permanent structural concrete, as indicated in base contract detail A/S1-3201.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1046 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0462	BGP - Grounding Wire Penetrations in Mud & Protection Slab	Closed	03/28/2013	04/07/2013	04/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Ref: 5/A1-8710 and Submittal Package TG0600-023.1 sheet 5.07, Specification Section 26 05 27 The contract plans and specifications call for the grounding wire to be bare copper. At the locations in which this grounding wire penetrates the mud & protection slab, the waterproofing supplier (Laurenco) requires the ground wire penetration to be solid metal or a rod. Laurenco has stated that if the electrical grounding penetration through the slab is wire as shown in the plans and specifications, the waterproofing system will leak. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For each of the grounding electrode conductors that penetrate the waterproof membrane, in order to provide a smooth impenetrable surface, splice a solid copper 4/0 grounding conductor per the attached detail sketch ESK-20 using Erico Cadweld mold #PTC-2P2L or equal. Refer to the attached revised waterproofing detail 5/A1-8710 for waterproofing of these spliced conductors. Jeff Thiel 4/10/2013 Pending TJPA approval, a CR for this work is forthcoming.		
T-0463	BSE - Micropiles W400 & 417 Relocation	Closed	03/28/2013	03/29/2013	04/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcoran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 31 63 33 Micropiles W400 and W417 cannot be installed as laid out due to an overhead obstruction (Geotechnical Instrumentation Pipes). BBII proposes moving W400 South 5' and W417 South 3' to provide adequate clearance. The proposed locations for Micropile W400 and W417 will be within the geothermal area; however, the proposed locations do not appear to impact geothermal piping. See attached sketch. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving micropiles W400 and W417 as proposed.		
T-0464	BGP - Clarification of Curing and Thermal Protection Methods	Closed	03/28/2013	04/07/2013	04/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1047 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Ref: Specification Section 033020.2.11.D, and 033020.3.7.A.c Ref: Submittal TG0600-201.1</p> <p>Reference Mass Concrete Plan prepared by CTL Group, Submittal Package TG0600-201.1, item 033000-011.1, page 10 - Curing. This paragraph state " ... slab placement will be cured in a method that does not artificially excessively decrease the surface temperature of the concrete placement. This means that continuous wetting of the concrete should he avoided."</p> <p>Reference specification section 033020.3.11.D. This paragraph states "Thermal Blankets are required to insure minimal thermal cracking."</p> <p>Reference specification section 033020.3.7.A.C. This paragraph calls for "Moist curing of the Mat Slab by means of continuously covering the slab with water."</p> <p>Reference attached letter " Wet Curing Mat Slab", author Bob Foley, CEMEX QC Manager Bay Area.</p> <p>SCCI intends to cure the Mat slab per recommendations of CLT Group Mass Concrete Plan. Due to the high risk of thermal cracking, SCCI intends to utilize impermeable insulated curing blankets and not cover the slab with water.</p> <p>Is this acceptable?</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					
T-0464.1	BGP - Mat Slab Curing Techniques	Closed	04/26/2013	05/06/2013	05/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>		<p>Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome</p>			
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Specification: 03 30 20</p> <p>Please reference TG06.0 Contract Specifications 03 30 20.3.7.5.b.3 and Project Meeting with Thornton Tomasetti (SER), held Thursday, April 25.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					
				<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>		
				<p>The proposed method of moist curing for the mat slab is acceptable.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1048 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	SCCI intends to Moist cure the Mat Foundation Slab using the above referenced method found in the contract specifications and discussed in the above mentioned Project meeting.						
	Please confirm this method is acceptable.						
T-0465	BGP - Relocation of Geothermal Risers Due to Leaking CDSM Wall	Closed	03/28/2013	04/07/2013	04/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference photo: Attached		Field 1 Risers should be located between east of soldier Pile 36 (between 36 and 37) as indicated in RFI T-0437 BGP. It is acceptable to locate Field 2 risers between 38 and 39.					
As seen in the picture attached, water is leaking through the surface of not only the CDSM panel that the geothermal riser is laid out on, but the various adjacent CDSM panels as well.							
Please confirm that SCCI can move the Field 1 risers location between Piles 35 & 36 and the Field 2 risers location between Piles 38 & 39. Both of these new locations appear to be leaking less than the original riser locations.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0466	BGP - Ground Rod for SFPUC	Closed	03/29/2013	04/08/2013	04/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
In follow up to the 3/28/2013 OAC, PCP informed us that the SF PUC requires a ground rod to be installed. Please provide all necessary information including but not limited to rod type, length, and location.				Add new ground rods and grounding electrode conductors for SFPUC utility requirements per the attached drawings. This grounding system shall not connect to the other building grounding systems except for the soldier pile connections. All other related details shall apply. Coordinate grounding conductors to rise in the foundation wall for extension into the Lower Concourse slab.			
				Jeff Thiel 4/10/2013 Pending TJPA approval, a CR for this work is forthcoming.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0466.1	BGP - Ground Rod for SFPUC	Closed	04/11/2013	04/21/2013	04/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: RFI T-0466, RFI T-0442 SCCI is in receipt of the response to RFI T -0466 concerning the addition of SFPUC grounding rods/grids. In order to price this change SCCI and its electrical subcontractor need the following information: On Drawing SKE-021, Note 8, please provide a location on where to terminate each of the four 4/0 cables at the lower concourse slab. A revised SKE-024 drawing showing the exact stub up locations and dimensions is needed to accurately price and construct this change. On Drawing SKE-022, Note 3, please again advise where to terminate the four 4/0 cables at the lower concourse slab. A revised SKE-024 drawing showing the exact stub up locations and dimensions is needed to accurately price and construct this change. Please confirm that the details from the RFI T -442 response will apply to these penetrations. Please confirm that there only two areas (detailed on SKE-021 & SKE-022) that will require the additional SFPUC grounding.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Please find the attached drawings to clarify the ground rod locations. The ground rods are noted to be approximately ten feet on center. Coordinate the specific placement of the rods and GEC to avoid the geothermal piping. We have included Lower Concourse drawings to indicate the grounding electrode conductors that will route into the Lower Concourse slab. Exact dimensioning of these conductors in the foundation wall and slab are not required, Contractor to coordinate exact locations with underground piping in this area. The GEC will be extended to bond to a ground grid at the four corners of the new Electrical Rooms B1289 and B1441. Additional slab details for the mesh and GEC bonding will be provided in an upcoming drawing issue. 2. Yes, the details from RFI T-442 will apply to these and all grounding conductor penetrations of the waterproof membrane. See SKE-025 for the connection detail referenced on sheet E1-6006, detail 2. 3. Yes, the two locations are the only known new SFPUC grounding locations. Please note that the ten foot ground rod separation shown on SKE-021R1 at the transformer vaults has been increased.				
T-0466.2	BGP - Requesting Detail 2 on drawing E1-6006	Closed	04/19/2013	04/29/2013	04/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: RFI T-0466, Drawing E1-6006 Reference is made to RFI T -0466 and the attached sketches. Note I on SKE-022, Note A on SKE-023 and the first note below (Top of Slab -35'-8") references a detail on Contract Drawing E1-6006 for the added SFPUC Ground Rods. The current drawing E1-6006 does not have the noted detail. SCCI requests an updated E1-6006 drawing with the new detail.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> SKE-025 issued with the RFI response indicates the specific referenced detail 2 on Sheet E1-6006. See attached for a duplicate copy.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1051 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0467	BGP - Lower Concourse Conflicts	Closed	03/28/2013	03/28/2013	04/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: SH-5002, SH-2007, SH-2008, SH-3001 SCCI is in discovery that the W21x101 and W14x30 support beams and lookouts at the shoring level B are encroaching into the lower concourse slab between GL 1 and 9.5. TOC for the concourse slab is at EL. -5.42' (GL 1 thru 9.5); Bottom of W21x101 support beams and W14x30 lookouts are at EL. -6.25' and -5.67' respectively. Please confirm that these will be removed prior to construction of the lower concourse level. If these struts supports are to remain throughout construction of the lower concourse please provide detailed drawings showing incorporation (or blockout) of these W21x101 support beams and W14x30 lookouts into the lower concourse slab.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is a contractor coordination issue. CM/GC to coordinate this work between their sub-contractors and show the proposed solution in the coordinated shop drawings.			
<hr/>							
T-0468	BGP - Geothermal Pipe Riser in CDSM Wall Excavation Specification	Closed	03/29/2013	04/08/2013	04/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 23 57 34, 31 23 34 Per discussions with the designer (ARUP), the CDSM wall will continue to move until the mat slab has been placed. With the geothermal pipe riser being installed much ahead of the mat slab, there is a good chance that the riser chase pour back will be jeopardized by the wall movement. Per specification 31 23 34, 3.2, B, the geothermal riser pipe chase cannot remain open for longer than 10 calendar days. Is it acceptable to extend this duration to account for the wall movement until the mat slab is poured? Please advise.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable west of gridline 7.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0469	BGP - Embed Nail Holes	Closed	04/01/2013	04/11/2013	04/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: Detail 3/S1-3010, Detail 2,3,6/S1-3205, Detail 1/S1-3411, Detail 9,11/S1-7600, Detail 8,12/S1-7602 Please reference attached drawings of typical steel embeds, not all embed drawings are attached. SCCI requests to drill 1/4" nail holes in the embedded steel angles, plates, pit frames and bearing assemblies. The holes shall provide a means to secure embeds to the formwork and prevent movement during placement of concrete. Nail holes shall be drilled prior to galvanization and shown on shop drawings. Please advise if this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed nail holes are acceptable provided that holes avoid studs by minimum of AISC bolt hole clear spacing requirements. Submit holes in shop drawings for review.				
T-0470	BGP - Concourse Slab Trestle Pile Block Out	Closed	04/02/2013	04/12/2013	04/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: Detail 4, 7/S1-3009, S1-3500, S1-3501, S1-3502 Please reference attached Contract Drawings S1-3009, S1-3500, S1-3501 and S1-3502. Details 4 and 7 on S1-3009 depict the typical mat foundation reinforcement and trestle pile block outs. SCCI is unable to locate a typical concourse slab reinforcement and trestle pile block out detail. The slab detail drawings, S1-3500 to S1-3502, do not contain details for the trestle pile block outs. Please provide trestle pile reinforcement and block detail for the concourse slab.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Since a block-out for a trestle pile is a temporary condition, it is the contractor's responsibility for this means and methods issue. Note that General Note GR-9 on S-0005 offers some additional information on this topic.				
T-0470.1	BGP - Concourse Penetrations Discrepancies	Closed	07/16/2013	07/16/2013	07/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference attached sketch and RFI T-0470. Note GR-9 on S-0005 raises a non constructability issue with the concourse slab penetration blockout. If the GR-9			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached SKS-0280 for a block-out detail for the typical Lower Concourse slab. Contractor to verify top and bottom bars with slab schedule as the RFI sketch reflects incorrect labels. Slab will shall be supported				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>is followed the minimal clear cover over couplers on the lower concourse slab will not conform to the specifications. Please provide rebar details for the concourse slab penetrations that conform to the specifications.</p>						
T-0471	BGP - Galvanizing Testing	Closed	04/02/2013	04/12/2013	04/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>	<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Ref: Specification Section 05 05 15 3.6 A</p> <p>Section 3.6 A of 05 05 15 -Hot Dip Galvanizing calls for "the contractor's testing laboratory shall perform inspection and testing of zinc coatings under the guidelines outlined in the American Galvanizer's Association (AGA)." Per the hot dip galvanizing pre-installation meeting, SCCI plans to use AZZ Galvanizing Services and their independent testing agency for shop testing and inspection and to fulfill all requirements described in 05 05 15-3.6 -Testing. Personnel qualifications are available upon request.</p> <p>Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The Contractor shall determine if the galvanizing service company and contractor's testing agency are appropriate. It is not required in the specification to obtain approval by a TJPA Representative of the galvanizing service company and contractor's testing agency.</p>				
T-0472	BGP - Future Train Platform Wall Conflict with Trestle Pile Opening	Closed	04/02/2013	04/16/2013	04/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>	<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Ref. Dwg: S1-2054, S1-2055, 1/S1-3205</p> <p>Dwg sheets S1-2054 and S1-2055 depict the future walls for the train platform which per detail 1/S1-3205 receive #7 dowels E.F. at 8" O.C. with a formsaver coupler positioned at the top of the mat slab. When referencing S1-2054 and S1-2055 it is noted that in 14 locations the openings for the trestle pile are shown directly on top of this future wall thus conflicting with the required dowels. Please provide a coupler detail at these blockouts.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The train platform dowels that coincide with trestle piles identified in the RFI shall be eliminated.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1054 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0473	BGP - Modifications to Geothermal Layout	Closed	04/02/2013	04/12/2013	04/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome							
REQUEST: Reference: M-0006 Per sheet Note 3 on M-0006, the center to center distance of loops can be adjusted where conflicts occur. In an effort to relocate geothermal piping as needed to avoid structural conflicts without multiple submissions of RFI's, please provide minimum distance allowed between loops. As built of the installed geothermal piping will be provided upon completion of the system.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The minimum distance between geothermal pipe loops is 4'-0".		
<hr/>							
T-0474	BGP - Micropile Penetration Detail at Sump Pits	Closed	04/02/2013	04/02/2013	04/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome							
REQUEST: Refrence Specification: 31 63 33 Reference Drawing: A1-8711 Reference Photos: Attached See attached photos of micropiles W028, W026, and W043 located in sump pits on an angle. Sheet 2/A1-8711 shows a micropile penetration detail on a horizontal surface. Please provide a micropile penetration detail for micropiles located in a sump pit on an angle.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Submit a shop drawing based on the waterproofing manufacturer's recommendations for this condition.		
<hr/>							
T-0475	BGP - Mat Slab Drainage Sloping	Closed	04/03/2013	04/17/2013	04/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Ref. Spec: 03 30 20.3.6.B.1.b Contract specification section 03 30 20.3.6.B.1.b, states "Slope surfaces uniformly to drains where required." However, the contract plans for the below grade package (TG06.0), does not show drainage slope for the Mat Slab.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We confirm that there are no slopes to drain on the Mat Slab. The top of slab is uniformly -35'-8".		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1055 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	SCCI intends to uniformly place top of Mat Slab at -35' - 8" as shown on contract drawings. If sloping of the Mat Slab is required, please provide drainage plan for top of Mat Slab.						
T-0476	BSE - Zone 4 Waler Connection Criteria	Closed	04/03/2013	04/13/2013	04/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis	To: Turner Construction Company	Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
	Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Danny Walsh						
	REQUEST: BBII has received COM1902 directing BBII to re-design the east end shoring utilizing similar waler connections provided in the attached sketches. Prior to commencing re-design, BBII requests the following information from the Shoring wall EOR so our Bracing EOR can properly evaluate the interaction between the Bracing system and wall. Will it be permissible to shed the bracing loads from the transverse end wall (line 35) into the longitudinal CDSM wall (A&J Lines)? If this is acceptable please indicate if there are any limitations, restrictions, or design assumptions regarding the amount of load that can be shed over a given length of wall.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Regarding permissibility, see Note 11 on Sheet GT-1111. Regarding the CDSM wall stiffness, see the response to RFI T-0345. Regarding the CDSM wall allowable friction, see the response to RFI T-0427. To evaluate horizontal stress, see the guidance provided on Sheet GT-1110				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1056 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0477	BSE - Multiple Micropile Relocation (Below Grade Obstruction)	Closed	04/03/2013	04/13/2013	04/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST: Ref: Submittal TG0300-622.4 While installing Micropile W454 as laid out in the approved submittal, BBII encountered a concrete obstruction 8' below grade and was unable to continue drilling at that location. Even though the micropile layout was approved in submittal TG0300-622.4, BBII suspects the drill rig encountered the CDSM Prototype wall as approximately shown in the attached drawing. BBII suggests relocating the micropiles as shown in the attached drawing to avoid the obstruction. The proposed locations for the micropile relocations will be within the geothermal area; however, the proposed locations do not appear to impact geothermal piping. See attached sketch. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to relocating micropiles W452, W454, W473, W475, W487, W488, and W500 as proposed.		
T-0478	BGP - Shear Reinforcement Clear Cover at Pits	Closed	04/03/2013	04/17/2013	04/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu							
REQUEST: Ref. Dwg. 2/S1-3005, 3/S1-3008, and S1-2063 Sheet S1-3005/Detail 2 specifies the typical top clear cover for the headed shear reinforcement to be 0.75" and for overall length of the headed shear reinforcement to be 57" long. It is not clear if the same clear cover of 0.75" applies to headed shear reinforcement that is within a pit as shown in Sheet S1-3008/Detail 3. Note that typical rebar around the pits are called out to be 3" as shown on sheet SI -2063. Please confirm top clear cover for headed shear reinforcement that is within a pit.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Top clear cover for headed shear reinforcement that is located within a pit shall be 2.25", such that total overall length of the headed shear reinforcement shall be 55.5" long at these locations.		
T-0479	BGP - Trestle/Pin pile in MAT Depressions	Closed	04/03/2013	04/17/2013	04/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Ref. Dwg. S1-2022, S1-2027, S1-3004, S1-3006</div><div>Please reference Sheets S1-2022, S1-2027, S1-3004, and S1-3006 of the Contract Plans. The trestle pile at Gridline D.4 between 4 and 5 is located in the sloped section of the mat slab depression (see highlighted S1-2022). The mat slab depression section plans (S1-3006) do not incorporate this type of sloped pipe penetration. Furthermore, the pin pile between Gridline F.7 and G, just east of 34 is located in the sloped section of the mat slab depression (see highlighted S1-2027). The mat slab depression section plans (S1-3004) do not incorporate this type of sloped pipe penetration. Also, Sheet S1-3003 depicts all pipe penetrations on a horizontal surface only. Please provide a trestle/pin pile penetration detail located on an angle in a mat slab depression incorporating a revised waterproofing detail.</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>					
					<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>For trestle piles located at slab depression edge of slope or on face of slope, the flat mud slab has to be lowered to provide 18" clear horizontal to allow waterproof membrane transition. The sides of the depression for the sleeve should be sloped at 45 deg. The sleeves will need to be made longer to suit these situations. Refer to attached SKA 2676 and 2677.</div><div>Jeff Thiel 4/17/2013 Pending TJPA approval, a CR for this work is forthcoming.</div></div>		
T-0479.1	BGP - Trestle and Pin Pile in MAT Depression Clarification	Closed	05/28/2013	06/07/2013	06/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<div><div>From:</div><div>Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Robert Kjome</div><div>Co-Author:</div></div>	<div><div>To:</div><div>Turner Construction Company</div><div>Gary Krutsch</div></div>			<div><div>Answered By:</div><div>Adamson Associates, Inc.</div><div>George Metzger</div></div>		
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Response to RFI T-0479 provides SKA-2676 and SKA-2677 which apply to two trestle piles in conflict with sloped portions of sump pits. BBII has identified several other pit locations which appear to have trestle piles, pin piles, or bridge piers located so that there is not 18" clear horizontal for waterproofing. Please clarify if the following slab penetration locations require the 18" clear horizontal for waterproofing. If so, please confirm that the details issued in RFI T-0479 can be used for the following locations:</div><div>1.) First St. Bridge Pier #5 at pit between Gridlines 17/18 at Gridline H</div><div>2.) Trestle Piles #53, #54, and #55 at pit between Gridlines 22.5/23.5 and D/F</div><div>3.) Fremont St. Bridge Pier #8 at pit between Gridlines 26/27 at E</div><div>4.) Trestle Pile #74 at pit between Gridlines 30/30.5 and D/E.</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>The Design Team does not object to the contractor implementing the solution provided on RFI T-0479 at the locations mentioned in RFI T-0479.1 as a means of attaining the required 18" clear horizontal waterproofing surface. Note for implementation of this detail at pin pile locations, the contractor shall use 24" as the outside diameter of the pin pile sleeve, which is the size from the reviewed sleeve submittal.</div></div>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	5.) Trestle Pile #80 at pit between Gridlines 32.5/33 and D/E 6.) Beale St. Bridge Piers #3 and #8 at pit between Gridlines 34/35 at Gridline E 7.) Pin Pile # 6 between Gridlines 4/5 8.) Pin Pile #14 between Gridlines 34/35 and F.7/H						
T-0479.2	BGP - Trestle and Pin Pile in MAT Depression Clarification	Closed	07/18/2013	07/28/2013	07/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference RFI T-0479 & T-0479.1 Grace requires that there be a minimum 8" clear horizontal to allow for the waterproofing membrane transition. For trestle piles and pin piles located at slab depressions at the edge of the slope or on the face off the slope, please confirm that the flat mud slab can be lowered to provide 8" clear horizontal to allow waterproof membrane transition in lieu of the 18" described in RFI T-0479 and T-0479.1		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI is for a substituted system that is not the system designed by the Architect, so the Architect cannot comment on design intent or other aspects of the substituted system. Per specification section 01 16 30 article 1.4/B and other associated specification sections the Contractor is to prepare all necessary documentation to support the contractor's substitution proposal which would include direction on the item noted in this RFI. The Contractor should have the design professional responsible for the substituted waterproofing design: (1) immediately prepare necessary design documentation for the substituted system including the impacts on adjacent trades as required by specification section 01 16 30 article 1.4/B.5, and stamp and certify that design to the Owner and the Architect; and (2) respond to Contractor submittals and manufacturer questions about the substituted system (with copies to the Owner and the Architect). Until that design professional's documentation, certification, and response process is in place, the Contractor should confirm all waterproofing system questions and details with the waterproofing manufacturer (with copies to the Owner and the Architect).			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1059 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0480	BGP - Future Train Platform Wall Dimension Conflict	Closed	04/03/2013	04/17/2013	04/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu REQUEST: Ref. Dwg. S1-2054, S1-2055 Drawing S1-2054, at Grid line E/13 calls out Future Train Platform Room Walls to be 1'- 2" Typ, UNO. Drawing S1-2055, at Grid line C/22 calls out Future Train Platform RM Walls to be 1'- 0" Typ. UNO. Please clarify the proper dimension of the Future Train Platform RM Walls.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The note for future train platform room wall thickness apply per zone sheet. Therefore the future train platform walls are confirmed to be 1'-2" typ UON on S1-2054 and confirmed to be 1'-0" typ UON on sheet S1-2055. Note that for S1-2055, there are 2 future train platform rooms - one at gridline C between 21 and 22 and the other at gridline E west of 19.9.				
T-0481	BGP - Concourse Slab Penetration Sleeves	Closed	04/08/2013	04/18/2013	04/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon REQUEST: Ref Dwg. A1-2842-2851 In SCCI's experience unanticipated modifications and adjustments to the plumbing system are inevitable. Because of this SCCI requests not installing vertical block out sleeves in the concourse level for plumbing prior to slab placement. SCCI shall core penetrations after the slab is placed. The slab shall be scanned for rebar prior to coring to avoid unnecessary rebar strikes. This will allow for any unforeseen modifications or adjustments and ensure there are no unnecessary or extra penetrations in the concourse slab. Please advise if this is acceptable.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 4/11/2013 It is not acceptable to post-core (or post-drill) penetration into the lower concourse slab, except where specifically approved by the Structural Engineer of Record. Contractor shall coordinate penetrations with other trades and embedded assemblies in concrete as required by specifications. Post-installed modifications/adjustments shall be submitted for review.				
T-0482	BGP - Partition Wall Pier Height	Closed	04/05/2013	04/15/2013	04/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon REQUEST: Reference Drawing: S1-9050 Please reference attached sheets S1-9050, A1-9216 and A1-9217 regarding partition wall piers. Detail 9 on S1-9050 shows an h max of 24'8" for wall piers. Detail A on sheet A1-9216, and detail B on sheet A1-9217 appear to be							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For inquired piers with max height of 28'-11" and max opening width of 6'-5", a 2'-0" min wide X 1'4" min thick pier shall have #9@8"OC EF vertical bars. Remaining information per detail 9/S1-9050.				



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1061 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0484	BGP - Water Welding Test	Closed	04/05/2013	04/15/2013	04/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 05 50 10- 2.5.C.2 Per the discussions held at the Metal Fabrications Preparatory DFOW meeting, SCCI is requesting a variance from Spec Section 05 50 10 - 2.5.C.2. This Spec. is feasible in a shop environment prior to galvanization and an effective means to dry and remove water upon completion of testing. These sleeves will be continuously welded in the field both before and after the horizontal waterproofing is installed (depending on the type of sleeve), therefore making it very difficult to seal and handle the water upon completion of the test. Discussions were held regarding leaving the water between the sleeve and pile and evaporating over time. SCCI sees this as a concern due to the backside of the weld and the heat-affected zone will not be galvanized and will potentially become a point of corrosion. SCCI requests 100% visual inspection on both the root and cover passes in lieu of filling the sleeve gap with water. Is this request and variance acceptable?			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The sleeve joints are to be water tight. Water testing of welds as required in the specification is to be executed. Please submit a test procedure description.				
T-0485	BGP - SCCI Issued Drawings	Closed	04/08/2013	04/18/2013	05/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
REQUEST: Reference spreadsheet: See attached. Please reference attached spreadsheet of SCCI missing contract drawings. Based on drawing index sheets G-0000 - G-0006 issued F.O. 15 there are 33 sheets that have a more current revision than what we have been issue. Please issue the updated drawings referenced.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reference CR T-068 for the current revisions of requested drawings. Also, note that drawings S1-3360 through S1-3363 do not exist; drawings S1-3660 through S1-3663 have been provided.				
T-0486	BGP - Extended Time for Concrete Delivery	Closed	04/08/2013	04/18/2013	04/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1062 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Reference Specification: 03 30 20</p> <p>Please reference 03 30 20.3.3.0, which states "Discharge of the concrete shall be completed within 1 1/2 hrs, or before the drum has revolved 300 revolutions, whichever comes first, after the introduction of the mixing waler to the cement and aggregates or the introduction of the cement to the aggregates."</p> <p>Per ASTM C 94, these limitations are permitted to be waived by the purchaser if the concrete is of such slump or slump flow after the 1 1/2 hr time or 300-revolutionlimit has been reached that it can be placed, without the addition of water, to the batch. Based on the quality of the mixes; the retarding effects of admixtures and SCMs, and the project's mild climate; CEMEX does not believe that placing concrete after 90 minutes negatively affects the quality of the concrete. SCCI and CEMEX requests an extension of delivery time as outlined per the attached letter.</p> <p>Please confirm the attached parameters are acceptable?</p>						
T-0486.1	BGP - Extened Time for Concrete Delivery - Mat Slab	Closed	05/06/2013	05/16/2013	05/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 033020							
Pursuant TJPA's response to RFI T-0486 please reference attached letter from SCCI's concrete supplier Cemex. Cemex has performed the set time test to evaluate the time at which at which the onset of hydration occurs for mixes 1556034 and 1558218. For the two mixes referenced herein, is it acceptable to extend the concrete delivery times to 2 hours?		Extending the concrete delivery to 2 hours is acceptable as proposed in RFI T-0486 provided that the tested mixes match approved mix designs.					
		It is not clear that the tested mixes were the approved mix designs for the mat and foundation wall (we assume the RFI means 3'-0" exterior foundation wall and not any other wall or shearwall and our response only applies to this item) as the mix numbers and/or the mix descriptions do not match any approved mix design.					



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0486.2	BGP - Extended Time for Concrete Delivery - Mat Slab	Closed	05/28/2013	06/07/2013	06/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference RFI: T-0486 Pursuant TJPA's response to RFI T-0486 please reference attached letter from SCCI's concrete supplier Cemex. Cemex has performed the set time test to evaluate the time at which at which the onset of hydration occurs for mix #1557204 (Mat Slab Mix). For the mix referenced herein, is it acceptable to extend the concrete delivery times to 2 hours?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to extend the concrete delivery to 2 hours as proposed in RFI T-0486 for mat slab mix #1557204.		
T-0487	BGP - Structural Pier Reinforcement Detail	Closed	04/08/2013	04/18/2013	04/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: A1-9215, 9/S1-9050 Please confirm that the vertical rebar size and spacing of #7 @ 8" OC EF (as shown on Detail 9 of S1-9050) applies to the structural pier between GL 4 and 5 which is dimensioned as 2'-0" x 2'-0" (A1-9215).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		
T-0488	BGP - Handling HVFA Test Cylinders- Mat Slab	Closed	04/08/2013	04/18/2013	04/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: Specification Section 03 30 20 1.7 F 3 j 2 ASTM C 31 ASTM C 31 Identifies that concrete cylinders should not be transported until at least 8 hours after final set. Per ASTM C 31, Allowable field curing is 48 hours maximum. Typically test cylinders are transported within 24 to 48 hours after casting. Some of the mix designs approved for this project include High volume of Flyash (HVFA) and high dose of Shrinkage Reducing Admixture (SRA). This			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TT does not take exception to the delay of handling HVFA test cylinders as proposed in RFI 0488.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1064 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0489	BGP - Proposed solutions to trestle pile / concourse level beams (not depicted in t From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Ref: S1-2202 Please reference the attached marked up sheet S1-2202 which depicts: 1. Trestle pile #3 conflicting with the line D.4 B77 (36"w x 46"h) beam between lines 3 & 4. In order to avoid the proximity conflict may we: a. Relocate the B77 beam North in order to clear the trestle pile? b. Skew the B77 beam so that it runs in between cols. 3/D.4 and 4/D? 2. Trestle pile #6 conflicting with the line E.6 B45 (30"w x 44"h) beam between lines 4 & 5. In order to avoid the proximity conflict may we relocate the B45 South, thereby cantilevering the slab, in order to clear the trestle pile? Please advise.	Lynn Kowallis Kirk Nielsen SUGGESTION:	04/09/2013	04/19/2013	04/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1065 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0490	BSE - Multiple Micropile Relocation (Trestle Overhead Obstruction)	Closed	04/09/2013	04/19/2013	04/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Kelly Phariss							
REQUEST: Ref: TG0300-622.4 Multiple micropiles underneath the trestle cannot be installed as laid out due to an overhead strut support obstruction. BBII suggests relocating these micropiles south to provide 4' of clearance from the overhead strut support to each micropile. The proposed micropile locations will be within the geothermal area; however, they do not appear to impact geothermal piping. See attached sketch. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to relocating these micropiles as proposed.		
<hr/>							
T-0492	BGP - Backfill of Geothermal Pipe	Closed	04/11/2013	04/21/2013	04/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Per discussions following the Turner BSE Progress Meeting with the geothermal designer, it is acceptable to backfill and compact the continuous loop after having been installed in the trench. This backfill is contingent upon the ends of the loop being left exposed for the loop welds to the manifold. Backfill over these welded joints and manifold will not be completed until the 100 psi hydro test is complete. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to backfill horizontal loop trenches after pneumatic test of individual horizontal loops.		
<hr/>							
T-0493	BGP - Geothermal Loop Spacing Tolerances	Closed	04/11/2013	04/21/2013	04/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Ref: RFI T-0473 Per the Engineer response to a WOJV RFI, the geothermal loop spacing cannot exceed 4'. Per discussions after the progress meeting today (4/10/ 13),			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, 20" Separation between Field 1, Loop 5 and Loop 6, is acceptable. The first sentence of this RFI that the loop spacing cannot exceed 4' is incorrect. The Response to		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0494	BGP - Formwork- Form Release Compatability Certification	Closed	04/11/2013	04/21/2013	04/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>the 5th and 6th loops in field 1 are acceptable with a spacing of 20". This exception is for this location only and all further exceptions are to be submitted under a seperate RFI at the time of the layout. Please confirm that this 20" spacing for Field 1 loops 5 & 6 is acceptable at 20".</p> <p>referenced RFI-T-0473 stated: The Minimum Distance between geothermal pipe loops is 4'-0".</p>							
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Ref: A1-9601 through A1-9606 Specifications Section 03 10 00.1.3.B.6</p> <p>Please reference specifications section 03 10 00.1.3.B.6. Section states contractor shall submit for record a written statement certifying that form release agent used is compatible with susequent architectural finish materials applied to concrete surfaces. Drawings A1-9601 through A1-9606, is the room finish schedule, however the TG06.0 drawing package does not include the above mentioned finish schedule drawings. Without knowledge of the subsequent architectural finish, Shimmick Construction cannot comply with the above mentioned specification.</p> <p>Please provide a room finish schedule so that Shimrnick Construction can comply with the above mentioned specification.</p> </div> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p>SUGGESTION:</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The finish schedules are currently being prepared. After May 30, 2013 the "draft in-progress" schedules could be shared in response to an RFI issued at that time.</p> </div> </div> <p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1068 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Ref Dwg. 2/A1-8711 Please reference Detail 2 of A1-8711 of the Contract Drawings and the attached letter from Deneef/Grace. Detail 2 of A1-8711 calls for a 6" diameter, 18 ga. galvanized steel boot to be adhered with trowelable grade adhesive and filled with urethane sealant. Submittal #TG0600-024 approved the use of Deneef Swellseal WA which is the product called out in Spec Section 07 12 10. The attached Deneef/Grace technical letter dated 04/05/13, states that filling the entire boot with Deneef Swellseal is excessive and state that filling the entire boot with Swellseal WA is more than necessary and affect the curing capability. Deneef/Grace suggests that the material be installed 2-3" deep and topped with a non-shrink grout such as "Rapid Set CT Construction Grout" or "Rapid Set Cement All" to contain it in the boot. The manufacturer states that the waterproofing ability of the material in this configuration would not be compromised. Please review and advise.	SUGGESTION:					
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				The design team does not object to your proposal.			
T-0497	BGP - C29 Column Detail Clarification	Closed	04/17/2013	04/27/2013	04/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu						
	REQUEST: Reference Specification: 03 20 00 Reference Drawing: S1-3300, A1-2850, S1-2030, S1-3303 Contract drawing S1-3300 refers to detail 1/S 1-3303 for the rebar elevation detail of column C29. Detail 1/SI-3303 appears to be for columns that pass through the ramp and based on drawing AI-2853 column C29 does not pass through the ramp. Please confirm if Detail 1/SI-3303 is the correct elevation detail for column C29.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				The elevation reference for C29 should reference 1/S1-3301 instead of 1/S1-3303.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0498	BGP - Waterproofing Mock Up	Closed	04/18/2013	04/18/2013	04/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 07 12 10 - 1.6.C.2 The waterproofing manufacturer's field representative/installer are to construct a 10'x10' on site mock up of the full waterproofing assembly. Upon completion of the mock up (excluding any major waterproofing deficiencies), SCCI intends to utilize it as part of the permanent structure. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is suggested, but not a requirement, the mock-up is installed separate from the work to allow the mock-up to be referenced in the future. Installing the mock-up as part of the work has some benefits in uncovering additional site issues. 2. All shop drawings related to the waterproofing and the proposed materials to be used have not been submitted to the design team for review at this time. The mock-up shall utilize the materials confirmed in the shop drawing process. If the mock-up is constructed with the wrong materials, the mock-up may need to be reconstructed with the proper materials based on the TJPA Representative's determination as to the acceptability of the materials utilized in the mock-up. 3. The mock-up is scheduled to be constructed today. The overall waterproofing work may not happen immediately, in which case the mock-up may need to be replaced if it is not properly protected until the remainder of the work is installed.				
T-0499	BGP - Geothermal Manifold Location for Fields1 & 2	Closed	04/18/2013	04/28/2013	04/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: SK-3 Per the contract drawing, the manifold is to be located at an elevation no greater than 14' below finish grade (street) elevation. Per conversations in the preparatory DFOW meeting and other coordination meetings, the Engineer planned to have the manifold in a specific location. Attached is an elevation drawing for Field 1 & 2 Manifolds. Please confirm that the attached elevation details work with the designer's intent for the manifold locations for Field 1 & 2.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Height of vertical sleeve penetrations through the foundation wall is acceptable for loop fields 1 and 2. Please submit similar clarifications for all further ground loop riser penetrations.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1070 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0500	BSE - Micropile Blockouts in Mud Slab	Closed	04/18/2013	04/28/2013	05/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Kelly Phariss			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 03 30 00 In mud slab pour 1, micropiles W154, W154R1, W127, W236, and W236R1 are all blocked out. BBII would like the option to pour back the blockouts with 4,000psi neat grout (mix approved for installation of micropiles) or the approved 2,500psi concrete. Please confirm that either option is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to using 4000psi neat grout in lieu of 2500psi concrete for filling mud slab blockouts at micropiles.		
<hr/>							
T-0501	BGP - Slide Bearing Connection details	Closed	04/18/2013	04/28/2013	04/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: S1-3204 and S1-3205 The two drawings detail the slide bearing assemblies at the east wall and vehicle/bike ramp. Detail 9-A on S1-3204 does not detail how the 10 gauge carbon steel plate is connected to the bottom support. Similarly, Details 2,3,6 and 7 on S1-3205 do not detail how the assemblies are connected to the embedded plates. Please provide details on connections between slide bearing assemblies and support/embedded plates.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 9/S1-3204: Provide 1"@4"OC max 1/8" fillet weld with 1" min at each corner along each side of the 10 gauge carbon steel plate attachment to the bottom support. Details 2 & 3 on S1-3205: For 16ga plate to embed plate, weld shall be 1/8" fillet, 2" @3"OC all sides. For reinforced elastomeric backing to steel plate, bonded attachment per manufacturer. Details 6 & 7 on S1-3205: For 16ga plate to embed plate, weld shall be 1/8" fillet, 1"@3"OC all sides. For detail 6 only, reinforced elastomeric backing to steel plate, bonded attachment per manufacturer.		
<hr/>							
T-0502	BGP - Slide Bearing Weld Details	Closed	04/18/2013	04/28/2013	04/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: S1-3205, S1-3210 and S1-3211			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For details 6, 7, & 9 on S1-3204, 3/S1-3210 and 1/S1-3411 for both bottom and top support connections,		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	The details call for various pieces of the slide bearing assemblies to be continuously and tack welded to plates. See clouded callouts on attached drawings. No welding details are provided with the callouts. Please provide details for continuous welds and spacing for tack welds.						provide 1"@4"oc max 1/8" fillet weld with 1" min at each corner along each side of the 10 gauge plate.
T-0503	BGP - Geothermal Pipe Loop Bends	Closed	04/18/2013	04/18/2013	04/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Per the geothermal pipe manufacturer's (Performance Pipe) recommendations, the geothermal pipe should not be bent in a radius smaller than 25 times the pipe diameter. For the geothermal pipe loops, this equates to a bend radius of 41.5". However, the goethermal design drawings depict the loops to be 60" on center that would leave a large overlap (in theory) of almost 24"/2'. To achieve a 41.5" radius, the trench spacing will have to be increased to 83" between the supply and return trench. Please note, that the pipe manufacturer discourage "bulbing" the end of the loop and recommended resolving the issue away from bending or "bulbing" the end of the pipe loop. S3H Inc. is proposing to overlap half of a loop onto another such that the spacing between pipes remains at a 4' minimum (per RFI T-0493). This would create a 8' minimum distance between the supply side of a loop and the return side of a loop. In doing so, a portion of the two overlapping loops would be crossing. Is this acceptable? Please find attached drawing #1 as a reference of the proposed layout. Please note that this proposed method would change the reverse return self balancing configuration of piping. This proposed method also has the possibility of being impacted by various micropile conflicts. S3H Inc. is also proposing as a fix to field one to install 2 fused - 90 degree elbows at the end of each loop in a U-shape configuration using the current, as installed dimensions between the loops. Please find attached Drawing #2 depicting the 90 degree elbows on the loops		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> WSPFK Response: Maintain pipe manufacturers' minimum long term bend radius as required per specifications with loop arrangement as shown on contract documents. Large Radius bends following the manufacturers' minimum pipe bend radius are an acceptable practice per IGSHPA standards (IGSHPA Design Manual Section 7.6.2.1). James Bradshaw 4/19/2013				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>This would eliminate the required 83" bend diameter. This is least impact proposal to rectify the already installed field 1, but would be an additional cost.</p> <p>Please advise as to how to proceed with Field 1 as well as the remaining 14 Fields.</p>							
T-0504	BGP - Radius Foundation Walls - R=637.63'	Closed	04/19/2013	04/29/2013	05/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Ref: Submittal Package T0600-030 SCCI's plan is to construct the R=637.63' foundation walls in 16' chords. Layout of the construction joints shall be per approved as noted CJ layout submittal. R=637.63' foundation wall runs along the Southwest portion of the project, from GL 3 thru GL 16, or SCCI's wall pours W160 thru W174A. See attached sketch of the wall detail for clarification. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal to layout the wall in 16' chord segments is not acceptable. The foundation wall assembly is designed with a 2" zone for the waterproofing assembly and a 3' thick foundation wall. Providing chord segments instead of a curved radius will reduce the thickness of the foundation wall.			
<hr/>							
T-0504.1	BGP - Radius Foundation Wall Formwork	Closed	11/19/2013	11/29/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI T-0504. SCCI plans to construct the south foundation walls from GL2.75 to GL 12.08 in 8' chords. See attached sketch for clarification. 8' chording of the walls will keep the wall faces within the construction tolerances. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/22/2013 RESPONSE: The 8' chording on the curved part of the foundation wall, as proposed in the RFI, is acceptable.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1073 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0505	BGP - Protection Board on Horizontal Surface of Waterproofing	Closed	04/19/2013	05/03/2013	04/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Ref. Dwg. A1-8710, A1 -8711, S1-3003 Please confirm that there is no protection board installed on top of the waterproofing membrane to receive protection slab. Drawing S1-3003 shows protection board, while A1-8710 & A1-8711 does not.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Protection board is not required on top of the waterproofing membrane which is to receive protection slab, as shown on the architectural drawings A1-8710 & A1-8711.		
T-0506	BGP - Continuous Horizontal Concrete Inserts	Closed	04/22/2013	05/02/2013	05/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: A1-6231 Please reference the attached sheets regarding continuous concrete inserts. On the enlarged detail C of A1-6231 SCCI is proposing the layout of the horizontal concrete inserts. Raising the bottom insert 1- 1/2" and lowering the top insert 1" will provide a greater clearance between the inserts and the construction joint. Achieving a greater clearance from the construction joint will reduce the risk of rock pockets or voids. Please confirm these dimensions as acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal to raise the bottom insert 1 ½" and lower the top insert by 1" is acceptable.		
T-0507	BGP - Continuous Concrete dobie-mat slab	Closed	04/22/2013	05/02/2013	05/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please see attached sheets regarding mat slab bulkhead forms. SCCI is proposing the use of a continuous concrete dobie as part of the bulkhead design along the vertical construction joint. The continuous dobie will be installed with the reinforcement mats and will act as a cast-in portion of the formwork. The dobie will become a permanent member and will meet all specifications that the mat slab concrete mix design requires. Please confirm			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The use of a continuous dobbie acting as both reinforcement support and permanently cast-in construction joint form is not acceptable to Thornton Tomasetti. We are concerned that the continuous nature of the proposed dobbie will increase likelihood of introducing two cracks in the mat (one at each face of the dobbie). Per spec, bottom reinforcing bars in mat slab shall be supported by precast concrete bricks		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1074 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0508	BGP - Drainage Composite Joint Orientation	Closed	04/23/2013	05/03/2013	04/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference Specification: 07 12 10-3.2.F			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
This spec section states "Install drainage composite either vertically or horizontally and lap sheets 1 inch in the direction of water flow." The manufacturer's instructions state "the drainage side laps must be tightly butt joined together so there are no gaps or voids between them." SCCI suggests butt joining the drainage composites per the manufacturer's instructions. Is this acceptable?			The proposal to butt joint the panels is not acceptable for the conditions of this project.				
			The purpose of interlocking is to aid in supporting the drainage panels by hanging one from the one above.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0510	BGP - Internal Bracing Pin Pile #8 in conflict with Moment Beam BMATV	Closed	04/23/2013	05/03/2013	04/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference attached marked up sheet S1-2202.			Per discussions during 04/25/2013 "W/OJV Assist Meeting", this pin pile is being re-visited by Contractor to consider being eliminated as well as to be coordinated with the in-progress re-bracing solution. Please close this RFI as currently presented.				
The location of internal bracing pin pile #8 conflicts with moment beam BMATV. General Note GR-9 on sheet S-0005 precludes blocking out moment frames. Upon submitting for the internal bracing system the TG03 BSE subcontractor was not aware of the location of beam BMATV to coordinate around. WOJV is requesting a variance from note GR-9 and is requesting to block out beam BMATV around pin pile #8.							
Please advise.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0510.1	BGP - Internal Bracing Pin Pile #8 in conflict with Moment Beam BMATV	Closed	05/02/2013	05/14/2013	05/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference attached marked up sheet S1-2202.					At pin pile #8 location, we will allow contractor to block-out the Lower Concourse beam. Contractor shall limit the width of block-out to 1/3 the width of the beam and refer to GR-9 for other block-out info. Block-out reinforcement shall be included in rebar shop drawings.		
The location of internal bracing pin pile #8 conflicts with moment beam BMATV. General Note GR-9 on sheet S-0005 precludes blocking out moment frames. Upon submitting for the internal bracing system the TG03 BSE subcontractor was not aware of the location of beam BMATV to coordinate around. On 4/23/13 WOJV submitted RFI #T-0510 requesting a variance from note GR-9 and is requesting to block out beam BMATV around pin pile #8. During the 4/25/13 "WOJV SE Assist Meeting," when the issue was brought up, a PMPC employee suggested prematurely removing strut STA09 because it has diminished load. On 4/30/13 WOJV received RFI response #T-0510 stating pin pile #8 was going to be removed hence WOJV should close the RFI #T-0510. In addition to strut STA09 pin pile #8 supports strut #STB09 which is carrying a load, not that the internal bracing EOR would allow the premature removal of two strut levels. WOJV again requests a variance from note GR-9 and is requesting to block out beam BMATV around pin pile #8.					Note that the Lower Concourse structure acts as a brace for the foundation wall. Contractor is responsible for the stability of the structure per GR-4 as well as coordinating with other packages.		
Please advise.					Note that the RFI mis-quotes the reason why the original RFI #510.0 was commented to be closed		
T-0511	BGP - Deneef Swellseal at Electrical Grounding System Boots	Closed	04/23/2013	05/07/2013	05/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcoran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference SCCI RFI #130, Detail 5/A1-8710, and the attached letter. Detail 5/A1-8710 calls for 2" diameter, 18 ga galvanized steel boot to be adhered with trowelable grade adhesive and filled with urethane sealant. Submittal #TG0600-024 approved the use of Deneef Swellseal WA which is the product called out in Specifications 07 12 10.					The manufacturer's recommendations are acceptable.		
The attached letter Deneef/Grace technical letter dated 04/05/13 states that filling the entire boot with Deneef Swellseal is excessive and state that filling the entire boot with Swellseal WA is more than necessary and may affect					The question on RFI T-0511 is very similar to the question on RFI T-0496 and could have been consolidated in to one RFI, or better yet, this installation method should have been researched and proposed on the Waterproofing shop drawing submittal		

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the curing capability.</p> <p>Deneef/Grace suggests that the material be installed 2-3" deep and topped with a non-shrink grout such as "Rapid Set CT Construction Grout" or "Rapid Set Cement All" to contain it in the boot. The Manufacturer states that the waterproofing ability of the material in this configuration would not be compromised.</p> <p>Please review and advise.</p>						
T-0512	BGP - Additional Fasteners for Protection Board Installation	Closed	04/23/2013	05/07/2013	04/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</p>					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Ref. Spec. 07 12 10-3.2.D</p> <p>Please reference Spec Section 07 12 10- 3.2.D. Spec Section 07 12 10 - 3.2.D states the following: "Secure 1/4" protection board to flanges of soldier piles with powder driven fasteners and washers spaced 12 inches o.c. Butt vertical joints. Maximum joint width: 1/4" ..."</p> <p>The manufacturer of membrane waterproofing system (Laurenco) has indicated that due to "out of plane" piles, and relaxation of CDSM substrate requirement, they are requiring intermediate fasteners to hold the 1/4" protection board tight to the CDSM wall. Please review and advise.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>The design team does not object to the proposal.</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1078 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0513	BSE - Steel plate at CDSM piles 738-739	Closed	04/24/2013	05/04/2013	05/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Lynn Kowallis	To: Turner Construction Company		Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Shad Gardner					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref: Specification Section 31 56 13							
During leak grouting at level 5 excavation, a section of the CDSM wall panel between soldier piles 738-739 became dislodged, resulting in a high volume leak. In an effort to stabilize the damaged CDSM panel and stop the leak, BBII installed a steel road plate between soldier piles 738-739 and injected grout behind it.		It is acceptable to leave the steel plate in place as proposed in the RFI. This will result in the waterproofing membrane encroaching in on the foundation wall at pile 738. The foundation wall at pile 738 may be reduced to 34 5/8" thickness and the foundation wall vertical reinforcement shall be modified per proposed solution presented in RFI 0448.0 for wall thickness reduction up to 3" and applied between piles 737 and 739.					
BBII is concerned that removing the plate will likely cause the panel to become destabilized and could reopen the flow of water. BBII surveyed the face of the plate and found that at pile #738, the face of plate is 3' 0-5/8" back from the inside face of concrete wall and at pile #739 the plate is 3' 1-7/8" back from inside face of concrete wall. BBII proposes leaving the steel plate in place to maintain integrity of the CDSM panel. The edges of the plate may be grouted to provide a smooth transition to the CDSM wall for waterproofing.		W/O Note: Acceptable provided BBII take a survey of the face of the plate and provide coordinates.					
Please confirm this is acceptable							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1079 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0513.1	BGP - Steel plate (RFI #T-0513) encroachment between CDSM Piles No. 738 & 739	Closed	05/16/2013	05/26/2013	05/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
As depicted in attached SK-0153.1, the encroachment of the steel plate is primarily in the mat slab pour. WOJV is proposing to locally adjust the reinforcement in the mat slab pour to achieve the required cover. There will be no change to the reinforcement on the wall width.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
As a means of chamfering the offset the result of steel plates edges to the face of CDSM wall: WOJV is proposing to mechanically fasten expanded metal lath to the CDSM beams using powder activated fasteners. Rapid set mortar is then applied to the required depth ensuring all edges of the plates have a gradual slope back to match the existing face of the CDSM wall.					ARUP Response:		
Please confirm this is acceptable.					This is acceptable however this work should be coordinated with other disciplines.		
					Thornton Tomasetti Response:		
					It is not clear from the RFI when the Contractor proposes "...no change to the reinforcement..." if this means the unmodified wall contract bars stay in original location or if the bars will move inward. Based on the provided encroachment info, there is still encroachment in the wall. If the bars are proposed to move inward, the thickness of the wall is reduced and therefore the original response of T-0513 shall apply. If the Contractor proposes not to modify the wall reinforcement, please submit technical justification.		
T-0514	BGP - Mech Room Slab Finish Elevation and Grate Clarification	Closed	04/24/2013	05/04/2013	04/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: P1-2022					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Drawing P1-2022 details slab elevations "TOC = -35'-8"" and "Future FFE = -35'-5"" Detail C/P1-4001 depicts a section view of the mat slab in the mechanical pump room; however, it is not clear whether both the Future FFE and TOC of mat slab are shown.					1. The two elevations are correct.		
1. Please confirm if the attached marked up drawing is correct in detailing the two elevations.					2. It is the design team's view the pits and oil-sand interceptor covers are not part of the TG06 scope of work. WOJV shall confirm the scope of work in each bid package.		
2. Also, please confirm if the grates shown in Detail C/P1-4001 are part of the TG06 scope of work. If so, then please provide details for the grate.							
T-0514.1	BGP -Mech Room Slab Finish Elevation and Grate Size Clarification	Closed	05/03/2013	05/10/2013	05/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1080 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Reference Drawings A1-2102, P1-4001 Sheet A1-2102 between G.L. 4/5 and C.3/D note reads "PITS AND COVERS REF. TO MEP DWGS." MEP drawings do not provide grate sizes for the SFG, SE, nor OSI on C/P1-4001 in RFI T-0514. Please clarify the MEP drawing that displays this information.			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch SUGGESTION:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor is responsible for determining the scope of work of each bid package. Contractor shall clarify this item for sub-contractor. In the future, do not submit scope of work questions between sub-contractors to the design team. The TJPA Representative does not believe the Covers for SPG, SE, and OSI are included in TG06 scope of work.	
T-0515	BGP - Epoxy Coating for Form Saver Couplers	Closed	04/23/2013	05/07/2013	05/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon REQUEST: Ref. Dwg. 6/S1-3001 Please confirm the typical splice form saver couplers (for future const.) as called out in detail 6/S1-3001 are to be epoxy coated per ASTM A-775 specifications.			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch SUGGESTION:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that epoxy coating of splice form saver couplers (for future const.) as called out in detail 6/S1-3001 shall be per ASTM A-775. In compliance with manufacturer's requirements (IAPMO-ER #0129), all threads of the coupler are to be free of debris, including epoxy coating, at the time of coupling, thus epoxy coating is to be applied to the exterior surface only (not the thread area). Note that the epoxy coating for the form saver is only required for the case where the form savers are used for splicing bars for future construction as noted in the detail 6/S1-3001. Other couplers do not need to be epoxy coated.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0516	BGP - C Channel Conflict	Closed	04/24/2013	05/04/2013	05/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Specification: 03 30 20 Reference Sketch: attached Reference Photos: attached					C-Channels should be removed when the associated level of bracing and waler are removed during the build-out of the train box.		
The C Channels welded to the soldier piles of the CDSM wall will interfere with the installation of vertical reinforcement of the foundation walls (See attachments). Is it acceptable to remove the C-Channels one level at a time with each foundation wall lift in order to allow installation vertical reinforcement overlap.							
<hr/>							
T-0517	BGP - Geothermal Pipe Loop Bends	Closed	04/25/2013	05/05/2013	04/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
SCCI and S3H Inc. are looking to confirm conversations from the Geothermal Design Engineer from the 4/24/2013 progress meeting.					The Geothermal Piping can "bulb" eccentrically and concentrically to incorporate the minimum 25D bend radius. -WSPFK Response: 25 Times OUTSIDE DIAMETER of pipe required for bend radius. Eccentric and Concentric "bulbs" are acceptable to achieve the radius		
-The Geothermal Piping can "bulb" eccentrically and concentrically to incorporate the minimum 25D bend radius. -The bulbing of the geothermal loops can cause the loops to overlap and this is acceptable at the bulb locations. -Due to the bulbing, the geothermal loo[may become in conflict with the micropile locations, please confirm that the pipe loopspacing can be adjusted. -Please confirm that the staking of the geothermal loop pipe is acceptable to achieve the 25D bend radius requirement as long as the stakes are removed for backfill.							
					-The bulbing of the geothermal loops can cause the loops to overlap and this is acceptable at the bulb locations. WSPFK Response: This is acceptable. At the meeting S3H agreed to provide some backfill between the pipes to prevent kinking of the pipes when they cross over each other.		
					-Due to the bulbing, the geothermal loo[may become in conflict with the micropile locations, please confirm that the pipe loopspacing can be adjusted. WSPFK Response: Loop Spacing at the bulbs can be less than the 4'-0" from RFI 473 in the areas required to miss micro piles but should return to 4'-0" minimum spacing after the conflict is passed.		
					-Please confirm that the staking of the geothermal loop pipe is acceptable to achieve the 25D bend radius requirement as long as the stakes are removed for backfill. WSPFK response: Temporary supports to		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
maintain the 25 time OUSIDE DIAMETER bend radius are the means and methods of the contractor.							
T-0518	BGP - Differential Movement in Waterproofing Layers	Closed	04/25/2013	05/05/2013	05/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Turner Construction Comç Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per the Engineer's response to Submittal TG0600-023.2, the Contractor is to install the waterproofing system to incorporate "provisions for differential movement". Please reference the contract documents that specify the design criteria for the differential movement of the structure. Please advise to a specification or drawing note that details such.					RFI retracted as a request by W/O		
T-0518.1	BGP - Differential Movement in Waterproofing Layers	Closed	05/01/2013	05/10/2013	05/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per the response to SCCI RFI #146 - Differential Movement in Waterproofing Layers, is movement expected and if so, how much movement is expected? If movement is expected, please provide Specification Section or Contract Drawing stating so.					As with all buildings there is expected to be movement due to settlement and at this site hydrostatic uplift on the building after the construction phase dewatering is turned off as well as movement from seismic events.		
					Please reference the geotechnical report for information regarding these issues.		
					W/O Note: The Geotechnical report was included in TG06 package as a reference document.		
T-0519	BGP - Waterproofing Detail Clarification at "Pressure Slab" Joints	Closed	04/25/2013	05/05/2013	04/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1083 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0520	BGP - Finish Floor Elevation	Closed	04/26/2013	05/10/2013	05/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
T-0521	BGP - 1 in Aggregate in Protection Slab Cast-in-Place Concrete Mix Design	Closed	04/29/2013	05/09/2013	05/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1084 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Ref: Submittal TG0600-200.1 Please reference submittal TG0600-200.1 (cast-in-place concrete mix design - Protection Slab). Per the referenced submittal and submittal response, sent to SCCI April 12, 2013 and returned as "Make Corrections Noted," SCCI intends to use 1" aggregate in the above mentioned cast-in-place concrete mix. In addition, the above mentioned mix design was also reviewed at the TG06.0 Protection Slab Preparatory DFOW meeting, held April19, 2013. Please confirm the use of 1" aggregate in the Protection Slab is acceptable.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed: the use of 1" aggregate at the Protection Slab is acceptable.		
T-0522	BSE - Micropile Relocation- Performance Test Pile Zone 2 (Sequencing)	Closed					
	From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				04/29/2013 05/09/2013 05/03/2013 Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>		
	Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller				Answered By: Turner Construction Comf Stacy Wilson		
	REQUEST: Ref: S1-2023 The primary performance test micropile is yet to be installed for Zone 2. Due to sequencing advantages, BBII proposes relocating this pile from the original location shown in S1-2023 to GL 15 between B&C. The relocated micropile location is within the geothermal area; however, it does not appear to impact geothermal piping. See attached sketch. Please confirm this is acceptable.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> At the request of W/O, this RFI will be pulled back from the design team, and superseded by RFI T-0522.1.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0522.1	BSE - Micropile Relocation- Performance Test Pile Zone 2 & 3 (Sequencing)	Closed	05/02/2013	05/12/2013	05/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: Specification Section 31 63 33 1.1B					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
This RFI supersedes RFI T-0522. DTDS proposes to reduce the design length of the Micropiles East of Gridline 17 (EG17) from 80 feet to 70 feet. DTDS has shown through testing and reduced post-grouting that a higher soil-grout bond than originally assumed in the design can be achieved in the field. DTDS will install two (2) performance test piles to verify the capacity of a 70 foot micropile EG17. One performance test pile will be installed in Zone 2 at gridline 17 between piles E005 and E008. The second performance test pile will be installed in Zone 3 at gridline 20 between piles E136 and E137. DTDS believes that 70 foot micropiles EG17 will still achieve the maximum required load capacity of 2.4 times Design Load (560 kip). The performance test piles will be installed with one (1) round of post-grout. Based on the results of the testing, additional post-grouting can be provided as necessary. Upon completion of the testing DTDS will submit revised micropile working drawings and calculation supplement. All production micropiles will continue to be proof tested per the Specifications. The performance test locations provided would supplant the performance test locations shown in the Contract plans for Zones 2 and 3. Please confirm this is acceptable.					The proposed relocation for the zone 2 performance test micropile is acceptable. The proposed relocation for the zone 3 performance test micropile is not acceptable. (The contract documents indicate the zone 3 performance test micropile to be located at GL E and to the east of GL 22. If the contractor desires to relocate the zone 3 performance test micropile, the proposed location will not be approved at locations west of GL 22.) Thornton Tomasetti does not object to the other aspects of the RFI except to note that the maximum required load capacity for the performance test remains at 2.8 times the Design Load (not 2.4), per the contract documents.		

T-0523	BGP - Floor Drain Elevation in Foot Traffic Areas	Closed	05/01/2013	05/09/2013	05/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: Specification Section 22 13 01 - 3.2 D.3					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract specification 22 13 01 - 3.2.D.3 have the following criteria for installation of floor drains: a. Set drain rims flush and level with finished floor in areas					All floor drains to be installed with rims and grates flush and level with finished floor, also the floor sinks.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>							
T-0524	subject to foot traffic. b. Set drain rims minus 1/8-inch to 1/4-inch from finish floor elevation, so as to provide positive drainage, where drain is not subject to foot traffic.	Closed	05/08/2013	05/18/2013	05/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>							
	Please provide a map of areas which are to be subject to foot traffic.													
	From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome							To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon													
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>								
Reference Drawing: S1-3201, A1-8710				Protection slab to be 4" thick typical throughout, but can locally reduce to 3".										
SCCI will set the top elevation of the protection slab at - 40.67' as shown on the attached contract drawing. Protection slab thickness may vary due to mudslab elevation, mudslab heaving or built-up waterproofing membrane, adhesive and flashings.														
Please provide minimum thickness for protection slab.														
T-0525	BGP - Asphalt Cement Specification	Closed	04/30/2013	05/10/2013	05/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>							
	From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis													
	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch													
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger						
	REQUEST:							SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Ref: Specification Section 07 12 10 - 3.2.E.				The Asphalt Flashing Cement product should conform to ASTM D3747 for bituminous emulsions or D4586 Class I Type I for solvent bearing depending on how dry the substrate is. An example is Karnak's Perfectseal, Flashing Cement, Amphibikote or "Slaters Cement". The Contractor shall provide a shop drawings submittal with their proposed product for use on the project.										
Please reference Specification Section 07 12 10 - 3.2.E. Specification 3.2.E states "Install two plies of asphalt saturated felts over the protection board in walnut sized gobs of asphalt cement sufficiently spaced to hold felts in place." Spec Section 07 12 10 does not specify the type of asphalt cement to be used. SCCI submitted Roofxtender RX-100 Flashing Cement which was rejected. Shimmick is now proposing to use Laurenco recommended AIM # 340 Flashing Cement. Please confirm that this is acceptable.														



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0526	BGP - Replacement of T9 Wall Cross Ties with S3 Open Stirrups	Closed	05/02/2013	05/14/2013	05/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Ref Dwg. S1-3201			Proposed replacement of two cross-ties with a single open stirrup is structurally acceptable. However, please verify the proposed reinforcement scheme does not negatively affect the constructability.				
Please confirm that it is acceptable to replace two T9 wall cross-ties, as depicted in detail 1 on S1-3201, with a single S3 open stirrup. Reference the attached sheets depicting the configuration of the T9 crosstie and S3 open stirrup.							
T-0527	BSE - Revision to Zone 4 bracing elevations level A-D	Closed	05/01/2013	05/11/2013	05/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Danny Walsh							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Ref: Specification section 31 55 00			This is acceptable with regards to the geotechnical aspects of building the excavation.				
Please confirm the design team has no exceptions to raising the Zone-4 bracing elevations, all levels of struts/walers and all related strut supports/trestle bracing, 1'-0" so as to facilitate the specified waterproofing lap in relation to the top of wall.			The Contractor shall coordinate this change with regards to potential conflicts during the construction of the other building trades.				
			Stacy Wilson 5/13/2013 URS: WO/BBII is required to provide written documentation from the Internal Bracing and Access Trestle design Engineers of Record (PB&A), stating that they have reviewed and approved this elevation change. If this contractor requested change is approved by PB&A and the design team (AAI, Arup, Thorton-Thomasetti, etc.), the Internal Bracing submittal is to be revised accordingly and resubmitted in constructware for review and approval.				
T-0527.1	BSE -Revision to Zone 4 Bracing Elevations Level A-D	Closed	05/10/2013	05/20/2013	05/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
As installed and or planned the current elevation of the A-level internal bracing walers conflicts with the TG06 wall			W/O to coordinate.				



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>termination elevations relative to the waterproofing overlap which was unspecified when the internal bracing was submitted. Please find attached RFI SK-527.1-1, WOJV proposes to:</p> <p>1. Reduce the TG06 top of wall elevation 2'-0" to an elevation of +7.50' between approx. GL(s) 1 to 16-17.</p> <p>2. Reduce the TG06 top of wall elevation 1'-0" to an elevation of +3.50' between GL(s) approx. GL(s) 16-17 to 25-26.</p> <p>3. Reduce the TG06 top of wall elevation .75' to an elevation of +1.50' between GL(s) approx.. GL(s) 25-26 to 35.</p> <p>This scope reallocation would exchange concrete rebar and waterproofing from TG06 to TG07 package, which assuming a prompt response, there is still time to do.</p>						
	<p>W/O Comment: WOJV is herein amending the TG06 documents to reflect the top of wall elevations specified in above items 1-3. The TG06 Trade Subcontractor is to provide a credit for, to include however not limited to, the concrete rebar and waterproofing which has been deleted from the TG06 scope of work.</p>						
T-0527.2	BSE - Revision to Zone 4 Bracing Elevations Level A-D	Closed	05/28/2013	06/07/2013	06/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Sketch: SK-5773			ARUP Response:				
<p>Webcor is proposing that the vertical changes in elevation (per RFI T-527.1) from +7.50' to +3.50' at level A gridline 16 - 17 will occur at a distance of 14'4" from gridline 16 and will be located between CDSM piles 164 - 165 on the north wall elevation and between CDSM piles 618 - 619 on the south elevation</p> <p>Also vertical changes in elevation level A between gridline 25-26 from +3.50 to +1.50 will occur at a distance of 18'4" from gridline 25 and will be located between CDSM piles 265 - 266 on the north wall elevation and between CDSM piles 517 - 518 on the south elevation</p> <p>Please confirm is this is acceptable</p>			Acceptable				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1089 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0527.3	BGP - Revision to the top of the foundation wall Elevations TG06	Closed	10/25/2013	11/04/2013	10/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Due to the revision of the Zone 4 internal bracing and the use of the already procured steel sections the lookout installed for level A bracing were installed at a lower elevation than first planned resulting in the need to revise the finished elevation of the foundation wall downwards for the TG06 package. This scope reallocation will now be moved to the TG07.2 work package. See sketch SK01 attached for TG06 foundation wall finish elevations. Please confirm if this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Judy Long 10/25/2013 RESPONSE: This RFI involves the Contractor's Means and Methods. It is not the Design Team's role to define Scope of Work.		
T-0528	BSE - Zone 4 Level 2 Excavation	Closed	05/02/2013	05/12/2013	05/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Danny Walsh							
REQUEST: Per sheet GT-1111, excavation at each level is limited to 3' below the centerline of internal bracing struts. In zone 4, the spacing between Level A and B struts is only 8' O.C. (typically 12' to 14' elsewhere), which provides extremely limited clearance below Level A for excavation & demolition equipment at level 2 excavation. BBII requests the limit of level 2 excavation be extended to 7' below centerline of level B struts. (Note: the plans already allow for a +/- 2' variation in bracing elevation from those shown on sheet GT-1111. Therefore, BBII is only requesting two additional feet of excavation over what is allowed based on the contract drawings). Please advise if this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: It is acceptable to overexcavate the center of the excavation below the centerline of the level B struts in accordance with the illustration titled Stage 5 on sheet GT-1111 of the drawings. Berms along the shoring wall must be maintained.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1090 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0529	BGP - CJ Layout at Gridline J	Closed	05/02/2013	05/14/2013	05/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref. Drawings: S1-2052 Ref. Spec. 03 30 20- 3.2.A.4 Per Contract Specification 03 30 20- 3.2.A.4, foundation wall, lower concourse floor slab, and ground floor construction joints shall align with the location of the mat slab joint below. SCCI proposes to have a construction joint at grid line J as shown on attached drawing CJ -11; however, the construction joint would end up dividing the knockout wall into 2 pieces. SCCI proposes to install the J-line construction joint through the mat slab and typical foundation walls while omitting the construction joint through the knockout wall. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The construction joint presented in the RFI is acceptable.		
<hr/>							
T-0530	BGP - Dimension conflict between space allocated for BGP waterproofing and BGI Closed		05/03/2013	05/12/2013	05/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: GT-2101 Detail 1 Specificaion Section 07 12 10 To include however not limited to, sheet 1/GT-2101 allows 2" for the specified below grade waterproofing. The installed waterproofing system (07 12 10) thickness is 2-1/4". The insulation layer of the waterproofing system is specified at ½" (07 12 10.2.5.E). So as to resolve the proximity conflict may the contractor reduce the specified insulation thickness from ½" to ¼"?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The insulation of the waterproofing assembly is to remain at the specified thickness of 1/2".		
<hr/>							
T-0531	BGP - Waterproofing Detail Clarification for Flashing Penetrations	Closed	05/03/2013	05/12/2013	05/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1091 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Specification: 07 12 10 Reference Drawings: A1-8710, A1-8711</p> <p>Contract Drawings and approved shop drawings show sheet metal boots over micropile penetrations set in trowel grade adhesive over two plies of Laurenc</p> <p>Spec Section 07 12 10- 3.4 states the following:</p> <p>A Install flashing at terminations and penetrations</p> <p>B. Flash waterproofing with a minimum of 2 plies of woven glass fabric and 3 applications of adhesive. Extend first ply 6 inches onto each membrane and second 8 inches</p> <p>C. At penetrations, apply a minimum of 2 plies spirally wrapped and a target patch per Manufacturer's requirements. Where indicated on the drawings provide stainless steel drawbands.</p> <p>Contract Drawing details and approved shop drawing submittal details do not match what is called out in the above Spec section. Please advise as to which detail is to be used (shop drawing or specifications).</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The micropile penetration detail is shown on 2/A1-8711, which is also shown on the BGP Modified Bitumen Waterproofing Shop Drawings. There have been subsequent RFI responses regarding the sealant fill for the boot.</p> <p>Please refer to Specification Section 07 12 10 1.4 C regarding details prepared specifically for this project. The shop drawing concurs with the designed detail. If the contractor believed this detail conflicts with intentions of the specification and design requirements, this issue should be raised earlier and an alternative proposal made for consideration at the shop drawing stage.</p>		
T-0532	BGP - Sump Pit Grate Requirements	Closed	05/07/2013	05/17/2013	05/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>		<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>			
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Ref. Dwg. P1-2022 through P1-2027</p> <p>There are several sumps shown on the referenced Architectural drawings which are not shown and/or defined on the corresponding Plumbing drawings. The Plumbing Drawing Sheet Notes indicate the grating requirements for all other sumps and Catch Basins on the project (reference note No 1 ,2, 14 and 16 on P1-2022 through P1-2027) There are no such notes for grating requirements for the sumps shown on the attached marked-up Contract Drawings. See attached. Please verify</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>There is no grating required for these sumps.</p>		



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0534	BGP - Request for Latest Revit Model	Closed	05/07/2013	05/16/2013	05/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Specification: 01 31 26 SCCI is requesting access to the latest, most up to date Structural and Architectural Revit models from the designers. The 3D database would be used for reference only and will not be used for construction. SCCI understands that the 3D Database is subject to change as the project design evolves. As a user of this 3D database, SCCI accepts the risk and acknowledge that the data is subject to change. SCCI also acknowledges the terms and conditions outlined in the Transbay Transit Specification Section 01 31 26.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The updated In-Progress Revit computer model will be issued to TJPA for review and comment on May 31, 2013. TJPA will forward this model to the Contractor for information, review, and comment. The Revit model is clearly clarified as not a Contract Document for use in construction. The documents issued on May 31, 2013 are not being issued for bid or construction. The Contractor shall determine when, for what purpose, and how the model is shared with their Sub-contractors.				
T-0535	BGP - Elevator Opening Encroachment at Concrete Beam B131	Closed	05/07/2013	05/16/2013	05/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: A1-2842, S1-2202, S1-3401 Please reference attached Contract Drawings A 1-2842, S 1-2202 and S 1-3401. Drawing S 1-2202 calls out concrete beam B131 running east to west between the elevator and Stair openings. The dimensions of concrete beam B131 are 22 inches wide and 36 inches high. See drawing S1-3401 for beam schedule. A1 -2842 calls out the spacing between openings to be 1'-9". This makes the elevator pit encroach 1 inch into concrete beam B131. Shall the elevator opening be relocated 1 inch to the south to accommodate the concrete beam? Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The openings in the Lower Concourse slab shall remain as shown on A1-2842. The beam shall be modified to 21" wide by 36" deep. Longitudinal reinforcement for this beam shall be 2-#10 for continuous top bars, 3-#10 continuous for bottom bars, and 3-#10 additional short bottom bars (L=18'-0" centered at midspan). Stirrups shall be #4's, type 2, 12@8"OC from each end, balance at 12" OC. Top & bottom clear cover to the stirrup shall be 3" and 1.5", respectively.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1094 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0536	BGP - Sump Conflicting with Trestle Pile	Closed	05/07/2013	05/06/2013	05/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Drawing: A1-2817, S1-2027				The sump pit located at 7'-6 ¾" west of GL 34 per A1-2817 shall be relocated to 12'-3" west of GL 34 to avoid this conflict.			
Based on the latest BBII trestle model available to SCCI and contract drawing A1-2817, there appears to be a conflict between a sump pit and trestle pile near column line "34" and "E". Please refer to the attached screen shot from SCCIs Revit Model.				W/O note: Please confirm that the relocation of this sump pit does not conflict with any micropiles in the surrounding area.			
8/31/2012 IFC drawings did not show this sump pit as it was added in ASI No. 0099.							
Please provide direction on how to proceed							
T-0537	BGP - Sump Pit/Catch Basin Clarification at Gridlines C/19.1	Closed	05/07/2013	05/16/2013	05/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Specification: 22 13 01 Reference Drawing: A1-2815, S1-2055, P1-2025				This is a sump pit in an escalator pit. There is no grate or piping associated with this sump pit.			
The pit near gridlines C/19.1 is identified as a catch basin in drawing A1-2815 but identified as a sump pit in drawing S1-2055. Drawing P1-2025 does not show any piping for this pit. Please confirm if this should be a sump pit or is the piping detail missing?							
T-0538	BGP - Sump Pit Frame Elevation	Closed	05/07/2013	05/15/2013	05/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPIan Corcorran</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref Dwg. P1-2022, P1-6001				All sump pits and catch basins identified on plumbing drawings and located in the future track areas have the grating flush with top of concrete at elevation -35'-8".			
Please reference attached sketch SK-0163 and Contract Drawings P1-2022 and P1-6001. Drawing P1-2022 calls out Top of Concrete = -35'-8" and Finish Floor Elevation= -35'-5". P1-6001 Detail 8 shows top of sump grate frames to be flush with the surface in which it is embedded. It is							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1095 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0539	BGP - ASTM 123 Galvanizing Variance From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon REQUEST: Reference Specification: 05 05 15.3.3.B and the attached letter from AZZ Galvanizing The steel pipe penetration sleeves are to be coated under the Structural Shapes and Plate Material Category with a grade of 100 and 3.9 mils thickness per Tables 1 & 2 of ASTM A123. The first 2 shipments of steel penetration sleeves (approximately 12 pin pile and 17 trestle pile) were coated under the pipe and tubing material category with a Grade 75 per Table 1 of ASTM A123. This coating grade requires 3.0 mils per Table 2 - Coating Thickness Grade. SCCI is requesting that the Grade 75 be allowed for the first two pin pile in Area 1 that are fit and welded to the intermetallic layers having still penetrated the material and per the attached letter, the process used will insure a long service life. The average thickness for the specified pin pile above is 3.2 mils. Is this acceptable?	Closed To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	05/07/2013	05/17/2013	05/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: No	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1096 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0541	BGP - Protection Board Installation at SW Corner	Closed	05/09/2013	05/23/2013	05/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Ref Spec. 07 12 10- 3.2.D Please reference Specifications Section 07 12 10- 3.2.D. This spec states the following: "Install protection board on vertical surfaces with long dimension vertical and the polyethylene film side facing the soil/cement surfaces. Secure 1 /4" protection board to flanges of soldier piles with powder driven fasteners and washers spaced 12 inches o.c " At the SW corner of the project, the soldier beams are spaced greater than the width of the protection board. We suggest rotating the protection board 90-degrees so that the long dimension is horizontal instead of vertical. This would allow for attachment to the soldier piles and the inside corner of protection board to be heated and formed into the corner. We also suggest using this method where pile spacing exceeds 4' on center. Please review and advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The contactor's suggestion to rotate the protection board 90-degrees is acceptable where the soldier pile spacing and the waterproofing manufacturer require.				
T-0542	BGP - Drainage Mat Installation Clarification	Closed	05/09/2013	05/23/2013	05/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Ref. Spec. 07 12 10- 3.2.F. This spec section states the following: "Install drainage composite in largest practical sizes over the entire area of the felts. Install either vertically or horizontally and lap sheets 1" in direction of flow ... " 1. If drainage composite is installed vertically, please confirm that direction of water flow is down vertically towards the mudslab. 2. Please confirm that only horizontal joints in the drainage composite will be lapped 1 inch. 3. Please confirm that vertical drainage core joints will be butt jointed.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Design Team confirms that Items 1, 2 and 3 of this RFI are correct.				

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0543	BGP - Galvanizing Varying Material Category Variance	Closed	05/09/2013	05/23/2013	05/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Ref. Spec. 05 05 15- 3.3.B.2 Reference is made to Specification Section 05 05 15- 3.3.B.2 and the attached 'Ask Dr. Galv' galvanizing article. Section 3.3.B.2 states "When galvanizing assemblies of components of varying material category and material thickness, provide minimum coating thickness grade for all members equal to or exceeding the maximum highest material category coating grade." For the dewatering and piezometer mat slab penetration sleeves, A513 tube is being used, which has a Grade 75 designation per ASTM A123. Based on the above specification, Grade 100 must be followed because these sleeves have plate components. The reason Grade 75 is specified in ASTM A123 is that it is the minimum consistent attainable galvanizing coating for the thickness and chemistry of the material being coated. As an aluminum killed steel product, it is not a natural catalyst to galvanizing as silicon is per the attached article. To specify Grade 100 goes beyond A123 specifications. Therefore, SCCI requests Grade 75 be used, with a minimum coating thickness of 3.0 mils, for the dewatering wells and piezometer mat slab penetration sleeves. Please be advised if Grade 100 (3.9 mils) is required, the galvanizing process to attain the thicker coating can lead to embrittlement and delamination of the coating. Is Grade 75, with a minimum 3.0 mil coating thickness on the dewatering well and piezometer mat slab sleeve penetrations, acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per specification section 05 05 15 / 1.3 submit shop drawings of the galvanizing schedule, submit samples of the galvanizing, and submit monthly certificate signed by the galvanizer. If in the shop drawing process the Contractor submits a certificate signed by the galvanizer as required by specification section 05 05 15 / 1.3D stating the proposal above meets the recommendations of and is in compliance with the specified ASTM standard's minimum requirements, the Contractor's proposed galvanizing thickness will meet the design intent of the contract documents. The last galvanizer certificate received in the Transbay shop drawing process was dated January 4, 2013 and it is not clear if that shop drawing covers the item referenced in this RFI.			
<hr/>							
T-0544	BSE - Micropile Relocation - W990 & W986 (Well Obstructions)	Closed	05/10/2013	05/11/2013	05/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST: Micropiles W990 and W986 as laid out are both in conflict with dewatering wells. BBII recommends relocating W990 south 3' and W986 north 3'. See attached sketch. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving micropiles W990 and W986 as proposed.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1098 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0545	BGP - Embedded Junction Box Details	Closed	05/10/2013	05/24/2013	05/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Ian Corcorran</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref. Dwg. A1-2842, A1-2850				Refer to the electrical drawings and specifications section 260534 for EJB specifications. The related information to select and detail the box is included in the Documents.			
Please reference Contract Drawings A1-2842 to A1-2850. These drawings contain numerous "EJB" callouts. SCCI's issued drawings do not contain details for embedded junction boxes. SCCI is trying to determine if there will be any conflicts with the EJB locations. Will the EJB's be selected by the future contactor in which this scope is contained? If specific EJB's have been specified already, please provide the detail so SCCI can confirm there are no conflicts with SCCI's scope.							
T-0546	BGP - Shear Reinforcement and Drainage Conflict at Grldlines 4/C	Closed	05/09/2013	05/23/2013	05/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Ian Corcorran</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref Dwg A1-9215, S1-2022				TT response: From the floor sink dimensional info provided in the RFI, it appears the floor sinks will interrupt the top bars of the mat. Contractor shall apply detail 1 on S1-3501 for reinforcement requirements at top mat bars that are interrupted by the floor sinks.			
At gridlines 4/C, the floor clean out and floor sinks (see A1-9215) cannot be installed due to the spacing of the top layer mat slab and shear reinforcement (see S1-2022). Please advise on how to proceed. Reference the attached sketch of conflict.				WSP Flack and Kurtz response: The floor sink located east of column 4/C may be moved North, next to the Fire Pump room North wall. The floor clean-out may be moved to a similar position, south of the relocated floor sink. The associated vent and the trap primer line will be relocated in front of the Fire Pump Room north wall.			
T-0546.1	BGP - Follow Up to RFI 173- Shear Reinforcement and Drainage Conflict at 4/C	Closed	06/28/2013	07/08/2013	07/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jackson Tukuafu</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: Drawing A1-9215, S1-2022, Spec Section 03				AAI - Please see SKA-2763 for new location of FSK			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1100 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
	REQUEST: Ref. Dwg. S1-2030, 2/S1-3204, A1-2110 Reference attached contract drawings S1-2030, S1-3204 (detail2) and A1-2110. Structural drawings do not show the detail for termination of the 3 ft chamfer at the end of the south foundation wall. CD A1-2110 indicates that the 3 ft chamfer terminates at the face of the knockout wall. Please provide details and where does the 3ft chamfer, at the West end of the South foundation wall, terminate?	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The chamfer along the south foundation wall terminates at the face of the west knock-out wall as shown on sheet S1-2060 (Mat Top Reinforcement - Zone 10 Plan), and is not intended to show on S1-2030. Vertical bars of pilaster reinforcement extend to bottom of mat and the hairpins & cross-ties extend 12" below top of mat.		
T-0549	BGP - Testing of WPM-1 Seams	Closed	05/13/2013	05/23/2013	05/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: During the 5/10/13 waterproofing meeting Jon Laurence (Laurenco) and Carl Keim (AAI) clarified that specification section 07 12 10.3.5.B (independent testing all seams) only applies to the Laurenco products i.e. membrane layers, butyl tape, and flashings. Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Design Team confirms that statement in the RFI is correct.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1101 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0550	BGP - Request to Revise Lower Concourse Elevation	Closed	05/14/2013	05/24/2013	05/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Exhibits: A - G			The contractor's suggestion to revise the Lower Concourse slab elevation is NOT acceptable. The contractor is to follow the elevations set out on the latest Below Grade Package documents.				
The BSE IFC drawing S1-3201 (Exhibit-A) depicted the Lower Concourse slab at an elevation of -8'-8" between grid lines 9-3 and West of grid 3 & North of grid E.6.							
Although specification section 01 13 00.1.3.H.3 precludes the TJPA from making scope changes in submittals, on 3/29/11 the TJPA returned submittal package ID TG0300-541/submittal ID TA2010-315500A10 (Exhibit-B) which included a note stating the Lower Concourse level slab varies as follows:							
T/Lower Concourse slab East of gridline 9 = -8'-2"							
T/Lower Concourse slab West of gridline 9 = -5'-5"							
Although specification section 00 07 00.1.01.37 stipulates a Field Order is not to involve a change in Contract Sum or Time, on 9/7/12 after the zone-1 level-B bracing and trestle was installed (Exhibit-C), the TJPA issued Field Order #T-00008 / ASI #0097 (Exhibit-D) which revised the top of the Lower Concourse slab elevation between grid lines 1-5.5 from -8'-8" to -5'-5" a difference of -3'-3" reference sheets S1-3201 (Exhibit-E) and S1-2202 (Exhibit-F).							
The latent elevation change of the Lower Concourse slab has created proximity conflicts with the previously installed internal bracing and trestle steel depicted on the attached marked-up drawings (Exhibit-G).							
WOJV has surveyed the internal bracing and trestle steel conflicting with the Lower Concourse slab and believes the most cost and schedule efficient solution would be to again revise the elevation of the Lower Concourse slab to -6'-6".							
Please advise if the proposed elevation revision is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0551	BGP - CR T-069 Wall Penetration Link Seals	Closed	05/14/2013	05/28/2013	05/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref Dwg. 4/A1-8712 SCCI is in receipt of CR T-069 regarding the below grade modifications. On Plan Sheet A1-8712, Detail 4 was modified to relocate the second link seal to opposite end of the penetration sleeve. Originally, both link seals were located in series at the surface of the concrete wall. This relocation is not constructible in that the link seal cannot be installed or tightened properly when located 3ft into an embedded sleeve. In addition, this link seal cannot be installed prior to placing concrete due to access issues adjacent to the CDSM wall. Is it acceptable to return the relocated link seal to it's original location near the surface of the concrete wall? This would be per the original design shown on A1-8712, Detail 4.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to have the linkseals installed in the sleeves from the inside, with exception of the incoming electrical service ducts to the transformer vaults that are located inboard of the exterior walls. This applies to the sleeves serving electrical vaults B1322, B1325, B1561 and B1562. Because these sleeves must be concrete encased as they enter the building and cross the service corridor, the linkseals need to be provided at the exterior side of the foundation wall penetration to prevent migration of water through the sleeves across the corridor.				
T-0552	BGP - CR T -069 Electrical Scope	Closed	05/14/2013	05/28/2013	05/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: SCCI is in receipt of CR T-069 regarding the below grade modifications. In the modifications, many of the mechanical, plumbing, and electrical rooms have been modified. In some cases, additional rooms had been added like that of the emergency electrical room. With theses changes, none of the electrical drawings pertaining to these rooms or additional rooms had been modified to account for these changes. Please confirm that there will be no electrical changes other than grounding as a result of CR T-069.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The electrical scope is identified with clouds and deltas on the drawings. For future reference please include specific drawing sheets and issue information (Sheet E1-2022 - ASI#0102 dated 04/29/2013) as we are not familiar with the CR T-069 reference used in this RFI.				
T-0553	BGP - Examination of Substrate Clarification	Closed	05/14/2013	05/28/2013	05/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please reference Specification Section 07 12 10- 3.1.A.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 07 12 10 - 3.1.A is in reference to surfaces to which				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1103 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0554	BGP - Field Quality Control From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcorran Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon REQUEST: Please reference Specifications Sections 07 12 10 - 3.3-3.5. Specifications Section 07 12 10- 3.5.A states the following: "The manufacturer's field representative shall be present before and during installation as specified above." Please confirm that this is in reference to Section 3.3 "Application" and Section 3.4 "Flashing" which are directly above Section 3.5, A on page 07 12 10-8 of the Specifications (attached for reference).	Closed To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	05/14/2013	05/28/2013	05/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
			No. The specification is clear and the question is superfluous. "The manufacture's field representative shall be present before and during installation" (for surface examination, protection board installation, felt installation, drainage installation and other activates before the membrane is installed). Section 3.1 also requires the manufacturer's presence related to substrate examination.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1104 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0555	BGP - Waterproofing Asphalt Cement Walnut Sized Gob Spacing	Closed	05/16/2013	05/26/2013	05/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Specification Section 07 12 10, 3.2, E states the following: "Install two piles of asphalt saturated felts over the protection board in walnut sized gobs of asphalt cement sufficiently spaced to hold felts in place." SCCI and Best have been informed that this layer is to act as the shear/slip plane for structural movement. Please provide the spacing requirements of the walnut sized gobs.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Follow the Waterproofing Manufacturer's installation instructions.		
T-0556	BGP - Waterproofing Asphalt Cement Diameter of Walnut Sized Gobs	Closed	05/16/2013	05/26/2013	05/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Specification Section 07 12 10, 3.2, E states the following: "Install two piles of asphalt saturated felts over the protection board in walnut sized gobs of asphalt cement sufficiently spaced to hold felts in place." Please provide approximate diameter of walnut sized gobs (maximum/minimum will suffice).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The approximate diameter of a walnut sized gob is 3/4" min to 7/8" max.		
T-0557	BGP - Waterproofing Asphalt Cement with Laps in Felt Layers	Closed	05/16/2013	05/26/2013	05/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: In reference to Specification Section 07 12 10, 3.2, E, the specifications do not mention laps in felt layers needing to be fully sealed in asphalt cement. Please confirm that fully sealed laps are not required.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The end laps are not to be sealed. Lap ends of felt layers in the direction of water flow.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1105 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0557.1	BGP - Waterproofing Asphalt Cement with Laps in Felt Layers	Closed	05/31/2013	06/10/2013	06/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0557 response and Specifications Section 071210-3.2. RFI #T-0557 response confirms that end laps are not sealed, but does not address the side laps. Please confirm that this applies to the side laps as well.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Do not seal any laps of the felt layers. Neither the end laps, the side laps nor any other laps are to be sealed.		
T-0558	BGP - Waterproofing Asphalt Cement at Protection Board Transitions	Closed	05/16/2013	05/26/2013	05/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: In discussions with the TJPA and Designers, the "gaps" where the 2' protection board meets 6" turnout at the base transition, shall be filled with asphalt cement. Is it acceptable to fill these "gaps" with asphalt cement?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is a contractor's means and methods item		
T-0559	BGP - ASI 102 Change Clarification at Elevator Pit Near GL 2-E 2	Closed	05/14/2013	05/28/2013	05/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ian Corcoran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Ref. Dwg. A1-2812, 1/A1-9214, 3/S1-3006 Revision 0 of A1-2812 previously contained dimensions for the elevator pit near gridlines 4-E.2; however, as a result of ASI 102 revision 1 of A1-2812 no longer contain the dimensions for the elevator pit and the referenced detail 1 of A1-9214 does not either. Please provide the dimensions of the elevator pit. Also, detail 3 of S1-3006 indicates that there is a change in the thickened section of the elevator but it does not appear that there were any changes made. Please confirm if there are changes to the thickened section.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The elevator dimensions have been revised and will be included in ASI 104. Please refer to the attached SKA 2709 (based on A1-9214) for revised dimensions. Thornton Tomasetti response: Detail 3 of S1-3006 is clouded because the pit depth and plan dimensions were revised in ASI 102. While the changes will require only minimal revision of the rebar lengths/bend locations/etc for rebar fabrication, and the structural intent of the rebar detailing remains unchanged, the mat depression region on 3/S1-3006 was clouded to alert the contractor to the need for these dimensional rebar detailing revisions due to the pit resizing. (We agree that on first glance there do not appear to be any revisions to the thickened section of the detail; the revisions are graphical only, and		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0560	<div><div>BGP - Grade 60 ASTM A-615 Conforming Bar In-Lieu of ASTM A-706</div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Ian Corcorran</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company</div><div>Gary Krutsch</div></div><div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu</div></div>	Closed	05/16/2013	05/29/2013	05/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Ref. Dwg. RE-2/S-0007</div><div>Gerdau proposes to use Grade 60 ASTM A-615 bar in place of Grade 60 ASTM A-706 material in the locations defined within RE-2 on sheet S-0007 which include foundation walls, columns and moment frame beams. The Grade 60 ASTM A-615 bar shall conform to the strength properties published in the attached ASTM specifications.</div><div>This is not a request to replace all Grade 60 ASTM A-706 bars with Grade 60 ASTM-615. Is it acceptable to use ASTM-615 bars, when available, that would otherwise be wasted during the rebar fabrication process?</div></div>			<div><div>small enough that they are not noticeable except in an aligned overlay.)</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>We will allow the use of A615 bars in lieu of A706 for inquired scope of elements provided that test data for the A615 bars meet ACI 318 section 21.2.5. Please submit test data that meets code requirements and identify where these bars will be used.</div></div>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0561	BSE - Standard for Determining Buttress Concrete Strength	Closed	05/16/2013	05/26/2013	05/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Spec. section 31 63 29.3.9.D states,			ACI 301 is the standard.				
"Not less than 28 days after concreting is completed, perform HQ coring over the full depth of 10% of the shafts to verify the quality of concrete and test whether the shafts are free of defects. Provide these cores for inspection by the TJPA Representative. The TJPA's Representative will select the locations where coring shall be performed and will select the cores which will be tested for strength."							
The aforementioned language in addition to spec. section 31 63 29.1.6.A which states:							
"Perform work in accordance with ACI 301, except where otherwise specified. Specifications herein set minimum results required and references to procedures to establish minimum guidelines."							
reads as if ACI 301 would be the specified standard for determining the required buttress concrete strength (specifically ACI 301 section 1.6.6.2) hence acceptance.							
Please confirm what if not ACI 301 is the standard for determining the buttress concrete strength hence acceptance.							
<hr/>							
T-0562	BGP Stair 403 Embed Conflict	Closed	05/17/2013	05/27/2013	05/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Drawings: S1-7011, SI -7600, S1-7602, and sketch SK-194.			Detail 8/S1-7602 has been revised to be an L8x8x1/2 angle. This change will be issued in a forthcoming ASI. Additional angle shown on 11/S1-7600 is not required.				
Detail 3 on S1-7011 has a callout for 11/S1-7600 and 8/S1-7602. Both of these angles are embedded in the top edge of the stair opening. The locations of embeds overlap at the Northeast and Southeast portions of the opening. See SK-194 for details. The 8" legs of the angles are to be on different surfaces of the concrete causing future stair							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
<div>installation issues.</div> <div>Please provide details on how to proceed.</div>							
T-0562.1	BGP - Stair 403 Embed Conflict	Closed	08/13/2013	08/23/2013	08/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: <div>1) Please reference RFI response T-0562. Please confirm the 7' -6" long embed per detail 8 on S I -7602 starts from the western edge of the opening, as shown in the attached sketch.</div> <div>2) Also, please clarify embedded angle conflicts highlighled on attached sketch, where embed as shown on detail 11, S1-7600 and embed as shown on detail 8, S1-7602 are specified to be installed at the same location.</div>		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> <div>George Metzger</div> <div>8/20/2013</div> <div>RESPONSE:</div> <div>1. 7'-6" long applies to stair 501 only (shown on 6/S1-7016). At stair 403, the L8x8 angle shall run the full length of the stair opening.</div> <div>2. Where L8x8x1/2 is provide per 8/S1-8602, the L8x4x1/2 x 1'2" long and (2) ¾" welded studs shall be deleted. The 3" pipe is welded directly to the L8x8x1/2 angle.</div>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1110 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0565	BGP - Waterstop Injection Hose Boxes From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon REQUEST: Please reference attached drawing A1-8711. Please confirm all Waterstop Injection Hose Boxes in the Mat Slab are to be mounted as illustrated in the attached drawing (flush@ -35' -8"). With the installation of a future topping slab, mounting these boxes at Mat Slab elevation may render the injection hose system inaccessible at that time.	Closed To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch SUGGESTION:	05/22/2013	06/01/2013	05/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Design Team confirms that that Waterstop Injection Hose Boxes in the Mat Slab are to be mounted flush at -35'-8". The rail bed system (by others), which will not be determined until a future time, will need to make provisions for access to these boxes.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0566	BSE - Zone 2 A-Line CDSM Embedded Metal Part at Soldier Pile 96	Closed	05/22/2013	06/01/2013	05/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Dean Wallahan ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Ref: BIM 360 - Field Condition Report (FCR) 000013 Specification Section 31 56 13 Per FCR 000013: "An Embedded Metal part is visible in the CDSM wall between Solder Piles 96 & 97. A Corrective Action Plan must be submitted to remove the object and repair the CDSM wall. Spec 31 56 13." Please see attached BBII proposed Corrective Action Plan. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Acceptable	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-0567	BGP - Fire Management System	Closed	05/23/2013	06/02/2013	06/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Ref: 5/E1-6001, E1-2202, E-0006 Per Plan Sheet E1-6001 , Detail 5. (attached) the embedded conduits for the fire managment system do not extend above or into the lower concourse floor slab. Additionally, on Plan Sheet E1-2202 for the lower concourse level, Sheet Note A (attached) states that the "scope of work on this sheet is limited only to grounding electrode conductors embedded in slab and main grounding bus (MGB) in the main electrical room." From these two notes, it is clear that the fire alarm system scope is limited to the train platfonn level. However, on Plan Sheet E-0006 (attached) General Note R., "For fire alarm devices, provide embedded boxes, conduit, and pull strings in the lower concourse slab for service to fire alarm devices for both levels". Please proved direction as to whether or not the fire alarm system conduit is to be installed in the lower concourse level slab.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: The referenced detail is limited to the conduits for devices that are mounted on walls or columns at the Train Platform level. Refer to Sheet E-0006, Note R, for the requirements for the fire alarm raceways and boxes to be embedded in the Lower Concourse slab.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1112 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0568	BGP - Monitoring Instrument Sleeves Detail	Closed	05/23/2013	06/02/2013	05/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon REQUEST: Reference Drawings: 3/A1-8711, 4/S1-3009 Detail 4 on SI-3009 does not apply to the monitoring instrument sleeves shown on A1-8711. The sleeves are continuous through the Mat Slab, and thus do not require a breakout. Please provide a typical mat slab rebar detail that is applicable to the monitoring instrument sleeves referenced herein.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As the contractor notes in this RFI, the breakout in the top region of the mat slab per 4/S1-3009 is not required at monitoring instrument sleeves. Contractor shall apply the rebar detailing of detail 7/S1-3009 to both the top and bottom of the mat at these sleeves.				
T-0569	BGP - Reinforced Concrete Wall Clarification	Closed	05/23/2013	06/02/2013	05/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu REQUEST: Reference Drawing: A1-2122 Per the note on A1-2122, walls called out as "RCW" are reference drawings and not in TG06's scope of work. "RCW" walls are generally illustrated with dotted lines; however, when referencing the walls for the elevator pit and stairs near gridline 2E, the walls are called out as "RCW" but also illustrated with solid lines. Please confirm which walls are part of the TG06 package and which are RCW. Also, please confirm if the entire South wall of the fuel tank room is supposed to be "RCW" or if it is just the wall section as shown.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The walls at the elevator pit and stairs near gridline 2,E are part of the TG06 package. The entire south wall of the fuel tank room is also part of the TG06 package. The referenced enlarged detail 1/A1-9214 shows the solid walls without the RCW annotation. The RCW annotation has been removed from these particular walls on drawing A1-2122 and is included ASI 104.				
T-0570	BGP - Underside of Beam Embed Conflict	Closed	05/24/2013	06/03/2013	06/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon REQUEST: Ref: S1-7011, S1-7900/Detail 9, S1-9100/Detail 2, Attached SK-0201 Please see attached Contract Drawing S1-7011 and Sketch SK-0201 . Stair opening 403 has stair post plates							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The continuous concrete insert in this RFI does not conflict with detail 9/S1-7600. The continuous concrete insert embed locations have been updated. Please see attached SKA 2713 to SKA 2717 for updated Continuous Concrete Insert layout on Lower				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1113 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	embedded on the underside of the concrete beams. See S1-7600/D9 for details. The underside of the concourse slab also contains continuous concrete inserts. See S1 - 9100/D2 for details and A1-2844 for locations. The two embeds overlap on the underside of the beams on the north and south sides of stair opening 403. See SK-0201 for drawing of conflicting embeds. This also occurs on the south side of stair opening 501.			Concourse Slab Edge Plans.			
	Please provide details on how to install the two conflicting embeds on the underside of the concourse.						
T-0571	BGP - New Waterproofing Install Instructions (Additional Adhesive)	Closed	05/28/2013	06/07/2013	05/31/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon						
	REQUEST: Specifications Section 071210 We are in receipt of Laurencio Waterproofing Products, Inc.'s Installation Instructions revision dated 5/15/13 and have found several discrepancies with what is called out in Specifications Section 071210. Section 8, f, iv, 4, (d), vi calls for an additional layer of adhesive on walls prior to concrete. It calls for a coat of Laurencio Adhesive over COMPLETED membrane and cold joint reinforcement applied after wall ply adhesive has cured at least (3) days and (1) to (3) days in advance of reinforcement steel application for walls. This is added scope as this additional layer is to be applied over the completed membrane and is not called out in the Specifications. Please confirm that SCCI is to use the manufacturers installation instructions	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Contractor is to follow specification section 07-12-10 Modified Bitumen waterproofing (WPM-1) where the Manufacturer involvement is specified. Questions on the proper installation of the system are to be directed to the waterproofing membrane manufacturer. Questions on the detailed installation procedure (Waterproofing Install Instructions) should be directed to Laurencio, not to the TJPAs Reps via RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0572	BGP - New Waterproofing Install Instructions (3 day Cure)	Closed	05/29/2013	06/08/2013	05/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Specifications: 071210			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
We are in receipt of Laurencio Waterproofing Products, Inc.'s Installation Instructions revision dated 5/15/13 and have found several discrepancies with what is called out in Specifications Section 071210. Section 8, f, iv, 5, (d), v calls for a minimum (3) days wait for top ply to firmly adhere before starting the rest of flashing details and placing concrete topping slab. This is not called out in the specifications and may significantly impact the project schedule.					The Contractor is to follow specification section 07-12-10 Modified Bitumen waterproofing (WPM-1) where the Manufacturer involvement is specified.		
Please confirm that SCCI is to use manufacturers installation instructions.					Questions on the proper installation of the system are to be directed to the waterproofing membrane manufacturer. Questions on the detailed installation procedure (Waterproofing Install Instructions) should be directed to Laurencio, not to the TJPA Reps via RFI.		
T-0573	BGP - Locations of Electrical Outlets, Equipment, and Fixtures	Closed	05/29/2013	06/08/2013	06/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Reference Specification 26 05 34, 3.2 B.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The exact locations of the electrical equipment are to be provided by the TJPA through the RFI process. With the electrical equipment provided and installed at a later date under a separate contract, please provide the dimensions of the electrical equipment, boxes, and cabinets to allow for accurate electrical riser locations in the concrete slabs. The equipment, boxes, and cabinet dimensions in Zone 1, Area 1 are needed first with the areas to the east to follow.					WSP Response: To address the specific information that is being requested, please identify which "equipment" is not sufficiently located in the drawings and requires clarification. Sheet E1-0006 notes specific requirements for coordinating the location of equipment and connections. Details on sheets E1-6001 and E1-6006 provide additional location requirements. Wireways have been indicated to position the conduits stubbing out of the slabs in the electrical rooms. Plans locate the embedded light fixture box layouts. Specifications 260502.3.4 require coordination of the work and contractor's coordination shop drawing layouts for review of the electrical room layouts.		
T-0574	BGP - Field Galvanizing of Mat Slab Sleeve Penetrations	Closed	05/31/2013	06/10/2013	06/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1115 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>				
<div><div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. John Berggren</div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference Specification Section 05 05 15-3.3.B</div><div>The shop applied coating thickness for the pin and trestle pile sleeve fabrications is determined to be 3.9 mils per Table 2 in ASTM A 123. Under Section 05 05 15-3.5 the repair/restoration field-applied coating thickness is specified to be 8.0 mils. For field touch-up of damaged areas Section 05 50 10-3.2.D states to apply a thickness of 2.5 to 3.5 mils. For the coating hold back areas for the sleeve field weld joints and for any damage coatings that may arise during installation - is a uniform required mimimum field-applied thickness of 3.9 mils acceptable?</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div></div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>The question asks for clarification of the galvanizing coating repair thickness required for a specific location and for specific repair or touchup. The location noted in the question is not clear enough to answer the question. Resubmit the question with a more specific location noted. "Sleeve field weld joints and for any damage coating that may arise during installation" is too vague. Also, clarify if you are asking about field repair or field touchup of damaged zinc coatings.</div><div>The 8.0 mil repair thickness specified in section 05 05 15 applies to repair/restoration on most items as specified in 05 05 15 / 1.1.A: "zinc galvanic coatings applied in the shop or factory to surfaces of iron and steel installed at exterior locations and either totally or partially exposed to weather, humidity, moisture or precipitation; and elsewhere as indicated and specified." Specification Section 05 50 10 / 2.6 call for Hot Dip Galvanizing per specification section 05 05 15. Specification 05 50 10 / 3.2D applies to field touchup of damaged zinc coatings at areas covered by specification 05 50 10.</div></div></div>											
T-0575	BSE - Micropile Relocation - E038 (Overhead Obstructions)	Closed	06/03/2013	06/13/2013	08/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>				
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis							
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller											
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference : Attached Sketch</div><div>Micropile E038 as laid out cannot be installed due to an overhead strut obstruction. BBII recommends relocating E038 east 1. .</div><div>Please confirm this is acceptable.</div></div> <div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div></div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Void RFI T-0575 and Ref to RFI T-0575.1</div></div>											
T-0575.1	BSE - Micropile Relocation - E038 (Overhead Obstructions) Revised	Closed	06/04/2013	06/14/2013	06/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>				
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1116 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST: Reference : Attached Sketch This RFI supersedes RFI 375. Micropile E038 as laid out cannot be installed due to an overhead strut obstruction. BBII now recommends relocating E038 east 3'4" to be in line with E037 and E039. See attached sketch. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving micropile E038 as proposed.			
T-0576	Wall Alignment on Westside of Zone 1	Closed	05/31/2013	06/10/2013	06/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the pile encroachments at the Zone 1 West and South West CDSM walls, as described and illustrated in this RFI, the Design Team confirms it is acceptable to offset the alignment of the inside face of the Concrete Foundation Walls as the contractor proposes in RFI T-0576 BGP.			
REQUEST: Webcor is proposing to change the alignment of the Concrete Foundation wall on the west elevation along gridlines 1 & X1-1. The Concrete wall which runs along gridline 1 would be offset into the structure by 0.2656' (3-1/8") (proposed Face of concrete Foundation wall would now be 15-1/8" of gridline 1). Similarly along gridline X1-1 the wall would also be offset into the structure by 0.1575' (1 7/8") these offsets would enable the contract reinforcement to be installed without the need for further modifications to the reinforcement due to encroachment of the CDSM piles. See sketch SK-1 showing Cross section of concrete Foundation wall between CDSM piles 818 - 822 GL 1 in proposed revised location. Please confirm if this is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1118 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0579.1	secured only to the vertical bars and have the potential during concrete placement to shift or slide down the vertical bars until resting on the next adjacent horizontal bar. The inconsistent spacing of the cross-ties and horizontal bars congests the reinforcing configuration which may lead to potential problems when interfacing the concourse level reinforcing with the walls. In order to eliminate these potential problems Gerdau proposes to perform a grade 80 conversion of the cross-ties such that the size of the cross-tie remains as a #4 bar but the spacing of the cross-ties are installed with uniform spacing to the horizontal reinforcing at 8" O.C. within the designed 6" O.C. ranges or 16" O.C. within the designed 12" O.C. ranges.	Closed	06/19/2013	06/29/2013	06/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Please advise if this grade and spacing change is acceptable.						
	BGP - Horizontal Wall Reinforcing Equal Area Conversion						
	From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon						
	REQUEST: Reference: S1-3201, Spec Section 03 30 20 Gerdau (SCCI's subcontractor) has recently constructed a mock-up of the 1st lift of typical wall reinforcing and identified a potential problem with congestion and quality of the final designed product. The contract drawings on sheet S1-3201 depict the typical wall reinforcing details including #8 horizontal wall reinforcing which is designed at 8" O.C. E.F. Typical. Additionally, the #4 cross tie spacing has been designed at either 6" O.C. or 12" O.C depending on the location (elevation) within the wall. With the non-uniform spacing of the cross-ties and horizontal bars the cross-ties are secured only to the vertical bars and have the potential during concrete placement to shift or slide down the vertical bars until resting on the next adjacent horizontal bar. Additionally, the inconsistent spacing of the cross-ties and horizontal bars congests the reinforcing configuration which may lead to potential problems when interfacing the concourse level reinforcing	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TT does not see slippage of the cross-ties will be a concern if they are properly tied, and we don't see reducing the spacing of the horizontal bar from 8" to 6" will help the congestion issue raised. However, we don't take exception to the proposed change as long as it does not affect the cost and schedule.				

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1120 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0582	BGP - Use of Laurencio Adhesive and Temporary Fasteners as Alternative	Closed	06/05/2013	06/15/2013	06/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Ref: RFI #T-0563 and Submittal #TG0600-024 Please reference the response to RFI #T -0563 and Submittal #TG0600-024. The response to Part 3 of the RFI is unclear. Is it the designer's intent to deem temporary fasteners unacceptable with or without the certifications? Or are the temporary fasteners acceptable with the certifications? Please clarify. Please note, the certifications were submitted and approved on 2/11/13 as part of Submittal Package #TG0600-024.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The use of temporary fasteners are acceptable provided that the contractor and membrane manufacturer verify that their use does not restrict the design concept which is to maintain a shear plane.		
T-0583	BGP - BBII Monitoring Instruments/Piezometers	Closed	06/06/2013	06/06/2013	06/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: 6/A1-8711, 3/A1-8711 Per coordination discussions with WOJV (email attached), SCCI is to install BBII Piezometer sleeves per Detail 6 of A 1-8711. In this detail, the sleeve is to be blocked out of the Mat Slab and poured back at a later date contrary to the piezometer/monitoring instrument detail 3 on A1-8711. Is it acceptable to eliminate the blockout portion of detail 3/ A 1-8711 and pour the BBII piezometers into the mat slab? The ARUP piezometers will remain operational (per Detail 3/ A1-8711) after the mat slab has been poured to monitor the water table levels.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The dewatering wells shall be capped and sealed in accordance with detail 6/A1-8711. The timing to decommission the dewatering wells is stated in the specifications and the structural drawings. The piezometers installed by Arup shall be protected as they will be used until further notice. Refer to detail 3/A1-8711 for detail at the mat slab. If BBI installed piezometers, these will be sleeved and waterproofed in accordance with detail 3/A1-8711 and shall be decommissioned when directed by BBI.		
T-0583.1	BGP - Dewatering / Piezometer Clarification	Closed	07/11/2013	07/11/2013	07/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1121 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Reference RFI T-0583, RFI T-0602 Reference Drawing: A1-8711</p> <p>In follow up to a phone conversation with George Metzger, detail 3/A1-8711 is to be used for all permanent instruments. Since the piezometers installed by BBII will be removed when the dewatering system is turned off, please confirm which waterproofing detail should be used.</p> <p>Also, please confirm if any of Arup's instruments will not be permanent. If they are not permanent, please confirm which waterproofing detail should be used.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1122 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0584.1	BSE - Abandoning Dewatering Well #3 at Shearwall	Closed	07/25/2013	08/04/2013	07/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference RFI: T-0584 Reference SK-001 and SK-002			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
BBI is proposing to abandon the dewatering well #3 at the mudslab level. This will mitigate the impact of shear wall dowels and penetration sleeve in the vicinity of the mat slab penetration created by dewatering well #3, in lieu of creating a blackout in the shear wall and designing rebracing to address structural concerns.			It is acceptable to abandon dewatering well #3, however the Design Team is concerned that the contractor's proposed solution, to cut off the plugged well flush with the top of the mud slab, may expose the underside of the waterproof membrane to potential damage due to differential movement. All of the mat slab penetration sleeve details were developed as mitigation in case potential movement occurs e.g. buoyancy movement.				
BBI has discussed this with Viking Drillers and have confirmed they can abandon this well. BBI is proposing to cut the pvc casing flush with the top of mudslab, drill and epoxy #4 bars 2" down from top of casing with 3" embedment. The bars will be installed in the north, south, east, and west face through the casing and are installed to better ensure the dewatering well cement plug does not upheave. They will use Type II Portland Cement with a 5% bentonite content. Waterproofing will then be installed over the dewatering well, lapping as necessary to the adjacent waterproofing.			The Design Team proposes that the mud slab is to be broken out sufficiently to allow a 4" excavation below the underside of the mud slab. The dewatering well cut off and filled. Compressible material : 4" of Styrofoam installed into the excavation and over the plugged dewatering well. Then the opening in mud slab is to be repaired with reinforced concrete infill.				
Please confirm that this is acceptable.			Note that BBII is still solely responsible for maintaining the dewatering.				
T-0584.2	BGP - Dewatering Well & Concrete Partition Conflict	Closed	07/30/2013	08/09/2013	08/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Burke To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1123 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: RFI T-0584, Attached sketch Please refer to RFI 584 and the attached sketch of the proposed block out in concrete partition walls as referenced in RFI 584. The 28" x 28" blockout in the mat slab will be transferred to the blockout of the wall and be 25" from the mat slab elevation to the top of blockout. This will create 3'-0" from top of penetration sleeve to top of wall blockout. We are proposing to use formsavers and the male ends will extend the length of the blockout. Please confirm this is acceptable or provide acceptable solution.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed block-out for the dewatering well & concrete partition conflicts is acceptable provided the following: 1. Confirm the vertical bar size for max height partition at these locations. 2. Extend the vertical bars in the block-out a min 4" into the top of mat.			
T-0585	BGP - Mass Concrete Specifications	Closed	06/05/2013	06/05/2013	06/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Specifications Section: 03 30 20 3.5 & 3.11 Reference attached letter from CTL Group SCCI is asking for variance to the temperature differential requirements for the mat slab concrete. If granted, this variance would be based on performance based temperature differential limit (PBTDL), which is tailored to both the Project's mass concrete mix design and the placement. Refer to the attached letter from CTL. The intent of this PBTDL is to prevent thermal cracking, and at the same time reduce duration of the thermal control requirement. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It will be acceptable to use the contractor-proposed performance-based temperature differential limit approach for spec section 3.11.B provided the following: 1. This approach shall be approved mix-specific. 3. The maximum temperature of 3.11.B as well as remaining mass concrete specification requirements shall still apply. 4. CTL shall provide the required measurements as well as field quality control. 4. Contractor shall still remain responsible for providing a mat foundation that meets requirements of the contract documents.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0586	BGP - Fire Management System and Concourse Slab Electrical Scope	Closed	06/05/2013	06/05/2013	06/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Drawing: E-0006, E-0000, 6/E-2202 Reference RFI: T-0567					WSPFK Response: Per sheet note J on Sheet E1-006, the scope for TG06.0 shall include fire alarm system conduits embedded in the Lower Concourse slab that are required to serve fire alarm equipment that is located at the Train Platform level. Note that conduits for fire alarm devices on the Lower Concourse level will be provided under a separate scope package.		
Per the response to RFI T-567, the fire management system conduit is to be installed into the concourse slab per Note on Sheet E-0006 . However, per Plan Sheet E-0000, only a small grounding portion of electrical drawings are in the TG06.0 concourse slab scope. The remaining concourse level electrical drawings are "For Reference Only" and for informational purposes only. Please confirm that the only TG06.0 electrical scopes in the concourse slab are the grounding wire extensions from the mud slab (per Detail 6/E 2202-TG06.2 scope), lighting conduit and boxes for Type "F15" and Exit Signs, and 4" 90 degree elbows per Details 1 & 2 on TE 1-8000. Please confirm that outside of those scopes, all other electrical scopes of work in the concourse slab are to be part of a later electrical scope package as indicated on the E-0000 index and the "for information only" plans.							
<hr/>							
T-0586.1	BGP - Fire Management System in the Concourse Slab Only	Closed	07/12/2013	07/22/2013	07/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per the response to RFI T-567 (attached), please confirm that the only slab with embedded fire system conduit is the concourse slab. All stub ups or risers will either come up out of the concourse slab for the concourse level fire management system or drop down out of the concourse slab for the fire management system on the train platform level. Please confirm that the fire management system is not embedded in the mat slab.					This RFI gets into contractors' means and methods. The contractor can route the fire alarm conduit embedded in either the Lower Concourse slab or the Foundation Mat Slab as required to provide connectivity to the fire alarm devices shown on the electrical drawings.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1125 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0587	BGP - Future Train Platform Wall Reinforcing Size and Spacing	Closed	06/05/2013	06/15/2013	06/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference RFI:T-0480 The contractor is to construct the future train platform walls using the thickness of the wall as called out within the specific zone sheet (1'-0" or 1'-2"). When coordinating the wall thickness called out in the Plan with Detail 5 on S1-3205 Future Wall Detail no specific bar size or spacing is called out for the 1'-2" thick walls. Please confirm if the reinforcing required for the 1'-2" walls is the same as that called out for a 12" wall, #6 @ 8" oc.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, the dowels for future train platform room walls that are 1'-2" thick are #6@8"OC each face.		
<hr/>							
T-0588	BGP - Future Partition Wall Dowel Size Spacing	Closed	06/06/2013	06/06/2013	06/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Contract drawing S1-2052 depicts 12" Partition Walls and 12" Future Partition Walls. Contract drawing S 1-9050 provides the reinforcing details for the Partition Walls which depict #7 @ 12" OC reinforcing dowels for a 12" wall. Per S 1-3205 Future 12" Walls receive #6 @8" OC reinforcing dowels. Please confirm the proper bar size for the Future Partition Wall dowels.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> "Future 12 thk conc wall partitions" shall be reinforced per S1-9050 as they are labeled as partition walls. Detail 5/S1-3205 is for future walls within the train platforms.		
<hr/>							
T-0589	BGP - Epoxy Coating Thickness Over Formsaver Couplers	Closed	06/06/2013	06/16/2013	06/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: 6/S1-3001, Attached Letter The response to RFI T 0515 confirmed to coat the form saver couplers for future construction as specified in ASTM A 775. Per ASTM A 775, the standard coating thickness specifies a required thickness range by which different size bars are to be coated 7 to 12 mills for bar sizes 3 to 5 and 7 to 16 mills for bar sizes 6 to 18; however, detail 6 on S1-3001 indicates a 12 mill minimum coating thickness over the couplers. Per the attached			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We understand that the epoxy-coated form-saver couplers supplied by Lenton may contain a mill thickness less than 12 while still complying with ASTM A 775 and consider this acceptable.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1126 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>letter from Stanley Johnson the Regional Manager for Erico (Lenton) the epoxy coated form-saver couplers specified for use cannot be procured with a guaranteed 12 mill coating but rather an epoxy coating that meets the requirements of the ASTM A 775 standard. Please confirm that supplying an epoxy coated form-saver coupler that meets the ASTM A 775 standard but may contain a mill thickness less than 12 is acceptable.</p>							
T-0590	BGP - Mechanical Room Plumbing Clarifications 002	Closed	06/06/2013	06/16/2013	06/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: Attached Drawing, P1-2022, Spec Section 22 13 01		See the WSP/MDS comments on the attached document.					
Reference attached mechanical room layout drawing P-112. Per the marked up referenced drawing please clarify or provide following:							
1. Invert elevations of the piping connecting the sumps.							
2. Verify dimensions of the pipes spacing and offsets, per attachment.							
3. Size and locations of the equipment pad.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1127 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0591	BGP - Mechanical Room Plumbing Clarifications 001	Closed	06/06/2013	06/06/2013	06/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Drawing, P1-2022, Spec Section 22 13 01 Reference attached drainage layout drawing P-110. Please verify marked up dimensions for the pipe spacing.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The dimensions for pipe spacing are acceptable. Comments: 1. The "1/2 SAN" shown for the floor sink to be corrected to show 1/2" trap primer. 2. All vent connections to horizontal drainage pipe shall have their inverts taken off above the drainage pipe center line downstream of the trap being vented (CPC 505.2). Generally, this is accomplished by rolling-up the wye fitting.		
T-0592	BGP - Mechanical Room Plumbing Clarifications 003	Closed	06/06/2013	06/16/2013	06/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Drawing, P1-2022, Spec Section 22 13 01 Reference attached drainage drawing P-113. Please verify marked up dimensions for pipes spacing.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the stairs 202 and 203 there are only (2) drain and vent piping connections. (1) 6" sprinkler drain and (1) 3" vent (refer also detail 3/P1-6001). The 6" sprinkler drain to be located with the center line 12" from the face of the column (or wall for stair 203) and then 12" to the 3" vent. Also, all vent connections to horizontal drainage pipe shall have their inverts taken off above the drainage pipe center line downstream of the trap being vented (CPC 505.2). Generally, this is accomplished by rolling-up the wye fitting.		
T-0593	BGP - Concrete Clear Cover of Reinforcing Support Bars	Closed	06/06/2013	06/16/2013	06/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1129 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div>Co-Author:</div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference: Attached Drawings</div><div>Please see the attached drawing of the proposed manlift pad to be installed flushed with the mudslab in Zone 2. Per WSP/Flack & Kurtz the dimension of soil between mudslab and top of geothermal pipe must be maintained at all times. It was stated that the geothermal piping could be installed 12" deeper as long as the rise of the pipe follow the radius loop bend requirments, in the method that the geothermal is installed in the sump pits. Please confirm that this is acceptable.</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>WSP Response: Please provide the structural loading weight of the Personnel Hoist and concrete pad in pounds per square foot.</div></div></div>							
T-0596	BGP - Sump Pit Grate and Frame at Gridline 19/C	Closed	06/11/2013	06/21/2013	06/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu</div> <div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Jesse Dillon</div>			<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>See attached drawing CB-2 of returned submittal package TG0600-710, P1-2025, and A1-2125.</div><div>The returned (returned to WOJV/SCCI on 06/07/13) shop drawing submittal (TG0600-710) for catch basin and sump pit grating indicates an additional sump pit grate and frame at approx. GL 19/C per drawing CB-2. The contract drawing P1-2025 does not have a call-out for a grate and frame at this location. Furthermore, drawing A1-2125 has the sump pit located within an escalator pit in the mat slab level. Per Field Order T-00011, all escalator pits do not receive grates or frames.</div><div>Please confirm the sump pit at GL 19/C does not have a grate and frame. An expedited response is requested in order to release the full order of frames and grates in a timely manner.</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>The sump pit at grid lines 19/C is located within an escalator pit. Frame and grate are not required.</div></div>							
T-0597	BGP - Concourse Deck Capacity for Construction Loads	Closed	06/11/2013	06/21/2013	06/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome</div> <div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div> <div>Co-Author:</div>			<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0597.1	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference: Attached Documents</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable to use a Sky Trak 8042 forklift with an approximate operating weight of 25,365 lbs and rated load capacity of 6,000 lbs on the concourse level deck without temporary shoring in place. The forklift is intended for use on the concourse level deck for the installation of wall reinforcing steel. Should this weight exceed the capacity of the structure please advise as to the structure's load capacities without temporary shoring in place for alternate equipment selection and planning.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The design load of the concourse level floor is noted on the contract document S-1002. Provide information on maximum fork-lift wheel reaction If the contract would want TT to evaluate the floor framing for the load imposed by the fork-lift.</p>				
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</p>		Closed	06/28/2013	07/08/2013	07/09/2013	<p>Potentially <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Per response to SCCI's RFI 215 (T-0597) see attached axle loadings for Sky Trak forklift model no. 8042. The forklift is intended for use on the concourse level deck for the installation of wall reinforcing steel.</p> <p>Please confirm if it is acceptable to use noted forklift on top of concourse slab.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The forklift identified in the RFI is acceptable for use on top of the Lower Concourse slab. NOTE that this response is for the forklift and its carrying capacity only and does NOT consider additional construction loads that may be present at the time of this forklift use.</p> <p>Please refer to original RFI T-0597 response for reference to Lower Concourse design loads.</p>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0598	BGP - Fire Management System Class A vs. Class B	Closed	06/12/2013	06/22/2013	06/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Documents, E1-5201 After consulting with Siemens on the fire management system a clarification is needed. The riser diagram on sheet EI-5201 shows Class A conduit routing for the train platform level and the lower concourse level. Using a Class A wiring layout limits the system to 3 or 4 strobe devices per circuit. Under the NFPA 130 6.3.3.2.8 specification, the embedded (note (1) of the specification) fire management conduit protects against the ASTM E119 fire conditions and Class A isn't required per NFP A specification. Is it acceptable to design the fire management conduit system to meet the NFP A 130 specification under Class B requirements and impliment 6 or 7 strobe devices per circuit instead of the 3 or 4 stobe devices per Class A. By implimenting a Class B system, the future fire management system (installed under a future contract) will be less costly all while meeting the the NFP A 130 requirements. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> WSP Response: We confirm the Specification requirements for Class A wiring shall apply. The design of the conduit systems shall be configured to achieve Class A wiring for the fire alarm communication circuits that will power the strobelights at the Train Platform Level and Lower Concourse Level. Although we have designed for embedded conduit where possible, we cannot assure in the future design that we can embed or provide approved fire rated cable from the source fire alarm panel to the end device, since the fire rated cable systems that were planned for extension of the circuits have had their listings voided. Embedment and layout for Class A wiring will provide the required protection to meet code and to provide the future flexibility for the life of the building.				
T-0599	BGP - Continuous Concrete Insert Elevations	Closed	06/13/2013	06/23/2013	06/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Documents, Drawing A1-6231 Please reference the attached - clouded, Submittal TG0600- 110 BGP -Concrete Formwork Lift #1 sheet, comment regarding the elevation of the cast-in-place continuous concrete insert. The submittal comment requests an adjustment of the concrete insert elevations. In the attached RFI T-0506 the elevations of the concrete inserts were given to accomplish equal spacing as required by the drawings, as well as incorporate the agreed upon adjustments to the top and bottom insert. SCCI would like to verify that the given elevations of the cast-in members in the clouded section of RFI T-0506 are the correct elevations.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to the attached SKA -2745 which confirms the elevations of the continuous concrete inserts.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1132 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0599.1	BGP - Horizontal Cast-In Inserts at EFCO Form Panels	Closed	11/19/2013	11/29/2013	11/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic REQUEST: See attached photo and reference RFI 599. Interior rib of the EFCO form panels lines up with the cast-in insert at EL -27.08'. SCCI intention is to bolt the inserts to the forms and this makes it difficult to properly secure the cast-in insert prior to concrete placement. SCCI proposes to lower or raise this insert 2" in order to properly secure it to the form. Is this acceptable?							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/20/2013 RESPONSE: It is acceptable to lower the cast-in insert as indicated in the RFI. Cast-in insert at EL -27.08' can be lowered 2" to have a new elevation of EL -27.25' to coordinate with the formwork installation.				
T-0600	BGP - Internal Wall Discrepancies 003	Closed	06/17/2013	06/27/2013	06/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon REQUEST: Reference attached marked up CD A1-9217 detail D. Referenced detail shows openings in the wall along the GL D. These openings appear to be in conflict with the moment beam that runs along GL D. Please clarify.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached SKA-2743 which shows modifications to the Detail Elevation D on A1-9217 for the Mechanical Opening adjusted for the beam CD-15 along GL D.				
T-0601	BGP - Internal Wall Discrepancies 004	Closed	06/17/2013	06/27/2013	06/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon REQUEST: Reference attached marked up CD A 1-9217 detail E. Referenced detail shows openings in the wall near GL5 and GL D. This opening appears to be in conflict with the moment beam that runs along GL D. Please clarify.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached SKA-2744 which shows modifications to the Detail Elevation E on A1-9217 for the Mechanical Opening adjusted for the beam CD-15 along GL D.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0602	Arup Monitoring Instruments	Closed	07/02/2013	07/12/2013	07/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: 3/A1-8711 and 6/A1-8711 BBII's dewatering wells and piezometers are installed per Detail 6 on Sheet A1-8711 which clearly shows how the wells and piezometers will be filled and capped after the dewatering has been decommissioned. Detail 3 on Sheet A1-8711 does not provide any indication that these piezometers will be plugged and/or filled. Does the design team intend on leaving these piezometer holes open after the dewatering is shut off? If not, please provide a revised 3/A1-8711 clarifying the design teams intent.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The monitoring instruments / piezometers will continue to function for a few years after the entire building has been completed, therefore will remain as shown on detail 3 / A1-8711. No additional detail is required at this time. The instrumentation cables are inside a 2" dia steel pipe. A seal between the sleeve and the pipe is provided by the two linkseals. When the instruments are decommissioned, the conduit is cut off and the opening sealed. Then a steel cap is fully welded to the ring flange at the top of the sleeve, which is flush to the top of the mat slab.			
<hr/>							
T-0603	BSE - Beale PG&E Utilities	Closed	06/19/2013	06/29/2013	07/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Lynn Kowallis		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Transbay PMPC Douglas Jacobson			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Rodney Gordon							
REQUEST: Refer RFI T-0286 Specification Section 01 53 13 Please reference W/O RFI T-0286. For First and Fremont street BBII was directed to use a cable weight of 8.2 lb/ft to be used with the 6" conduit. BBII was supplied with a weight of 3 lb/ft for fiber cable used in 4" conduit (not PG&E conduit). BBII does not have a cable weight for 4" PG&E conduit. 1. Please confirm that the 6" PG&E conduit on Beale Street will contain a 8.2 lb/ft cable. 2. Please clarify the weight/ft of the cable used in the 4" PG&E conduit on Beale Street. This information is necessary to design the utility supports on the Beale street Bridge.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Based on the attached Reference Data table, the total wt. of rigid conduit + conductors: 4" dia = 19.7 plf; 6" diameter = 40.0 plf			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0604	#2 CPH Platform through Mat Slab in Zone 2	Closed	06/20/2013	06/30/2013	07/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please see the attached shop drawings and layout of the construction personnel hoist (CPH) to be installed in Zone 2. The CPH elevated steel PLATFORM to be installed and later removed and poured back such as the trestle pile penetrations.			The proposed Zone 2 personnel hoist installation described in the RFI is acceptable to the Design Team.				
All work dimensions have been coordinated with structure overhead into future bid packages as well as as-built information of internal bracing in the field.							
We propose to :							
1) Lower the geothermal piping an additional 12" to maintain the same 15" deep trench under all concrete. This will be performed the same way they install the piping in the sump pits with correct bend radius.							
2) Install at 19'-6" x 13'-0" x 16" thickened slab incorporated with the current 4" reinforced mudslab. The thickened slab will contain #5 bars 12" OC EW T&B and we have confirmed that the total load of thickened slab, CPH, and platform will not exceed 500 PSF.							
3) Install CPH elevated steel platform through the mat slab with 3'-0" of clearance between top of mat slab and bottom of platform deck and beams.							
4) Waterproof platform legs per detail 5/A1-8711 04/29/13 per ASI 0102 Issued for Construction, Below Grade Package, including galvanized penetration sleeves and waterproofing. Penetration sleeve will be 30" diameter.							
5) Reinforcing details will be the same as all other reinforcing at pin/trestle pile blockouts.							
Please confirm this is all acceptable.							
<hr/>							
T-0605	BGP - Plumbing and Electrical Autocad Files	Closed	06/21/2013	07/01/2013	06/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0607	BGP - Bracing Removal Sequence- Area 5-16	Closed	06/21/2013	07/01/2013	06/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Spencer Sayles			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>The latest Webcor's weekly update schedule received by SCCI (Data date 06.17.2013), shows that:</p> <p>* "Bracing Removal- Level D" (BGSOX-1120) is the driving predecessor to "Wall Waterproofing- 1st lift" (BGSOX-4000)- in each area.</p> <p>* "Bracing Removal- Level E" (BGSOX-41 00) is the predecessor to "Wall Waterproofing- 2nd lift" (BGSOX - 4110)- in each area</p> <p>* "Bracing Removal- Level B" (BGSOX-6000) is the predecessor to "Wall Waterproofing- 3rd lift" (BGSOX - 6010) in each area</p> <p>Based on the current schedule logic, the bracing will need to be modified to allow the removal of walers and struts in each area, separately and independently from each other. E.g: Any walers spanning two areas will need to be cut during removal ofbracing so seer can proceed with the waterproofing install in that area, without having to wait for the adjacent area. This is applicable to Bracing Removal level B, C and D.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>				<p>As was discussed in yesterday's schedule meeting, please provide a detailed wall pour sequence schedule and indicate where specific waler conflicts are anticipated. We will be able to perform an analysis at that point in time.</p>			
<hr/>							
T-0608	Detail of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement	Closed	06/26/2013	07/06/2013	07/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michael Spillane	To: Turner Construction Company	Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Reference Documents: Exhibits A - C, RFI SCI# 236</p> <p>This RFI addresses the transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement at GL6 at the south west corner see Location Plan exhibit - A Exhibit - B (RFI- T-0448.5) proposed the modification of the reinforcement and this detail exhibit C clarifies the exact location and detail where the modified reinforcement changes to the contract reinforcement</p> <p>This detail if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings</p> <p>Please confirm if this detail is acceptable</p>				<p>The proposed foundation wall reinforcement transition is acceptable.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0608.1	BGP - Revised Spacing to Foundation Wall Vertical Reinforcement in Area 2	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPJackson Tukuafu</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
A 16-ft portion of the Area 2 wall vertical reinforcement, between GL 6 and 7, has been installed at 6" OC instead of the required WR1 spacing (8" OC).				George Metzger 10/11/2013		RESPONSE:	
Please confirm the as-built vertical wall reinforcement spacing identified in the attached sketch is acceptable.				Please resubmit the RFI with the sketch referenced in the question.			
T-0608.2	BGP - Revised Spacing to Foundation Wall Vertical Reinforcement in Area 2	Closed	10/14/2013	10/24/2013	10/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPJackson Tukuafu</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please reference drawing S1-2061.				George Metzger 10/16/2013		RESPONSE:	
A 16-ft portion of the Area 2 wall vertical reinforcement, between GL 6 and 7, has been installed at 6" OC instead of the required WR1 spacing (8" OC).				As built vertical wall reinforcement spacing indicated in the RFI is acceptable. Please incorporate this change into as-built drawings.			
Please confirm the as-built vertical wall reinforcement spacing identified in the attached excerpt drawing sheet S1-2061 is acceptable.							
T-0609	BGP - Clear Cover to the Vertical Reinforcement on the Foundation Wall	Closed	07/03/2013	07/13/2013	07/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPMichael Spillane</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author:</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: Exhibit A, Attached				Maximum acceptable clear cover between the waterproofing system and foundation wall vertical reinforcement is 6 inches. For clear cover larger than 6 inches, evaluation will be made on a case by case basis. Submit information for review where clear cover exceeds 6". For this calculation, waterproofing thickness can be assumed 2 inches and location of foundation wall reinforcement can be assumed as indicated in contract drawings.			
At some locations the clear cover to the vertical reinforcement on the foundation wall will be far in excess of the 2" shown on detail 1/S1-3201. Base on the RFI T-180.1 (see Exhibit - A) the clear cover could potentially be up 8" at the interface between the foundation wall at lower mat slab elevation and the waterproofing system.							
Existing grade elevation = +25' + (protection slab elevation = -42') = 67' X 1/200 (CDSM pile vertical tolerance) = 4"							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1138 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0610	BGP - Micropiles at CPH #2 Thickened Slab From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: REQUEST: Reference Sketch: SK-001 There are 4 micropiles within the perimeter of the thickened slab at CPH #2. Hand excavation will occur around these micropiles to keep from damaging the grout columns. The grout columns will be considered penetrations, in the structural design of the thickened mudslab and trim steel will be installed accordingly at each micropile. We will be installing butyl tape around the exposed grout column and onto the micropile, to top of thickened mudslab as a bond breaker. Please confirm this is acceptable.	Closed	06/24/2013	07/04/2013	07/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to proposed micropile detailing at thickened mudslab as presented in RFI. Adamson Associates Comment: The proposal in this RFI is not to alter the waterproofing system.			
		SUGGESTION:					
		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0611	SSS - Grout Hole Diameter and Material	Closed	06/24/2013	07/04/2013	07/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference RFI: CN-005 Following up with the response to RFI CN-005 please clarify the following: 1. Please advise if steel pipes intend to be filled with grout or concrete. 2. If the filler is grout, a 1" hole for venting should work. We do not need a 3" hole for venting. 3. If the filler is grout please advise if locations of the grout holes in cast nodes have been reviewed in the 3D model for accessibility in the field after nodes are attached to structural steel. 4. If steel pipes are filled with concrete and 3" hole must be patched with partial penetration weld please provide proposed detail and procedure for PJP weld. 5. Please provide procedure for patching the node grout hole.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Steel pipe is to be filled with 4000 psi pea gravel concrete. 2. As noted in the response #1 to RFI CN-005, the 1" dia hole in the cast node will be remain to serve as a vent hole. 3. Hole in the cast node is to be used as vent hole, not as a grout port. W/O should review the constructability issue raised as this is a means and method issue. 4. As noted in item 2 of RFI CN-005 response, the 3" dia hole and patching details will be provided in a future ASI. 5. 1" dia hole in the node does not require patching.				
T-0611.1	SSS - Grout Hole Options	Closed	08/19/2013	08/29/2013	08/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: S1-4002 Reference RFI: T-0611 Reference Sketch: Sketch 1, Sketch 2 Design documents do not specify or provide procedures for filling the steel pipe column with 4,000psi pea gravel. The following two options are proposed, please review and advise. Option 1 (prefered) 1. Locate 3" grout hole at the back of the pipe to provide access from inside of the building. 2. Locate 3" grout hole about 6" below CJP weld.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is a contractor's means and method issue. Arup fire/blast engineer indicated that the fill needs to be concrete with carbonate aggregate with strength from 4000 to 6000 psi. From the IFC document, a 3" dia grout hole is to be provided for concrete pumping. If the pea gravel cannot travel thru the 1" dia hole in the bus deck cast node, a second group hole is needed above the bus deck node for pumping concrete above the bus deck. Using grout (with siliceous aggregates) is not permitted.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

3. Fill out pipe with concrete up to the hole.
4. Use 1" vent / grout hole in the cast node to fill out the upper void with grout (not concrete). If it is not required leave the void to reduce added cost.

Option 2

1. Weld a pipe nozzle with threaded end with a valve to 3" grout port.
2. Pump up concrete to completely fill the pipe column including voids in cast nodes.
3. Shut down the valve and wait until concrete sets.
4. Cut the pipe nozzle off.
5. Clean up the nozzle weld, remove extra concrete, weld in the plug, grind to AESS requirements, touch up.
6. Note: this option will be very expensive.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0611.2	SSS - Grout Hole Options	Closed	08/28/2013	09/07/2013	09/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference RFI: T-0611.1			TT has previous responded to RFI 611.1. TT's original response is excerpted below:				
Reference Sketch: Attached							
The response to RFI T-0611.1 does not address the question. If grouting of the void in the cast node per Option 1 is not permitted, then Option 2 should be applied to completely fill the pipe column and the void in the cast node with concrete. Please confirm this is acceptable.			"This is a contractor's means and method issue. Arup fire/blast engineer indicated that the fill needs to be concrete with carbonate aggregate with strength from 4000 to 6000 psi. From the IFC document, a 3" dia grout hole is to be provided for concrete pumping. If the pea gravel cannot travel thru the 1" dia hole in the bus deck cast node, a second group hole is needed above the bus deck node for pumping concrete above the bus deck. Using grout (with siliceous aggregates) is not permitted."				
			TT is not in the position to give instruction to the contractor on how to fill the pipe with pea gravel concrete, as it is contractor's Means and Methods as stated in the original response. Some other possible options are discussed below for contractor's consideration:				
			Instead of using a 3" grout hole above the ground floor node as noted in Option 2, the contractor can pour the concrete through a 3" hole above the bus deck node and let the grout flowing through the 1" hole in the bus deck node to the pipe below, and the existing grout hole in the ground floor node can be used as a vent hole.				
			The Contractor may decide to grout the pipe by pouring concrete from the top of the lower pipe before the bus deck cast node is welded.				
			The Contractor may decide to grout the pipe by pouring concrete from the top of the upper pipe after the bus deck cast node is welded but before the roof node is welded (an external vibrator might be needed to facilitate the flow of the pea gravel concrete thru the 1" hole in the center of the bus deck node.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0612	B2 Electrical Room	Closed	06/24/2013	07/04/2013	07/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Drawing: A1-9214					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm the pilaster size and whether a control joint is required at the single door opening to B2 Emergency Electrical Room B2880 adjacent to GL C, 1.4 and verify adjacent wall openings.					Please refer to attached SKA-2746, 2747, 2748, 2749 and 2750 which provides updated wall, door opening and control joint locations for the B2 Emergency Electrical Room B2880.		
<hr/>							
T-0612.1	BGP - Revised Plumbing Layout in Emergency Electrical Room B2	Closed	08/14/2013	08/24/2013	08/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: T-0612					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The response to RFI T-0612 BGP revised the location of the doors to Emergency Electrical Room B2280. Are there any Mechanical, Electrical or Plumbing revisions required in Below Grade Package, to accommodate equipment layout changes resulting from the modified door locations.					For revised routing of vent and trap primer lines within the mat slab at Room B2280. Refer to attached sketch PSK-2022.		
			Minola Anghel / MDS		8/14/2013		
<hr/>							
T-0612.2	BGP - Updated Plumbing Drawing	Closed	09/06/2013	09/16/2013	09/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please refer to T-0612.1 and drawing P1-3002.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The vent and trap primer lines within the mat slab at Room B2280 were revised in the Foundation Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan PSK-2022 via RFI T-0612.1. The revised drawing did not include an enlarged plan detail.					George Metzger 9/9/2013 RESPONSE: See the attached drawing PSK-3002. CMGC should note that RFI's are answers to questions. The Contract Documents are not continuously updated to follow all questions and answers that arise during construction. All drawings that may relate to a RFI answer will not necessarily be updated when the RFI answer is provided.		
Please provide the revised enlarged drawing plan shown on detail 1 of sheet P1-3002 for coordination.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1143 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0613	BSE - Excavation For Zone 4 Timber Pile Survey	Closed	06/24/2013	07/04/2013	07/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Kelly Phariss							
REQUEST: Please see attached BBII Letter 4225-000-1232.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1. In Zone 4, East of the buttress shafts, BBII would like to excavate down 3 feet within the 50' berm in order to uncover timber piles. Please confirm this acceptable.					ARUP Response:		
2. Please confirm if the soils need to be immediately backfilled upon completion of the survey or if the excavated elevation can remain.					This is acceptable east of the buttress and west of Beale Street only.		
T-0614	BGP - C21 Column Vert Std. Hooks, Replace with HRC 555 T-head	Closed	06/24/2013	07/04/2013	07/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing S1-3302			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Section 1 on sheet SI-3302 depicts a standard hook at the bottom of the #11 vertical for the embedded C21 column. Please confirm it's acceptable to replace the standard hook with an HRC 555 T-head similar to that of the typical vertical wall reinforcing.					It is not acceptable to replace the standard hooks with heads in Detail 1/S1-3302. The possibility of using heads in the second layer of vertical bars in this detail was previously discussed with Seismic and Structural Review Committee (SSRC). Citing minimum clear spacing requirements between headed bars, SSRC recommended use of hooks in the second layer of vertical bars as indicated in the construction drawings.		
T-0615	BGP - Clear Cover Notation Discrepancy with RFI 339 Response	Closed	06/24/2013	07/04/2013	06/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing S1-3302, S1-3201			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Section 1 on S1-3302 details 2-1 /4" clear cover from the face of concrete to the typical wall vertical reinforcing. Per the response to RFI T-0339, the clear cover to the vertical reinforcing was confirmed to be 2" and the cross-ties would encroach into the 2" clear cover. Please confirm the wall vertical reinforcing cover detail in 1/S 1-3302 is superseded by the response outlining the clear cover requirements in RFI T-0339.					The wall vertical reinforcing cover detail in 1/S1-3302 is not superseded by our response to RFI T-0339. RFI T-0339 was on detail 1/S1-3201. Detail 1/S1-3201 and detail 1/S1-3302 correspond to different sections through the foundation wall. Detail 1/S1-3201 is a typical section and detail 1/S1-3302 is embedded columns within the foundation wall. 2-1/4" cover to the vertical reinforcement is specified in Detail 1/S1-3302 because of the larger cross ties required in the embedded columns.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0616	BGP - Micro Pile and Mat Slab CJ Conflict	Closed	06/24/2013	07/04/2013	06/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing S1-3001 See attached sketches of the mat slab joint between S101 and S102. While performing the layout of the mat slab construction joints SCCI has discovered a conflict between one of the micro piles and the CJ between the two noted mat slab areas. SCCI will not be able to construct the joint as shown Detail 2 on CD S1-3001, with the micro pile in the way. SCCI proposes to modify the mat slab construction joint, to clear the conflicting micro pile, as shown on the attached sketches. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It will be acceptable to modify the mat construction joint as proposed in the RFI.		
T-0617	BGP - Catch Basin at the Construction Joint	Closed	06/24/2013	07/04/2013	07/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing A1-2813 See attached lift drawings S105.0, S105.4, and CD A1-2813. For construction convenience, SCCI is proposing to move catch basin that falls between GL 8-9 and South of GL J, 24" westward (towards GL 8). Moving noted CB will make this part of the drainage system fall within the S105 mat slab our, and not have CB split between the CJ. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to shift the catch basin 2'-0" directly West to avoid conflict with the mat slab construction joint. See attached sketch SKA-2756.		
T-0618	BGP - Mechanical Room Plumbing Clarifications 004	Closed	06/25/2013	07/05/2013	07/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing P1-2022, Spec Section 22 13 01 Reference attached marked up CD PI-2022 and the drainage layout drawings. One of the floor sinks is located in the pin pile blockout. This creates a conflict between the added reinforcement in the mat slab and the floor sink.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For revised piping layout of the Domestic Booster and Irrigation Pump Room, see attached sketch PSK-2022 and SKA-2761.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1145 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please provide details for this conflict.							
T-0619	BGP - CDSM Wall Encroachments rebar details- RFI T-0448.5	Closed	06/26/2013	07/06/2013	07/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon		To: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Within the issued response to RFI 448.5 no details were provided to depict the reinforcing configuration at the point in which the wall steps from it's reduced width back to it's original contract width of 36". Please provide a detail depicting the acceptable configuration at both the typical wall section and of the concourse level which includes the spandrel beam/wall interface.				Please refer to RFI response T-0608. The WOJV generated RFI T-0608 anticipated these revisions and was submitted prior to RFI T-0619 (SCCI #236).			
T-0620	BGP - Strut Bracing Conflicts With Shear Walls and Columns	Closed	06/26/2013	07/06/2013	07/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: Drawing S1-3260, S1-3301, S1-2030 Based on the layout of the shoring and diagonal struts in the West end of the job, shear wall reinforcement (as shown on CD S1-3260) and the diagonal struts are in conflict. CD S1-3260 shows continuous vertical shear wall reinforcement from top of the mat slab to top of concourse deck. To avoid constructability issues SCCI suggests for shear walls to be constructed with horizontal construction joints at the same elevation as the first level of foundation walls. Adding horizontal joints will require modification of the reinforcement. Please confirm this is acceptable.				Contractor-proposed addition of horizontal CJ's for the shearwalls is acceptable. Contractor to propose reinforcement changes for submittal review.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0621	CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 3	Closed	06/26/2013	07/06/2013	07/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference Documents: Exhibits A - H

This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north wall in slab area 3 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 1 to 32 as well. Location Plan see exhibit - A

Exhibit - B , C & H depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching

Option A

Webcor is proposing to change the alignment of the Concrete Foundation wall on the north elevation along gridlines A between gridlines 1 and 5 - 6 (CDSM piles 1 to 50)

The Concrete foundation wall which runs along gridline A between gridlines 1 and 5-6 would be offset into the structure by 0.1979' (2-3/8") the proposed Face of concrete Foundation wall would then be 2-3/8" off gridline A, this offset would enable the contract reinforcement to be installed without the need for further modifications to the reinforcement due to encroachment of the CDSM piles in concrete pour Areas 3 & 4. See Exhibit - H

Option B

WOJV proposal: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 1 to 20-21 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear all the encroaching SP. This foundation wall area was originally a WR1 reinforcement area (#11@8"oc EF vertically) and would change to #11@6"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.1 see Exhibit - D.

Between CDSM piles 20-21 to 22 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness again to 33 5/8" to clear all the encroaching SP, originally this was a WR2 reinforcement area #11@6"oc vertically and would change to #11@5"OC the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit - E)

Between CDSM piles 22 to 31 the reinforcement would remain unchanged as per the Contract Reinforcement.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Option A

For Option A the proposed revision is acceptable, with the following conditions:

The Train Box design is restricted at the B2 Train Platform Level by the Rail Vehicle Kinematic Envelopes (RVKE). The B1 Lower Concourse Level is strictly controlled by space planning constraints, particularly minimum requirements for Public Utility rooms, service rooms and associated structural and service coordination.

The CDSM wall zone described in this RFI is outside of the RVKE, therefore at the B2 level the foundation wall face can be offset as proposed. However, at B1 Level, the offset will affect Utility Room and Service configurations.

If Option A is adopted, either:

1) Provided the foundation wall configuration and structural design permit, the offset should only occur in this area at the B2 Level and transition back to the original alignment on Gridline A before reaching the B1 Level.

OR

2) Any offset to the foundation wall face at B1 Level will require adjustment to space planning, coupler layouts, structural / service opening coordination and potentially may need further negotiations with Public Utility Companies i.e. it is not acceptable to simply 'shave off' a couple of inches from a room at this level.

Note that all transitions are to be smooth and not stepped.

Our comments for proposed Option B are as follows:

1) It is not acceptable to transition foundation reinforcement width and/or vertical rebar spacing within sections where specified foundation wall



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0621.1	CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 3	Closed	07/12/2013	07/22/2013	07/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>See Exhibit-G showing a detail of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement with a non-contact reinforcement lap detail. Either of these options if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings Please confirm if either of these options would be acceptable</p>		<p>reinforcement is "WR2" or where there is an embedded column per construction documents. Provide uniform reinforcement width and rebar spacing within these regions. The transitions can be acceptable at the ends of (or just outside) these regions.</p> <p>2) Foundation wall rebar WR2 and embedded columns are designed using vertical rebar spacing of 6" (see construction documents). Proposed changes to this spacing can negatively impact the constructability moment frame beam at the lower concourse level. As an example, see attached sketch which shows the rebar detail at the lower concourse moment frame beam and foundation wall. To assist in addressing these constructability issues it may be acceptable to move wall rebar a maximum of 3/4 inch as needed.</p> <p>3) Use of tighter foundation wall rebar spacing than those specified in the construction drawings will negatively impact the constructability at the ground floor, where moment frame beams join the foundation wall. To assist in addressing these constructability issues it may be acceptable to move wall rebar a maximum of 3/4 inch as needed.</p> <p>4) Min center-to-center spacing between two #11 foundation wall vertical rebar with heads cannot be less than 5" (3.5 times bar diameter). The rule does not apply for hooked rebar. This is a general comment provided as a reminder for future revision requests."</p> <p>The Design Team must be informed of the contractor's preferred approach prior to committing to shop drawings.</p>					
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>		<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1148 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0621.2	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Documents: Exhibits A - C</p> <p>This RFI is an additional request based on the response to RFI T- 621 option A (see exhibit - A) The original RFI T- 621 option A addressed the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles on the north wall in slab in areas 3 and 4 by proposing to offset the face of concrete foundation wall by 0.1979' (2-3/8") into the structure. WOJV note the original response where it was acceptable to offset the foundation wall between B2 and B1 elevations but would have to transition back to design alignment between B1 and ground elevation however this transition back would not be possible as there are CDSM piles encroaching the full high of the foundation wall, with that WOJV is proposing the following possible solution, to continue the revised offset alignment between B1 and ground elevation however limiting it to an area between GL 1 and 2-3 (CDSM piles 1 to 21)full wall height , WOJV acknowledge the fact the PG&E transformer room need to remain at its current size but feel there may be some scope to slightly change the dimensions of the main switchgear room or the service corridor or both see exhibit B and exhibit C.</p> <p>This proposal if acceptable to offset the foundation wall would enable the contract reinforcement to be installed without the need for further modifications due to encroachment.</p> <p>Please confirm if this option would be acceptable</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>As discussed in the meeting with TJPA, WOJV, Turner, AAI and WSP (07/22/13), the proposed solution to maintain the offset of the foundation wall up through Level B1 is acceptable to the Design Team subject to the following adjustments:</p> <p>PG&E Transformer Vault (B1223/4) shall remain the same size and shift south by 2-3/8". Main Switchgear Room (B1222) will absorb the 2-3/8" wall shift south. Floor opening in NW corner of Main Switchgear Room will shift south 2-3/8" with wall. North Electrical Room (B1289) shall remain same size and shift down 2-3/8" (with electrical slab opening). Landscape Storage (B1288) will accommodate the 2-3/8" wall shift south. Fire Main POE (B1290) wall will move 2-3/8" south. Plumbing Intake Room (B1229) shall absorb the 2-3/8" foundation wall shift south.</p> <p>Please also note that RFI 621 was on Area 3, not on 3 and 4 as indicated in RFI 621.1</p>				
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Ryan Burke</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Moving the foundation wall vertical rebar more than 3/4 inch is not acceptable. Clashes between foundation wall vertical rebar and mat rebar, if any, can be addressed moving the mat rebar up to 1-3/8 inches.</p>				
			07/24/2013	08/03/2013	07/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>

Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>#10 (1 ½"), in the worst case a mat reinforcing bar will clash with the vertical bar when the layout ends up with both bars installed on the same centerline. Please confirm that in this case, the reinforcing can be moved the 1 3/8" to avoid the clash.</p>						
T-0621.3	BGP - Area 3 North Wall Verts Clearance Near GL 2	Closed	01/27/2014	02/06/2014	01/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: RFI T-0621.1 and drawing S1-3201.				George Metzger			
Due to the CDSM soldier pile encroachment, the area 3 North foundation wall reinforcement was moved 2-3/8" towards the center of the structure per RFI T-0621.1. During placement of a 4'-6" section (8 vertical bars) of the first lift of the foundation wall exterior vertical steel approximately 2'-0" west of GL 2, it was discovered that there was 1/4" to 1" of clearance between the waterproofing and vertical bars. The concern is once the cross-ties are placed between the vertical bar and waterproofing, there would not be enough concrete coverage.				1/29/2014 It is acceptable to omit the cross ties in the region depicted in the RFI provided that additional ties be provided elsewhere as follows: Assume encroachment region measures L x h. For a distance equal to L/2 on both sides of the encroachment region, provide double the number ties over a height equal to 2 x h. Additionally, provide double the number of ties for a distance, L, and a height, h, directly above the encroachment. It is acceptable to secure the added ties to the wall horizontal reinforcing on the opposite side of the normally required ties, i.e. an even spacing increment is not required.			
Please confirm if it is acceptable to omit the first 3 rows of cross-ties (24 total) in the area as described.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0622	BGP- CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 4	Closed	06/26/2013	07/06/2013	07/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author:**REQUEST:**

Reference Documents: Exhibits A - J

This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north wall in slab area 4 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 31 to 60 as well. Location Plan see exhibit - A

Exhibit - B ,C & J depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching

Option A

Webcor is proposing to change the alignment of the Concrete Foundation wall on the north elevation along gridlines A between gridlines 1 and 5 - 6 (CDSM piles 1 to 50)

The Concrete foundation wall which runs along gridline A between gridlines 1 and 5-6 would be offset into the structure by 0.1979' (2-3/8") the proposed Face of concrete Foundation wall would then be 2-3/8" off gridline A, this offset would enable the contract reinforcement to be installed without the need for further modifications to the reinforcement due to encroachment of the CDSM piles in concrete pour Areas 3 & 4. See Exhibit - J

Option B

WOJV proposal: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 31-32 to 35 and 41-42 to 45-46 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear all the encroaching SP, originally this was a WR2 reinforcement area #11 @6"oc EF vertically and would change to #11 @5"OC the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit -E) Between CDSM piles 35 to 41-42 and 45-46 to 49 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear all the encroaching SP. This foundation wall area was originally a WR1 reinforcement area (#11 @8"oc EF vertically) and would change to #11 @6"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D). Between CDSM piles 49 to 60 the reinforcement would remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings. See Exhibit-G, H & I showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.

SUGGESTION:**ANSWER:**

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Option A

For Option A the proposed revision is acceptable, with the following conditions:

The Train Box design is restricted at the B2 Train Platform Level by the Rail Vehicle Kinematic Envelopes (RVKE). The B1 Lower Concourse Level is strictly controlled by space planning constraints, particularly minimum requirements for Public Utility rooms, service rooms and associated structural and service coordination.

The CDSM wall zone described in this RFI is outside of the RVKE, therefore at the B2 level the foundation wall face can be offset as proposed. However, at B1 Level, the offset will affect Utility Room and Service configurations.

If Option A is adopted, either:

1) Provided the foundation wall configuration and structural design permit, the offset should only occur in this area at the B2 Level and transition back to the original alignment on Gridline A before reaching the B1 Level.

OR

2) Any offset to the foundation wall face at B1 Level will require adjustment to space planning, coupler layouts, structural / service opening coordination and potentially may need further negotiations with Public Utility Companies i.e. it is not acceptable to simply 'shave off' a couple of inches from a room at this level.

Note that all transitions are to be smooth and not stepped.

Option B

For Option B, proposed revision is acceptable however, we note the following:



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Either of these options if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings Please confirm if either of these options would be acceptable</p>			<p>1) Near gridline 4, move the proposed reinforcement width transition to west by a few feet so that uniform wall thickness can be achieved within the WR2 zone.</p> <p>2) See Option B Comments 2 and 3 provided in response to RFI #T-0621.</p> <p>The Design Team must be informed of the contractor's preferred approach prior to committing to shop drawings.</p>			
T-0622.1	<p>BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 4</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A & D</p> <p>This RFI addresses the previous comments to RFI T-622 see exhibit - D.</p> <p>The contractor preference approach is to use a modified option B originally outlined in RFI T-622</p> <p>Exhibit - A shows the revised Plan view with modifications made. Exhibit - C depict the degree in which the SP are encroaching in area 4.</p> <p>Based on the response to previous RFI's the number of encroaching beams in area 4 has been reduced mainly due to the decreased thickness of the waterproofing system and the contractor willingness to use some of the construction tolerances in an effort to mitigate some of the smaller encroachments. This has resulted in only one area where modified reinforcement will have to be installed; Between CDSM piles 47 to 49 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP number 48. This wall area was originally a WR1 reinforcement area (#11@8"oc EF vertically) and would change to #11@6"OC this reduction</p>	Closed	08/13/2013	08/23/2013	08/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1-) We have not received any formal information from the contractor regarding the reduction in the thickness of the waterproofing system mentioned in this RFI. Therefore, we cannot assess the impact of the change in waterproofing system thickness to the encroachment calculations presented in Exhibit C. Also, the calculations provided in this RFI seem to consider 2 inch thickness for the waterproofing system, which is unchanged from previous RFIs.</p> <p>AAI Comment: The below grade waterproofing Substitution Request accepted by the TJPA does not significantly change the overall dimension of the materials in the waterproofing system.</p> <p>2-) As indicated in our response to RFI T-0626, if the contractor prefers to address small encroachment issues through acceptable construction tolerances, this approach is acceptable</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing.</p> <p>In all other locations in area 4 the reinforcement would remain unchanged.</p> <p>See Exhibit-B showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.</p> <p>Please confirm if this solution is acceptable.</p>						
T-0622.2	BGP - Wall Vertical Reinforcement Spacing in Area 4	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: RFI T-0622 and RFI T-0622.1.							
The Area 4 wall vertical reinforcement has been installed different from the layout in RFI T-0622.1.							
Please confirm the revised vertical wall reinforcement spacing as shown in the attached sketch is acceptable.							
Note that the wall thicknesses remain the same as approved in RFI T-0622.1.		George Metzger 10/16/20013 RESPONSE: Revised vertical wall reinforcement spacing is acceptable as long as all vertical rebar have cross-ties. Please incorporate these changes into as-built drawings. Note that using tighter rebar spacing in foundation walls than required in construction drawings may negatively impact constructability at Lower Concourse and Ground Levels where beam and slab rebar is embedded into the foundation walls.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1153 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0623	BSE - Micropile Relocation - Overhead Obstructions	Closed	06/28/2013	06/28/2013	07/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST: Reference : Attached Documents, Spec Section 31 63 33 Nine (9) micropiles under trestle span 3.3 in Zone 3 had to be relocated in the field due to overhead obstructions and a very confined working area. See attached chart and drawings for as-built relocation information. Please confirm these relocations are acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving the 9 micropiles presented in RFI as proposed. Reminder for Contractor to verify/coordinate potential conflicts with future train platform walls.		
T-0624	BSE - Micropile E231 Relocation - Instrumentation Pipe - Overhead Obstructions	Closed	06/28/2013	07/08/2013	07/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Drawing, Spec Section 31 63 33 Micropile E231 under trestle span 3.4 in Zone 3 had to be relocated in field 5.5' north due to overhead obstructions. Blue piping with instrumentation wiring inside was directly in the way of the micropile. See attached drawing for relocation information. Please confirm this relocation is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving micropile E231 as proposed.		
T-0625	BSE - Micropile E137 Relocation - Above Ground Equipment Obstruction	Closed	06/28/2013	07/08/2013	07/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Drawing, Spec Section 31 63 33 Micropile E137 in Zone 3 was installed 1' south of original location because it was in conflict with the de-sanding equipment. See attached drawing for relocation information. Please confirm this relocation is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Thornton Tomasetti does not object to moving micropile E137 as proposed.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0626	BGP- CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 5	Closed	07/02/2013	07/12/2013	07/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference Documents: Exhibits A - J

This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south walls in slab area 5 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 60 to 81 on the north elevation and 702 to 732 on the south elevation. For Location Plan see exhibit - A.

Exhibit - B, & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching

For this RFI, the combined layers of the water proofing system had been assumed to be 2" thick, which is subject to change, this may increase or decrease the number of encroaching piles depending on the thickness of the system used.

WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 60 to 62 and 69 to 71 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP 61 & 70, originally these were WR1 reinforcement area's #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D). Between CDSM piles 76 to 78-42, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP 77. This foundation wall area was originally a WR2 reinforcement area (#11@6"oc EF vertically) and would change to #11@5"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit - E).

WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B & F) Between CDSM piles 704 to 706, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP 705, originally this was a WR1 reinforcement area #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

1-) It is not acceptable to transition foundation reinforcement width and/or vertical rebar spacing within sections where specified foundation wall reinforcement is "WR2" or where there is an embedded column per contract documents. Provide uniform reinforcement width and rebar spacing within these regions. The transitions can be acceptable at the ends of (or just outside) these regions. In Area 5, this comment applies near GL 8, North Wall.

2-) Per Exhibit D, encroachments for some piles seem very small (for example, pile 61). For small encroachments, a 'no remedy' approach can be followed as long as the actual construction is executed within the tolerances specified in the contract documents (see specifications for information on construction tolerances).

3-) Mock up specimen is being developed for a location where an embedded column is used within the foundation wall. Embedded columns include two layers of #11 rebar with 6" spacing. The contractor proposes to use #11@5" in lieu of WR2 foundation wall reinforcement (#11@6") at a number of locations to remedy encroachment issues. If this option is adopted, the tightest foundation wall reinforcement will become #11@5". Revise the foundation wall mock up specimen shop drawings to include #11@5" single layer foundation wall vertical reinforcement.

4-) Foundation wall rebar WR2 and embedded columns are designed using vertical rebar spacing of 6" (see construction documents). We note that proposed changes to this spacing can negatively impact the constructability of the foundation wall joints at mat, lower concourse and ground levels (e.g. installing beam rebar, foundation wall dowels at the mat). An example was provided with our response to RFI T-0621.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1155 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>In all other areas without CDSM encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings. See Exhibit-G, H, I & J showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement. These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings. Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.</p>							
T-0626.1	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 5	Closed	08/13/2013	08/23/2013	08/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michael Spillane	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Documents: Exhibits A & D				1-) See our response to RFI T-0622.1.			
This RFI addresses the previous comments to RFI T-626 see exhibit - D.				2-) Revised reinforcement detail near GL 8, North wall is acceptable.			
Exhibit - A shows the revised Plan view with modifications made. Exhibit -C depict the degree in which the SP are encroaching in area 5.							
Based on the response to the previous RFI the number of encroaching beams in area 5 has been reduced mainly due to the decreased thickness of the waterproofing system and the contractor willingness to use some of the construction tolerances in an effort to mitigate some of the smaller encroachments. This has resulted in only one area where modified reinforcement will have to be installed this is Between CDSM piles 73-74 to 78 on the north wall elevation WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP number 77. This wall area was originally a WR2 reinforcement area (#11 @6"oc EF vertically) and would change to #11@5"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing.							
In all other locations on the north and south walls of area 5							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1156 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>the reinforcement would remain unchanged.</div> <div>See Exhibit-B showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.</div> <div>Please confirm if this solution is acceptable.</div>							
T-0627	BGP- CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 6	Closed	07/03/2013	07/13/2013	07/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - J			It is not acceptable to transition foundation reinforcement width and/or vertical rebar spacing within sections where specified foundation wall reinforcement is "WR2" or where there is an embedded column per contract documents. Provide uniform reinforcement width and rebar spacing within these regions. The transitions can be acceptable at the ends of (or just outside) these regions. In Area 6, this comment applies near GL 9, South Wall. Solutions at all other locations are acceptable. However, as indicated in response to RFI T-0626, use of #11 @5" for foundation wall vertical reinforcement can negatively impact constructability.				
This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south walls in slab area 6 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 81 to 104 on the north elevation and 679 to 703 on the south elevation. For Location Plan see exhibit - A.							
Exhibit - B, & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching							
For this RFI, the combined layers of the water proofing system had being assumed to be 2" thick, which is subject to change this may increase or decrease the number of encroaching piles depending on the thickness of the system used.							
WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 82 to 84 and 102 to 105 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP 83 & 103, originally these were WR1 reinforcement area's #11 @8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11 @6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).							
WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B &							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1157 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Exhibit - F) Between CDSM piles 680 to 683, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP 681 & 682, originally this was a WR1 reinforcement area #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>Between CDSM piles 695 to 697, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP 696. This foundation wall area was originally a WR2 reinforcement area (#11@6"oc EF vertically) and would change to #11@5"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit -E).</p> <p>In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings.</p> <p>See Exhibit-G, H, I & J showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement. These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings. Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.</p>						
T-0627.1	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 6	Closed	08/13/2013	08/23/2013	08/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A & D This RFI addresses the previous comments to RFI T-626 see exhibit - D. Exhibit - A shows the revised Plan view with modifications made. Exhibit -C depict the degree in which the SP are encroaching in area 6.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			1-) See our response to RFI T-0622.1.				
			2-) Revised reinforcement detail near GL 9, South wall is acceptable.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1158 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Based on the response to the previous RFI the number of encroaching beams in area 6 north elevation has been reduced mainly due to the decreased thickness of the waterproofing system and the contractor willingness to use some of the construction tolerances in an effort to mitigate some of the smaller encroachments. This has resulted in no modifications now required to the contract reinforcement on the north elevation and changes have been made to the south elevation in line with response to the original RFI T-626.

See Exhibit-B & E which shows details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement on the south elevations.

Please confirm if this solution is acceptable.

T-0627.2	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment: SP696 & SP104 in Area 6	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							

REQUEST:

During Shimmick's (SCCI) field layout of the CDSM encroachment in Area 6, the following extent of encroachment has been moved:

-For encroachment at SP696, SCCI moved the East extent to SP694, this is due to SP695 encroaching during the buried bar layout. This accounts for 4' additional wall length with 33-5/8" due to CDSM encroachment.

- For encroachment at SP104, the west extent of encroachment was moved to SP102. The rebar option 1 for SK1 with #11 rebar @ 6" OC will be used from SK102 to the West Extent of WR2 at Gridline 11

Please confirm the deviation from RFI response to T-0627.1 is acceptable.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

George Metzger

10/16/2013

RESPONSE:

The deviations indicated in this RFI from the RFI response T-627.1 are acceptable. Please incorporate these changes into as-built drawings.



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0628	BGP-CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment in Area 7	Closed	07/03/2013	07/13/2013	07/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - J			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south walls in slab area 7 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 104 to 134 on the north elevation and 649 to 679 on the south elevation. For Location Plan see Exhibit A.			It is not acceptable to transition foundation reinforcement width and/or vertical rebar spacing within sections where specified foundation wall reinforcement is "WR2" or where there is an embedded column per contract documents. Provide uniform reinforcement width and rebar spacing within these regions. The transitions can be acceptable at the ends of (or just outside) these regions. In Area 7, this comment applies near GL 12, South Wall. Solutions at all other locations are acceptable. However, as indicated in response to RFI T-0626, use of #11@5" for foundation wall vertical reinforcement can negatively impact constructability.				
Exhibit B, & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching							
For this RFI, the combined layers of the water proofing system had being assumed to be 2" thick, which is subject to change this may increase or decrease the number of encroaching piles depending on the thickness of the system used.							
WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit B) Between CDSM piles 102 to 105 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP 103 & 104, originally these were WR1 reinforcement area #11@8"OC EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit D).							
WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit B & Exhibit F) Between CDSM piles 657 to 659 & 677 to 680, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 1/2" & 33 5/8" respectively to clear the encroaching SP 658 & 678, Originally these were a WR1 reinforcement area #11@8"OC EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit D). Between CDSM piles 665 to 667 & 673 to 677, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 32 15/16" & 33 5/8" respectively to clear the encroaching SP 666, 674 & 675. This foundation wall area was originally a WR2 reinforcement area (#11@6"OC EF vertically) and would change to #11@5"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1160 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit E).</p> <p>In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings.</p> <p>See Exhibit G, H, I & J showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.</p> <p>These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.</p> <p>Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.</p>						
T-0628.1	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 7	Closed	07/16/2013	07/26/2013	07/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Documents: Exhibits A & B			The proposed revision to the foundation wall reinforcement near Gridline 12 is acceptable.				
This RFI addresses the previous comments to RFI T-628 see exhibit - A.							
Exhibit - B shows the revised Plan views with modifications made.							
Please confirm if this solution is acceptable.							
T-0629	BGP - Clear Cover on Concourse Slab	Closed	06/28/2013	07/08/2013	07/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: Drawing S1-3500, Spec Section 03 30 20, 03 20 00			Concrete cover is for protection of reinforcement against weather and other effects. The cover is prescribed for 3 classes of structural members in ACI				

Page: 1161 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1162 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0630	BGP - Mat Slab Key Way Waterstops Installation From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon REQUEST: Reference: Attached Photos, Spec Section 03 30 20 SCCI is proposing to leave the formed key surface in the mat slab as a formed finish to aid in the bonding of the hydrophilic waterstops to the concrete. With a specified 1/4" amplitude on the concrete surface, the bond between the concrete and the waterstop system decreases. The remainder of the construction joint will have stayform in place which generates a roughened surface. Please see attached photos that high light the area which will be formed finish. Please advise if this is acceptable?	Closed	06/28/2013	07/08/2013	07/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification section 03 20 00 2.5.C addresses this topic and requires a reasonably smooth finish at surfaces which are to receive waterstops. 2.5.C also requires roughened surface be leveled with 2-part epoxy per manufacturer's recommendations. Leaving the vertical surface indicated in the RFI as a formed finish will be acceptable provided the finish to receive the waterstop is reasonably smooth and meets the installation surface requirements of the hydrophilic waterstop manufacturer. The hydrophilic waterstop is to be installed on surfaces prepared in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1163 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0631	BGP - Mat Slab Reinforcing Conflict with Micropiles	Closed	07/01/2013	07/11/2013	07/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Reference: Drawing S1-2022 Thru S1-2031							
The typical mat slab reinforcing designed to be installed at 8" O.C.E.W. for the bottom and top mats. The micropile layout also consists of a uniformed spacing and at some locations has been adjusted for conflicts or for other purposes, example RFI 490. Should the typical mat slab reinforcing when laid out at 8" O.C.E.W. or some other reinforcing designed within the mat slab conflict with the micropile asbuilt, is it acceptable to displace the reinforcing from the designed spacing layout such that it is repositioned to either side of the micropile? Additionally, please confirm if reinforcing in direct contact with the micropile is acceptable? Should the displacement of the reinforcing to either side of a micropile not be acceptable please provide direction.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			Typical and additional mat reinforcing bars (flexural steel) and mat pit reinforcing bars may be shifted in plan up to +/- 4" from the typical spacing of 8" o.c.e.w. where the typical spacing would result in a conflict between the flexural steel and the micropile. Before making such a shift, the contractor shall verify that said shift will not cause unforeseen conflicts that impact the placement of column dowels, mat headed shear reinforcement, or any other mat or wall reinforcement detailing. Where such a shift will impact the placement of other reinforcement, contractor shall not shift the mat bar out of typical spacing, and instead may resolve the conflict by either of the following methods:				
			a) Treat the micropile obstruction sim to a typical opening per the Typical Slab Opening Detail found on 1/S1-3501 (i.e. add 2 bars of same dia and grade as the bar being interrupted, one to either side of the conflicting micropile).				
			b) Shift the conflicting bar only locally, up to +/- 4" from the typical as permitted above, splicing back to typical spacing (with non-contact splice either side of micropile) as required to avoid any conflicts with other mat reinforcement that may occur due to the shift.				
			Mat rebar shall not be in direct contact with the micropile or gage steel boot that functions as part of the waterproofing assembly, but rather achieve min 1.5" clear btwn rebar and micropile steel. Refer to 2/A1-8711 for waterproofing assembly info.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1164 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0632	BGP - Geothermal Field 7 & 8 Manifold Riser Layout	Closed	07/02/2013	07/12/2013	07/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Photos			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The initial geothermal riser/manifold layout for Fields 7 & 8 placed the field 7 & field 8 risers between soldier piles 176-177 and 177-178 respectively. To avoid conflicts with the riser install and the temporary 1st bridge, is it acceptable to move the field 7 riser to the CDSM wall panel between piles 172 and 173 and the field 8 riser to the CDSM wall panel between piles 173 and 174? See attached photos. Additionally, SCCI is looking to relocate the temperature probe to the CDSM wall panel between soldier pile beams 171 and 172. Is this acceptable? Please advise.					It is not acceptable to locate the risers for fields 7&8 as suggested between soldier piles 172-173-174. Riser for field 7 can be located between piles 174 and 175. Riser for field 8 can be located between piles 175 and 176. It is not acceptable to re-locate temperature probe pipe between 171 and 172. It is acceptable to locate the probe east of risers 7 and 8 between soldier piles 178 and 179.		
T-0633	BGP - ASI#104 Clarifications	Closed	07/03/2013	07/13/2013	07/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: ASI 104s			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
SCCI is in receipt of ASI #104 on June 25th, 2013 in CR#T-071. Please clarify the following: 1) Per Sheet S-2202 to S-2211, the additional internal walls at the concourse are shown to be in solid line, for Zone 2-7, 10-11. Note 7 on S1-2022 refers us to the architectural drawings for CMU and concrete partition layout dimensions, joint locations, and CMU thickness. However, the corresponding Architectural drawings issued in ASI #104 for wall at concourse (A-2222 and A-2223), only depicts changes in Zones 2 and 3. a) A-2222 and A-2223 depicts the revised concourse walls to be RCW- please confirm that the internal concourse walls are not in TG-06 scope and additional scope to TG-06 contract will only be the additional couplers for added wall. b) Please confirm that there are no internal walls to be constructed in TG06's scope at concours level.					See below GM/TT comments. WOJV comments included. 1. a. WOJV to confirm this item. JT/WOJV - Confirmed. b. WOJV to confirm this item. JT/WOJV - Confirmed, same as 1a. c. We assume the RFI means sheet range starting with S1-2202 and not S-2022. These lower concourse partition walls are supposed to be dashed. WOJV to confirm these are NOT part of the TG06 package. JT/WOJV - Price all internal walls below the concourse level. d. WOJV to confirm this item. JT/WOJV - Provide dowels for all CMU walls shown on the concourse level and below.		



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>c) Please confirm that the internal concourse walls shown as solid lines in drawing S-2022 to S-2211 are supposed to be shown as 'dotted' or 'ghost' lines in ASI #104.</p> <p>d) In multiple drawings (e.g: S1-2204), at the middle top of the page, the word "Future" has been deleted. Original drawings show "Future CMU walls, TYP". ASI #104 structural drawings deleted the word "Future". Please clarify if the CMU walls at the concourse are in TG06's scope.</p> <p>e) Please issue revised Architectural drawings for Zone 4-Zone 11 (A2224-2231, revised) with the additional RCWs layout for the wall plan at concourse</p> <p>2) Per S1-2210 revised, a new note states: "Coordinate w/ manufacturer shop drawings for extent of beams". Please clarify which manufacturer SCCI is to coordinate with, or provide dimensions</p> <p>3) ASI #104 issued new "Slab Edge Plan" A2842, A2843 and A2847 for Zone 2, 3 and 7. The new drawings depict the locations of MEP sleeves that were not shown in previous drawings.</p> <p>a) SCCI has not received any revisions to concourse plumbing drawings depicting these changes. The original plumbing drawings do not correspond to the location of the sleeves/blackouts shown in the new Architectural drawings A2842, 2843, 2847. Please verify which drawings SCCI needs to utilize to layout the sleeves/openings.</p> <p>b) Please issue Architectural drawings with sleeves/blackouts locations at the reminders of the zones.</p> <p>4) ASI #104 issued revised electrical drawings E1-2202 to E1-2204 that changes the layout of the electrical rooms. TG06 contract scope includes the installation F15 junction boxes to be terminated in designated electrical rooms.</p> <p>a) Please provide revised detailed drawings on the electrical room layout (E1-3201, 3202).</p>						<p>e. Sheets A1-2224 through A1-2231 have been issued with 100%CD Phase 1 documentation.</p> <p>2. "manufacturer" refers to cooling tower manufacturer as the support framing is labeled for the cooling tower. JT-WOJV - An MEP subcontractor is projected to awarded in March 2014. Please remit an RFI isolating the details of the cooling tower pier, dimensions, etc.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>a. Slab edge plans issued for ASI#104 are coordinated with updated plumbing background drawings.</p> <p>b. Slab edge plans for the remainder of the Lower Concourse Level have been issued with 100%CD Phase 1 documentation.</p> <p>4. Please refer to attached sketches SKE-01-3202,SKE-01-3201 and SKE-02-3201 for electrical room layouts.</p>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0633.1	BGP - 100% CD Phase 1 Documentation	Closed	08/27/2013	09/01/2013	09/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please reference CR T-071 - ASI 104 - Below Grade Modifications and RFI T-0633. As per coordination meeting on 08/26/2013, to discuss discrepancies in ASI #104, the architectural drawings for Zone 4 thru Zone 11 (A1-224-2231, A1-2844-2846, A1-2848-2851) are not included in ASI 104. The architectural drawings are critical for SCCI's coordination and pricing of interior wall layout on the concourse level in conjunction with the corresponding structural drawings released in CR T-071 - ASI #104. Although, the design team provided their response to these discrepancies in RFI T-0633 by referencing "100% CD Phase 1 Documentation," the drawings have yet to be released for construction. 1. As per request by the design team, please release the following most-up-to date drawing sheets via this RFI : A1-2224 - 2231, A1-2844 - 2846, A1-2848 - 2851. 2. Please confirm the aforementioned drawings are to supersede current drawings in trade group package TG06.0.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 9/11/2013 RESPONSE: The attached SKAs update the Architectural Drawings indicated on RFI T-0633.1 SKAs-2825 to 2830 based on A1-2224 to A1-2231 Wall Plans SKAs- 2831 to 2834 based on A1-2844 to A1 -2847 Slab Edge Plans SKA-2835 to 2836 based on A1-2850 to A1-2851 Slab Edge Plans Although requested in the RFI, drawing A1-2848 does not exist in the drawing set. The information contained in the above noted SKAs supersedes the above noted Wall Plans and Slab Edge plans.	
<hr/>							
T-0634	BGP - Mass Concrete Placing Temperature	Closed	07/08/2013	07/18/2013	07/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference: Spec Section 03 30 20, Attached Letter Please reference attached CTL Group letter dated 7.3.2013, Mat Slab Mock-Up thermal monitoring graph, Mat Slab Mock-Up thermal monitoring sensor locations sketch, Mat Slab CEMEX concrete tags and BOP spec section 03 30 20.3.5.B. Shimmick proposes the Maximum concrete placing temperature for Mass Concrete be increased to 80 degrees Farenheit. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor-proposed increase in maximum placement temperature is acceptable.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1168 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0637	BGP - CDSM Wall Encroachment Rebar Details at Spandrel and Concourse Neede	Closed	07/15/2013	07/25/2013	07/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to RFI response T-0608 and T-0448.5. The approved typical CDSM encroachment wall reinforcement detail at the SW corner, West of GL 6 found in RFI T-0608 does not include the concourse level spandrel beam/wall interface. Please provide a detail depicting an acceptable configuration at the concourse level which includes the spandrel beam/wall interface.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The details provided in RFIs T-608 and T-448.5 were developed by WOJV. Submit RFIs regarding CDSM encroachment at spandral beam/wall interface for specific locations similar to prior encroachment RFIs. Include detailed backup and proposed solutions.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1169 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0638	BGP - Mat Slab U Bars in Modified WR-2 Reinforcement Areas	Closed	07/16/2013	07/26/2013	07/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - E					Either of the options presented in this RFI are acceptable where the #11@5" rebar is used. The "candy cane shaped bar" should include 180-deg standard hook (refer to detail 4/S1-3001 in contract drawings). Note that this RFI seems to focus on the constructability of the U-bars. However, if the top mat rebar was projected on Exhibits D or E, clashes with the 5" spaced foundation wall vertical rebar (inner face) can also be seen."		
The contractor has highlighted a potential conflict with the uses of #11@5"OC vertically at the areas where CDSM piles at encroaching in WR-2 reinforcement areas.							
Exhibit - A is a vertical cross section through the modified WR-2 area							
Exhibit - B is a cross section showing the potential conflict with verts @ 5"OC							
Exhibit - C is a cross section showing the original design with verts @ 6"OC							
Exhibit - D & E depicts possible solutions							
One of the proposed solutions Exhibit - D is to have the "U" bars at the contract width of 7.41"(6"+#11 bar dia) and the vertically rebar @ 5" OC and the U bars moves horizontally to avoid any conflicts with the mat slab reinforcement.							
Another possible solution is to change the "U" bars to a bar with a standard hook "candy cane shaped bar" see Exhibit - E							
Please confirm if either of these options would be acceptable							
T-0639	BGP - Weld Access Hole repair	Closed	07/16/2013	07/26/2013	07/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: S1-3003, Spec Section 05 50 10					All contractor means and methods holes in all locations of the steel sleeve elements are to be welded watertight closed. The waterproofing details are to follow the waterproofing manufacturer's instructions.		
Please reference attached Pile Sleeve pictures, shop drawings, and product data/MSDS for Bituthene Liquid Membrane and Sikaflex Ia. Weld access holes (see photos) allow us to weld the penetration sleeves together in a continuous vertical weld (see shop drawings). SCCI proposes sealing access holes prior to pouring the mat slab.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1170 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0641	BGP - Level D Internal Bracing Removal	Closed	07/16/2013	07/26/2013	07/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Reference Document: Exhibit A Level D internal bracing removal in areas where walers are not connected together. Due to the curing requirements of the concrete in the mat slab, the contractor is proposing to have a "hopscotch" sequence to the mat slab pours, as an effort to mitigate delays. The removal of the level D bracing will follow the pour sequence, however as shown in Exhibit A which is a north wall elevation, what is the maximum clear distance horizontal between the construction joint in the mat pours and the next level D internal bracing strut/waler. This becomes an issue when trying to schedule the bracing removal with the mat and wall pours. WOJV understands that this is for areas where the walers are not connected together. Once the parameters for the bracing removal have been established the contractor will create a plan and sequence for each pour area on the removal of the internal bracing where the walers have being connected together.				This work should be coordinated between the internal bracing designer and the structural engineer.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1171 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0642	BSE - Steel Plates at CDSM Piles 167-168	Open	07/17/2013	07/27/2013	07/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Spec Section 31 56 13					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
During leak grouting at level 5 excavation, a section of the CDSM wall panel between soldier piles 167-168 became dislodged, resulting in a high volume leak. In an effort to stabilize the damaged CDSM panel and stop the leak, BBII installed a steel road plate between soldier piles 167-168 and injected grout behind it.					W/O to resubmit once the encroachment requirement is determined.		
BBII is concerned that removing the plate will likely cause the panel to become destabilized and could reopen the flow of water. BBII surveyed the face of the plate and found that at pile #167, the face of plate is 1/2" out from the theoretical face of pile, and at pile #168 the plate is 1-1/2" out from the theoretical face of pile. BBII proposes leaving the steel plate in place to maintain integrity of the CDSM panel. The edges of the plate may be grouted to provide a smooth transition to the CDSM wall for waterproofing.							
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-0643	BGP - ASI#104 - A1-2122 Added Line	Closed	07/17/2013	07/27/2013	07/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Drawing A1-2122, ASI#104					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please find attached A1-2122 issued in ASI#104. Please clarify what do the highlighted lines represent.					The highlighted line indicated in this RFI, is a 3" concrete topping with slope that will added later. It is not part of the Below Grade Package and should not have been shown on this Wall Plan Drawing. The attached SKA-2771 shows A1-2122 without the topping line.		
T-0644	BGP - Plumbing Scope Clarification ASI 104	Closed	07/17/2013	07/27/2013	07/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Shimmick Construction Comp Ben Gordon			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1173 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
	REQUEST: Reference: Drawing A1-9215, S1-9050, Spec Section 03 30 20 There appears to be conflicting dimensions for the concrete interior wall pier located near gridlines 3.5/C.3 as shown in the attached drawing A1-9215. Contract drawing A1-9215 details the pier to be 2'0" wide by 1 '4" thick. However, based on criteria for wall piers as shown on S1-9050, the wall pier should be 2'0" wide by 1 '6" thick. Please confirm if the two wall piers identified in the attached A 1-9215 should be 1 '4" thick or 1 '6" thick. If the wall is to be 1 '6" thick, please provide direction as to which side of the wall pier is to be maintained flush with adjacent wall.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 2 piers identified in the RFI sketch are 1'-6" thick as per schedule on S1-9050. The north side of the piers along the corridor shall remain flush with adjacent walls. See attached SKA-2783. The pier thickness dimensions have been removed from this architectural drawing as the pier dimensions are obtained from S1-9050 as noted above.		
T-0647	BGP - Area 3 Clear Cover to the Vertical Reinforcement on the Foundation Wall	Closed					
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michael Spillane	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		07/19/2013	07/29/2013	07/26/2013
Co-Author:					Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A - G Further to response to RFI T-609 (see exhibit - F) this RFI shows the areas of foundation wall in pour area 3, north and west walls which will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement for location plan see exhibit - A & C Exhibit - B & C depict the amount and location of the foundation walls which will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement Area of concern is the west wall along gridline 1 where the alignment of the foundation wall was moved by 3-1/8" per RFI T-576 see exhibit - E due to encroachment issues on CDSM piles see exhibit - G for information on the encroaching piles in this area as a result of this move there are large areas which will have greater than 6" of clear cover.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The clear cover between the waterproofing system and vertical reinforcement as presented in Exhibit B of this RFI is acceptable. We note that the reference to RFI T-0448.5 in Exhibit B in is incorrect. RFI T-0448.5 is not relevant to this zone.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1174 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>This RFI assumes that the solution to encroachment on the north wall Area 3 RFI T-621.1 (see exhibit D) is to move the wall 2-3/8" to offset the encroachment is acceptable.</p> <p>Please confirm that the clear cover between the waterproofing system and the vertical reinforcement outlined at these locations is acceptable</p>						
T-0648	BGP - Area 1 Clear Cover to the Vertical Reinforcement on the Foundation Wall	Closed	07/19/2013	07/29/2013	07/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - G			The clear cover between the waterproofing system and vertical reinforcement as presented in Exhibit B of this RFI is acceptable.				
Further to response to RFI T-609 (see exhibit - F) this RFI shows the areas of foundation wall in pour area 1, south and west walls which will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement for location plan see exhibit - A & C							
Exhibit - B & C depict the amount and location of the foundation walls which the will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement							
Areas of concern are the west wall along where the alignment of the foundation wall was moved to per RFI T-576 see exhibit - E due to encroachment issues on CDSM piles, however this has resulted in large areas which will have greater than 6" of clear cover. On the south elevation see Exhibit - D (RFI T - 448.5) which shows the thinning of the wall with the revised reinforcement spacing due to CDSM pile encroachment.							
Exhibit - G shows the information on encroaching CDSM pile in this area for your review.							
Please confirm that the clear cover between the waterproofing system and the vertical reinforcement outlined at these locations is acceptable							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0649	BGP -Area 2 Clear Cover to the Vertical Reinforcement on the Foundation Wall	Closed	07/22/2013	08/01/2013	07/31/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A - G Further to response to RFI T-609 (see exhibit - F) this RFI shows the areas of foundation wall in pour area 2, south wall which will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement for location plan see exhibit - A & C Exhibit - B & C depict the amount and location of the foundation walls which the will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement Exhibit - D & E (RFI T-448.5 and RFI T-608) which shows the thinning of the wall with the revised reinforcement spacing due to CDSM pile encroachment in area 2. Exhibit - G shows the information on encroaching CDSM pile in this area for your review. Please confirm that the clear cover between the waterproofing system and the vertical reinforcement outlined at these locations is acceptable			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The clear cover between the waterproofing system and vertical reinforcement as presented in Exhibit B of this RFI is acceptable.		
T-0650	BGP - Fire Management System Layout Conflicts with Class A Design	Closed	07/19/2013	07/29/2013	07/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing E1-2026, Spec Section 28 30 01, Attached Drawing Review of the fire management system device layout appears to not meet the minimum candela rating of the NFPA code; refer to the attached drawing (dwg. #1, shaded) showing the areas of the platform that are deficient. Please confirm the candela rating set forth in the NFPA code are met with the current layout on drawing E1-2026 or provide a new layout that comply with NFPA candela rating requirements.			SUGGESTION: The revised device layout shown in drawing #2 will greatly decrease the candela rating to meet the NFPA requirements. This layout would require additional devices.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The fire management system design is a performance based design as per Section 28 30 01-1.1C of the contract documents. The Contractor is responsible for the design of the system as required to meet NFPA 72 and provide additional visual alarm strobes in addition to those shown on the drawings to meet NFPA 72 (Section 28 30 01-2.6P).		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1176 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0651	BGP - Area 3 Partition Wall Clarification	Closed	07/19/2013	07/29/2013	07/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing A1-2122,S1-9050, Spec Section 03 20 00, Gerdau's RFI#58 Please clarify if the highlighted portions within the outline of the Partition Walls should be denoted as a different structural element i.e: a column, pilaster ,or a thickened wall that is different than the typical 12" thick partition wall per detail 3/S19050. If the answer is yes, please reference or provide the correct reinforcing detail that is to be applied at each location.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The intent for the partition wall at gridline C.3 to the right of gridline 1.4 is to apply the 9/S1-9050 pier reinforcement & pier thickness required for the door width and pier height at each end of the partition wall and extend to result in a uniform thickness wall to simplify construction. The intent for the partition wall at gridline E to the left of gridline 2 is to apply the 9/S1-9050 reinforcement & pier thickness required for the elevator door width and pier height and apply along the full length of this wall. The intent for the partition wall at gridline E.6 to the left of column at gridline 2 is to apply the 9/S1-9050 pier reinforcement for the 12" thick pier.	
<hr/>							
T-0652	BSE - Zone 4 Excavation Sequence	Closed	07/22/2013	08/01/2013	07/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Based on the 7/18/2013 OAC Meeting please confirm it is acceptable to excavate level 2 West of Gridline 31 once level A cross lot bracing has been stressed.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ARUP Response: Confirmed. Excavation east of gridline 31 is contingent on connection of the level A walers on the east end and prestressing of the diagonal braces on the east end. A 3:1 slope for the excavated face is required per the specifications 31 00 00 Section 3.8 D. The top of this slope should be at gridline 31.	
<hr/>							
T-0653	BSE - Fremont Bridge Pier 6 Near Mat Depression	Closed	07/22/2013	08/01/2013	07/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Stacy Wilson	
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Brandon Miller							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Autocad Drawing			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Correction: This location is at the First Street Bridge,	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1177 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0654	<p>BGP - Mat Slab Control Joints</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference: Attached Drawing</p> <p>Please reference attached CJ Layout for Mat Slab in Zone 1. SCCI requests acceptance to move Mat Slab Control Joints to have a 2' clearance of any pit. Control joints will be returned to their original layout and will tie to Foundation Wall at the submitted CJ locations.</p>	Closed	07/22/2013	08/01/2013	07/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>				<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>We assume the 2'-0" proposed clearance of pit means clear of the thickened extent of mat for the pit as graphically implied in the RFI sketch.</p> <p>It will be acceptable to modify the CJ layout in the mat for the 3 clouded locations identified in the RFI, however, Contractor to coordinate installation of and/or verify that headed shear reinforcement at columns (where applicable) can be installed at CJ's.</p>	<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1178 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0655	BGP - Revised Attached Method of Nelson Studs to the Elevator Pit Embedded Angle	Closed	07/24/2013	08/03/2013	08/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Spec Section 05 50 10 While attaching the 3/4" diameter by 8" Nelson Studs to the 8" X 4" X 1/2" angle it was determined the studs were not fusing to the base metal (angle). To maintain the procurement schedule of this fabrication needed for the Zone 1 - Area 03 Mat Slab placement, our fabricator (Gerlinger Steel) used the fillet weld method performed under the attached Welding Procedure Specifications (WPS) to attach studs to the angle(s). The welding was witnessed by the dispatched (IR #001459) ISI Shop CWI. Attached for the readers information and use are the shop fabrication drawing, the employed WPS, and photographs of the finished fabrication. Is the alternate means of attaching the Nelson Studs to the angle, using the fillet weld method in lieu of the fusing method, acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The angled stud in the interior of the angle requires a different type of ferrule (heel) to address the angled condition. The alternate means used to attach Nelson studs for angles in this RFI is acceptable provided that at least 2 studs per angle have been verified by bend test per specification section 03 20 00 2.2.C.2, which references AWS D1.1-2010 (Paragraph 7.8 for testing requirements).		
T-0656	BGP - Shear Wall Dowel and Shoring Pipe Bracing Conflict	Closed	07/24/2013	08/03/2013	08/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing S1-3001, Spec Section 03 30 20 A few potential conflicts exist between the typical shear wall vertical dowels and the 36" OD shoring Pipe Struts in Area 1. See attachment for locations of conflict. Based on Detail A shown in S1-3260, the typical shear wall verts will be lap spliced. Per the schedule in Detail 1-S1-3001, the #9 vertical shear wall reinforcement requires a 63" lap splice, which places the top of dowel at elevation -30'-5". The centerline of Level D diagonal bracing atop Area 1 is shown to be at EL -29'-0" and the bottom of the 36" OD pipe strut at level D is at EL -30'-6". The pipe strut will potentially encroach on the shear wall			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The contractor proposed lap splice length is acceptable only at locations where the conflict exists.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1181 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0661	BSE - Access trestle penetration sleeve	Closed	07/30/2013	08/09/2013	08/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: 4/A1-8711, Attached Sketch 2 bump outs have been installed onto the South side of the access trestle in Zone 2 (see attached sketch). Each bump out has 4 trestle piles identical to the trestle piles supporting the rest of the access trestle. Please confirm it is acceptable sleeve and waterproof the 8 piles (2 bump outs - 4 trestle piles ea.) per detail 4/A1-8711. The bump outs will be removed prior to the concourse slab.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to sleeve the 8 piles for the access trestle extensions (bump outs) as shown in detail 4/A1-8711. Part of this RFI is for a waterproofing system proposed by the Contractors, not the system designed by the Architect. The Contractors should have their engineer who prepared this waterproofing system design respond to this RFI. Until that is done, the Contractor should confirm all waterproofing system questions and details with the waterproofing manufacturer (with copies to the TJPA and its consultants and the Architect). Contractor shall submit dimensioned locations of bump out piers and size for review of introducing sleeved penetrations into the mat. Prior to submitting dimensioned locations, Contractor shall review for, including but not limited to, mat conflicts with other work and mat exclusion zones.				
T-0662	BGP - Clarification for the Response to RFI T-0631 Micropile Conflict	Closed	08/01/2013	08/11/2013	08/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Spec Section 03 30 20, Attached sketches Per discussions on 7/31/13 between members of TT, Webcor, Shimmick and Gerdau please confirm the following clarifications and intent of method "B" as it relates to the response issued for RFI 631 reviewed via teleconference. 1. The clear cover of 1 1/2" as described in the response to RFI 631 has been eliminated. The reinforcing bars may come into contact with the micropile and the waterproofing wrapped around the lower portion of the micropile. 2. At the contractor's discretion, he/she may displace the			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Confirmed. 2. Confirmed. 3. Confirmed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1182 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>typical contract bar +/- 4" from the called out spacing as required to avoid clashes with the installed micropile. The displacement of the typical reinforcing may be either for the full length of the bar or weaved around the clashes depending on the specific condition. If this solution is incorporated and results in the typical reinforcing being displaced such that the end of the bar is not in the typical alignment a non-contact lap splice with the next adjacent designed/detailed bar is acceptable. Should the displacement of the typical contract bar to resolve the clash with the micropile result in another clash with another element of the reinforcing design this condition will be addressed through the RFI process upon recognition. See attached sketch #1 for reference.</p> <p>3. At the contractor's discretion, he/she may cut the typical contract bar creating a gap in the bar to allow for the clashing micropile. Should this be the selected method to resolve the clash a lap splice bar of the same grade and bar size will be required at either side of the gap. The splice bar may be a non-contact lap splice. See attached sketch #2 for reference.</p>						
T-0663	BSE - Micropile Tie-Down detail	Closed	08/05/2013	08/15/2013	08/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Drawing: S1-3003 Reference Submittal: TG0300-620.1				Confirmed that contractor-designed micropile without the plate is acceptable.			
Detail 1 on S1-3003 shows a 12"x12"x2" plate under the domed nut on top of the micropile. Note 1 on S1-3003 states that "the contractor is responsible for the design of the pile to meet the design load requirements ... as stated in the project specifications." Submittal No. TG0300-620.1 was returned "No Exceptions Taken" and did not include the plate under the domed nut as it was not a part of BBII's micropile design. Please confirm that it is acceptable to move forward with approved Submittal No. TG0300-620.1 without the 12"x12"x2" plate.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0664	BGP - Conflict Between Pit Reinforcing & Trestle/Pin Piles	Closed	08/05/2013	08/15/2013	08/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: Drawing S1-2022, Attached Photos				The tails of pit reinforcement that are extending beyond limits of pits and are in conflict with trestle/pin piles may be trimmed for only the 4 of the 5 locations identified in the RFI.			
During the installation of the pit reinforcing between GL 1.4-2.3 and D.4-F a conflict was discovered between trestle/pile and the tail of the #11 pit reinforcing that extends beyond the limit of the pit out and into the main mat slab. Gerdau proposes to trim the tails of the conflicting rebar (Flame Cut) such that clearance can be maintained to the sleeve around the piles.				For the 5th location at trestle pile located at D.4-4.4 (which is within the pit depression), see attached SKS-0281.			
Please confirm this is acceptable or provide direction on how to proceed. This conflict is expected to occur at future pits too.				Note that flame-cutting that has been allowed is limited to applications of this RFI only.			
				For future pits within the remainder of the Project, when the tails of pit reinforcement that extend beyond the limits of the pits that conflict with trestle/pin piles/bridge piers, Contractor shall coordinate with as-built locations and apply detail similar to 1/S1-3007 (where bars interrupted by trestle/pin/bridge pier shall turn up).			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0665	BGP - Locations of Electrical Outlets, Equipment, and Fixtures	Closed	08/05/2013	08/10/2013	08/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Spec Section, 26 05 34 Per Specification Section 26 05 34, 3.2 B., the dimensions of the equipment fixtures and outlets are to be submitted via RFI for clarification pre pour. Attached is the layout for Electrical Room B2221 in the first Mat Slab pour. Please confirm that these dimensions are acceptable so that the conduit can be laid out correctly.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Layout does not match architectural wall dimensions. Contractor to revise and resubmit layout as coordinated with ASI-102, dated 04/29/2013. Refer to sheet A1-9215 markup attached and coordinate with architectural wall dimensions. Submitted sketch does not show wall details. Future layouts to be submitted on current CAD backgrounds and all dimensions must be based on interior clearances. All electrical rooms will be lined with 3/4" plywood backboard. Contractor to coordinate layouts to accommodate. Due to potential conflict with door, FATC to be relocated to south wall, 9" from west wall, as shown in sheet E1-3101 markup attached. Dimensions added for clarity.				
T-0665.1	BGP - Electrical Locations of Outlets, Equipment, and Fixtures in Electrical Room	Closed	08/23/2013	09/03/2013	08/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing A1-9215, 1/E1-3101 and attached sketch SK-SCCI-0204.2. Please find a revised electrical conduit layout for Electrical Room B2221 as requested in RFI T-0665. Please confirm the conduit layout and outlet, equipment and fixture locations shown in the attached sketch SK-.SCCI-0204.2 is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> WSP notes revised location of FATC per original RFI response; however, the following items are still outstanding: Layout does not match architectural wall dimensions. Contractor to revise and resubmit layout as coordinated with ASI-102, dated 04/29/2013. Submitted sketch does not show wall details. Future layouts to be submitted on current Contract Document backgrounds and all dimensions must be based on interior clearances. All electrical rooms will be lined with 3/4" plywood backboard. Contractor to coordinate layouts to accommodate.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1185 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0665.2	BGP - Locations of Electrical Outlets, Equipment and Fixtures in Electrical Room I	Closed	09/12/2013	09/22/2013	09/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing A1-9215 dated 04/29/2013, E1-3101 dated 05/31/2013 (RFI T-0665) and attached shimmick sketch SK-RFI204.4. The attached layout for Electrical Room B2221 shows the dimensions of the conduit locations in respect to the interior walls which are lined with 3/4" plywood per RFI T-0665. In addition, the room is located from grid lines, respectively.. Please confirm the layout as shown in the attached Shimmick sketch is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 9/19/2013 RESPONSE: Layout as shown is acceptable. Conduit provisions for pumps connected to LPH-B2-A-12 are not shown. Please submit for review.		
T-0665.3	BGP - Locations of Electrical Outlets, Equipment and Fixtures in Electrical Room I	Closed	09/23/2013	10/03/2013	09/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference E1-3101 Confirm that the conduits for circuits to panelboard LPH-B2-A-12 are not included in the TG06 scope of work.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 9/24/2013 RESPONSE: WSP Response: This statement is correct. The circuits to this panelboard are in the main project package and are not applicable for this phase.		
T-0666	BSE - Elevator Pit Dimensions between GL 1.4 and GL 2	Closed	08/05/2013	08/15/2013	08/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: ASI #104, A1-9214 / A1-2122 Since the elevator manufacturer has not been selected, please confirm that the size of the elevator pit located between GL 1.4 and GL 2 is to be 10'-8" by 8'-10" as depicted in ASI #104 sheet A1-9214.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> CMGC shall confirm the pit dimensions noted on the contract documents are acceptable to all the elevator subcontractors on the CMGC approved bidder shortlist. CMGC shall schedule hiring of sub-contractors as required to allow CMGC coordination between the trades.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1186 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0666.1	BGP - Mat Slab Clarification to Elevator Pit and Slab Opening Dimensions	Closed	08/21/2013	09/03/2013	08/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Webcor/Obayashi (W/O) is in receipt of attached Adamson Associates, Inc. (AAI) response to RFI T-0666 - BSE - Elevator Pit Dimensions Between GL1.4 and GL 2.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
This response is unacceptable. The Architect has sole responsibility for confirming that the pit dimensions of all elevators and escalators will accommodate the Architect's proposed elevator and escalator systems.					The design team believes the elevator pit dimensions noted in the contract documents are coordinated with the requirements of the alternate elevator manufacturers noted in the specification. The CMGC shall confirm the work of adjacent trades have been coordinated between shop drawings and existing field conditions. The CMGC shall coordinate with the TJPA to hire Sub-contractors at the required times to ensure that construction work and shop drawings of adjacent trades are completed in time to coordinate between trades.		
Until a 100% IFC set is completed by the Architect, W/O has no definite knowledge of the Architect's proposed elevator and escalator systems. This issue has been discussed verbally for over 2 years, during which the Architect has maintained that they have full responsibility for designing all pits and openings to fit their proposed elevator and escalator systems. W/O is unable to even start the RFQ/Bidding process for hiring sub-contractors until the 100% IFC Contract Drawings are finalized by the Architect and approved by the owner; therefore, it is impossible for W/O to hire/coordinate sub-contractors prior to pouring of the elevator pit in the mat slab.							
The same applies to all pits and openings throughout the design documents, only the Architect is capable of confirming that these dimensions are acceptable for all of the Architect's proposed elevator/escalator systems.							
Please confirm all elvator pits and slab openings are acceptable as currently shown on the contract documents.							
T-0667	BGP - Geothermal Loop Excavation in Zone 4	Closed	08/05/2013	08/09/2013	08/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Spec Section 31 23 34.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please refer to attached WOJV and SCCI internal correspondence in RFI #SHIMM000-0038.					ARUP Response: The question asked is Contractor's means and methods.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>SCCi is aware of the CDSM wall excavation required for the geothermal field risers, but is not aware of a geothermal specification requiring buttress shaft demolition for the geothermal loop trenches. Specification 31 23 34, Section 3.2 is very clear in the full scope of the ground excavation in soil and wall riser excavation in the CDSM, but it does not cover trenching in buttress shaft concrete.</p> <p>Please provide a design defining the geothermal fields within the buttress shafts. Please include slot excavation, back-fill and compaction requirements in the the affected buttress'.</p>						
T-0668	BGP - CIDH Temporary Bridge Pier Sleeve Detail	Closed	08/05/2013	08/04/2013	08/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
<p>Please refer to drawing S1-3003, A1-8711, SCCI RFI #269 with asbuilt information of CIDH Piles at First Street, and ACI 117-90 section 3.4.1.2</p> <p>The typical 48" diameter bridge pier detail (6/S1-3003) and waterproofing detail (4/A1-8711, 5/A1-8711 and 6//A1-8711) are designed for a steel assembly i.e. bridge pier, piles for shoring, bracing and trestle columns, pin piles and dewatering wells. As a result, the means of achieving the shown steel pipe sleeve is attainable.</p> <p>As per submittal package TG0300-201.3, the 48" temporary bridge piers are designed as CIDH (cast-in-drilled piles) piles and not steel. Specifications for concrete construction tolerances in ACI 117, section 3.4.1.2 allow for horizontal dimension of unformed members cast against soil for greater than 2 ft. but less than 6 ft. allow for +6" and -1/2".</p> <p>The penetration sleeves for these piles have been fabricated.</p> <p>Proposed Solutions:</p>				<p>Utilization of concrete piles for the bridge piers was chosen by the contractor to suit their means and methods. The sleeve shown on the architectural and structural drawings provide details of sleeving penetrations to permit expected movement and provide a waterproofing interface. Sleeves at bridge piers were indicated on the Bridge shop drawings and the requirements for field measurements before fabrication were indicated on the metal sleeve shop drawings.</p> <p>New details will not be provided. CM/CG to provide means and methods of adapting concrete pier to suit mat slab waterproofing metal sleeve details.</p>			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>1. Remove extra concrete from the outside diameter of the CIDH pile to allow the fabricated 48" penetrations to fit through means of bushing or grinding the concrete as necessary and utilize sleeves as originally intended.</div> <div>2. Please provide a detail drawing with the 48" temporary bridge pier condition as CIDH pile. Please include a sleeve detail allowing for the aforementioned tolerances and waterproofing. Please note, as typical of CIDH piles, the surface profile varies much greater than the 1/2" gap tolerance required for steel assemblies shown in 6/S1-3003.</div>						
T-0669	BGP - Foundation Wall Vertical CJ	Closed	08/06/2013	08/16/2013	08/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:		Option 2 will be acceptable (reduce the depth of the foundation wall vertical construction joint to 1.5").					
Reference: Spec Section 033020, Attached Drawings							
See attached sketch of the vertical foundation wall CJ.							
During construction of the high congestion mockup SCCI has discovered a constructibility issue with the construction of the foundation walls, more particularly, the vertical construction joints. Vertical construction joints are to be constructed as prescribed on Detail 2 of the S 1-3001 CD.							
The designed vertical reinforcement consists of the following:							
a. WR-1 with #11 vertical bars 8" OC, haunch #10 bars 8" OC, and #4 cross ties 6" or 12" OC.							
b. WR-2 with #11 vertical bars 8" OC, haunch #10 bars 8" OC, and #4 cross ties 6" or 12" OC.							
c. WR-2MOD (CDSM Encroachments) with #11 vertical bars 5" OC, haunch #10 bars 8" OC, and #4 cross ties 5".							
When rebar configurations noted above are implemented, even with ACI allowed tolerances included, it will conflict							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>with construction of the waterstops, hydrophilic hoses and forming of the vertical CJ.</p> <p>As a possible solution to this issue SCCI suggests the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eliminate a column of cross ties at the construction joints to allow construction of the vertical CJs per Det. 2 on SI-3001 2. Reduce the depth of the vertical construction joint to 1.5" (similar to horizontal CJ). <p>Please advise.</p>						
T-0670	BGP - Mat Slab Control Joints 2	Closed	08/06/2013	08/16/2013	08/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Drawing Please see attached drawing of Zone 1 control joints. SCCI would like to move the green clouded control joint around the pit with a typical 2' offset. Please verify this change to be acceptable.				Reference RFI T-0670.1 for response. Contractor submitted RFI T-0670.1 while RFI T-0670.0 was still in review and the Rev 1 RFI contains the same request included in Rev 0 along with an additional location.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0670.1	BGP - Mat Slab Construction Joint Conflicts	Closed	08/19/2013	08/29/2013	08/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Reference: Spec Section 03 30 20, Attached Sketches Please see attached sketches of mat slab CJ layout. SCCI has discovered conflicts between the CJ formwork and reinforcing steel, pin pile. SCCI proposes to modify the mat slab construction joint to clear the conflicting reinforcing steel and pin pile, as shown on the attached sketches. Is this acceptable?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor-proposed CJ layout as presented in the RFI is acceptable. Although the contractor has not inquired yet, one N-S line of shear reinforcement for the column at F-4 will conflict with the joint key. Contractor may shift this one conflicting line of shear reinforcement max of 3" to clear the key.				
T-0671	BGP - Control Joint Amplitude	Closed	08/08/2013	08/18/2013	08/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing S1-3001 See attached contract drawing S1-3001 regarding vertical and horizontal control joints of the foundation walls. SCCI is requesting acceptance to eliminate amplitude on the face of the control joint keyway where hydrophilic waterstop and injection hose is to be installed. Amplitude will remain on the diagonal portions of the CJ. This RFI is intended to clarify the use of this procedure for foundation walls only.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For vertical and horizontal control joints at the foundation wall, see response to RFI T-0630.				
T-0672	BGP - Fire Management Device Layout	Closed	08/08/2013	08/18/2013	08/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon ANSWERED By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel							
REQUEST: As discussed in the fire management coordination meeting on Monday 8/5, the contract plan device layout does not meet code for current draw. The stub ups from the mat slab to the devices shown on the contract plans at every other column will not be sufficient enough to meet code requirements for the future fully occupied space. If stubbed up at every other column, the consequences are		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The fire management system of design is a performance based design as per Section 28 30 01-1.1C of the contract documents. The contractor is responsible for the design of the system, including stub ups and device layout, as required to adhere to all applicable code requirements.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1191 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	having circuit runs that will end up doubling when the devices are added in the future. Siemens recommends that the stub ups are made at every column which will reduce the total current draw when devices are added in the future.						
	Please advise.						
T-0673	BGP - Displacement of Cap Bar for Support	Closed	08/12/2013	08/22/2013	08/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: S1-3600, Attached RFI 069		RFI was retracted in Constructware. This RFI will be responded to internally. Per meeting between TT, WOJV and SCCI on 08/08/2013, TT rejected the proposed alternative.					
See attached Gerdau's RFI#069							
At the contractors option, Gerdau is requesting to displace one top cap bar every 5' OC within the moment frame beams for support. Allowing the displacement of one top cap bar would reduce congestion near the top of the beam.							
Please confirm that this is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0675	BGP - 400 Series HRC Couplers Assembly Procedure	Closed	08/12/2013	08/22/2013	08/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Spec Section 03 30 20 SCCI is in receipt of the approval to SCCI's Request for Substitution TG0600-077 .1 to approve the use of HRC 400 Series Couplers at Vertical Walls. The comment on the approved Request for Substitution noted that assembly of the couplers is to be completed using strict adherence to the manufacturer's installation procedures. HRC, the manufacturer of the couplers has provided installation instructions, video footage of performance testing, test result and an operator qualification procedure, all supporting the assembly of the of the 400 serious couplers installation is acceptable with "hand tightened" procedure. Please confirm that the assembly of the 410/420 couplers "hand tight" is acceptable based on this manufacturer's recommendation as it was not directly addressed in the returned submittal comments. Video of the performance testing can be viewed : http://youtu.be/M5pFkjOgdN8			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As previously stated in response to the Request for Substitution, the assembly of the couplers shall be per manufacturer's installation procedures. The manufacturer has stated that hand tightening is allowed with the use of qualified operators, therefore it is confirmed that hand tightened procedure is acceptable. Contractor shall submit operator qualifications for personnel that will be performing the hand tightened procedure.				
T-0676	BGP - Mat Slab Construction Joint at 3ft Chamfer	Closed	08/13/2013	08/23/2013	08/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Drawing S1-3201, Spec Section 03 30 20 See attached sketch of the mat slab wall CJ interface, reference Contract Drawing S 1-3201 , and RFI T- 0669. During layout of the bulkhead for the mat slab SCCI has discovered a constructibility issue with the construction ofthe mat slab CJ keyway as depicted on Detail 3 on SI-3001 , at the mat slab interface with the foundation walls. Reinforcement bars that are in conflict with the 10" deep keyway are: a.# 4 U-bars as depicted on detail3 on SI-3201. These			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor-proposed Option 2 is acceptable (transition mat keyway depth for extent shown on RFI sketch).				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1193 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>bars are spaced 6" OC vertically and 5", 6" or 8" OC horizontally with the respect of the type of wall (i.e. WR-1, WR-2, or WR-2MOD)</p> <p>b. 3ft chamfer face bars- #10 at 8" OC per detail 1 on SI-3201</p> <p>When rebar configurations noted above are implemented, even with ACI allowed tolerances included, it will conflict with construction of the waterstops, hydrophilic hoses and forming of the mat slab CJ.</p> <p>As a possible solution to this issue SCCI suggests the following:</p> <p>1. Eliminate a section of#4 U-bars and 3' chamfer face bars to allow constuction of the vertical CJs per Det. 3 on SI-3001</p> <p>2. Transition mat slab keyway to match the foundation wall vertical keyway at 1 1/2" depth (reference RFI T-0669).</p> <p>Please advise.</p>						
T-0677	BGP - Sand Oil Interceptor and Baffle	Closed	08/13/2013	08/23/2013	08/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference specification section 22 13 01 2.5, CD PI-6001 Rev 1 (ASI 104), and SCCI's RFI 255. Drawings do not call out nor provide details for the sand oil interceptor and baffle wall that is called out in SP 22 13 01 2.5.				The pit baffles are post-installed and will be part of the TG07.2 Superstructure Concrete Package.			
Please provide details for the sand oil interceptor and baffle wall.				The baffles are to be 6" thick concrete walls with #5@8" OC EA WAY, bars centered in wall. Post-installed epoxy dowel embedment depths per structural General Notes.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1194 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0678	BGP - Stair 203 Embed Conflict	Closed	08/13/2013	08/23/2013	08/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please see attached SI-2022, SI-7004 and SI-7602. Please confirm full length L8x4xl/2 embed, as shown on detail 2 of S 1-7004 is required. This embed may conflict with future walls as shown on detail 2 of S 1-7004.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The inquired embeds L8x4x1/2 that is called out in detail 12/S1-7602 are not required at this location as the stair landing framing shall attach directly to the TG07.2 concrete walls.	
<hr/>							
T-0679	BGP - CDSM Wall leaks	Closed	08/13/2013	08/23/2013	08/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Photo, Spec Section 07 12 10 Please reference the attached photo. CDSM wall leaks above Level D bracing have created standing water on top of the Area 3 protection slab in multiple areas. The ponding water is triggering the Ad cor ES Waterstop (see photo) along the perimeter of the excavation. SCCI has had minimal success shimming the areas of high leakage to help mitigate the water. Please review and provide direction as to how the leaks will be mitigated. As for the repair of the Adcor Waterstop, SCCI suggests cutting and removing the activated waterstop and installing a new strip with a 4" overlap on both sides. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The suggested remedial work by SCCI is recommended as to adhere to Article 3.07, Section D of the general conditions; SCCI to protect installed materials to prevent damage. As per the approved product data, proper confinement time restrictions are required for any premature swelling or remove and replace damaged material. Please coordinate accordingly with WOJV for specific locations where areas of high leakage occur. As currently coordinated, SCCI is performing mitigation efforts on force account where applicable.	
<hr/>							
T-0680	BGP -Area 7 Clear Cover to the Vertical Reinforcement on the Foundation Wall	Closed	08/14/2013	08/24/2013	08/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A - D Further to response to RFI T-609 (see exhibit - D) this RFI shows the areas of foundation wall in pour area 7, on the north & south wall elevations which will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement for location plan see exhibit - A			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The clear cover between the waterproofing system and vertical reinforcement as presented in Exhibit C of this RFI is acceptable.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Exhibit - B & C depict the amount and location of the foundation walls which the will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement</p> <p>RFI T - 628.1 which shows the thinning of the wall with the revised reinforcement spacing due to CDSM pile encroachment in Area 7.</p> <p>Please confirm that the clear cover between the waterproofing system and the vertical reinforcement as outlined at these locations is acceptable.</p>						
T-0681	BGP - Area 6 Clear Cover to the Vertical Reinforcement on the Foundation Wall	Closed	08/16/2013	08/26/2013	08/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - D				The clear cover between the waterproofing system and vertical reinforcement as presented in Exhibit C of this RFI is acceptable.			
Further to response to RFI T-609 (see exhibit - D) this RFI shows the areas of foundation wall in pour area 6, on the north & south wall elevations which will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement for location plan see exhibit - A							
Exhibit - B & C depict the amount and location of the foundation walls which the will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement							
RFI T - 627.1 shows the thinning of the wall with the revised reinforcement spacing due to CDSM pile encroachment in Area 6.							
Please confirm that the clear cover between the waterproofing system and the vertical reinforcement as outlined at these locations is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1196 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0682	BGP -Area 5 Clear Cover to the Vertical Reinforcement on the Foundation Wall	Closed	08/16/2013	08/26/2013	08/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - D					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Further to response to RFI T-609 (see exhibit - D) this RFI shows the areas of foundation wall in pour area 5, on the north & south wall elevations which will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement for location plan see exhibit - A					The clear cover between the waterproofing system and vertical reinforcement as presented in Exhibit C of this RFI is acceptable.		
Exhibit - B & C depict the amount and location of the foundation walls which the will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement							
RFI T - 626.1 shows the thinning of the wall with the revised reinforcement spacing due to CDSM pile encroachment in Area 5.							
Please confirm that the clear cover between the waterproofing system and the vertical reinforcement as outlined at these locations is acceptable.							
T-0683	BGP -Area 4 clear cover to the vertical reinforcement on the foundation wall	Closed	08/16/2013	08/26/2013	08/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - C					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Further to response to RFI T-609 (see exhibit - C) this RFI shows the clear cover to the vertical reinforcement on the foundation wall in pour area 4 for location plan see exhibit - A					Information noted. See the response to RFI T-0609.		
Exhibit - B depict the amount of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement on the foundation wall in area 4, however there are no areas which will have greater than 6" of clear cover so this RFI is for information only.							
RFI T - 622.1 shows the thinning of the wall with the revised reinforcement spacing due to CDSM pile encroachment in Area 4.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1197 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i><u>Number</u></i>	<i><u>Subject</u></i>	<i><u>Status</u></i>	<i><u>Date Created</u></i>	<i><u>Date Required</u></i>	<i><u>Date Answered</u></i>	<i><u>Cost Impact</u></i>	<i><u>Proceed</u></i>
<p>Please confirm that the clear cover between the waterproofing system and the vertical reinforcement as outlined at these locations is acceptable.</p>							
T-0684	BGP - Couplers for Future Construction	Closed	08/19/2013	08/29/2013	08/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: Drawing S1-3206, Spec Section 03 30 20		Thornton Tomasetti does not object to the contractor's proposal, contained in RFI T-0684 BGP, regarding couplers for future construction.					
See attached photo of the form savers that are going to be used for the coupler for future construction as depicted on Detail 4 of S1-3206, and Detail 6 of S1-3001.		The proposal contained in this RFI also concerns a waterproofing system proposed by the Contractors, not the system designed by the Architect. The Contractors should have their engineer who prepared this waterproofing system design respond to this RFI. Until that is done, the Contractor should confirm all waterproofing system questions and details with the waterproofing manufacturer (with copies to the TJPA and its consultants and the Architect).					
SCCI believes that Detail 6 on S1-3001 is not applicable due to the following:							
1. As shown on the attached photo, epoxy coated form savers have tin cap incorporated into the coupler body. This tin cap will protect the rebar until the future construction.							
2. Whatever tar is intended to be used with form savers in not compatible with the Grace waterproofing.							
3. Detail 6 on S1-3001 is a detail for the slabs, where future walls are to be constructed.							
SCCI proposed to install the coupler for future construction as shown on Detail 4 S1-3206 with form savers set against the waterproofing membrane. Care shall be taken to ensure that waterproofing is not damaged.							
Is this acceptable?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1198 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0685	BGP - North Shear Wall Concrete Mix	Open	08/09/2013	08/23/2013	08/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached drawing regarding the North shear wall. Due to the monolithic pours at the intersection of the shear wall, foundation wall and mat slab chamfer, there will be differentiating concrete mix uses. The attached drawing assigns the portions of this intersection with its corresponding concrete mix. Please verify the use of these concrete mixes at this location as acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor-proposed concrete mix use at north shearwall is acceptable.		
T-0686	BGP - Drain Line Conflict with Micro Piles	Closed	08/22/2013	09/01/2013	09/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached photo and CD PI-2030. After performed layout of the drainage line system around GL K5 SCCI has discovered that a row of micro piles is in conflict with the 4" cast iron pipe drain line. SCCI suggest shifting the drain line run to clear the micro piles. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> In order to avoid the conflict between micropiles and drainage piping, the catch basin indicated in RFI T-0686 BGP has been relocated slightly north. The drainage piping will run straight from the catch based as it did before. Refer to the attached PSK-2030 and SKA-2822.		
T-0687	BGP - Drain Line Conflict with Reinforcement	Closed	08/22/2013	09/01/2013	09/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached photos and CD P 1-2030. Tails of the bottom rebar mat at the drainage pit are interfering with the construction of drainage lines and catch basin. SCCI proposes following: 1. Shift the catch basin to where it clears the reinforcement tails.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Option 2 will be allowed. Rebar tail ends that conflict with the catch basin for this location may be cut to clear the catch basin. 12" max may be cut off.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1199 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>2. Cut the rebar tails to allow installation of the drainage lines and the catch basin.</div> <div>Please advise.</div>						
T-0688	BGP - Pin Pile No 6 Conflict with Future Walls	Closed	08/23/2013	09/02/2013	09/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please refer to attached drawing S1-2052 (ASI 102), S1-3205 (ASI 100) and attached photos.				Note that the wall reinforcement for this RFI is #7 @12" OC each face per S1-9050 as it is labeled as a partition wall on plan as well as reflected in rebar submittal TG0600-301.2.			
Drawing S1-2052, shows pin pile No. 6 (43"x43 block-out) at GL D.8/4 encroaching the future reinforced concrete wall (RCW). As a result, the couplers shown in detail drawing 5/S1-3205 cannot be installed in the area where the pin pile 43"x43" block-out is located.				The OC spacing of the vertical dowels shall be 6" OC each face for a distance of 3'-0" on either side of the inquired block-out. For vertical bars within the block-out embed min 4" into concrete.			
Please confirm it is acceptable to reduce the distance between the mechanical coupler for the future 12" RCW from 8" O.C. to 4" O.C. as shown in detail drawing 5/S1-3205, The revised coupler spacing would only span a distance of three feet on either side of the block-out to compensate for the coupler that cannot be installed due to the block-out/pin pile location.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1200 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0689	BSE - Micropiles in Depressions	Open	08/23/2013	09/02/2013	08/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Sketch: attached Reference Email: attached The micropile designer has confirmed that it is not necessary to extend the micropile to within 6" of the top of concrete and that the 5' embedment in the sump pit is adequate. Please confirm that this is acceptable to the design team.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is acceptable with the design team.	
<hr/>							
T-0690	SSS - Stainless steel welded to cast iron	Closed	08/23/2013	09/02/2013	09/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: 1/S1-6056 A number of details throughout structural steel drawings indicate stainless steel welded to cast iron or mild steel, see detail 1, 2/S1-6056 as one example. If two metals are fused, cast iron welded to stainless steel results in carbon migration. The chromium in the stainless and carbon in the steel have affinity for each other at elevated temperatures that results in carbon and chromium combining to form chromium carbide. This turns the welded area into hard and brittle material with a potential for rust that overtime has a high possibility to crack and fail. For Det. 1 and 2 on S1-6056 the added tension from cables may contribute to failure. The proposed solutions include: 1.Use stainless steel instead of mild steel for the bottom connection plate thus welding stainless steel to stainless steel. Where the bottom plate has to connect to structural steel use bolted connection with thin dielectric isolator between two surfaces. 2.Replace welded connection to bolted connection with an isolator. 3.Use galvanized and painted plate instead of stainless			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The inquired connection can be executed in the way shown. Welding stainless steel to carbon steel is an established method, which can be done using an appropriate welding method. As with all welding methods, there are certain points to be considered, such as: - The fabricator to be approved for welding stainless steel to carbon steel and/or cast steel (qualification submittals) - The welder to be approved for welding stainless steel to carbon steel and/or cast steel (qualification submittals) - Surface preparation before welding necessary (welding procedure submittals) - Selection of weld filler material (welding procedure submittals in combination with structural design verification) - Surface preparation after welding (welding procedure submittals) - Coating of weld and stainless steel member 30mm beyond weld (welding procedure submittals)	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1202 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0692	BGP - Rebar Configuration at Moment Beam with Incorporation of S-3 vs T-9 Ties	Closed	08/23/2013	09/03/2013	08/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached detail 3 on drawing S1-3603 and attached Gerdau Sketch SK-Gerdau RFI 070. Please confirm it is acceptable to install S-3 stirrups and one T-9 tie as shown in the attached sketch for the vertical ties in the moment frame beam in lieu of installing all T-9 ties as depicted in detail 3/S1-3603. The proposed concrete reinforcement configuration is needed to avoid the constructability issues associated with alternating the hooks under the 1.5" of clear cover beneath the bottom beam bars.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor proposed reinforcement configuration for the lower concourse moment frame beam transverse reinforcement is acceptable.		
T-0693	BGP - Conduits in Columns	Closed	08/23/2013	09/02/2013	08/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: From discussions with the Design Team, we have been informed that a number of columns will have post installed steel jackets. Columns with Fire Management and steel jackets will require the conduits and j-boxes to be embedded. It is noted that the jackets will not be full height, so the j-boxes will be flush with the concrete face. Please provide the locations of the affected columns and a height for the boxes.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI response: Refer to the attached sketches SKA-2808R1, SKA-2809R1, SKA-2811R1 showing the locations of the West End B2 level concrete columns which will receive post installed steel jackets and embedded conduits. The attached SKA-2817R2 shows the mounting height of the surface mounted electrical boxes for these columns. WSP response: On the steel jacketed columns, backboxes will be surface mounted with conduit routed within the column. Conduit will exit the column terminating into the back of the surface mounted box. Contractor shall lay out and route the embedded conduits such that the number of bends between boxes does not exceed code (360 degrees between boxes). These embedded conduits shall not be required to follow building column lines, and direct runs between devices shall be acceptable to avoid intermediate junction boxes.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0693.1	BGP - Embedded Conduits in Columns	Closed	09/04/2013	09/14/2013	09/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: In the MEP meeting on 9/4/13, the response to RFI T-0693 was clarified. To confirm conversations with the WSP Electrical Design representative, the only conduits to be embedded in columns per the RFI T-0693 response are to be fire management conduits per the locations depicted in the response. All other conduits (power recepticals etc) are to be stubbed up on the face of the columns and are not to be embedded in the column.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			With reference to RFI T-0693, all other conduits (power receptacles etc.) are to be stubbed up adjacent to the face of the columns and are not to be embedded in the columns. The conduits and receptacles will be surface mounted on the post-installed steel jackets. Note that the conduits are to be stubbed up with 5" between the conduit face and the concrete column face, to allow for the post-installation of the steel jackets. There are also plumbing risers on a number of the steel jacketed columns. The pipe risers should be positioned relative to the columns in accordance with the plumbing documents, but should not be closer than 5" to the concrete column, to permit post installation of the steel jackets.				
<hr/>							
T-0694	Additional Rebar Conflict for Plumbing Trim at GL2/D.4	Closed	08/26/2013	09/03/2013	08/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawings 1/A1-2122, 1/S1-3501 and attached Gerdau sketch SKS-1 Due to the density or the typical N-S top mat bars (#10) and additional bars (#11) near the elevator pit at Gridlines 2 and D.4, the additional trim rebar per 1/S1-3501 for interrupting the bars over the plumbing opening cannot be installed to the East of the plumbing opening within 3" of the opening. The alternative solution would be to install the additional steel in a new layer below the top mat; however, due to proximity of the piping to the steel the bars cannot be placed below the top mat. Gerdau proposes the folloing options: A. Omit the additional trim bars to the East of the trimmed opening. B. Relocate the additional trim bars approximately 3'-0" East of the opening where the rebar spacing would allow for additional steel. Please advise if proposed options are acceptable.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			Contractor-proposed option to omit additional trim bars to the east of the trimmed opening is acceptable for the cut plumbing opening at Grid 2/D.4. Added trim bars to the west of the opening will remain as placed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1204 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>(see attached SKS-1)</div>							
T-0695	BGP - Additional Rebar Conflict for Floor Sink Trim GL B.7/2.7	Closed	08/26/2013	09/02/2013	08/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached Gerdau's RFI #72, 1/S1-3501, A1-2122, attached Gerdau sketch SKS-1		Per SKS-0282 (attached),					
Due to the density of the typical N-S top mat bars (#10), additional N-S top mat bars (#11) and pin pile trim steel (#11 with lap splices directly over floor sink) near the floor sink at Gridlines 2.7 and B.7, the additional trim rebar per 1/S1-3501 for interrupting the bars over the plumbing opening cannot be installed on either side of the plumbing opening. The alternative solution would be to install the additional steel in a new layer below the top mat; however, due to the proximity of the plumbing piping to the steel the additional bars cannot be placed below the top mat. Also, the additional bar to the East of the opening would conflict with the pin pile. Gerdau proposes to cut top mat bars to allow for the floor sink installation and omit the additional trim bars.		Pin pile add bars will be calculated as ½ the number of interrupted bars each side in lieu of ½+1 bars. This eliminates (2) pin-pile add bars being interrupted by the drain.					
Please advise if the proposed solution is acceptable.		One wall add bar interrupted by the drain will be cut short at the northern limit of the drain and not be considered interrupted by the drain.					
		Reinforcing west of the drain centerline, but within the cut zone, will be jockeyed west so that no bars are required to be cut.					
		Reinforcing east of the drain centerline, but within the cut zone, will be jockeyed east so that no bars are required to be cut.					
		A single typical mat bar will remain within the cut zone and may be cut.					
		Congested reinforcing east of the cut zone will be jockeyed east aided by the partial (or complete) removal of a plumbing add bar.					
		Clear spacing of 1db to be maintained between all bars except where lap spliced.					
		In displacing bars to achieve the configuration shown in the SKS, resulting non-contact lap splices will be tolerated up to 6".					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1205 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0696	SSS - Type 1 Drag Connection Angles	Closed	08/26/2013	09/05/2013	08/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Drawings: S1-2502, S1-2503, S1-2504, S1-2505, S1-2506, S1-2507					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The angles shown in the bus deck plan views (drawings S1-2502 through S1-2507) for the Type 1 drag connections to the bus deck cast nodes do not appear to match with the corresponding angles shown on the casting drawings (drawings S1-5121 through S1-5125).					Beam plan angles (Sheets S1-2502 through S1-2507) and Bus Deck casting angles (S1-5121 through S1-5125) will not match in all cases because some casting types are used at multiple locations as indicated in Sheet S1-5120. The design intent was to minimize the number of unique castings in the structure which is more cost effective than developing unique casting geometry for every joint. For example, as indicated Sheet S1-5120, Casting 21A is used at various different joints at which joining beam angles vary in a certain range. The pad widths on the castings have been designed to be wide enough so that beams with different plan angles can be connected to the casting.		
The attached mark-ups show our fabricator's (Oregon Iron Works) attempt to calculate the angles on the bus deck plan views and compare them to the corresponding angles of the castings.					In some other cases, the casting angles were revised during cast node shop drawing review. For example, for Casting 35B one of the plan angles was changed from 42.25 to 26.14 degrees to match the beam angle. Contractor shall coordinate the information in the drawings with those in cast node shop drawings.		
Please clarify.							
T-0697	BGP - Moment and Spandrel Beams 180 Degree Hooks Versus 135 Degree Hooks	Closed	08/26/2013	09/06/2013	08/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached Gerdau's RFI#068, S1-3600, S1-3410					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
At the contractor's option, Gerdau is requesting to change the 135 degree hooks on the Moment Frame and the Spandrel Beam stirrups to 180 degree hooks.					Contractors proposal to replace the 135 degree hooks with 180 degree hooks on the Lower Concourse Moment Frame Beam and Spandrel Beam Perimeter Stirrups is acceptable.		
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-0698	SSS - Clash Between Slab on Deck and Transfer Girder	Closed	08/26/2013	09/05/2013	08/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1206 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Reference Drawings: A1-2863, S1-2303, S1-5000 Reference Sketch: attached There are many conflicts in the plans where the top of concrete and the top of the transfer girder in that given area does not leave the amount of space required under the Metal Deck Schedule on 2/S1-5000. For Example: Using the Top Of Concrete (TOC) and Top Of Steel (TOS) elevation from sheet S1-2303 a clash occurs between the slab (S3 - TOC: 19.00') and Transfer Girder TR9 (TR9 - TOS: 18.37'). The 10" that the S3 deck requires in the Metal Deck Schedule on 2/S1-5000 cannot be maintained over the Transfer Girder. Please clarify.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to details that have been cut on plan across the transfer girders as applicable in the Superstructure IFC/ASI 105 issue. Example: See section detail 8/S1-3705 that is cut at gridline 9 & D.4 on S1-2303 (included in the RFI).		
T-0699	BGP - Catch Basin Requirements	Closed	08/27/2013	09/06/2013	09/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
	REQUEST: See attached page from DBI's standard catch basin detail, and reference drawings P1-6001 and P1-2022 thru 2030. On 08/26/2013 during pressure testing inspection of the drainage lines in mat slab areas 1 and 2, the SFDBI Plumbing Inspector pointed out that all catch basins in the mat slab should be constructed per city standard catch basin details. However, the contract drawings do not show catch basins details with cleanouts, vents and trap primer connections per the City Standard details. Please confirm the attached SFDBI city standard catch basin detail is to supersede all catch basin details currently shown in trade group package TG06.0 drawing set. Please include revised plumbing drawings incorporating the City Standard details.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As discussed in our review meeting with the SFDBI Plumbing Inspectors, the catch basin which are actually points of collection, will be installed as shown on contract documents.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1207 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0700	BGP - Vehicle/Bike Beam End Support Embed	Open	08/27/2013	09/09/2013	08/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference attached drawing S1-3411 .				The inquired embed width is 24" as shown in detail 1D.			
The corbel section detail I of sheet S1-3411 calls for a 3/4"x4"x 18" embed plate at the toe of the corbel. However, the embed detail in 1D/S1-3411 shows the embed width at 24".							
Please clarify the embed width dimensional discrepancy: 3/4"x4"x18" or 3/4"x4"x24". Please advise.							
T-0702	BGP - Chamfer Bar Top Hook	Open	08/29/2013	09/08/2013	08/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached Gerdau's RFI#74. See attached SKS-74				Contractor-proposed 180 degree hook for the chamfer bars that are in conflict with double shoring walers is acceptable for bars that have not been fabricated. The radius point for the bend shall remain located as originally detailed on 1/S1-3201.			
In an effort to prevent the chamfer bar from encroaching on the existing shoring waler beams, Gerdau would like to propose over bending the top hook and turning it into a standard 180 degree hook as shown on the attached sketch.							
Please advise if this is acceptable							
T-0703	BGP - Drainage Conflicts with Reinforcement	Closed	08/29/2013	09/08/2013	09/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached marked up contract drawings PSK-2022 and S1-3005				General guidelines for displacement of headed reinforcing at plumbing conflicts are as follows:			
Some of the drainage lines and fixtures are designed to be constructed in close proximity of the concrete columns, similarly S1-3005 depicts typical mat shear reinforcement schedule and details. Some of these shear reinforcement bars will be interfering with the drainage lines and fixtures.				Lines refer to heads that are perpendicular to a column face.			
				1) Any head in line can be displaced 4" in any direction provided that it is not the first head. First			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>SCCI suggest to displace these shear reinforcement bars where conflicts occur. Displacement would occur lateraly, in 8" increments, governed by the grid of the mat slab main reinforcement bars.</p> <p>Please advise.</p>			<p>heads can only be displaced away from the column or parallel to the column face.</p> <p>2) The maximum spacing of heads in a line shall be 12".</p> <p>3) The minimum spacing of heads in a line shall be 4".</p> <p>4) Any line can be started 8" along that line from the previously intended starting position provided the displacement is away from the column.</p> <p>5) Any line or group of lines can be displaced laterally such that all lines are within the projection of the column face and the centroid of the resulting group is within the middle third of the projection of the column face.</p> <p>6) The minimum spacing between adjacent lines shall be 4"</p> <p>7) The maximum spacing between adjacent lines shall be 24".</p> <p>All locations with displaced heads shall be observed by Thornton Tomasetti's field engineer prior to inspection.</p>			
T-0704	SSS - Domestic Manufactured W40x503	Closed	08/29/2013	09/08/2013	09/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Drawings: S1-2505, S1-2506, S1-2507, S1-5050		W40x503 may be replaced by a built-up wide flange with steel plates. The plates shall match the dimensions of the rolled shape.					
We have determined that W40x503 is not produced Domestic melted and manufactured. This size girder occurs in 12 locations at the Perimeter Bus Deck Level between grid lines 21 and 33.		Please be noted that the W40x503 are not only used at Bus Deck between Grid 31 and 33. They are also used at the ground level drag beam along Grid C & G.					
This beam is available from import sources, or it can be		Skanska and W/O please provide information on how					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1209 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0704.1	SSS - Built Up Plate Fabrication for W40x503	Closed	09/16/2013	09/26/2013	09/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference RFI: T-0704			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The built up beam will consist of 1 9/16" webs and 2 3/4" flanges. Please confirm that these plate sizes are appropriate.			Flange and web thicknesses are confirmed. The beams shall be 42" deep, the flanges shall be 16-3/8" wide. The plates shall be ASTM A572, GR 50 per General Notes SS-1. Web to flange welding shall be with double 5/8" fillet welds for 4 ft from each end of each flange plate and double 3/8" fillet welds in between.				
The web to flange weld was not addressed on returned RFI T-0704. We would suggest a 3/8" double fillet weld to join the web and flanges.			W40X503 are also used at Roof and Ground Levels. W/O to coordinate RFI T-0704-SSS and T-0704.1-SSS responses with other sub-contractors, as needed.				
Please confirm or provide an alternate detail.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0705	BGP - Haunch Reinforcement at Double Waler Condition	Closed	08/29/2013	09/08/2013	09/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. John Berggren							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing 1/S1-3201 attached Photo SCCI-RFI 305. As per field coordination, the double shoring waler condition, where the waler web is lower than that of a single waler, the tail of the #10@8" (reference attached excerpt drawing BM-3t of submittal package TG0600-301.1) haunch reinforcement interferes with the web of the shoring waler. The condition was observed at Grid 2/ A and will likely repeat at other double waler locations. The typical resolution to the condition shall be to adjust the position, where required, so that the interfering tail clears the double waler web. As a result the 1-1/2" clear cover will deviate up to 4-112" of clear cover. The plan location of the tail shall remain as close as possible per the placement drawings. See the attached Photo for further details. The 1-1/2" clear spacing shall remain at locations unaffected by the reduced clearance of the double-wlaer. For pieces not yet fabricated and delivered, please refer to RFI T-0603 as the proposed solution to conform to the 1-1/2" clear cover. Plases confirm the revised haunch reinforcement clear clover as coordinated in the field is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The revised haunch reinforcement clear cover as described in the RFI per field coordination is confirmed.				
T-0706	BGP - Locations of Electrical Outlets, Equipment, and Fixtures	Closed	08/30/2013	09/09/2013	09/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Per the RFI response, please find attached the revised layout for the Electrical Room B2221. This revised layout shows the dimensions off of the interior walls as requested. Please advise if it is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per the Pour #1 RFI coordination meeting on 9/5/13, W/O is to resubmit RFI with revised sketch. Refer to RFI T-0665.2 submitted on 9/12/13.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0707	BGP - Spandrel beam modifications in Area 1 & 2	Closed	08/30/2013	09/09/2013	09/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - C			George Metzger 9/9/2013				
Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes and details to the spandrel beams in pour area 1 & 2 for location plan see Exhibit - A and B			RESPONSE: Contractor proposed modifications to the Lower Concourse spandrel beams within Area 1 and 2 are acceptable.				
Exhibit - B shows the extent of the modifications necessary due to the foundation wall offset and changes made to wall reinforcement due to CDSM encroachment.							
Exhibit - C shows the transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement at spandrel beam as well as cross sections of the original design and the proposed modified beam detail.							
RFI T-448.5 and T-608 shows the thinning of the wall with the revised reinforcement spacing due to CDSM pile encroachment in Area 1 and 2.							
RFI T-576 shows the revised location of the foundation wall on the west elevation of area 1.							
Please confirm that these modification as outlined at these locations are acceptable.							
T-0708	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modification in Area 3	Closed	09/03/2013	09/13/2013	09/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Documents: Exhibits A & B			George Metzger 9/11/2013				
Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour area 3 for location plan see Exhibit - A			RESPONSE: Contractor proposed modifications to the Lower Concourse spandrel beams within Area 3 are acceptable.				
Exhibit - B shows the extent of the modifications necessary due to the foundation wall offset due to CDSM encroachment.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1212 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	RFI T - 621.1 shows the revised location of the foundation wall on the north elevation of area 3 due CDSM pile encroachment.						
	RFI T - 576 shows the revised location of the foundation wall on the west elevation of area 3 again due CDSM pile encroachment.						
	Please confirm that this modification as outlined at these locations is acceptable.						
T-0709	BGP - Mat Slab Added Steel Interference	Closed	09/03/2013	09/16/2013	09/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Drawing S1-3003 and Spec Section 03 20 00 See attached Gerdau Sketch SK-77, BM-3b, BM-3t							
Due to the location of select trestle and pin piles, the #9@16" (bottom mat) and #11@16" (top mat) added North-South layer reinforcement cannot be installed at the desired spacing. The proposed solution is to cut the added #9 or #11 bars, where interrupted by a pile, and add a hook of equal size or greater (#11 hook max) with a lap splice similar to the hooks used for the trestle and pin pile trim steel.		The rebar conditions for bars at pin/trestle piles are addressed in typical details 2 & 3 on S1-3003 as well as details 4 & 7 on S1-3009 - these also apply to the inquired add bars in the RFI. The contractor-proposed use of spliced hook at these locations is acceptable.					
Please confirm if this is acceptable.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0710	BGP - Haunch Reinforcement Alternative Detail at Dewatering Well in Area 3	Closed	09/03/2013	09/16/2013	09/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: S1 -3201 Reference Spec: 03 20 00 Attached Gerdau Sketch: SKS-76.1, SKS-76.2, SKS-76.3 A portion of the #10 @ 8" haunch bars cannot be installed as fabricated due to conflicts with overhead obstructions (shoring walers and struts) and the dewatering well sleeves. Per discussions with Sean McNeil where bars cannot be installed due to the obstructions, a modified #10 haunch bar with an HRC 555 head can be installed in place of the typical haunch bar. The attached sketches (SKS-76.1 and SKS-76.2) depict the magnitude of the obstructions at the dewatering wells in Area 3. Please confirm if this is acceptable. Additionally, please provide the required embedment length for the headed tail of the modified haunch bar.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> At conflicts with dewatering wells, the tail of the haunch bar may be terminated as shown in Gerdau SKS-76.3 contained in the RFI. The embedment length for #10 headed bar shall be 18". Alternatively, the embedment may be a straight development, either inclined or vertical, of 42". The 180 degree hook at the top of the bar shall comply with the RFI T-702 BGP response regarding the location of the radius point.		

T-0711	SSS - Radius Change Request for LC301	Closed	09/03/2013	09/13/2013	09/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: A design change on the light column critical type LC301 (CN0058) node has changed the radius between the body and the lifting bracket from the original two inches to one inch. We would like to formally request a change to a minimum of a two inch radius in this location. A one inch radius on the 301 bracket creates the following manufacturing challenges: A. The sand in the 1 inch radius in the mold will superheat and cause burn in/on sand adherence to the casting causing additional grinding and work in the finishing department to meet visual acceptance criteria. B. The sharper radius will create a hot spot and solidification challenges - liquid metal contracts % inch per foot and silica sand expands 1.2% during solidification and as cast hot tear potential in the radius may occur causing welding, grinding and blending. This again will be to meet			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed 2" fillet radius between the main body of casting LC301 and its side fin is acceptable.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the visual acceptance criteria.</p> <p>C. With a 2 inch radius the appendage (lifting bracket) will be much closer to thermally neutral reducing solidification stresses and potential shrinkage in the section radius.</p> <p>D. Cosmetically a 2 inch radius will look much more presentable in the as cast state.</p> <p>E. The 1 inch radius will require either chill sand in the radius, a metal chill made in the mold, or solidification cracking brackets as heat sinks to equalize the solidification temperatures and add strength to prevent hot tearing during solidification. Additional grinding of these areas will be necessary to meet visual acceptance criteria.</p> <p>F. Items A, B, and E will add costs to the manufacturing process of the casting.</p> <p>Our purpose is to point out the effects of the 1 inch radius design request and make sure that the designers are aware of the potential impact of having the smaller radius versus the 2 inch radius in the original designs that were reviewed. Bradken Atchison can certainly produce the 1 inch radius and manage the effects the 1 inch radius causes, but producing that design will have cost impacts to the casting process.</p>						
T-0712	BGP - Jitter Bug Finish on Mat Slab Surface	Open	09/03/2013	09/13/2013	09/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Spec Section 033020.3.6.B.I.c. See attached photos for a visual reference.				The proposed ¿Jitter Bug¿ finish is not acceptable. Future requirements for the train bed are unknown and the proposed finish may not be acceptable in some instances. Use the stiff broom finish per specification section: 03 30 20.3.6.B.1.c			
Please reference TG06.0, BGP contract specifications 033020.3.6.B.I.c. SCCI is proposing to finish the top surface of the Mat foundation Slab, as a "Jitter Bug" finish. All other finishing requirements will remain the same.							
Is this acceptable?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1215 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0713	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 4	Closed	09/05/2013	09/15/2013	09/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A - B Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 4 for location plan see exhibit - A. Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall as well as typical cross sections. RFI T - 622.1 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north elevation of area 4. Please confirm that this modification as outlined at this location is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 9/13/2013 RESPONSE: Contractor proposed modification to the Lower Concourse spandrel beam within Area 4 is acceptable. Proper lap splices shall be provided where the beam rebar is transitioned from 7-1/16 inch spacing to 6-1/2 inch at each side of the encroached wall region.				
T-0714	BGP - Area 3- Partition Wall Pier Rebar Conflict With Plumbing Near GL3/C.3	Closed	09/03/2013	09/13/2013	09/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: See attached Gerdau's RFI #078. Near Gridlines 3/C.3, there is a conflict between the partition wall pier dowels and the installed 6" plumbing pipe (8" with insulation). The wall pier currently overlaps with the plumbing pipe by approximately 6". Gerdau proposes to move the wall pier to the East, or West to allow the dowels to clear the pipe. Please provide the acceptable direction (East or West) to shift the wall pier. Please note that there are conduits stub up on the East side that would need to be moved, should the opening is shifted towards the East.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 2 corner bar dowels of the pier that are in conflict with the pipe may be minimally bent to clear the pipe. Non-corner vertical bar dowels within the pier that are in conflict with the pipe may be shifted to clear the pipe.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1216 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0715	BGP - Adjustment to CB location	Closed	09/03/2013	09/13/2013	09/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: We understand from Design Team small adjustment to the locations of CBs at GL 1.8, J ; GL 7.2, C.3 and GL 10.2, B.5 are required. Please provide dimensions for the modified locations.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the attached SKA-2820 and SKA-2821 for the modified locations of the CBs indicated in RFI T-0715 BGP.	
<hr/>							
T-0715.1	BGP - Adjustment to CB location	Closed	09/04/2013	09/14/2013	09/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Spencer Sayles			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing SKA-2820 and A1-2812 dated 04/29/2013. As per design coordination meeting between SCCI, WOJV, AAI and TT, please confirm it is acceptable to omit SKA-2820 provided in RFI T-0715. Due to the timing of the issuance of this change, the Area 3 mat slab pour would be delayed by at least a week because the catch basin is already installed per drawing A1-2812, tested and inspected by DBI.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to omit SKA-2820 provided in RFI T-0715.	
<hr/>							
T-0716	BGP - Haunch Reinforcement Alternative Detail	Closed	09/03/2013	09/13/2013	09/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu							
REQUEST: See attached Gerdau's RFI #79. The RFI Response to RFI T -0702 stated that the 180 degree hook chamfer bars are acceptable where the bars conflict with the double shoring walers. The intent of the RFI was to request the use of the 180- degree hook for the chamfer bars throughout the structure regardless of whether or not the bars were below a double or single walers. Please confirm that this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per RFI 702 response, contractor-proposed 180 degree hook for the chamfer bars that are in conflict with double shoring walers is acceptable for bars that have not been fabricated. The radius point for the bend shall remain located as originally detailed on 1/S1-3201. At contractor's option, the same bars may be used at any haunch location and are not restricted to the double walers.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1217 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0716.1	BGP - Haunch Hook Embedment Clarification	Closed	10/08/2013	10/18/2013	10/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to RFI T-0716 and drawing detail 1/S1-3201. As per field review by SCCI, Gerdau and TT Field Engineer, the embedment lengths of the haunch hooks (see RFI T-716) provided average 35" but are no less than 29". The embedment lengths are measured from their intersection with the wall interior reinforcing curtain as shown in the attached Gerdau sketch SK-094. Please confirm the embedment lengths are acceptable as discussed with TT field engineer.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/9/2013 RESPONSE: The haunch hooked embedment lengths as described in the RFI are acceptable.				
T-0717	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 5	Closed	09/09/2013	09/19/2013	09/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane							
REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A - B Further to response to RFI T-637, please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 5 for location plan see Exhibit- A Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north elevation due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall as well as typical cross sections. The spandrel beam on the south elevation will be installed as per contract drawing with no modifications necessary. RFI T-626.1 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of area 5. Please confirm that this modification as outlined at this location is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 9/17/2013 RESPONSE: Contractor proposed modification to the Lower Concourse spandrel beam within Area 5 is acceptable. Proper lap splices shall be provided where the beam rebar is transitioned from 7-1/16 inch spacing to 6-1/2 inch at each side of the encroached wall region.				
T-0718	BGP-Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 6	Open	09/11/2013	09/21/2013	09/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

*PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG*

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:**REQUEST:**

Reference Documents: Exhibits A - B

Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 6 for location plan see exhibit - A

Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north and south elevations due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall due to encroachment of the CDSM beams as well as typical cross sections of the spandrel beam. RFI T - 627.1 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of Area 6.

Please confirm that this modification as outlined at this location is acceptable.

SUGGESTION:**ANSWER:****Accept Suggestion:** ☐

George Metzger

9/18/2013

RESPONSE:

Contractor proposed modification to the Lower Concourse spandrel beam within Area 6 is acceptable. Proper lap splices shall be provided where the beam rebar is transitioned from 7-1/16 inch spacing to 6-1/2 inch at each side of the modified cross-section.



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0719	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 7	Open	09/16/2013	09/26/2013	09/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane							
REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A - B Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 7 for location plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north and south elevations due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall due to encroachment of the CDSM beams as well as typical cross sections of the revised spandrel beams. RFI T - 628.1 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of Area 7. Please confirm that this modification as outlined at this location is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 9/18/2013 RESPONSE: Contractor proposed modification to the Lower Concourse spandrel beam within Area 7 is acceptable. Proper lap splices shall be provided where the beam rebar is transitioned from the spacing in the construction drawings to the modified spacing at each side of the modified cross-section.				
T-0720	BGP - Electrical Design Intent for Typical Train Platform Drawings	Void	09/04/2013	09/14/2013	09/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The electrical plan drawings that are noted for reference only in the For Construction - Below Grade Package drawing set dated 08/30/2012 include, but not limited to: E1-2102, E1-2103, E1-2104, E1-2105, E1-2106, E1-2107, E1-2110, E1-2204, E1-2206, E1-2207, E1-2210, E1-3101, E1-3102, E1-3201, E1-3202, E1-3203, and E1-5201. As discussed between F&K, SCCI and WOJV on Wednesday, September 04, 2013, SCCI has not installed or accommodated for any electrical conduits that may be required for devices shown in the aforementioned drawings due to the note "For Reference Only." As requested by F&K, this RFI is being submitted to review design intent.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As discussed internally, F&K to pursue FCR process.				
T-0721	BGP - NW Corner Wall Intersection Horizontal and Haunch - Area 3	Closed	09/04/2013	09/14/2013	09/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1220 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0722	From: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: Reference Drawing: 3/S 1-3001 Reference Spec: 03 20 00 Per field coordination with the on-site structural engineer the following conditions are to be confirmed as acceptable: 1. In the Northwest corner of Area 3, corner bars matching the size, spacing and lap splices of typical horizontal reinforcing are installed in-lieu of bent typical horizontal bars. See Bar A in sketch FC-1 2. In-lieu of hooked haunch horizontal bars, straight bars of the same size have been installed with the required embedment. See Bar B in sketch FC-1. 3. At the intersection of the North and West haunch bars, the haunch bars along the North (Bar D) wall have been trimmed at the approximate intersection with the West (Bar C) haunch bars. Reference sketch FC-2. The observed condition is acceptable, but at future locations within the intersection of two haunches the detail for Bar E will be used unless Bar D already has 42" of embedment.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The field conditions as described in the RFI are confirmed as acceptable.				
T-0722	BGP - Haunch Reinforcing Intersection with Dewatering Wells	Closed	09/04/2013	09/04/2013	09/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
T-0722	REQUEST: Reference drawing: 1/S1-3201 Reference spec: 03 20 00 Per field coordination with the on-site structural engineer the following conditions are to be confirmed as acceptable: 1. In Area 3 along Gridline A, the haunch bars have been trimmed at the approximate intersections with the bottom mat. See sketch FC-3 2. In Area 3 along Gridline 1, (2) haunch bars have been trimmed at the approximate intersection with the top mat with no embedment. See sketch FC-4.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The field conditions as described in the RFI are confirmed as acceptable. Regarding potential future conflicts with dewatering wells, refer to RFI T-0710 BGP response.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1221 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0723	BGP - Couplers for Future Walls From: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic REQUEST: Reference Det. 6 on S1-3001 See attached photo of the form savers that are going to be used as couplers for future walls. As discussed in area 3 Mat Slab meeting on 9/4/2013 SCCI is proposing to installing all formsavers for future walls in the Mat slab flush with the top of the Mat slab, to EL -35.67'. As shown on the attached photo, epoxy coated form savers have tin cap incorporated into coupler's body. This tin cap will protect the rebar until the future construction, and will substitute "tar" shown on Det. 6 on S1-3001. Is this acceptable?	Pending	09/05/2013	09/13/2013	09/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Epoxy-coated form savers shall be installed at the top of the mat slab as discussed on site in the RFI for locations where Detail 1/S1-9051 is applicable and may remain attached to the field observed 2x12 lumber, which shall be chaired to the target elevation. The form-saver/ lumber assembly is not applicable to any wall where there is a keyed joint or waterstop, such as the water tank walls. The arrangement is not acceptable for any "future wall" where the form-saver warranty will not cover corrosion protection for the construction interval without supplementary surface measures to be approved by the design team.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1222 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0724	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 8	Closed	09/06/2013	09/16/2013	09/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - I					George Metzger 9/16/2013		
This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south wall in mat slab pour Area 8 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 133 to 164 on the north elevation and 618 to 650 on the south elevation for Location Plan see exhibit - A					RESPONSE: The contractor proposed revisions to foundation wall reinforcement due to encroaching CDSM Piles 146, 158, 161 and 632 are acceptable.		
Exhibit - B, & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching							
WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B & Exhibit - F) Between CDSM piles 145 to 147 and 157 to 159 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP 146 & 158, originally these were WR1 reinforcement area's #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).							
Between CDSM piles 159 to 162-163, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP 161. This foundation wall area was originally a WR2 reinforcement area (#11@6"oc EF vertically) and would change to #11@5"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit -E).							
WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 631 to 635, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33 5/8" to clear the encroaching SP 632. This foundation wall area was originally a WR2 reinforcement area (#11@6"oc EF vertically) and would change to #11@5"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on SE stamped Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit - E).							
In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1223 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u><i>Number</i></u>	<u><i>Subject</i></u>	<u><i>Status</i></u>	<u><i>Date Created</i></u>	<u><i>Date Required</i></u>	<u><i>Date Answered</i></u>	<u><i>Cost Impact</i></u>	<u><i>Proceed</i></u>
	Contract drawings.						
	See Exhibit- G, H & I shows details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.						
	These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.						
	Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0725	BGP- CDSM Soldier Pile Cut-Off	Closed	09/06/2013	09/16/2013	09/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>In Detail 2/A1-8710 (see attached) it's not clear as to the final cut-off elevation for the CDSM wall shoring piles. Currently CDSM shoring piles extend up past the existing grade and future TG12.1 Civil Site Work Trade Contractor will be responsible for cutting off the CDSM wall shoring steel piles to the final elevation. WOJV propose that the cut-off elevations for the shoring piles be established at 3" above the train box lid i.e. at the top of concrete protection slab. See attached sketch SK -1.</p>					<p>George Metzger 9/17/2013 RESPONSE: The soldier piles are within the City Public Right of Way. Obstructions either have to be at least 4' below the surface or be protected with 1" thick steel plates (similar to the Train Box Lid). Leaving the soldier piles in this Public Right of Way may compromise agreements that have been established with the City.</p>		
<p>If the shoring piles are to be cut off below the train box lid as currently shown in detail 2/A-8710, the waterproofing membrane could be compromised by the heat generated by the cutting torches which will have to be used to cut these large steel piles, also this detail does not address the instances where the shoring wall is shared with further new projects i.e. 181 Fremont street in Zone 4 and 101 1st street in Zone 3.</p>					<p>Either the piles will need to be cut down below the 4' depth entirely or the vertical flange adjacent to the Train box is left in place and the opposite (outside) flange and the web are cut down to 4' below the finished surface. Leaving the inside flange in place to the top of the Train Box Lid could facilitate support for the vertical waterproofing assembly.</p>		
<p>It is preferable that the shoring piles be cut-off 3" above the top of the train box lid to ensure that the waterproofing system isn't compromised and omits the need to pothole around 861 CDSM piles which are in close proximity to adjacent property and live traffic.</p>							
<p>Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>							
T-0725.1	BGP- CDSM Soldier Pile Cut-Off	Closed	09/30/2013	10/10/2013	10/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>Further, in response to RFI T-725, WOJV requires the cut-off elevations for the 861 CDSM piles around the perimeter of the train box taking into account but not limited to, San Francisco city requirements for beam cut off in a public right of way, the elevation of utilities entering the train box structure, bridge structures and ramps as well as pedestrian stair towers 201A and 201 B and passenger elevator 201 foundations on the west side of Zone 1.</p>					<p>RESPONSE: RFI T-0725.1 BGP- CDSM Soldier Pile cut-off</p> <p>George Metzger 10/11/2013 RESPONSE: Per Design Review Meeting discussion on 10/09/2013, TJPA (ES) stated to reject the RFI as it is not construction related and will be addressed with W/O</p>		

*PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG*

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------

Another item which will also need to be taken into account is where the CDSM shoring wall is shared with adjoining Projects i.e. 181 Fremont Street in Zone 4 and 101 1st street in Zone 3.

This information once provided will but used as part of the future trade packages TG07.2 Concrete Superstructure and TG12.1 Civil Sitework scopes of work.

Please provide in tabular format a list of the final cut-off elevations for each individual CDSM pile around the perimeter of the train box.

within the bidding documents.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1226 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0725.2	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Cut-off	Closed	06/30/2014	07/10/2014	07/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Turner Construction Company Jack Adams			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Further to response to RFI T-725.1 TG07.2 trade package requires the cut off elevations for the 861 CDSM pile around the perimeter or the train box taking into account but not limited to, San Francisco city requirements for beam cut off in a public right of way, the elevation of utility/s entering the train box structure, bridge structures and ramps as well as pedestrian stair towers 201A and 201B and passenger elevator 201 foundations on the west side of zone 1, Another item which will also need to be take into account is where the CDSM shoring wall is shared with adjoining Projects i.e. 181 Fremont street in Zone 4 and 101 1st street in Zone 3.				As discussed with the design team and the TJPA, Tabular format a list of the final cut-off elevations for each individual CDSM pile does not exist. The CDSM Wall cut-off elevations are by contractor means and methods with the elevation determined by the contractor based on the various components of the Transit Center building construction for example; contractor formwork, waterproofing and re-construction of adjacent streets/sidewalks.			
Please provide in Tabular format a list of the final cut-off elevations for each individual CDSM pile.				Where CDSM wall is shared with adjoining Projects i.e. 181 Fremont street in Zone 4 and (Salesforce Tower) 101 First street again the CDSM Wall cut-off elevations are a contractor means and methods with the elevation determined by the contractor to construct the Transbay Transit Center.			
				For future bid packages, the Construction Manager can coordinate with the City of San Francisco for the requirement for removal. For example the City DPW states sheet piling and laggin"shall be cut off at least 3 feet below pavement subgrade with the upper part removed."			
				Jack Adams, Turner Construction		Dated 7/16/14	
<hr/>							
T-0726	BGP- Trestle pile No 6 in conflict with beam at Lower Concourse Level	Open	09/09/2013	09/19/2013	09/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Following a review and discussion on the trestle pile location, it has been noted that trestle pile number 6 (see sketch attached) is in conflict with a beam (B45) at the lower concourse slab elevation between gridline 5-6, E-F. The contractor is proposing to blockout a section of slab as shown on the sketch, this blockout section would then be infilled once the trestle pile has been removed.				George Metzger 9/20/2013 RESPONSE: This approach is acceptable. Please submit detailing in reinforcement submittal for review.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0728	BGP - Column Shear Reinforcement and Bump-Out Pile Interference at GL G/15 in	Closed	09/10/2013	09/20/2013	09/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Bob Garcia							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing S1-2024 (dated 11/27/12), S1-3005 (dated 08/3012) and attached Shimmick sketch SK-SCCI 316. Per field measurements, the 36" bump-out trestle pile near gridlines F.7/15 interferes with the nearby column shear reinforcement at gridlines G/15. Due to the size of trestle pile, the adjustment of the shear head locations, as provided in RFI T-0703, cannot be achieved. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per SKS-0283 (Attached): To avoid the trestle pile interference with the column shear heads at Grid G/15, the heads layout shall be rotated 45 degrees about the column center. The layout of heads in an arm shall be modified such that each of the arms contains 9 lines of heads extending to 16' from the column center. Heads in an arm shall be placed approximately at each 8' reinforcing module intersection, such that each adjacent line radiating from the column is staggered. The minimum number of total heads shall be 508.				
T-0729	BGP - Typical Trim Steel Requirements for Mat Slab per Field Coordination	Closed	09/10/2013	09/20/2013	09/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing S1-3009 and S1-3501. As per field coordination between SCCI, Gerdau, WOJV and TT on 09/09/2013, to help alleviate congestion in the mat reinforcing, and in particular, congestion resulting from add bars due to openings and penetrations, please confirm the following items are acceptable: 1. Details 4 and 7 on Sheet S1-3009 in so far as they apply to trestle piles, pin piles, dewatering wells and piezometric pipes can be relaxed in terms of additional bars. For an even number of bars interrupted (typical bars and add bars) the number of bars added on either side of the opening can be (number of interrupted bars)/2. For an odd number of bars interrupted (typical bars and add bars) the number of bars added on either side of the opening can be (number of interrupted bars +1)/2. 2. Detail 1 on Sheet S1-3501, which applies to sinks, can be relaxed in terms of additional bars. For an even number			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 9/11/2013 RESPONSE: The measures to reduce congestion described in the RFI are confirmed.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>of bars interrupted (typical bars and add bars) the number of bars added on either side of the opening can be (number of interrupted bars)/2. For an odd number of bars interrupted (typical bars and add bars) the number of bars added on either side of the opening can be (number of interrupted bars +1)/2. The minimum requirement of 2 bars on either side of the opening need not apply.</p> <p>3. The number of bars and maintenance of clear spacing will take precedence over 8" or 4" module spacing as to minimize the number of potential bar interruptions (and minimize resulting add bars). Any bar may be displaced to avoid conflict. The maximum center-to-center spacing of any two adjacent bars may be as large as 16". Clear spacing of 1 bar diameter shall be maintained between bars where bar relocation necessarily reduces spacing in the vicinity of relocation. Where bar relocation affects a lap splice, noncontact lap splices will be allowed up to 6" for #10 and #11 bars. This remedy shall apply in particular when seeking to avoid interruptions at small penetrations such as risers, vents, sinks and conduits.</p> <p>4. Clear spacing of 1db minimum shall be maintained in all mat reinforcing except for contact lap splices.</p> <p>5. Measures to reduce congestion at other locations such as catch basins, sump pits, elevator pits, shoring bracing and bridge piers will be considered on a case-by-case basis during field coordination with Thornton Tomasetti's field representative.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1230 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0730	BGP - Extended Time for Concrete Delivery of Protection Slab Mix	Closed	09/10/2013	09/20/2013	09/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached excerpt from specification section 033020, Article 3.3 - D. The referenced specification section requires mixed discharge concrete "...be completed within 1-1/2 hours or before the drum has revolved 300 revolutions, whichever comes first..." However, Cemex the concrete supplier has performed the set time test to evaluate the time at which the onset of hydration occurs for mix #1557217 (Protection Slab Mix) as per the attached Cemex letter dated August 26, 2013. As per the attached test result by Cemex, please confirm it is acceptable to extend the concrete delivery to two (2) hours in lieu of 1-1/2 hours as specified.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It will be acceptable to extend the concrete delivery time as proposed in the RFI. The contractor shall be responsible for providing an end concrete product that meets the specifications.		
T-0730.1	BGP - Extended Time for Concrete Delivery for Columns, Foundation Walls, Shear Closed		12/04/2013	12/14/2013	12/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please see attached Set-time tests and Letter dated 11/25/2013, authored by Robert Foley, CEMEX QC Manager. The attached Set-time tests are for mixes: #1557205 - Columns, #1557216 - Foundation Walls, and #1558218 - Shear Walls and Concourse Slab. Is it acceptable to extend the delivery time of the mixes refernced herein to 2 hours?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 12/10/2013 RESPONSE: It will be acceptable to extend the concrete delivery time as proposed in the RFI. The contractor shall be responsible for providing an end concrete product that meets the specifications.		
T-0731	BGP - Conduit Termination Location for Sump Pumps Between Grid Lines 1 & 12 - Closed		09/12/2013	09/22/2013	09/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing E1-6001, A1-2102, A1-2103, E1-2023 and E1-2022. Per Detail 7 on plan sheet E1-6001, the sump pump			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per detail 7 on sheet E1-6001, note B reads to mount disconnect and receptacle on nearest column for zones 02 and 03. Please terminate conduit 12" above mat slab at nearest face of rectangular column		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1231 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>conduits for the below grade package are to be terminated 12" above the mat slab directly adjacent to the future train platform wall.</p> <p>1. With the train platform wall beginning at grid line 12 and moving east, please provide the conduit termination location for the sumps installed west of grid line 12 where there is no train platform. Please include a set dimension the conduit should be set away from the sump.</p> <p>Please note that for the two sumps that have been poured in Area 3, the conduits were placed roughly 9' to the north of each sump opening to avoid the future train tracks. There are 8 total sumps west of grid line 12 with 6 of them left to be placed.</p>						
T-0732	SSS - Train Box Column Material Specification	Closed	09/13/2013	09/23/2013	09/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: S-0007 After review of General notes SS-9 F on drawing S-0007 Skanskas fabricator, Thompson Metal Fab, is requesting clarification on the material grade specification for the Train Box Columns. Please review and update the following if needed prior to Thomson Metal Fab's material order. Plate: Grade ASTM A709 H.P.S. 70W Zone 1 All Train Box material to have a Charpy V Notch Impact Test with a Minimum of 25FT Lbs. @ -10 degrees. ASTM A673 Frequency "P", ASTM A6 supplementary requirement S5.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For Trainbox Steel Columns, Frequency P testing is not required. Testing at Frequency H is acceptable.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0733	SSS - Transfer Girder Material Specifications	Closed	09/13/2013	09/23/2013	09/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: S-0007 After review of General notes drawing S-0007 Note our fabricator, Thompson Metal Fab, is requesting clarification on the material grade specification for the Transfer Girders. Please review and update the following if needed prior to their material order. Plate: Grade ASTM A572 GR 50 Zone 1 All Transfer Beam Material to have a Charpy V Notch Impact Test with a Minimum of 20FT Lbs. @ 70 degree F. ASTM A673 Frequency "P", ASTM A6 supplementary requirement S5. Or "AS Noted" ASTM A709 Grade H.P.S. 70 W, Zone 1, CVN 25FT Lbs. @ -10 Deg. F. ASTM Frequency "P", ASTM A6 Supplementary requirement S5.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No update required.		

T-0734	SSS - Transfer Girder Elevations	Closed	09/13/2013	09/23/2013	09/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Documents: S1-2303 thru S1-2307, Elevations for transfer girders shown on drawings S1-2303 thru S1-2307 are in decimal feet. Once converted to feet/ inches they become 1/16th values. Please verify if the elevations should be rounded up to the nearest 1/8th of an inch or kept as converted. See attached specific conversions for each transfer girder locations			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Transfer girder elevations may be rounded to the nearest 1/8".		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1233 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0735	SSS -Clarification of Lateral Bracing Members	Closed	09/16/2013	09/26/2013	09/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: S-0007 Please identify what are considered "LATERAL SYSTEM MEMBERS" as called out in the GENERAL NOTES SS-9, B "REGARDLESS OF THICKNESS ALL TRUSSES, LATERAL SYSTEM MEMBERS (INCLUDING COLUMNS, BRACES, ETC.): 20FT-LB @ 70 DEG. F."			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Lateral system members refer to members of the seismic framing. Following members constitute the seismic frame: Members designated as SLRS or SFRS in the drawings, members in "seismic frame elevations". See plan notes to locate "seismic frame elevations". As called out in Specification 05 12 10 (Structural Steel - Additional Seismic Requirements) Section 2.1.A.1, "Heavy sections shall be supplied with CVN testing in accordance with AISC 341". Therefore, requirements of SS-9B need not be applied and CVN testing requirements can be limited to heavy sections (shapes) per the AISC 341 requirements. As noted in General Notes GR-2, AISC 341-10 is the governing provision.		
<hr/>							
T-0736	SSS - PJP Weld Designation at Type 2 Drag Connection	Closed	09/16/2013	09/26/2013	09/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: 2/S1-5017 Reference Sketch: SK1 On detail 2/S1-5017 for the Type 2 Drag connection verify at the 2" plates the 1/2" PJP weld is the actual prep or is additional prep required to achieve a 1/2" effective weld requirement (IE; 5/8" prep).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 1/2" is actual bevel dimension, effective weld will be (1/2"-1/8")=3/8".		
<hr/>							
T-0737	SSS - Type 2 Drag Connection Pin Clearance	Closed	10/07/2013	10/17/2013	10/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: 1) The Drag Connection Details on drawing S1-5017 appears to show double nuts securing each end of the pin, please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) It is confirmed that double nuts are required. 2) It is acceptable to add a cotter pin thru the threads of the pins after the double nuts to further secure the nuts from backing out.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1234 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>2) Refer to the Drag Connection Details on drawing S1-5017, is it acceptable to add a cotter pin thru the threads of the pins after the double nut to further secure the nuts from backing out?</p> <p>3) Skanska proposes to size the pins for the Drag Connections per AISC Table 15-8, "Dimensions and Weights of Recessed-Pin Nut", i.e. provide a 4 ½" diameter thread for a 6" diameter pin. Is this acceptable?</p>				<p>3) Sizing the diameter of the thread area per AISC Table 15-8 is acceptable, but please note that the pin for the Type IIM & IIP drag connections is 7" diameter, not 6" as noted in the RFI.</p> <p>Stacy Wilson (TCCO Response) If the Contractor elects to use cotter pins as described in the RFI above, it will come at no cost to the TJPA as it is considered means and methods.</p>		
T-0738	SSS - Drag Connection to Bus Deck Castings	Closed	09/17/2013	09/27/2013	10/01/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Drawings: S1-5016 and S1-5017			In concept, TT take no exception with standardizing the bolt and pin lengths, but offer the following comments:				
The spacing of the shear plates on the bus deck cast nodes varies in conjunction with the thickness of the web of each connecting beam. See 1c/S1-5016 and 1b/S1-5017 for reference.			1.The bus deck cast nodes are in the process being fabricated, so the proposed change shall not affect the cast node pad width. The pad on the cast node has sufficient width to accommodate the connection plates as shown on the contract documents.				
In order to avoid customizing the cast nodes, connection pins and/or the bolt lengths, our fabricator, Oregon Iron Works, proposes to standardize the spacing on the cast node shear connection plates and customize the thickness of the web reinforcing plates. See the attached mark-ups of S1-5016 & S1-5017 depicting the proposed detail.			2.For Type I drag connection, the tabulated plate thicknesses do not include the ones for W40 x327 (near Grid 9.9, 10.1, & 19.9) and W40x392 (near Grid 20.1).				
Please confirm that this proposal is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1235 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0738.1	SSS - Nominal Gap Dimensions for Cast Node Drag Connections	Closed	01/14/2014	01/24/2014	01/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: WOJV RFI T-0738 (SK RFI 004.1) was submitted to the EOR proposing a 1/2" gap for Type 1 and Type 2M drag connections at the Bus Deck Level Cast Nodes. These ½" gaps were not explicitly called out, but were indicated on the supporting documents attached for your reference. Subsequent conversations with Thornton Tomasetti and Webcor/Obayashi have revealed that a 1/8" nominal gap is preferred in lieu of the noted ½" gap. Please advise if a 1/2" or 1/8" nominal gap is required for the Type 1 drag connection on 1/S1-5016 and Type 2M drag connection on 1/S1-5017.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 1/2" gap was proposed initially in RFI T-0738 to allow for 1/4" gap at each side of the beam web. We propose a 1/8" gap each side to mitigate the potential joint movement in an earthquake. We believe that the 1/8" gap is sufficient for erection tolerance. If Skanska prefer the 1/4" gap, please provide justification for the Design Team to review.			
T-0739	BGP - Column C16 and Knock-Out Corbel at West Throat	Closed	09/17/2013	09/27/2013	09/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing detail 1/S1-2022 and 4/S1-3260. Per previous discussion with TT field engineer, in the West throat shearwalls which contain integrated C16 columns and vertical corbels to restrain the knock-out walls, only the C16 column ties are required to penetrate the mat at the designated spacing for a distance of at least 12" below the lowest top mat elevation. The ties associated with the corbel are not required to penetrate the mat slab. This RFI confirms that the column and corbel ties, as placed, are acceptable based on the observation by the TT field engineer.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 9/17/2013 RESPONSE: Column C16 is a boundary element in the West Throat Shearwall. Integral to the column (and the wall) is a vertical corbel that restrains the knock-out wall. Ties are indicated for both the column and the corbel. Only the column ties are required to penetrate the mat at the designated spacing for a distance of at least 12" below the lowest top mat elevation. The ties associated with the vertical corbel are not. As the corbel ties are not required below the mat, the corbel ties observed in the field are necessarily confirmed as acceptable. The column ties, which are required to penetrate the mat, shall be placed per the contract drawings. This RFI response does NOT confirm the placement or spacing of the column ties observed in the field.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1236 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0740	BGP - Mat Slab Rebar Alternate to Grade 75 #11 in Area 6 & 7	Closed	09/17/2013	09/27/2013	09/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Due to mill shortages of grade 75 #10 reinforcing please confirm that at no cost to the Owner, the implementation of grade 75 #11 reinforcing where required will be acceptable for use within the typical mat reinforcing installed at 8" O.C.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The use of the grade 75 # 11 rebar is expected to supplement the typical #1 0 bar in the following locations, 3rd and 4th layer of Area 6, and 4th layer of Area 7.			George Metzger 9/25/2013 RESPONSE: GR75 #11 bars as proposed in and limited to the scope of the RFI is acceptable. Note that the lap splice length for #11 GR75 bars to #11 GR75 bars will increase over than of the previous #10 GR75 to #10 GR75 bars. Other combinations of spliced bars will be governed by the larger of LTE or the larger (or stronger) bar and the tension lap splice length of the smaller (or weaker) bar per Note 4 of Detail 1/S1-3001. Clear documentation of these bars shall be made available from time of delivery. Submit as-built or marked-up submittal that reflects these bars for record.				
T-0741	BGP - Pile Location Discrepancy at GL E/34.5 in Zone 4	Closed	09/17/2013	09/27/2013	09/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Please reference attached drawing S1-2057 and S1-3007.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The bridge pier pile (4'-0" diameter) near grid E/34.5 is shown in SI-2057 to be offset from the typical row of piles shown along gridline 34.7. In addition, detail 1/SI-3007 depicts the pile being located within the pit that is located at gridline E/34.5. However, as per BBI's Beale Street Bridge drawings and as-built conditions, the aforementioned bridge pile is installed in line with the other piles on gridline 34.7.			George Metzger 9/25/2013 RESPONSE: This topic has already been addressed in past RFI's. Please refer to responses for RFI T-0264.7 BSE as well as RFI-0264.3 BSE.				
Please confirm the as-built location of the bridge pier is acceptable and the sump pit detail shown in 1/S1-3007 is no longer applicable.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0742	BGP- CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 9	Closed	09/20/2013	09/30/2013	09/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference Documents: Exhibits A - G

This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) and steel plate on the north & south wall in mat slab pour Area 9 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 164 to 188 on the north elevation and 595 to 618 on the south elevation for Location Plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B, & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching

WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 167 to 168 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching Steel plate attached to SP 167 & 168, originally this was a WR1 reinforcement area #11@8" oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6" OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).

WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 611-612 to 613-614, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 612. This foundation wall area was originally a embedment column with reinforcement in this area was a double layer of #11@6" OC EF vertically and would change to #11@5" OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.4 option1 (Exhibit -E).

In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings.

See Exhibit - F & G showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.

These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.

Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

George Metzger

9/25/2013

RESPONSE:

The contractor proposed revisions to foundation wall reinforcement due to encroaching CDSM Piles (and added steel plates) in Area 9 are acceptable. Note that reducing the spacing of embedded column vertical reinforcement from 6 inch to 5 inch may negatively impact the installation of embedded column cross-ties which are #5 per construction drawings.

T-0742.1	BGP - U-Bar at CDSM Encroachment Near GL 16.9/J in Area 9	Closed	10/17/2013	10/27/2013	10/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please refer to drawing S1-2024, S1-3302 and response to RFI T-0742 - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 9.			George Metzger 10/22/2013				
Per the response to RFI T-0742, the spacing of the verticals in the C21 embedded column at Gridlines 16.9/J was changed from 6" OC to 5" OC due to the CDSM soldier pile encroachment. As a result, there is an odd number (19) of verticals per layer which would leave one row of verticals to not be straddled by a U-bar. Gerdau proposes to widen the final U-bar in the embedded column and straddle 3 rows of vertical bars as depicted in the attached Gerdau sketch SK-97.			RESPONSE: All exterior wall bars at their penetration into the mat shall have lateral support perpendicular to the edge of the mat. In Gerdau Sketch SK-97, provide a single leg tie with a 180 hook on the odd exterior vertical wall bar. Alternatively, normal u-shaped ties can be placed either side of an odd bar and a 180 hook added to the odd bar. The embedment length of the single leg tie shall be that of the u-shaped bars.				
Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed as shown in SK-97.							
T-0743	BGP- CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 10	Open	09/20/2013	09/20/2013	09/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - I			George Metzger 9/25/2013				
This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south wall in mat slab pour Area 10 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 164 to 188 on the north elevation and 571 to 595 on the south elevation for Location Plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) between CDSM pile 200-201 to 206, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 206. This foundation wall area was originally a WR2 reinforcement area (#11@6" OC EF vertically) and would change to #11@5" OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit - E). WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 574 to 576 and 587 to 588 - 589			RESPONSE: The contractor proposed revisions to foundation wall reinforcement due to encroaching CDSM Piles in Area 10 are acceptable. Note that reducing the spacing of embedded column vertical reinforcement from 6 inch to 5 inch may negatively impact the installation of embedded column cross-ties which are #5 per construction drawings.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1239 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 575 & 588, originally these were WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8" OC EF vertically and would change to #11@6" OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).

Between CDSM piles 588-589 to 591, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 589 & 590. This foundation wall area was originally a embedment column with reinforcement in this area was a double layer of #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@5" OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.4 option1 (Exhibit -F).

In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings.

See Exhibit - G, H & I showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.

These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.

Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.

T-0744

BGP - Reinforcement Ties in Knock-Out Corbel and Haunch at SW Corner in Area ' Closed

From: Webcor Construction LP

Jackson Tukuafu

To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch

09/17/2013

09/27/2013

09/18/2013

Potentially



Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger

Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon

REQUEST:

Please refer to attached detail drawing 2/S1-2030, excerpt drawing from submittal package TG0600-301.2 and SCCI Sketch SK-RFI-324

Per field coordination with TT field engineer, please confirm it is acceptable to omit the pilaster ties of detail 2/S1- 3204 within the body of the haunch provided that:

- The pilaster West corner bar (Bar A in attached sketch)

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

George Metzger

9/17/2013

RESPONSE:

The pilaster detailing as described in the RFI is acceptable within the body of the haunch.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0745	<p>BGP - Construction Joint Layout Modifications at Area 6</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutusch</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic</p> <p>REQUEST: See attached photos of the construction joint at mat slab area 6 South, near grid line 8.5, and CJ layout drawings.</p> <p>Due to congestion and access SCCI would like to shift the walls and concourse joints at this location 14.5" to the East. This adjustment does not affect any other structure's elements and complies with the CJ parameters outlined in the contract specifications.</p> <p>Please confirm modifying the construction joint layout is acceptable.</p>	Closed	09/18/2013	09/28/2013	09/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>George Metzger 9/27/2013 RESPONSE: Per conversation between TT & Shimmick, it was clarified that the proposed joint modification is only at the south end where the original N-S running joint in the mat and the Lower Concourse will turn an angle near the toe of the chamfer so that the joint will end perpendicular to the foundation wall. The 14.5" shift proposed in the RFI is shift in the south end point only.</p>				
T-0746	<p>BGP - Plumbing Clarifications to 2" Vent and 3" San Connection in Area 4</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic</p>	Open	09/18/2013	09/28/2013	09/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1241 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Pleaes refer to attached plumbing drawing PSK-2022 (dated 04/26/2013) and IR Report 1633. On 09/10/2013, the SFDBI inspector expressed concern about the installation of the 2" vent and 3" connections in the mat slab area 4 - See IR 1633. Please confirm the 2" vent and 3" connection pipes are to be installed per drawing PSK-2022..	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 9/20/13 RESPONSE: The 3" drain and 2" vent connections serve as drain for the future Phase 2 under car deluge system control assemblies. They are similar to sprinkler drains, refer to detail 3/P1-6001 (with trap below floor, no trap primer connection below floor, the trap primer connection will be above floor).		
T-0747	SSS - BU Girder Size at Roof GL 28	Closed	09/20/2013	09/30/2013	09/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Reference Drawing: S1-4114 Reference Sketch: CD RFI 015 SK1 attached. Reference detail A/S1-4114 which does not indicated the built-up girder size at the Roof Park Level between column lines E.6 and D.4 (see CD RFI-015 SK1 attachment). It appears from the latest Revit model that the BU girder is intended to be BU66x30x1.5x2.25. Please confirm the size provided on the Revit model is accurate or advise the girder size to be used at this location.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> GL28 Roof Beam size provided in the Revit model is accurate.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0748	SSS - Type TTT Threadbar Anchor Bolt Embedment	Closed	09/20/2013	09/30/2013	09/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Drawings: S1-5051					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference S1-5051 which indicates the embedment depths for Type T and TT threadbar anchors are to be 3'-8" and 2'-8", respectively, while the embedment depth for type TTT threadbar anchors is to be 16'-0". Please verify the embedment depth for Type TTT threadbar anchors is to be 16'-0" as indicated on 4/S1-5051.					Please see attached email from Lee Ishida of Thornton Tomasetti confirming the embed length is 16 feet.		
T-0749	SSS - Anchor Bolt Finish Requirement	Closed	09/20/2013	09/30/2013	09/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Drawing: S1-5051, S-0007 Reference Specification: 05 10 00 3.2.P.6					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference is made to the base plate anchor rod schedule on 7/S1-5051 indicating anchor rods are to conform to either ASTM A615 or A722 standards. While ASTM A615 does not explicitly state finish requirements, A722 calls for all bars to be uncoated. Within the IFC documents, Specification Section 05 10 00 3.2.P.6 and Note SS-10 on S-0007 call for miscellaneous metals and exposed steel to be the hot-dipped galvanized.					Anchor rods shown on sheet S1-5051 are to be uncoated, as they will be covered by fireproofing.		
Please confirm the finish requirements for materials listed in the base plate anchor rod schedule on 7/S1-5051.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0750	SSS - Moment Frame Column Field Splice at Bus Level	Open	09/20/2013	09/30/2013	10/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Drawing: S1-4201, S1-4203, S1-4202					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Sketch: CD RFI 022 SK1 & SK2					The contractor's proposal to extend the thickened web plate to the splice point is acceptable.		
Reference is made to drawing 1/S1-4201 detailing the moment frame column field splice above the Bus Deck Level. Per details 1/S1-4201 and 1/S1-4203, a thickened column web plate is required at the Bus Deck Level in the 48" deep moment columns. Please verify the following is acceptable at this field splice:					The thickened web plate shall be tapered similar to detail 8/S1-4202 as stated in the RFI.		
1. The web plate can be extended 14" to the field splice location, eliminating a shop web splice in the column. Reference CD RFI 022 SK1 & SK2 for additional information.							
2. The thickened column web plate will need to be tapered similar to detail 8/S1-4202 at the field splice location.							
T-0751	SSS - Roof Level Moment Frame Column Field Splice at GL 28	Closed	09/20/2013	09/30/2013	09/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Drawing: S1-4114 ,S1-4203					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Sketch: Reference CD RFI 023 SK1 & SK2					At GL28, 8 ft field splice dimension is measured from the bottom of the Roof beam, providing an 8 ft column section welded to the underside of the beam.		
Reference is made to drawing 1A/S1-4114 and detail 5/S1-4203 indicating the SMRF column to beam flange moment connection at the Roof Level. Please verify the 8'-0" typical field splice dimension noted on A/S1-4114 at column grid D4 and E.6 is from the top of the roof girder, providing a 30" column section welded to the underside of the girder.							
T-0752	SSS - Anchor Bolt Coupler Location	Closed	09/20/2013	09/30/2013	09/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Reference Drawing: S1-5051 Reference is made to detail 6/S1-5051 for Type TT Threadbar Anchors. Please confirm the couplers will be centered about the bottom of the moment frame beam as indicated.					Confirmed that the couplers will be centered about the bottom of the moment frame beam as indicated.	
T-0752.1	SSS - Anchor Bolt Coupler Location	Closed	10/21/2013	10/31/2013	10/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please confirm it is acceptable to locate the couplers for the Type TT Anchor system 12-3/4" above the column and moment frame beam joint to allow for the installation of a temporary 1/4" alignment plate to aid with the installation and alignment of the anchor rods during the initial column pour.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the couplers for Type TT anchor system may be moved to 12-3/4" above the column and moment frame beam joint as proposed for the installation of a temporary alignment plate.			
<hr/>							
T-0753	BGP - East Bulkhead and Catch Basin Conflict with Mat Slab Construction Joint in Closed		09/20/2013	09/30/2013	10/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached photo of as-built location, drawing SKA-2821 and excerpt from the CJ submittal shop drawing CJ-04 (TG0600-030). SCCI had to shift the construction joint between mat slab areas 6 and 7 Eastward due to the interference with the micropiles and trestle piles. This shift in the CJ puts the bulkhead against the catch basin near GL G11. Please confirm it is acceptable to shift the catch basin location approx. 24-inches in either east or west direction of the bulkhead/CJ.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 9/28/2013 RESPONSE: It is acceptable to shift the Catch Basin location approximately 24" to the West (Refer to SKA-2850). Drainage piping to be shifted to the west accordingly.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0754	BGP - Area 9 Clear Cover to the Vertical Reinforcement on the Foundation Wall	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Further to response to RFI T-609 this RFI shows the areas of foundation wall/embedded column in pour Area 9, on the north & south wall elevations which will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement for location plan see exhibit - A					George Metzger 10/16/2013		
Exhibit - B & C depict the amount and location of the foundation walls which the will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement					RESPONSE: The clear cover between the waterproofing system and vertical reinforcement as presented in Exhibit C of this RFI is acceptable.		
RFI T - 742 shows the thinning of the wall with the revised reinforcement spacing due to CDSM pile encroachment in Area 9.							
Please confirm that the clear cover between the waterproofing system and the vertical reinforcement as outlined at these locations is acceptable.							
T-0755	BGP - Area 10 Clear Cover to the Vertical Reinforcement on the Foundation Wall	Closed	10/11/2013	10/21/2013	10/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Further to response to RFI T-609 this RFI shows the areas of foundation wall/embedded column in pour Area 10, on the north & south wall elevations which will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement for location plan see exhibit - A					George Metzger 10/16/2013		
Exhibit - B & C depict the amount and location of the foundation walls which the will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement.					RESPONSE: The clear cover between the waterproofing system and vertical reinforcement as presented in Exhibit C of this RFI is acceptable.		
RFI T - 743 shows the thinning of the wall with the revised reinforcement spacing due to CDSM pile encroachment in Area 10.							
Please confirm that the clear cover between the waterproofing system and the vertical reinforcement as outlined at these locations is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1246 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0756	BGP - Structural Slurry Primer in Mat Slab	Closed	09/24/2013	10/04/2013	09/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to the attached letter, authored by Rober Foley (CEMEX QC), dated September 17, 2013.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: George Metzger 9/24/2012		
With limited site access, many Mat Slab pours will require a larger than normal amount of slick-line. To ensure that no slick-line gets plugged, SCCI is proposing to prime the slick-line with a structural slurry that will reach and exceed the specified design strength for the Mat Slab. A miniscule percentage of this primer will be deposited into the mat slab. This percentage would amount to .01 to .02 percent by volume.					RESPONSE: Any material that is not the approved mix design for the mat slab, including slick-line primer, shall not be placed in the mat slab.		
Please confirm the proposed SCCI method of slick-line priming is acceptable.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-0757	SSS - HSS Vertical Post Size at Roof Park Level	Closed	09/25/2013	10/05/2013	09/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: 2/S1-7109, A&C/S1-7136			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: The four vertical HSS posts that were added above the Roof Park Level in ASI No. 105 and shown on S1-7109 and details A & C on S1-7136 have been removed in ASI No. 106.		
At grid lines D.4 and E.6, west of grid line 24.9, four HSS vertical posts were added per ASI No. 0105. Please provide the missing HSS vertical post sizes at the indicated locations above the Roof Park Level (reference CD RFI 021 SK1 & SK2).					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-0758	SSS - W12 Beam Information at Roof Level GL E.1	Closed	09/25/2013	10/05/2013	10/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference is made to Drawing S1-2602 regarding the W12x14 beam stubs near grid line E, east of grid line 1. Please verify the following W12x14 beam characteristics as noted on CD RFI 027 SK1:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: 1. The W12x14 beam identified in the RFI sketch is not required. 2. The 3 beams identified in the RFI sketch are not required. 3. See response to #2.		
1) Please supply the location, length, and elevation for					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1247 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	W12x14 beams between grids E.2 and E.6. 2) Please verify the member sizes for the three areas noted between grids D & E.2 are to be W12x14. 3) For the same areas indicated in item #2, please supply the beam locations, lengths, and elevations.						
						</	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1248 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
T-0760	SSS - Column Base Plate Detail Clarification	Closed	09/25/2013	10/05/2013	10/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Please verify the following in reference to Detail 5B on S1-5051 and the sketches attached (SD RFI 029 SK1, SK2, & SK3)					1) The Grout hole in the shear key is to be centered at the 10" deep shear key (5" from the bottom of the base plate).			
1) For type 2 column base plates at the lower concourse please confirm the grout hole indicated is to be 7" below the base plate in order to place it 5" below the top of concrete as appears to be shown in detail 5B/S1-5051.					2) The location of the shear key shall be as shown on 3/S1-5051. Location of the shear key is controlled by the concrete beam top bars below. Where the base plate is only 26" wide, the shear key may be located 10" from center of column (instead of 10- 3/4" shown on 3/S1-5051) to fit within the width of the 26" wide base plate.			
2) For the 26" by 30" type 2 base plates as shown in 2/S1-5051 please confirm the shear key plates may be located 10" from center of column to fit within the width of the 26" wide as shown on SK3 base plates.								
T-0761	SSS - Beam Size Clarification - Roof Park Level GL	Closed	09/25/2013	10/05/2013	10/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Please reference S1-2603 which calls out the beam near grid F.8 as "BU-44x230" (see CD RFI 032 SK1 attached).					The framing in the area between 7.8 & 9 has been changed. Please refer to ASI 106.			
Please supply the plate sizes for this BU member or advise if this should be a W44x230 beam.								
T-0762	BGP - Haunch Bar Grade and Size Increase	Closed	09/25/2013	10/05/2013	09/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Please refer to attached drawing S1-3201 and spec section 032000.					George Metzger 9/30/2013 RESPONSE:			
The #10, Grade 60 concrete reinforcement for the "haunch" is shown on the typical foundation wall section drawing S1-3201. The trade group package contractor SCCI proposes the use of a Grade 75 #10 or #11 rebar in-lieu of the Grade 60 #10 "haunch."					The #10 GR60 haunch reinforcing shown on the typical foundation wall section, 1/S1-3201, can be substituted with #10 GR75 reinforcing with the following conditions:			
					1. RFI T-702 BGP stands, i.e. the detailing and			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1249 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0763	SSS - MC10 Link Brace Foul at Roof Perimeter	Closed	09/26/2013	10/06/2013	10/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference detail 5/S1-4205 showing the link brace detail at the roof along column lines B and H. In the IFC documents, the beam size was increased from W21x55 to W24x55, causing the MC10x41.1 brace (increased from M8x22.6) to foul the beam flange. See CD RFI 020 SK 1 & SK2 attached for reference and advise on resolution for the foul noted.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					A portion of the W24x55 bottom flange and a portion of the web (up to 1" from the bottom of the beam) may be coped to clear the double channel braces.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1250 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0764	SSS - Built-Up Beams - Plate Yield Strength	Closed	09/26/2013	10/06/2013	09/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please reference contract sheet S-0007, specifically structural steel note SS-1, which indicates that plates used for flanges in built up beams shall meet the criteria of ASTM Designation A572-50 (UNO) and have a maximum yield point of 58ksi.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The plate mills will not guarantee material that meets the A572-50 criteria and further restricts the yield to a maximum of 58ksi. The plate mills will guarantee material that will yield within the range of 50ksi - 65ksi. Attached you will find correspondence with two major US steel mills for reference.					The maximum yield strength specified on General Note SS-1 is to ensure the strong column/weak beam condition is met. Hence, this requirement may be relaxed to applicable to steel plates for seismic moment frame beams only.		
Please confirm, for the plates used for flanges in built-up members produced from A572-50 material, that a yield range of 50ksi - 65ksi is acceptable.					From our past experience, the maximum yield of 58 ksi is a very reasonable target. Also, the lab tensile tests commonly show a lower yield than what is provided on the mill certifications (around 2- 6 ksi lower).		
					However, we understand that this is still a risk to the steel contractor even though it is only applicable to the seismic moment frame beams. We agree to relax this requirement further accepting the yield strength up to 65 ksi as requested		
T-0766	SSS - Stiffener Requirements at Column Base Detail	Closed	09/27/2013	10/07/2013	10/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please confirm the following in reference to the column base details shown on S1-5051.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
a) With reference to Drawing S1-5051, please confirm that only the Type I base plates have vertical stiffeners at the column flanges and web, while the Type II and Type III base plates have vertical stiffeners only at the column web.					a) Yes. Type I base plate has stiffeners at flange and web while Type II & Type III base plate only have stiffeners at column web.		
b) With reference to Details 4 and 6 on Drawing S1-5051, please confirm the base plate type and column indicated in these details are for graphical purposes only and do not indicate the type of base plate to be used with the detailed threadbar anchor.					b) Yes. the base plate shown is for graphical purpose only. The type of the base plate shall be in accordance with Base Plate Schedule.		
T-0767	SSS - Herrick RFI 01 - W shapes from BU	Closed	09/27/2013	10/07/2013	10/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<hr/>							
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The following sizes and shapes are not available in the U.S. Please confirm all sizes will be Built up sections from plate.			We confirm that equivalent built-up sections can be provided in lieu of rolled shapes listed in the RFI that are domestically unavailable. Proposed plate types and grades are acceptable. Plate dimensions for the equivalent built-up sections shall be per corresponding rolled shapes in AISC Steel Manual.				
W40 X 392 Grade A992, W40 X 503 Grade A992, W40 X 593 Grade A992 will be fabricated with A572-50 Plate. W40 X 392 Grade A709, W40 X 503 Grade A709, W40 X 593 Grade A709 at the Bus Deck will be fabricated with A709-50 Plate.							
Welding Preparation of Built up sections to follow.							
T-0767.1	SSS - Fillet Weld Sizes for Built up Members	Closed	10/18/2013	10/28/2013	10/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The response to Webcor/Obayashi RFI T-0767 (SK RFI 013) confirmed that equivalent built-up sections can be provided in lieu of W shapes not available domestically. All W40 X 503 and W40 X 593 at the Ground level (reference S1-2302 thru S1-2311) will be built-up sections.			1) For web to flange welding of built-up sections equivalent to W40x503, refer to response provided for RFI T-0704.1.				
Please provide fillet weld sizes accordingly for the sections noted in the attached sketch.			2) For built-up sections equivalent to W40x593, web to flange welding shall be with double 7/8" fillet welds for 4 ft from each end of each flange plate and double 5/8" fillet welds in between.				
			Note that W40X503 and W40x593 are also used at Bus Deck and Roof Levels. W/O to coordinate RFI T-0767.1 response with other sub-contractors, as needed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1253 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0769.1	SSS - Verify Beam Locations at Ground Level East	Closed	11/22/2013	12/02/2013	12/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
On the response to Webcor RFI # T-0769 (SK RFI # SK 050) & T-0801 (SK RFI # 066) we have reviewed and located most of the beam locations in question using the nearest gridlines, architectural dwg's, partial plans, equal spacing, etc per the noted guidelines in the response. However on drawings S1-2302, S1-2303 & S1-2304 there are still some beam locations that cannot be located and require verification therefore on sketches CD RFI 047.1 SK1 to SK3 please verify all clouded dimensions in RED as noted to close this RFI.				Responses to the queries on dimensions for locating beams on floor plans have been noted on the attached sketches SKS-0303, SKS-0304 and SKS-0305.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1254 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0770	SSS - Verify Beam Locations at Roof Park Level West	Closed	09/30/2013	10/10/2013	10/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Drawings: S1-2602					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached CD RFI 026 SK1 showing missing dimensions required to locate beams at the Roof Park Level Zone 02. Please verify all dimensions indicated in red, which have been taken from the latest Revit model, are accurate to locate the steel in question.					Please see response to RFI T-769 for response.		
<hr/>							
T-0770.1	SSS - Verify Additional Beam Locations at Roof Park Level West	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/31/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Arup Rich Coffin							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
On the response to Webcor RFI # T-0770 (SK RFI # SK 052) & T-0769 (SK RFI # 050) we have reviewed and located most of the beam locations in question using the nearest gridlines, architectural dwg's, partial plans, equal spacing, etc per the noted guidelines in the response. However, on drawings S1-2602 to S1-2607 there are still some beam locations that cannot be located and require verification; therefore, on sketches CD RFI 026.1 SK1 to SK6 please verify all clouded dimensions in RED as noted to close this RFI.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Responses to the queries on dimensions for locating beams on floor plans have been noted on the attached sketches SKS-0316 through SKS-0321.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1255 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0771	SSS - Lower Concourse Anchor Bolt Details	Closed	09/30/2013	10/10/2013	10/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div>				
Please reference Drawing S1-5051 and confirm the following in regards to the column base details:			The numbering of the response below matches with the numbering of the RFI.				
1) Confirm it is acceptable to oversize the holes for anchor bolt penetrations through base plate per AISC's 13th Edition Table 14-2 (reference CD RFI 016 SK2 attached).			1. Confirmed the holes may be oversized per AISC's 13th edition, Table 14-2.				
2) Confirm the hole sizes indicated in Part 1 are acceptable for anchor bolt penetrations through the horizontal column stiffener.			2. Confirmed.				
3) Confirm it is acceptable to supply a ½" x 4" x 4" (A36) plate washer above the column stiffener with a 1/16" oversize hole.			3. Washer thickness shall be in accordance with AISC's 13th edition, Table 14-2.				
4) Confirm it is acceptable to locate the grout holes typically as shown on CD RFI 016 SK3.			4. Grout hole locations and procedure shall be confirmed by the mock-up.				
5) To aid in the alignment of the thread bar anchor rods during concrete operations, please confirm it is acceptable to provide one ½" thick anchor plate at the base of the thread bars with size to match the base plate in lieu of four separate ½" x 4" x 4" anchor plates.			5. 1/2" anchor plate matching the base plate at the bottom of the anchor bolt is not acceptable as it will affect the consolidation of the concrete.				
6) Confirm the thickness of the stiffener for Type II and Type III column bases is to be 2".			6. Confirmed, the stiffener is 2" thick.				
7) Confirm an anchor bolt projection of 2.5 x AB dia. above the plate washer on top of the column stiffener is acceptable. See CD RFI 030 SK3 for reference.			7. Contractor to verify with the anchor rod suppliers for the length of the hex nut. Recommend projection = washer thickness + hex nut length + 1.5x d Minimum to account for construction tolerance				
8) Confirm the thickness of the stiffener for Type II and Type III column bases is to be 2".			8. See response to question #7.				
9) Confirm an anchor bolt extension of 2.5 x AB dia. below the bottom plate washer is acceptable. See CD RFI 030 SK3 for reference.			9. Confirmed the 1" clear is acceptable.				
10) Confirm that the 1" cover as shown on CD RFI 030 SK3 is acceptable.			10. Confirmed that wrench tight is adequate.				
10) Confirm that the anchor bolts shall be installed wrench tight.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0771.1	SSS - Lower Concourse Anchor Bolt Details at Column Base	Closed	10/11/2013	10/21/2013	10/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
As per the response to RFI# T-0771 please confirm the following:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1. For items 8 & 9 please confirm it is acceptable to have 0" cover at the underside of the concrete beam. See attached sketch SK-1 for clarification.					1) Confirmed that it is acceptable to have 0" cover at the underside of the concrete beam, as the bolt is directly above the concrete column.		
2. For item 5 please confirm it is acceptable to use an alignment plate with a 7" diameter center hole to allow for the consolidation of concrete and aid the alignment of the threaded bar. See attached sketch SK-2 for clarification.					2. Confirmed that it is acceptable to use an alignment plate with a 7" diameter center hole		
T-0772	SSS - Anchor Bolt Details at Column Base	Closed	09/30/2013	10/10/2013	10/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please reference Drawing S1-5051 and the attached sketches in regards to the column base details:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) Confirm that the 1-3/4" anchor bolts as referenced 7/S1-5051 are acceptable to typically locate as shown (reference CD RFI 034 SK1 attached) so that the plate washers clear the stiffener plate and weld.					1) confirmed.		
2) Confirm the plate washer size, thickness and grade is acceptable (reference CD RFI 034 SK1 attached).					2) confirmed.		
3) Confirm that the 2-1/2" anchor bolts as referenced 7/S1-5051 are acceptable to typically locate as shown (reference CD RFI 034 SK2 attached) so that the plate washers clear the stiffener plate and weld					3) confirmed.		
4) Confirm the plate washer size, thickness and grade is acceptable (reference CD RFI 034 SK2 attached).					4) Use 1" thick washer plate per anchor rod catalog.		
T-0773	BGP - Geothermal Fields 11, 12, & 13 Layout in Zone 4	Closed	09/30/2013	10/10/2013	10/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1258 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0774	BGP-Pre-cutting of CDSM Soldier Pile	Closed	09/30/2013	10/10/2013	10/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				

REQUEST:

Further, in response to RFI T-725, WOJV is proposing to pre-cut the inside flange of the CDSM beams at the required cut off elevations prior to the installation of the waterproofing system see exhibit A for details, This pre-cutting of the CDSM beams would minimize the possibility of heat damage to the waterproofing system. The remainder of the CDSM beam cutting and top section removal will be completed by the TG012.1 Civil Sitework contractor.
Please confirm if this would be acceptable.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Judy Long
10/18/2013
RESPONSE:
This is a means and method item. Contractor to comply with manufacturer's requirements and recommendations to ensure proper installations and warranties while performing work per contract documents.

T-0775	BGP-Concrete strength requirement for bracing Removal	Closed	09/30/2013	10/10/2013	10/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

REQUEST:

In accordance with Spec section 31-55-00 1.4 J the contractor is to submit concrete strength results to the design team prior to the removal of internal bracing. In order to fulfill this requirement the contractor has asked the following questions.

1. What is the criteria for bracing removal for instant if the average strength of the concrete cylinders tested is calculated to be above the design strength can the internal bracing be removed?

2. Is there any tolerance on the design strength requirement for bracing removal, for example if the concrete has reached 90% of design strength could the bracing be removed? Obviously this could have a positive effect on the construction schedule.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

George Metzger
10/9/2013
RESPONSE:
The response of this RFI is limited to the scope of the removal of the lowest level D temporary shoring struts:

1. The criteria for removing the shoring struts is defined in general note FO-5 on sheet S-0005 of the TG03 BSE documents: " F0-5 Do not remove temporary shoring struts against foundation walls until the foundation wall and mat concrete has attained 100% of its design strength."

For consideration of bracing removal prior to 56 day concrete cylinder tests, design strength may be considered achieved when all earlier tested cylinders meet ACI 318 acceptance criteria. For this purpose, "test" in ACI will not be required to be the average of multiple test results of a particular batch.

If the results of the concrete cylinders meet ACI criteria and averages (as defined by ACI) exhibit values above design strength, the element may be considered to have attained its design strength.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1259 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0775.1	BGP-Concrete strength requirement for level D bracing removal	Closed	10/09/2013	10/19/2013	10/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: To clarify question 2 in RFI T-0775 WOJV is requesting that the level D bracing be removed once the concrete in the mat slab beneath has reached 75% of its design strength. Please confirm if this would be acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/15/2013 RESPONSE: RFI T-0775 already allowed a relaxation of the original contract document requirement. To consider the criteria of 75% design strength, the Contractor shall produce all necessary calculations to justify that the 75% strength and the reduced stiffness at 75% strength is sufficient.				
T-0775.2	BGP-Concrete strength requirement for the level D bracing removal	Closed	11/15/2013	11/25/2013	11/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Further to response to RFI T-0775.1, Please find attached supporting calculations to justify that the concrete in the mat slab is sufficient at 3000 psi to removal the level D bracing. Please confirm that this is acceptable			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/19/2013 RESPONSE: A submittal is required to address the contents of this RFI.				

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0776	BGP - Mat Slab Construction Joint Between Area 2 and Area 4	Closed	10/01/2013	10/11/2013	10/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached excerpt drawing CJ-04 from submittal package TG0600-030.3, Item ID #033000-003.3. As discussed and coordinated in various Progress Meetings, SCCI plans to combine slab pours S102 and S104 into one pour without bulkhead forms in between. The specificaitons do not restict SCCI from using bulkheads in the east and west directions. The returned construction joint layout shop drawing review comments do not reflect the coordinated revised construction joint. Please confirm it is acceptable to combine slab placement areas S102 and S104 into one pour without bulkhead forms in between.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/3/2013 RESPONSE: The construction joints submitted and approved in Submittal TG0600-030.2 (Item 033000-003.2) dated May 29, 2013 were acceptable to the design team and formed the basis for CTL's Submittal TG0600-201.1 (Item 033020-011). CTL (Shimmick's consultant) indicates that slab cracking becomes increasingly likely when aspect ratios exceed 1.5:1. TT notes that the revised construction joint layout creates an additional high aspect ratio pour. While TT does not recommend the elimination of the joint, the contractor may at their own risk eliminate the joint between Area S102 and S104 per the revised joint layout contained in Submittal TG0600-030.3 (Item 033000-003.3) dated September 17, 2013. Further, the contractor shall verify that the new geometry does not change the previously issued CTL submittals.	
<hr/>							
T-0777	BGP - FF & FL Values for Concourse Slab	Closed	10/02/2013	10/12/2013	10/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached RFI T-0691. This RFI is being submitted in response to RFI response T-0691. As per contract specification section 033020, Section 3.6.B the concrete finish of the lower concourse slab notes an FF value of 20. Table 8.15.3b of ACI 302.1R (page 46) states that to achieve a surface with an FF value of 20, it must be a smooth floated surface. ACI 302.1R does not provide any recommendations of "F" numbers for broomed surfaces. Please confirm the design intent for the concourse slab finish: 1. To have a rough broom/rake finish or 2. To have			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/16/2013 RESPONSE: The Lower Concourse shall be finished to the FF and FL numbers contained in the Specification 03 30 20, Section 3.6B-1a. Section 3.6B-1a will take precedence over Section 3.6B-1c.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1261 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page:1262 of 3091

Date:06/17/2015

Time:02:27 PM

Job:30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0778.3	REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0779, drawing EI-2024, and Spec Section 26 05 34. As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, the "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment is governed by field conditions...verify final location of outlets, fixture and equipment with the TJPA through the RFI process." Please confirm the coordinated equipment layout with the knee walls per RFI T-0899 as shown in the attached proposed layout SCCI sketch SK-RFI-337.1 for Electrical Room B2640 in Area 15 is acceptable. Please refer to the conduit layout in submittal shop drawing package TG0600-905.	SUGGESTION:					
	ANSWER: Judy Long 12/23/2013 RESPONSE: Per design team, Delete the subcontractor's request regarding additional cost. Please submit layout in shop drawing submission for all areas.						
	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>						
BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2640 - Area 15		Closed		01/28/2014	02/07/2014	02/10/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello						
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu							
T-0778.3	REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0779, drawing EI-2024, and Spec Section 26 05 34. As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, the "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment is governed by field conditions...verify final location of outlets, fixture and equipment with the TJPA through the RFI process." Please confirm the coordinated equipment layout with the knee walls per RFI T-0899 as shown in the attached proposed layout SCCI sketch SK-RFI-337.1 for Electrical Room B2640 in Area 15 is acceptable. Please refer to the conduit layout in submittal shop drawing package TG0600-905.	SUGGESTION:					
	ANSWER: For confirmation of the equipment layouts, please document on shop drawings. All further layout confirmations for panels and conduits should be submitted on shop drawing format						
	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>						
				01/28/2014	02/07/2014	02/10/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0779	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2461 - Area 8	Closed	10/02/2013	10/12/2013	10/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Please reference drawing E1-2024 and Spec Section 26 05 34. As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, please confirm the proposed "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment..." layout as shown in the attached SCCI sketch SK-RFI-336 for Electrical Room B2461 in Area 08 is acceptable. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/10/2013 RESPONSE: WSP has reviewed these layouts for conformance with electrical equipment locations and layouts are in conformance with the Contract Documents. As noted in response to RFI 0665.1, documentation should be presented on CAD for review and approval, hand sketches are not acceptable.		
T-0779.1	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2461 - Area 8	Closed	10/28/2013	11/07/2013	10/31/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0779, drawing EI-2024, and Spec Section 26 05 34. RFI #T - 0779 response proposes layout for electrical equipment and box layout in Electrical Room B2461 - Area 08 in CAD format. See attached. Please confirm layout is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RESPONSE: RFI T-0779.1 BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2461 - Area 8 George Metzger 10/29/2013 RESPONSE: WSP cannot review these layouts because walls have not been properly coordinated. Refer to markup on AAI. Further submissions of equipment layouts should be submitted as shop drawings on CAD backgrounds for proper coordination.		
T-0779.2	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2461 - Area 8	Closed	12/20/2013	12/30/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0779, drawing EI-2024, and Spec Section 26 05 34. As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1264 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0779.3	Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, the "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment is governed by field conditions...verify final location of outlets, fixture and equipment with the TJPA through the RFI process."						
	Please confirm the coordinated equipment layout with the knee walls per RFI T-0899 as shown in the attached as-built layout SCCI sketch SK-RFI-336.1 for Electrical Room B2461 in Area 08 is acceptable. Please refer to the conduit layout in submittal shop drawing package TG0600-905.						
	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2461 - Area 8	Closed	01/28/2014	02/07/2014	02/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu						
	REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0779, drawing EI-2024, and Spec Section 26 05 34. As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, the "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment is governed by field conditions...verify final location of outlets, fixture and equipment with the TJPA through the RFI process." Please confirm the coordinated equipment layout with the knee walls per RFI T-0899 as shown in the attached as-built layout SCCI sketch SK-RFI-336.1 for Electrical Room B2461 in Area 08 is acceptable. Please refer to the conduit layout in submittal shop drawing package TG0600-905. Please note this RFI is being remitted per coordination meeting between AAI, WOJV, SCCI and TCCO on 1/10, to exclude SCCI's version of the RFI which makes reference to cost impacts.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
					For confirmation of the equipment layouts, please document on shop drawings. All further layout confirmations for panels and conduits should be submitted on shop drawing format.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1265 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0780	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2460 - Area 08	Closed	10/02/2013	10/12/2013	10/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Please reference drawing E1-2026, A1-2104 and Spec Section 26 05 34. As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, please confirm the proposed "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment..." layout as shown in the attached SCCI sketch SK-RFI-335 for Electrical Room B2460 in Area 08 is acceptable. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/10/2013 RESPONSE: WSP has reviewed these layouts for conformance with electrical equipment locations. The layout dimensioning should be revised as noted in the attachments to be in conformance with the Contract Documents. As previously noted in response to RFI 0665.1, documentation should be presented on CAD for review and approval, hand sketches are not acceptable.				
T-0780.1	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2460 - Area 08	Closed	10/28/2013	11/07/2013	10/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0780, drawings EI-2026 and AI-2104, and Spec Section 26 05 34. RFI #T - 0780 response proposes layout for electrical equipment and box layout in Electrical Room B2460 - Area 08 in CAD format. See attached. Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/29/2013 RESPONSE: WSP cannot review these layouts because walls have not been properly coordinated. Refer to markup from AAI. Further submissions of equipment layouts should be submitted as shop drawings on CAD backgrounds for proper coordination.				
T-0780.2	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2460 - Area 08	Closed	12/20/2013	12/20/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0780, drawings EI-2026 and AI-2104, and Spec Section 26 05 34. As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, the "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment is governed by field conditions...verify final			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 12/27/2013 RESPONSE: WSP response: WSP has reviewed these layouts for conformance with electrical equipment locations and layouts are in conformance with the Contract				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1266 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0781	<p>BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2441 - Area 09</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please reference drawing E1-2024, A1-2104 and Spec Section 26 05 34.</p> <p>As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, please confirm the proposed "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment..." layout as shown in the attached SCCI sketch SK-RFI-334 for Electrical Room B2441 in Area 09 is acceptable.</p> <p>Please advise.</p>	Closed	10/02/2013	10/12/2013	10/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>George Metzger 10/10/2013</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>WSP has reviewed these layouts for conformance with electrical equipment locations and layouts are in conformance with the Contract Documents. As noted in response to RFI 0655.1, documentation should be presented on CAD for review and approval, hand sketches are not acceptable.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1267 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0781.1	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2441 - Area 09	Closed	10/28/2013	11/07/2013	10/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0781, drawings EI-2024 and AI-2104 and Spec Section 26 05 34. RFI #T-0781 response proposes layout for electrical equipment box layout in Electrical Room B2441 - Area 09 in CAD format. See attached. Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/29/2013 RESPONSE: WSP cannot review these layouts because walls have not been properly coordinated. Refer to markup from AAI. Further submissions of equipment layouts should be submitted as shop drawings on CAD backgrounds for proper coordination.				
T-0781.2	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2441 - Area 09	Closed	12/20/2013	12/30/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0781, drawings EI-2024 and AI-2104 and Spec Section 26 05 34. As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, the "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment is governed by field conditions...verify final location of outlets, fixture and equipment with the TJPA through the RFI process." Please confirm the coordinated equipment layout with the knee walls per RFI T-0899 as shown in the attached as-built layout SCCI sketch SK-RFI-334.1 for Electrical Room B2441 in Area 09 is acceptable. Please refer to the conduit layout in submittal shop drawing package TG0600-905.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
T-0781.3	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2441 - Area 09	Closed	01/28/2014	02/07/2014	02/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0781, drawings EI-2024 and AI-2104 and Spec Section 26 05 34.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For confirmation of the equipment layouts, please refer to the shop drawings TG0600-104.0 BGP-				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1268 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
	<p>As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, the "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment is governed by field conditions...verify final location of outlets, fixture and equipment with the TJPA through the RFI process."</p> <p>Please confirm the coordinated equipment layout with the knee walls per RFI T-0899 as shown in the attached as-built layout SCCI sketch SK-RFI-334.1 for Electrical Room B2441 in Area 09 is acceptable. Please refer to the conduit layout in submittal shop drawing package TG0600-905.</p> <p>Please note this RFI is being remitted per coordination meeting between AAI, WOJV, SCCI and TCCO on 1/10, to exclude SCCI's version of the RFI which makes reference to cost impacts.</p>							
T-0782	<p>BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2560 - Area 09</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please reference drawing E1-2025, A1-2105 and Spec Section 26 05 34.</p> <p>As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, please confirm the proposed "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment..." layout as shown in the attached SCCI sketch SK-RFI-333 for Electrical Room B2560 in Area 09 is acceptable.</p> <p>Please advise.</p>	Closed	10/02/2013	10/02/2013	10/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
			<p>ANSWERED By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>George Metzger 10/10/2013</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>WSP has reviewed these layouts for conformance with electrical equipment locations. The layout dimensioning should be revised as noted in the attachments to be in conformance with the Contract Documents. As previously noted in response to RFI 0665.1, documentation should be presented on CAD for review and approval, hand sketches are not acceptable.</p>					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0782.1	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2560 - Area 10	Closed	10/28/2013	11/07/2013	10/31/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI #T-0782, drawing EI-2025, AI-2105, and Spec Section 26 05 34. RFI #T -0782 response proposes layout for electrical equipment and box layout in Electrical Room B2560 - Area 10 in CAD format. See attached. Please confirm that the layout is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/29/2013 RESPONSE: WSP cannot review these layouts because walls have not been properly coordinated. Refer to markup from AAI. Further submissions of equipment layouts should be submitted as shop drawings on CAD backgrounds for proper coordination.		
T-0782.2	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2560 - Area 10	Closed	12/20/2013	12/30/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference drawing E1-2025, A1-2105 and Spec Section 26 05 34. As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, the "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment is governed by field conditions...verify final location of outlets, fixture and equipment with the TJPA through the RFI process." Please confirm the coordinated equipment layout with the knee walls per RFI T-0899 as shown in the attached as-built layout SCCI sketch SK-RFI-333.1 for Electrical Room B2560 in Area 10 is acceptable. Please refer to the conduit layout in submittal shop drawing package TG0600-905.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-0782.3	BGP - Electrical Equipment and Box Layout in Electrical Room B2560 - Area 10	Closed	01/28/2014	02/07/2014	02/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu							
REQUEST: Please reference drawing E1-2025, A1-2105 and Spec			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For confirmation of the equipment layouts, please		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1270 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Section 26 05 34.</p> <p>As per spec section requirement 26 05 34 - Raceways and Boxes, Article 3.2 - B, the "...location of outlets, fixtures and equipment is governed by field conditions...verify final location of outlets, fixture and equipment with the TJPA through the RFI process."</p> <p>Please confirm the coordinated equipment layout with the knee walls per RFI T-0899 as shown in the attached as-built layout SCCI sketch SK-RFI-333.1 for Electrical Room B2560 in Area 10 is acceptable. Please refer to the conduit layout in submittal shop drawing package TG0600-905.</p> <p>Please note this RFI is being remitted per coordination meeting between AAI, WOJV, SCCI and TCCO on 1/10, to exclude SCCI's version of the RFI which makes reference to cost impacts.</p>						
T-0783	BGP- CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 11	Closed	10/18/2013	10/28/2013	10/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south wall in mat slab pour Area 11 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 188 to 236 on the north elevation and 548 to 571 on the south elevation for Location Plan see exhibit - A</p> <p>Exhibit - B & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching</p> <p>WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) between CDSM pile 234 to 236, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34' to clear the encroaching SP 235. Originally this was a WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6" OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the</p>				<p>George Metzger 10/23/2013 RESPONSE: The contractor proposed revisions to foundation wall reinforcement due to encroaching CDSM Piles in Area 11 are acceptable.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1271 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 548 to 551 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 550, originally this was a WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8" oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings.</p> <p>See Exhibit - E & F showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.</p> <p>These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.</p> <p>Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.</p>						
T-0784	BGP- CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 12	Closed	10/18/2013	10/18/2013	10/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north elevation in mat slab pour Area 12 for location Plan see exhibit - A. This RFI is subject to revision as the current survey data available does not recorded positioning of the CDSM beams at the lowest mat slab elevation.</p> <p>Exhibit - B, & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching</p> <p>WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) between CDSM pile254 to 257, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 255 & 256. Originally this</p>				<p>George Metzger 10/23/2013</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The contractor proposed revisions to foundation wall reinforcement due to encroaching CDSM Piles in Area 12 are acceptable. We note that the survey data for CDSM piles near the mat level is not provided in this RFI. Once that information is available, the encroachment information and therefore the foundation wall reinforcement in Area 12 may require further revision.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1272 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>was a WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>The South elevation has no encroaching piles and therefore the reinforcement would remain unchanged per the contract drawings</p> <p>In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings.</p> <p>See Exhibit - E which shows a detail of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.</p> <p>This solution if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.</p> <p>Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.</p>						
T-0784.1	BGP- CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 12	Closed	03/06/2014	03/16/2014	03/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - G							
This revised RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south wall in mat slab pour Area 12 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 235 to 265 on the north elevation and 517 to 548 to on the south elevation for location Plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B, & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching						The contractor proposed revisions to foundation wall reinforcement due to encroaching CDSM Piles in Area 12 are acceptable. Update Area 12 shop drawings affected by the new shoring encroachment info presented in this RFI and submit them for record.	
WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) between CDSM pile 234 to 237-238, 241-242 to 243, 254 to 257 and 262-263 to 270 WOJV is proposing							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 235,242,255,256,263. Originally these were WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>Between CDSM piles 237-238 to 241-242, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 241. This foundation wall area was originally a WR2 reinforcement area (#11@6"oc EF vertically) and would change to #11@5"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit - E).</p> <p>WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 530 to 531 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 531, originally this was a WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>Between CDSM piles 531 to 535 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 531, originally this was a WR2 reinforcement areas #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@5"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit - E).</p> <p>In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings. See Exhibit - E, F & G showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.</p> <p>These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.</p> <p>Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1274 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0785	BGP - Column Type C31/D22 Vertical Coupler Layout	Closed	10/03/2013	10/03/2013	10/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing 1/S1-3300, S1-3301, S1-3306 and attached Sketch SK-90. Detail 1/S1-3301 requires the couplers for the adjacent column vertical bars be staggered with a vertical distance of 24" or more; however, due to the pattern and spacing of vertical bars for the type C31/D22 detailed on S1-3306, the condition cannot be met. Attached is Gerdau sketch SK-90 - C31/C22 Column Vert Layout with a proposed pattern for the vertical bars in the type C1/D22 columns. Please confirm the proposed concrete reinforcement detail shown in the attached sketch is acceptable for type C31/D22 columns.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/7/2013 RESPONSE: Contractor proposed configuration for placement of vertical bars for Column C31 is acceptable.			
T-0785.1	BGP - Type C8 & C9 Coupler Stagger Revised Pattern	Closed	01/17/2014	01/27/2014	01/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Reference: RFI T-0785 and drawings s1-3300, S1-3301 and S1-3305. Detail 1/S1-3301 requires the couplers for the adjacent column vertical bars be staggered with a vertical distance of 24" or more; however, due to the pattern and spacing of vertical bars for the type C8/D9 detailed on S1-3305, the condition cannot be met. The attached SCCI sketch SK-RFI418, is the proposed pattern for the vertical bars in the type C8/D9 columns, please confirm if it is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RESPONSE: RFI T-0785.1 BGP - Type C8 & C9 Coupler Stagger Revised Pattern George Metzger 1/24/2014 RESPONSE: The proposed stagger is acceptable			
T-0786	SSS - Light Column Clevis Pin Material	Closed	10/04/2013	10/14/2013	10/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawing: S1-6006 Note on drawing S1-6006 states "ALL CLEVIS PINS AISI		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We checked the proposed substitution with regard to chemical composition and strength requirements. An acceptable substitution for the pin material is ASTM-			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1275 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	5160 STEEL, OIL QUENCHED FROM 830C, 650C TEMPER OR DIN 34 CRNIMO 6 + QT CODE EN 10083". The pin manufacturer, Dyson Corp., indicates this material is not available and suggests a substitution to ASTM-A540 grade 823, class 5 (see attachment).					A540 grade B23, class 4.	
T-0787	SSS - Charpy V-Notch Impact Testing Requirements	Closed	10/04/2013	10/14/2013	10/10/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please confirm the following regarding the Charpy V-Notch (CVN) testing requirements for the project:				1-) In elevation sheets S1-4101 through S1-4116; moment frame columns, transfer girders and tapered roof girders are part of Seismic Framing (SFRS). In this RFI, only moment frame beams are highlighted by the Contractor as SFRS in these sheets. As indicated in Sheet S1-2302 (see Sheet Notes), Sheets S1-4101 through S1-4116 include "superstructure transverse seismic frame elevations".			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The members identified on the attached sketches (SFRS - SK) are the only members that are part of the Seismic Force Resisting System (SFRS/SLRS/MF/BF) and are CVN tested in accordance with AISC 341-10 "Heavy Section" definition.<ul style="list-style-type: none">Except from AISC 341-10: "For structural steel in the SFRS, hot rolled shapes with flanges 1-1/2" thick and thicker shall have a minimum CVN toughness of 20 ft-lb at 70°F, tested in the alternate core location as described in ASTM A6 Supplementary Requirement S30. Plates 2" thick and thicker shall have a minimum CVN toughness of 20 ft-lb at 70°F, measured at any location permitted by ASTM A673, Frequency P, where the plates is used for the following:"<ul style="list-style-type: none">Members built up form plateThe steel core of buckling restrained bracesSFRS/SLRS/MF material will use the "Heavy Section" definition from AISC 341-10: hot rolled shapes with flanges 1-1/2" thick and thicker and plate 2" thick and thicker.Non SFRS/SLRS/MF material will use the project specification, Section 05 10 00, Part 1, 1.2, C.6, "Heavy Section" definition: hot rolled shapes with flanges exceeding 1-1/2" thick and plates exceeding 2" thick.				2-) RFI correctly highlighted all the members in the "longitudinal seismic framing elevations" as SFRS. This was also indicated in Sheet S1-2302 (Sheet Notes).			
				3-) Buckling Restrained Braces are part of SFRS. If core plates within the BRBs 2" or thicker (unlikely since the specified BRB steel core area is relatively small), AISC 341-10 Heavy Section CVN requirements will apply.			
				4-) Ground Level Gridline G beams between Gridlines 12 and 16.9 are SFRS. Note that RFI correctly highlights these beams as SFRS in longitudinal seismic framing elevation views. However, they were not shown as SFRS in the plans.			
				5-) 2nd Floor Gridline D beam between Gridlines 16 and 16.9 is SFRS as indicated in construction drawings.			
				6-) For pipe columns (large diameter tubular sections),			

Page: 1276 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1277 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0788	BGP - Areas 5 and 6 EW Top Mat Reinforcing at South Wall Radius	Closed	10/04/2013	10/14/2013	10/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Refer to the attached sketch 131003_S105-S106 South Radius. In Areas S105 and S106, EW top mat reinforcing makes an increasingly acute angle with the south wall. This eventually prevents the reinforcing from penetrating the haunch and wall reinforcing curtains to reach the edge of the mat. Per field coordination, please confirm it is acceptable to terminate EW top mat reinforcing in a hook prior to reaching the edge of the mat slab provided the following provisions are as followed: - All terminating EW top mat reinforcing shall be hooked - Where the angle becomes such that the mat reinforcing cannot penetrate the inner wall reinforcing. The reinforcing may terminate immediately in front of the wall reinforcing inside the haunch. This is labeled Zone 1 in the sketch. - In Zone 1, single haunch bars that interfere with penetration of mat reinforcing into the haunch shall be relocated to allow penetration. Relocation will be to the nearest adjacent placement opportunity without regard to the 8" spacing module. Clear spacing, however, between haunch bars shall be maintained. - The total number of haunch bars will remain unchanged. - In Zone 1, provide a curved band of reinforcing at the typical size and spacing of the mat within the wall. - Where the angle becomes such that the mat reinforcing cannot penetrate the haunch without relocating more than one haunch bar, reinforcing may terminate at the toe of the haunch. This is labeled Zone 2 in the sketch. - In Zone 2, provide a curved band of reinforcing at the typical size and spacing of the mat within the haunch. - Zone 1 and Zone 2 bands will overlap typical reinforcing by the distance LTS.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/4/2013 RESPONSE: It is acceptable to terminate EW top mat reinforcing of Areas S105 and S106 prior to reaching the edge of the mat as described in the RFI.	
T-0789	ASI 106 - Forced Air Thermal Cooling addition to LCC Nodes	Closed	10/07/2013	10/17/2013	10/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1278 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Reference: Attached Bradken letter</p> <p>ASI 106 specification section 05 15 21 2.1.B.2.a.1.f calls for "casting to be normalized with forced air cooling."; however, in order to reach other requirements (chemistry, carbon equivalent, and mechanical properties) Skanska will need to water quench the material to achieve the mechanical properties specified for the nodes.</p> <p>The addition of this specification requirement will greatly affect Bradkens ability to deliver the product, thus Bradken is requesting that this change to the specifications be removed.</p>						
T-0790	SSS - Anchor Bolt Diameter Clarification	Closed	10/07/2013	10/17/2013	10/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Drawings: S1-5051</p> <p>See attached CD RFI 043 SK1 & SK2 and confirm the anchor bolts for the columns at Grids 21/D.4 & 21/E.6 are 1" diameter per 7/S1-5051.</p>				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>				ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
					Anchor bolts are 3/4" diameter. The details for 3/4" diameter anchor is similar to the ones for 1" diameter (Type T anchor bolts). At the contractor's option without additional cost to TJPA, 1" diameter anchor bolt is acceptable to substitute the 3/4" diameter anchor bolt.		
T-0791	SSS - Anchor Plate Dimensions	Closed	10/07/2013	10/17/2013	10/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>See attached CD RFI 044 SK1 and confirm the noted plate washer dimensions are sufficient for the 2 1/2" dia. anchor bolts. Additionally confirm that the plate washer thickness may be 1/2" as per Detail 3 Section A, not 2" as shown.</p>				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>				ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
					The plate washer dimension is correct as shown (2' x 4" x 4").		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1279 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0792	SSS - Anchor Bolt Detail Clarification	Closed	10/07/2013	10/17/2013	10/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Drawing: S1-5051				In the direction parallel to column web, moving the anchor bolts to 5-1/2" from column center line as proposed in RFI will cause washer plates to clash with column flange (or welds). To alleviate this problem, suggest locating the 2 1/2" anchor bolts 4" from column center line (in direction parallel to web). The plate washer for the lower nut may be deleted.			
1) The plate washer will clear the fillet weld by 3/16". This is not sufficient to accommodate the maximum anchor bolt as-built tolerance based on the maximum oversize holes per A.I.S.C. Please advise.							
2) The plate washer will clear the fillet weld by 1/4". This is not sufficient to accommodate the maximum anchor bolt as-built tolerance based on the maximum oversize holes per A.I.S.C. Confirm it is acceptable to locate the anchor bolts 5 1/2" from the center of the column.				In the direction perpendicular to column web, moving the anchor bolts as proposed in this RFI is acceptable.			
T-0793	SSS - Connection Plates at Type 2 Drag Connections	Closed	10/07/2013	10/17/2013	10/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
On S1-5017 for the Type 2 Drag connections there are finger type connections where the carrying plates on the beams slide between the framing plates. In order for the beams to side down between these shop attached plates during erection please confirm a 1/8" clearance is acceptable.				Confirmed that the proposed 1/8" gap is acceptable.			
T-0795	SSS - Transfer Girder Stiffener Configuration	Closed	10/07/2013	10/17/2013	10/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Drawings: S1-4302 & S1-5052				Trimming not required. Interference for this case can be avoided moving the below grade column stiffener 1/2" towards the center of the column.			
Stiffeners required on TR9 transfer girder (A/ S1-4302) at line F are fouling. Stiffeners were detailed as per 2/ S1-5052 and 4/ S1-5052. See attached sketch CD RFI 040 SK1 for clarification. We propose to trim the stiffeners by ½" to avoid fouling.							
Please advise if this proposal is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1280 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0796	SSS - Transfer Girder Stiffener Thickness	Closed	10/07/2013	10/17/2013	10/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: S1-4300, S1-4308, S1-5052 For columns above transfer girders Detail 1/ S1-5052 calls out thicknesses of "X=1 1/2" for tfc <2 or tfc=2" and "X=2" for tfc >2"). For columns that are below transfer girders 4/ S1-5052 calls out "2 1/2" thk stiffener PL ea side, typ. (see note 3)". Note 3 states "Stiffeners required UON in transfer girder elevations". Where columns are directly above and below a transfer girder and full height stiffeners are shown per transfer girder elevations, please advise on what thickness these full height stiffeners should be. *Please note that 1/S1-5052 is also referred to on 2 and 6/S1-5052.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> When a below grade column is present immediately below an above grade column, full depth stiffeners that line up with the flanges of the column above are used within the transfer girder. Therefore, Details 1, 2 or 6/S1-5052, which are for above grade columns, govern the thickness of the full height stiffeners. This condition is indicated by Note 4 of Detail 1/S1-5052 which states, the stiffeners are half-depth UON in transfer girder elevations. For information not shown in Detail 2 and 6/S1-5052 (see Note 2 in these details), Detail 1/S1-5052 is referred to as correctly understood by the contractor. Note that where the above grade columns are connected to the transfer girders via castings, different details apply and stiffener requirements are different. Refer to corresponding details from Transfer Girder elevations.	
T-0797	BGP - Mat Slab Construction Joint Conflicts in Area 8	Closed	10/08/2013	10/18/2013	10/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached photos, excerpt drawing CJ-05 from submittal package TG0600-030.3 and SCCI sketch SK-0341. The east side of the mat slab construction joint of Area 8 (S108) has several constructability issues with the mat keyway and other project structure elements. The following are identified conflicts and SCCI proposed remediation: 1. The current east construction joint layout in Area 8 falls within the row of micropiles as shown in attached Photo-1 and Photo-2. SCCI intends to jog the joint an addition 12" +/- to the East of GL 16.6 to clear the micropile conflict 2. The east construction joint of area 8 currently jogs thru the thickened slab section at GL 16.6/G.3. SCCI intends to shift the joint Eastward to capture the thickened section			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/15/2013 RESPONSE: 1. We assume the RFI means to state the proposed shift is "... 12" +/- to the East towards GL 16.6..." (and not "...12" +/- to the East of GL 16.6...") as graphically depicted in the RFI sketch SK-341. This is acceptable. 2. The proposed jog around the pit/thickened slab is not acceptable as proposed. However, an acceptable alternative would be to turn the CJ westward along (or parallel) to GL F.7 within S108 and then turn 90 degrees south to align with the CJ on the west side of wall W160.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0802	BGP - Mat Slab Construction Joint (east side) Conflicts in Area 10		Closed	10/08/2013	10/18/2013	10/16/2013	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic						
	REQUEST: Please refer to attached SCCI sketch SK-345 and drawing (CJ-05) excerpt from submittal package TG0600-30.2. The east side of the mat slab construction joint of Area 10 (S110) has several constructability issues wih the mat keyway and other project structure elements. SCCI proposed to install the CJ between area 10 and 11 as shown on the attached sketches. Please confirm the revised construction joint layout as shown in the attached SCCI sketch SK-345 is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/15/2013 RESPONSE: The proposed mat joint between S110 and S111 is acceptable. Refer to RFI T-0798 for the joint on west side of area 10 between S110 and S111.			
T-0803	SSS - 2nd Level Revit Model Dimension Verification		Closed	10/08/2013	10/18/2013	10/09/2013	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: On S1-2402, S1-2403, S1-2404, S1-2406 & S1-2407 there are some beam & HSS member locations that are not located on the design drawings therefore we have used the Revit model to locate these members. On sketches CD RFI 048 SK1 to SK5 please verify all clouded dimensions that were taken from the latest Revit model received 9/12/13 to locate the steel in question		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Revit model is not a contract document. See response to RFI-0769. Resubmit the RFI considering the guidelines provided in the response to RFI-0769 to locate beams on floor plans.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0803.1	SSS - 2nd Level Revit Model Dimension Verification	Closed	11/22/2013	12/02/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On the response to Webcor RFI # T-0769 (SK RFI # SK 050) & T-0803 SK RFI # 067) we have reviewed and located most of the beam locations in question using the nearest gridlines, architectural dwg's, partial plans, equal spacing, etc per the noted guidelines in the response. However on drawings S1-2402, S1-2403, S1-2404, S1-2406 & S1-2407 there are still some beam locations that cannot be located and require verification therefore on sketches CD RFI 048.1 SK1 to SK5 please verify all clouded dimensions in RED as noted to close this RFI.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Responses to the queries on dimensions for locating beams on floor plans have been noted on the attached sketches SKS-0307 through SKS-0311 and SKA-2970.		
T-0804	SSS - W21 Beam Substitution	Closed	10/08/2013	10/18/2013	10/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: With reference to the W21x44 and W21x50 beams shown on Dwgs S1-2302 to S1-2307 (Ground Level), S1-2402 to S1-2407 (Second Level), Dwgs S1-2502 to S1-2507 (Bus Level) and Dwgs S1-2602 to S1-2607 (Roof Park Level), these beams have relatively narrow flanges. These beams sizes are problematic with regard to stability during erection for spans over 30 feet in length. The substitution of the W21x48 for the W21x44 and W21x55 for the W21x50 would resolve the stability issue. Please advise if these substitutions are acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> In general, where there is no shaft opening or recess on either one or both sides of the W21, the proposed substitutions for temporary erection stability are acceptable as long as there is no additional cost to TJPA. However, where there is an opening or recess on either one or both sides of the W21, substituting W21x44 or W50 with a beam with wider flange might negatively affect the edge clearance. Skanska may decide to move the beam to gain the same edge distance and submit the revised framing plan (with dimensions) as a RFI.		
T-0805	BGP-Area 7 level D bracing removal	Closed	10/08/2013	10/18/2013	10/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Further to response to RFI T-0641 please find attached supporting information from the internal bracing designer (PB&A) see exhibits B this information is a three dimensional structural analysis of the CDSM wall and bracing system. WOJV is proposing the removal of the level D bracing in area 7 and also the bracing which spans			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/17/2013 RESPONSE: For the condition where the Level D bracing will be removed above a poured mat slab that has not reached adequate strength, the structural engineer		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1285 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>across the Construction joints between Areas 6 & 7 and Areas 7 & 8 waler (WD-09 to WD-12, & WD-60 to WD-63 as well as struts 20-25 level D See SK-1 2 &3 in exhibit A) The removal of this bracing will allow all the first lift of wall to be completed in area 7 and mitigate any possible delays to the construction schedule.</p> <p>As part of this bracing removal process, WOJV will also put a monitoring plan in place to monitor the CDSM beams which will be unsupported by either the concrete of the mat slab or the level D walers and struts see exhibit C</p> <p>Please confirm if this would be acceptable</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1286 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0807	Blockout and reinforcement detail on the future bridge decks	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please provide a blockout and reinforcement detail for the 48" diameter bridge piers support the TG03 BSE (Balfour installed) temporary bridges on 1st street, Fremont street and Beale street.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Provide specification for positional couplers to be used, and confirm that rebar has appropriate concrete cover with positional coupler use.					George Metzger		
This detail will be part of the TG07.2 scope of works.					10/14/2013		
					RESPONSE:		
					It is our understanding that this RFI is in regards to block-outs for the temporary bridge piers through the TG07.2 Ground Level concrete roadway slabs. These block-outs are considered temporary openings and therefore the responsibility of the Contractor per General Note GR-9 to propose a detail.		

T-0808	SSS - Material Grade Certification	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please refer to attached CD RFI 046 SK1 to SK5 sketches and confirm all connection material shown on drawing S1-5051 is ASTM A36 material per the material note for plates in SS-2 on drawing S-0007 unless specifically noted on the drawing.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Confirmed		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0809	SSS - Shear Plate Connections	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
For the typical shear plate connections per detail 1/S1-5011 see sketches CD RFI 060 SK1 & SK2 for items 1, 2 & 3 noted below.			1. Confirmed. It is typically acceptable to provide a distance of 2 3/4" between face of the beam web and the bolt centerline.				
1. Confirm it is acceptable to locate the bolts 2 3/4" from face of beam web as shown for duplication of shear plate marks.			2. It is acceptable to typically cope the supported beam by a distance of k - e while maintaining a 1/2" minimum clearance as noted wherever detail 1/S1-5011 applies. k is the "k" distance of the supported beam and e is the fillet encroachment allowed per Figure 10-3 of the AISC Steel Manual 14th Edition. For the instance highlighted in the RFI, see response to 3.				
2. Confirm it is acceptable to cope the beam to match the "k" distance of the supported beam (W24) while maintaining a 1/2" minimum clearance to avoid cutting inside the "k" in lieu of the 1/2" max. shown in detail 1/S1-5011.			3. The shear plate connection shown in SK1 and SK2 occurs at 4 locations between GL 12 and 14. W16 beams at these four locations are going to be upsized in a future ASI.				
3. Confirm the shear plate thickness and weld size at a W16x31 to W24x68 connection as per Note 3 in 1/S1-5011 is 3/8" shear plate and 1/4" weld.							
T-0810	SSS - Transfer Girder Kicker Connection	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
On S1-2305 near grids 24.9/E the kicker angle connection per detail 5/S1-5015 will miss the connecting beams at 4 locations as noted on sketches CD RFI 064 SK1 & SK2. Please supply an alternate connection detail at these locations.			Provide kickers with 1 to 1.25 slope at the four locations highlighted in the RFI so that the top gusset plates connect to the short W44 beams that span East-West.				
T-0811	SSS - Fitted Stiffeners	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: Attached sketch			1.) When a stiffener is called out in the drawings as "fitted" stiffener, it shall be ground to fit closely against the flanges as indicated in the specification. In following cases, "fitted" requirement can be				
Spec 05 10 00 - 16 N states: "Stiffeners: Fitted stiffeners shall be ground to fit closely against flanges."							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1288 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>1.Please clarify which stiffeners are fitted stiffeners as this terminology does not appear to be noted in the structural drawings.</p> <p>2. Confirm it is acceptable to provide the shear plate height as d-2tf minus 1/16" for fabrication tolerance.</p>			<p>disregarded and stiffeners can be constructed using standard AISC fabrication tolerances: a-) When stiffeners are welded to beam/column flanges using CJP welding. b-) In Sheets S1-8001, S1-8002, S1-8003. c-) In Detail 1/S1-5013.</p> <p>2.) If a stiffener is not called out as "fitted", use of standard AISC fabrication tolerances for construction is acceptable.</p>			
T-0812	SSS - Pipe Column Connections to Cast Nodes	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Please review attached sketches with details on S1-4020 and cast node details for pipe connections to cast nodes.</p> <p>1. Work points for 32" diameter basket column to cast node connections have been offset from the theoretical work line as noted on design sheet S1-4020. Verify ends of 32" pipe will need to be bevel cut to match face of cast node geometry.</p> <p>2. Where necessary bevel cuts are required at each end of the 32" diameter pipe we propose to add a scribe line along the top surface on centerline of the pipe to facilitate matching the cut surface to the cast node face. Please verify a corresponding scribe line will be added to the face of Cast Nodes.</p>				<p>1. As noted on details on Sheet S1-4020, the center line of the pipe is not in line with the center line of the cast node. Since the cast node ears are casted to be perpendicular to the cast node axis, the pipe end need to be bevel cut to match face of the case node geometry.</p> <p>2. Scribe line if needed shall be laid out and scored into the casting by Skanska as a part of means and methods. The depth and thickness of the scribe line shall be submitted for review. Scribe line if added, shall not affect the appearance of the cast node nor pipe after painting.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1289 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0813	SSS - Kick Angle Requirements	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please refer to sketch CD RFI #070 SK1. The BU members on Grid 1 are not noted as MF, TR or TPG and it is not clear which kicker brace detail on S1-5015 applies. Please advise which kicker brace detail on S1-5015 is to be applied along Grid 1				Bottom flange bracing is not required at the BU-40x22x1x2 beams along GL 1.			
T-0814	SSS - Missing BU Members in the Bottom Flange Brace Schedule	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Per detail 7/S1-5015 please refer to sketch CD RFI # 072 SK1 and supply the information for the missing BU 30x18x1x1.5 & BU 30x22x1.5x2 members in the schedule.				Bottom flanges of Moment Frame (MF) beams are to be braced per 6/S1-5015 where the "H" dimension noted in the detail is less than or equal to 12" or per 7/S1-5015 where the "H" dimension is greater than 12". The BU30 MF beams highlighted in the RFI are to be braced per 6/S1-5015 as "H" < 12" for these beams			
T-0815	SSS -Missing Kicker Brace Details	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
At the Bus level near grid line 12 and at grids 18 & 26 please refer to sketches CD RFI # 073 SK1 to SK3 and supply the appropriate kicker brace detail on S1-5015 to be used for the noted beams as these beams are not MF beams, Transfer Girders or Tapered Girders.				Kicker brace at the locations highlighted in the RFI shall be per Detail 7/S1-5015, similar to the one for BU-40x18x0.75x1.5.			
T-0816	BGP - Revised Placement Tolerance at Top Mat Reinforcement	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPJackson Tukuafu</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please refer to drawing S1-2052 and ACI 117.				George Metzger			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please confirm it is acceptable to increase the top mat slab reinforcement placement tolerance from +/-1/2" to +1/2" and -1" as discussed and coordinated with TT field representative. This would also change the concrete cover tolerance from -1/2" to +/-1/2".</p>		10/18/2013				
			RESPONSE:				
			Minimum acceptable concrete cover over top reinforcing stands at 1" per ACI 117 Section 2.2.2 (+1/2 proposed in RFI). Minimum acceptable concrete cover over headed reinforcing stands at ½" per ACI 117 Section 2.2.2.				
			Maximum acceptable concrete cover may be increased to as much as 3" provided that the distance from the top of reinforcing to the protection slab is no less than 58" (Relaxation of proposed -1" tolerance in RFI to -1.5" with stipulation).				
T-0817	BGP -Compressible material between concrete structure & CDSM wall	Closed	10/11/2013	10/21/2013	10/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	The contractor has raised a concern see letter in exhibit A attached.		George Metzger				
	Does the design team envisage any possible issues with the CDSM wall if the waterproofing substrate becomes compressed between the permanent structure and the CDSM wall once the level D bracing is removed? The same question applies when the re-bracing is installed against the permanent foundation walls.		10/21/2013				
			RESPONSE:				
			We do not envisage any problems with the CDSM wall due to the compressible layer. The performance of the CDSM wall with regards to meeting the specified deflection criteria is the responsibility of the internal bracing designer.				
			WOJV shall coordinate between the Waterproofing and shoring Sub-contractor and provide requested information to BBI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1291 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0818	SSS- Kicker Brace Connection to Underside of Beam Flange	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
On S1-2505 at grid lines 20.1/E please refer to sketches CD RFI # 074 SK1 & SK2 and supply a connection detail for the kicker brace to the underside of the beam flange as shown.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Adjust the slope of the kicker brace such that the top gusset plate connects to the bottom flange of the W24x55 beam. For connection detail of kicker brace to underside of beam flange refer to typical gusset plate detail 7/S1-5015. Slope of the kicker brace should not exceed 3:5 (3 horizontal to 5 vertical).				
<hr/>							
T-0819	SSS -Gusset Plates at Kicker Angle Connections	Closed	10/10/2013	10/20/2013	10/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
On S1-5015 for the bottom flange connection and the kicker angle connection clarification please refer to sketches CD RFI # 077 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) Confirm it is acceptable to cut the gusset plate as shown to avoid a pointed corner as the weld will not be effective in the shaded triangle area.			Confirmed. Changes proposed in the RFI (cutting the gusset plate as shown in CD RFI 077 SK1 and SK2) are acceptable				
2) Confirm it is acceptable to cut the gusset plate as shown to avoid a pointed corner as the weld will not be effective in the shaded triangle area.							
<hr/>							
T-0820	SSS - Missing Beam Connection Details	Closed	10/10/2013	10/10/2013	10/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
At the ground level north of grid line G at grids 2, 3 & 4 please refer to sketches CD RFI # 078 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 4 below and supply connection details as noted.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) Supply a connection detail.			1. Connection detail at the W30x99 beam will be similar to 2/S1-5011 except that instead of a single shear plate, the connection will have two shear plates between the three transfer girder flange plates. Width of plates to match the larger of the transfer girder flange plate widths. Provide 2 bolts in the top shear plate and 4 bolts in the bottom shear plate. Bolt sizes, spacing between the bolts, bolt edge distances, shear plate thickness and fillet weld between the shear plate and transfer girder flanges/web for the two plates are to be followed per 2/S1-5011. Provide closure plates				
2) Confirm connection is per 12/S1?]5010.							
3) Supply a connection detail.							
4) Supply a connection detail.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1292 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	1020.1.2, plumbing line or drains are not listed under Penetrations.						
	Please confirm the plumbing line detailed inside the Area 4 stairway will comply with the referenced code section.						
T-0822	SSS - Angle Connection Details at GL 23	Closed	10/11/2013	10/21/2013	10/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
On S1-2305 around the light column @ grid 23 see attached CD RFI 062 SK1 and confirm details 6 & 7/S1-5015 may be applied at the noted (16) locations. If not, supply a detail reference.			Confirmed. Braces may be provided per 6 and 7/S1-5015 at the 16 highlighted locations.				
T-0822.1	SSS - Angle Connection Details at GL 23	Closed	12/03/2013	12/13/2013	12/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
RFI T-0822 (attached for reference) confirmed the use of details 6 and 7/S1-5015 at the 16 highlighted areas. Please refer to CD RFI 062.1 SK1 and confirm that the weld dimension "A" indicated on 7/S1-5015 applies to skewed angle connections as indicated on the sketch attached. Otherwise, please provide the required welding information.			Confirmed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1294 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0823	SSS - Bolted Beam Connections	Closed	10/11/2013	10/21/2013	10/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per S1-5012 for the typical bolt beam connections please refer to sketches CD RFI # 079 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 7:					1) Confirmed. Vertical bolt edge distance 2db can be changed to 1 3/4" in details 1 and 2/S1-5012 if the bolt diameter is not more than 7/8".		
1) Confirm the noted dimension may be 1 3/4" in details 1 & 2/S1-5012 to match 3/S1-5012.					2) Confirmed. The noted dimensions are acceptable for details 1, 2 and 3/S1-5012. Note that the distance between the centerline of the bolts and the face of the column is 3".		
2) Confirm the noted dimensions are acceptable for details 1, 2 & 3/S1-5012.					3) Plate thickness is 3/4" as noted on Superstructure ASI 106 drawings.		
3) Supply plate thickness.					4) Welds between shear plate and column are double sided 5/16" fillet welds as noted on ASI 106 drawings.		
4) Supply welding for shear plate to column.					5) Confirmed. Noted dimensions are acceptable.		
5) Confirm dimensions are acceptable.					6) Confirmed. Noted dimensions are acceptable.		
6) Confirm dimensions are acceptable.					7) Plate thickness is 1" as noted on Superstructure ASI 106 drawings.		
7) Supply plate thickness.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1295 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0824	SSS - Bottom Flange Connection Plate	Closed	10/11/2013	10/21/2013	10/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per detail 6/S1-5015 for the bottom flange connection plate please refer to sketches CD RFI # 069 SK1, SK2 & SK3.					Access for field welding of the web extension plate per 6/S1-5015 is a problem at the following locations:		
1) Access for field welding the web extension plate per 6/S1-5015 is a problem at the noted location as well as other similar locations.					1) Location highlighted in SK1 in the RFI		
					2) At GLs 6/C.3 and 6/F.7		
					3) At GLs 9.9/C.3 and 9.9/F.7		
					4) At GLs 20.1/C.3 and 20.1/F.7		
					5) At W40x149 beams framing into moment frame beams between GL 32.4 and 33.2 (Total 8 brace locations).		
Confirm the web extension plate may be typically omitted when the dimension shown as 1 3/4" is 3" or less.					Provide brace detail per sketch SKS-0290 (attached) at locations listed in 1, 3 and 4 above. Braces at locations listed in 2 and 5 are not required.		
T-0825	SSS - W30 Beam to Girder where bf exceeds 22	Closed	10/11/2013	10/21/2013	10/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
On S1-2505 along grid line 20.1/E.6 where the W30x108 beam frames into the MF girder please refer to sketches CD RFI # 076 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2 noted below.					1) Provide double angle connection per 1/S1-5010 at the two W30x108 beams that frame into the Moment Frame beam at GL 20.1. For the four shear plate connections at the W30x108 and W40x149 beams on GL 21, provide connections per 1/S1-5011. There are no other locations where a shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011 is specified and where support beam flange width is greater than 22".		
1) The noted "MF" beam is a BU-44x24x1.25x2.75. Detail 1/S1-5011 does not apply as "bf" exceeds 22". Please supply a typical connection for a round circle on plans when the "bf" exceeds 22 (work with item 2 on SK2)							
2) Please note that if a full depth shear plate is used it will foul the beam extension plate per 6/S1-5015. Please clarify.					2) See response to 1.		
T-0826	SSS - Oversized Hole Size in Web Stiffeners	Closed	10/14/2013	10/24/2013	10/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Co-Author:	Request:	Suggestion:	Answer:
	<p>Reference the response to W/O RFI # T-0826 (SK 114 & CD 055D), attached for reference.</p> <p>W/O RFI T-0826 response states that "Use of oversize bolt holes in this drag connection is not acceptable." Confirm that the response above applies only to conditions when the web stiffener plate is the outside plate in a connection and that the 3/16" oversize holes for the web stiffener plates are acceptable in details 1 & 2/S1-5016 when the web stiffener plate is not the outside plate in the connection.</p>		<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>RESPONSE: Use of oversize hole is not allowed for drag connections, neither at the shear plates nor at the web stiffener plates, and regardless of whether the web stiffener plate is the inside plate in the connection or not.</p>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1297 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0827	BGP - Clarification to Galvanized Steel Plate at Seismic Joint in Area 16	Closed	10/14/2013	10/24/2013	10/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing detail 7/A1-8881 and 4/S1-3010. Detail 7/A1-8881 (and other details on A1-8881) call for a 5/8" x 6' galvanized steel plate secured to the mud slab and soldier piles. This plate does not appear on the structural details for the seismic joint in drawing S1-3010. 1. Please explain the functionality and purpose of the galvanized steel plate shown in 7/A1-8881 and 1/A1-8881 in relation to the seismic joint assembly. 2. Please provide revised structural drawings showing all welding and design criteria required to attach and secure the "5/8" THK x 6' wide galv steel plate" to the mud slab and soldier beam, respectively.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/24/2013 RESPONSE: AAI Response: 1. The 5/8" thk x 6' wide plates were provided at the mat slab (horizontal) and at the shoring wall (vertical) to serve as relatively smooth backing for the seismic joint assembly as the train box moves against the mud slab and shoring wall. It also provides a flat surface for the neoprene gasket seal when pressed against it. 2. The horizontal plates are mechanically anchored to the 4" thk reinforced mud slab with 3/8" expansion anchors (with the shortest minimum embed 2 5/8" or 3" depending on the manufacturer) spaced at 8" min. The vertical plates are either seam/slot welded to the soldier piles or are 2 plates (with total width of 6')- plate panels welded to the soldier piles, depending on the field location of installed adjacent soldier piles. Welds ground to a smooth finish. TT Response: This plate is not intended to show on the structural drawings.				
T-0828	SSS - Locations for Scratch Plate for BRBs	Closed	10/14/2013	10/14/2013	10/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please reference the sketch attached and verify the proposed scratch plate end locations and surface locations are acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The locations of the BRB scratch plates are acceptable with following modification: Move the scratch plate from the BRB in Detail H/S1-4150 to one of the BRBs in Detail F/S1-4150. Mount scratch plate near the top of the brace, on near side.				
T-0829	BSE - Voids Across Top of CDSM Wall on the West side of Zone 1	Closed	10/15/2013	10/25/2013	10/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1298 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference Photos: attached</div><div>There are a number of voids that run across the top of the CDSM wall on the West side of zone 1 (see attached photos). During prior conversations between W/O and Arup there has been discussion of filling these voids with material. Please provide the material and application desired by the design team to fill these voids.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>					
			<div>ANSWER:</div>	<div>Accept Suggestion:</div>	<div></div>		
			<div>The voids do not need to be filled at this time.</div>				
T-0830	SSS - Type T, TT, and TTT Base Plate Anchor Rod Location Confirmation	Closed	10/15/2013	10/25/2013	10/21/2013	Potentially	<div></div>
	<div><div>From:</div>Webcor Construction LP</div> <div>Robert Kjome</div>	<div>To:</div> Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	<div>Answered By:</div> Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	<div><div>Co-Author:</div></div>						
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Detail 7 on S1-5051 provides locations where type TT and type TTT base plate anchor rods will be installed. There are other details throughout the plans that contradict the columns base plate anchor rod locations provided in 7/S1-5051. For example: 7/S1-5051 shows a column at gridline 10.1/G.3 as having a type TTT base plate anchor rod detail; however, 1/S1-3610 shows the column at 10.1 and G.3 as having a type T base plate anchor rod detail.</div><div>Please confirm that detail 7/S1-5051 provides the correct base plate anchor rod detail for each of the columns.</div><div>Please provide a type T base plate anchor rod detail.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>					
			<div>ANSWER:</div>	<div>Accept Suggestion:</div>	<div></div>		
			<div>1) Confirmed that 7/S1-5051 provide correct anchor rods information.</div>				
			<div>2) Type T anchor rod details are provided in Detail 3 & 5/S1-5051 (see the note stating "TYPE T thread bar anchor shown, for Type TTT threadbar anchor see 4/S1-5051, for TYPE II threadbar anchor see 6/S1-5051).</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1299 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0831	BGP - Area 11 Clear Cover to the Vertical Reinforcement on the Foundation Wall	Closed	10/22/2013	11/12/2013	10/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Further to response to RFI T-609 this RFI shows the areas of foundation wall/embedded column in pour Area 11, on the north & south wall elevations which will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement for location plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B & C depict the amount and location of the foundation walls which the will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement in this case only pile number 225 on the north elevation has this issue. RFI T - 783 shows the thinning of the wall with the revised reinforcement spacing due to CDSM pile encroachment in Area 11. Please confirm that the clear cover between the waterproofing system and the vertical reinforcement as outlined at these locations is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/29/2013 RESPONSE: The clear cover between the waterproofing system and vertical reinforcement as presented in Exhibit C of this RFI is acceptable.				

T-0832	BGP - Area 12 Clear Cover to the Vertical Reinforcement on the Foundation Wall	Closed	10/24/2013	11/05/2013	10/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Further to response to RFI T-609 this RFI shows the areas of foundation wall/embedded column in pour Area 12, on the north & south wall elevations which will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement for location plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B & C depict the amount and location of the foundation walls which the will have greater than 6" of clear cover to the vertical reinforcement in this case only two pile numbers 237 & 238 on the north elevation has this issue. RFI T - 784 shows the thinning of the wall with the revised reinforcement spacing due to CDSM pile encroachment in Area 12. Please confirm that the clear cover between the			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/29/2013 RESPONSE: The clear cover between the waterproofing system and vertical reinforcement as presented in Exhibit C of this RFI is acceptable.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1300 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0833	BGP - Embed Clarification at Elevator Rail Support From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon REQUEST: Please confirm the length of the elevator rail support embed dimension is 2'-7", as shown in the attached detail drawing 4/S1-7630..	Closed	10/16/2013	10/26/2013	10/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/26/2013 RESPONSE: Inquired length is confirmed. Note that there is more than one size of HSS, therefore the height of vertical plate may vary. CMGC shall make all future bidders of trades that may be impacted by detail issues such as this, aware of the work of adjacent trades.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1301 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0834	BGP - Structural Steel Embeds in Concourse Slab/Columns	Closed	10/17/2013	10/27/2013	10/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Chris Williams							
REQUEST: Attached is a rebar congestion model of the concourse slab and column C2 at C/24.9. As is apparent, the structural steel shear lug portion of the plate embed is in conflict with the reinforcing steel and will not fit with required rebar spacing. The rebar conflicts with the shear lug and blockout that are present, include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Typical MFB Beam at C/24.9 (blue colored bars in model)- B-68 Beam (yellow colored bars in model)- Main concourse slab (pink colored bars in model)- Column C-2 vertical T-Heads (purple colored bars in model) Please provide a solution that will provide a constructible blockout and embedment of the structural steel plate.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 3-D images provided seems to orient the base plate/shear key in the wrong direction. The long face of the shear keys are to be in parallel to the web of the steel column as shown in details on Sheet S1-5051. Spacing for the slab rebars and the top rebars for the misc. beams (e.g., B71 at Grid C/2, B68 @ Grid C/24.9) shall be adjusted slightly to clear the shear keys.				
T-0835	BGP - Vehicle Ramp Beam and Wall Support Embed Clarifications	Closed	10/17/2013	10/27/2013	10/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please reference attached drawings S1-2251, A1-7401, S1-3411, S1-3203 and S1-3204. 1. Please confirm the beam support angle/plate as shown on D1 of S1-3411 are located where shown on drawing S1-2251 (notation in red). There will be a total of three total embeds. 2. Please confirm the wall support angle/plate (two total embeds) shown on detail D6/S1-3203 and D10/S1-3204 are located where shown on the notated drawing S1-2251 (notation in green). 3. Please provide a drawing that shows the acute and obtuse angles for embeds highlighted on A1-7401. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/29/2013 RESPONSE: 1. Confirmed. 2. Confirmed. 3. See attached SKA-2863.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1302 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0835.1	BGP - Vehicle Ramp Beam Support Embeds	Closed	11/05/2013	11/15/2013	11/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI T-0835, RFI T-0453.1 and attached SKA-2863. RFI Response T-0453.1, stated that in lieu of bending the L8x8x1-1/8" member, it was acceptable to weld two 1-1/8" thick plates together in order to achieve desired obtuse and acute angles. 1. Please confirm that additional embeds per detail 1 S1-3411, not reference in RFI T-0453.1, can be welded to create the specified angles per RFI response T-0853 (this will be an additional 2 angles). Please reference attached SKA-2863 for specified angles and locations of embeds in question.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/17/2013 RESPONSE: Contractor proposal as presented in the RFI is acceptable. Include in forthcoming shop drawings that is referenced in RFI T-0881. (Note that we assume the RFI is intending to reference "T-0835" and not "T-0853".				
T-0836	BGP - Sump Pit Rebar Tail and Trestle Pile @ GL 18.5/E - Area 9	Closed	10/17/2013	10/27/2013	10/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Reference: RFI T-0644 Three of the sump pit lower mat #11 tails near grid line 18.5/E are in conflict with the nearby trestle pile. The bars have been trimmed to clear the trestle pile and provide an LTE of 34" instead of 60" as required per plans. Typically, a bent bar would be spliced to the interrupted bar as required in SKS-0281 in the response to RFI T-066; however, the trimmed bars have a 70" length which would not meet the 78" LTS requirement. Gerdau propose to leave the 3 ea trimmed bars as-is and not incorporate an additional spliced bent bar. Please confirm if this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/22/2013 RESPONSE: Provide spliced bent bar as indicated in RFI T-0664 and that RFI's accompanying Sketch SKS0281. Lap length may be reduced to 69". The total length of bent bar extending beyond the intersection with the bottom mat reinforcing shall be 60". The bent bar may be rotated so that the tail clears the layer of mat top reinforcing.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1303 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0837	BGP - Structural Details for Elevator Door Sill Plate Angles on Concourse Level	Closed	10/17/2013	10/26/2013	11/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing A1-2824 through A1-2847. The architectural drawing note at the elevator door sill plates refer to the structural drawings for details. However, the current structural drawing set do not provide the applicable misc metal angle detail. Please provide structural detail drawings showing the typical misc metal elevator door sill support angle. Please include mounting detail to concourse slab or topping slab detail, misc. metal details, and all pertinent information to accurately detail the elevator door sill plate angle.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/7/2013 RESPONSE: Refer to detail 4/A1-7576. The galvanized steel angle cast on top of the lower concourse structure (which forms the edge of the topping) shall be an L6x4x3/8 (LLH) with 3/4" x 8" long studs at 12" OC. Studs shall be 3" clear from edge of lower concourse slab. Elevator sill angle to be provided by elevator manufacturer.		
T-0837.1	BGP - Elevator Sill Conflict with Elevator Rail Embed Plate	Closed	11/19/2013	11/29/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: The architectural elevator sill angle/embed (continuous) detail shown in 4/A1-7576 is in conflict with the structural elevator rail support embed drawing in 4/S1-7130. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 12/3/2013 RESPONSE: The elevator sill plate support angle is interrupted by the HSS elevator guiderail support. The support angle shall terminate and recommence as follows: Cope horizontal (6") leg of sill plate support L6x4x3/8 contained in RFI response T-0837 up to 2" to clear vertical PL 5/8 of Detail 4/S1-7630. Remaining L4x4 (approx.) shall extend over the PL 1/2 embed plate to within 2" of the HSS elevator guiderail support. Length of cope shall not exceed HSS depth. A stud shall be placed within 3" of the cope.		
T-0838	BGP - Concourse Slab Opening Dimension Clarification at GL C/13	Closed	10/17/2013	10/26/2013	10/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1304 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please refer to attached drawing A1-2844 and S1-2204.</p> <p>The slab opening east of GL 13 and north of GL C shown on drawing A1-2844 appears to be in conflict with the slab opening shown on drawing S1-2204.</p> <p>Please confirm the aforementioned slab opening is 26'-3" x 8'-8 3/4".</p>						
T-0838.1	<p>BGP - Concourse Slab Opening Dimension Clarification at GL C/13</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please refer to the attached drawing A1-2844, S1-2204 and RFI T-0838.</p> <p>WOJV is in receipt of AAI's response to RFI T-0838, in which the slab opening dimension is referenced in a drawing that has yet to be issued for construction (A1-2844, ASI 107).</p> <p>Please provide the dimensions for the slab opening east of GL 13 and north of GL C as located on the current contract drawing A1-2844 dated 08/31/2012.</p>	Closed					
			10/29/2013	11/08/2013	11/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			George Metzger 11/14/2013 RESPONSE: See attached SKA-2870 showing dimensions to the slab opening east of GL 13 and north of GL C. Structural beams are aligned at the edges of the opening.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1305 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0839	SSS - Bolt Specifications	Closed	10/18/2013	10/28/2013	10/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: As per the Contract Drawings and Specifications all high strength bolts shall be A325, A490 & A354 BD. All TC bolts shall additionally conform to ASTM F1852 & F2280. 1. We propose to use TC bolts for all connections (shop & field) 1-1/8" diameter or less (unless galvanized). All galvanized bolts to be standard A325. 2. All bolts 1-1/4" to 1-1/2" diameter to be standard A490. 3. All bolts larger than 1-1/2" diameter to be standard A354 BD Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We assume the term "Standard AXXX" used in this RFI refers to high-strength bolts with Hex Heads that will be pre-tensioned using acceptable methods per Specification Section 05 10 00 - 3.2.K (other than TC). If this is not the case, please resubmit the RFI with additional clarification. Responses to individual items in RFI as follows: 1.) As indicated in Specification Section 05 10 00 - 3.2.K.1, it is acceptable to use TC bolts. Bolt specification shall be as indicated in the construction drawings. Standard A325 is acceptable for galvanized bolts. 2.) Standard A490 is acceptable in this diameter range. 3.) Standard A354BD is acceptable in this diameter range.		
T-0840	SSS - Means & Methods - Erection Devices	Closed	10/21/2013	10/31/2013	10/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: As per OSHA Standards Sub Part R Steel Erection 1926.756 (C)(1) When two structural members are sharing common connection holes, at least one bolt shall remain connected to the first member unless a shop or field attached seat or equivalent connection device is supplied with the member to prevent displacement. We propose the Means & Methods depicted in the attached sketch SK-1A to meet these OSHA requirements. Please advise if this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per 01 10 40 1.6 C 2 - TJPA will not reply and will reject the RFI: "Questions relating to construction means, methods, techniques, sequences, procedures or safety precautions. (These are the Contractor's responsibilities exclusively.)"		
T-0841	SSS - Transfer Girder Splice Conflict with Clip Angle Connection	Closed	10/18/2013	10/28/2013	10/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1306 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0842	SSS - Full Height Columns	Closed	10/18/2013	10/28/2013	10/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
REQUEST: As noted on sketches CD RFI 075 SK1 through SK8, there are several instances where the clip angle at the beam to transfer girder connection is in conflict with the transfer girder web splice. This condition occurs at TR7, TR8, TR11, TR19.1, TR19.9, TR21, and TR24. Please reference the sketches attached and confirm the modified transfer girder web splice locations are acceptable to avoid conflict with the beam clip angle connection.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Transfer girder splice locations may be moved as shown in sketches SK1 through SK7 in this RFI. There is no splice specified on the structural drawings (D/S1-4305) at TR24 between gridlines E.2 and D.8. Additional splice shown on SK8 is not acceptable.			
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> At moment frames where the column sections above and below the splice point are identical, it is acceptable to eliminate the column field splice.			
REQUEST: Please refer to the attached drawing, S1-4104. The columns shown in the transverse frame elevation that extend from the ground level to the roof level typically have a field splice located 4' above the bus deck slab. Please confirm that this field splice may be eliminated and that it is acceptable to provide full height columns. The detail is shown at GL 7 & GL 8. Other locations are similar. Note that a shop splice may be required due to limitations in mill rolling lengths.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0842.1	SSS - Moment Frame Column Splice	Closed	01/27/2014	02/06/2014	02/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: In reference to W/O RFI T-0842, in which permission was given to eliminate field splices in the built-up columns, please see the following: At certain column locations (see S1-4102 at GL4, for example) the thickness of the flange is constant throughout the height of the column. The fabricator will seek to provide single piece flanges when material availability permits. In instances where the availability of certain plate sizes does not permit the fabricator to provide a single piece / full height flange plate, a shop splice will need to be introduced. Please identify any locations or areas along the height of the column flange that a shop splice is not permissible so that these limitations may be considered while finalizing our shop details and plate purchases.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to use single plate flanges where column depth is the same throughout the column height (refer to Sheets S1-4101 through S1-4116 Moment Frame Elevations). However, where column depth changes at the splice locations (for example, at GL2/E.6 and GL2/D.4), splices will be needed since flange thicknesses change. It is acceptable to have these splices done in the shop at Contractor's option.				
T-0843	SSS - PJP Welds at Roof Node to Brace Beam	Closed	10/18/2013	10/28/2013	10/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference is made to sheet S1-4205, Detail 2 "Brace Detail" which specifies a 1 3/4" effective weld from roof node to brace beam. Sheet S1-5131, Detail 1, Side View F specifies a bevel of 2 3/8" x 45 degrees for the weld joint area in question. Sheet S-0007, General Note SC-4 states that weld sizes shown are considered effective weld sizes. Prequalified weld joint BTC-P4-GF (attached for reference) states that the effective weld size shall equal the bevel size for flat and horizontal weld positions. These welds are intended to be performed in the horizontal or flat position. Please confirm that a bevel size of 1 3/4" to equal the specified weld size of 1 3/4" is acceptable and conforms to the requirements of note SC-4 and AWS 2010 D1.1 Detail BTC-P4-GF attached.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The weld size shown in Detail 2/S1-4205 is the effective weld size required for this joint. It is acceptable to revise the bevel size shown in 1/S1-5131 according to the effective weld size as required by the welding procedure.				



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0844	SSS - PJP Weld at Roof Node to EBF Link Beam	Closed	10/18/2013	10/28/2013	10/24/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference is made to sheet S1-4205, Detail 1 "EBF Link Beam Detail" which specifies a 2 ¼" effective weld from roof node to EBF Link beam. Sheet S1-5131, Detail 2, Side View F specifies a bevel of 2 3/8" x 45 degrees for the weld joint area in question.					The weld size shown in Detail 1/S1-4205 is the effective weld size required for this joint. It is acceptable to revise the bevel size shown in 2/S1-5131 according to the effective weld size as required by the welding procedure.		
Sheet S-0007, General Note SC-4 states that weld sizes shown are considered effective weld sizes. Prequalified weld joint BTC-P4-GF (attached for reference) states that the effective weld size shall equal the bevel size for flat and horizontal weld positions.							
These welds are intended to be performed in the horizontal or flat position. Please confirm that a bevel size of 2 ¼" to equal the specified weld size of 2 ¼" is acceptable and conforms to the requirements of note SC-4 and AWS 2010 D1.1 Detail BTC-P4-GF attached.							
<hr/>							
T-0845	SSS - Welding Type 61 Roof Nodes to Roof Beams	Closed	10/21/2013	10/31/2013	11/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Drawings: S1-4205, S1-5132, S-0007					Effective weld size required for this joint is 1".		
Reference is made to sheet S1-5132, Detail 1, Side View D which specifies a bevel of 1" x 45 degrees for the weld joint for Type 61 roof nodes to the roof beam.					According to the welding procedure indicated in this RFI, corresponding bevel size at this joint would also be 1".		
Sheet S-0007, General Note SC-4 states that weld sizes shown are considered effective weld sizes. Prequalified weld joint BTC-P4-GF (attached for reference) states that the effective weld size shall equal the bevel size for flat and horizontal weld positions.							
These welds are intended to be performed in the horizontal or flat position. Based on the information provided above, please provide the required effective weld size at the area in question and confirm the bevel size is to match the specified weld size.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1309 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0846	SSS - Grade 60 A615 Threaded Anchor Rod	Closed	10/21/2013	10/31/2013	10/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: With reference to the Grade 60 A615 Type T threaded anchor rod specified on detail 7/S1.5051 (attached), we request to substitute this material for the higher Grade 75 A615 anchor rod at no additional cost. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that substituting Grade 60 Type T thread bar anchors with Grade 75 A615 anchor rods as proposed is acceptable.		
T-0847	SSS - Weld Process for Roof Nodes at Roof Beams	Closed	10/21/2013	10/31/2013	10/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please reference sheet S1-5131 Detail 1 Section F, Detail 2 Section F, and sheet S1-5132 Section D. OIW is proposing to perform the CJP welds from P3 to P4 using a "Narrow Gap Improved Electroslag Weld (NGI ESW)" process. AWS D1.8 Section 6.2.1 allows the use of alternate weld processes contingent upon approval by the Engineer. Attached is a detailed narrative and supporting data for this welding process including the following: -Process Details, General Parameters, and Practices from ARCMATIC (OIW welding consultant) -Sample Welding Procedure Data Sheets (WPS) including MTR's and destructive testing Upon conceptual approval of this process, applicable and job specific PQR/WPS data will be provided for Engineer review. Please confirm that NGI ESW welding process is acceptable in this application.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Using "Narrow Gap Improved Electroslag Weld" (NGI ESW) for the proposed location is acceptable pending on prior approval of the WPS and Welding procedure Qualification. WPS shall be prepared in accordance with AWS D1.5.		
T-0847.1	SSS - Weld Process for Roof Nodes at Roof Beams	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	11/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1311 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0849	BGP - Mat Slab Layer 3 Lap Splice Relocation in Area 11 thru 16	Closed	10/21/2013	10/31/2013	10/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-2052. Due to limited access between the waterproofing and access trestle, Gerdau proposes to shorten the mat slab typical layer three (North-South) 67'-0" bars at Areas 11 through 16. This requires the lap splice location to be moved from the center of column line, as specified on Note 1 of the Mat Top Bar Notes in S1-2052, to the location shown in the attached Gerdau sketch SK-99. Please confirm the revised lap splice detail shown in Gerdau sketch SK-99 is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/22/2013 RESPONSE: It is acceptable to move the reinforcing splice from the center of the column line as indicated in the RFI.		
T-0850	BGP - Request for 14 day Concrete Compressive Strength test on future mat slab	Closed	10/22/2013	11/01/2013	10/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per discussion with TT field Engineer and TJPA representatives, WOJV is asking for all future mat slab pours that one of the two concrete test cylinders allotted for the 28 day compressive strength test could be tested at 14 days instead, This information will be used to assess the concrete strength for the level D bracing removal. Please confirm if this would be acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/24/2013 RESPONSE: At 14 days it is acceptable to test (1) of the (2) concrete test cylinders allotted for 28 day compressive strength testing by the Specifications. All future mat slab pours will have a sample set for testing consisting of (1) cylinder for 7, 14, and 28 days followed by (3) cylinders for 56 days. (1) additional cylinder per set shall be retained in reserve for later testing if required. The total number of cylinders taken per sample set shall remain at (7).		
T-0852	SSS - Weld Returns at EBF Link Beams	Closed	10/24/2013	11/03/2013	10/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Detail 3 on sheet S1-4205 indicates the weld requirements			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to use 1-1/2 inch reinforcing fillets at		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0853	SSS - Transfer Girder Field Splice From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome Co-Author: REQUEST: In order to facilitate self-supporting erection of the transfer girders during temporary conditions prior to the completion of the field welded splice joints, please confirm it is acceptable to utilize a temporary connection plate that will bolt the two transfer girders together while the weld takes place, as shown on the attached sketches GS-1.0 and GS-2.0. The temporary connection plate will be removed and open holes will be permanently filled with A325 bolts.	Closed To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch SUGGESTION:	10/24/2013	11/03/2013	11/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			the 6 inch returns provided that welding pass is continuous from the 3-1/2 inch thick region into the 6 inch returns.				
			Please confirm it is acceptable for the returns running longitudinal to the direction of the EBF Beam to be made as 1 ½" reinforcing fillets, while the weld running transverse to the girder flange remain at 3 ½" as specified. Reference the attached detail showing this condition.				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable for the bolt diameter (1-1/8") and spacing (6") shown in sketches GS-1.0 and GS-2.0.				
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0854	SSS - Type 4 Drag Connection (Y)	Closed	10/25/2013	11/04/2013	10/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
For Type 4 Drag connection (Y) per detail 1/S1-5019 please refer to sketches CD RFI # 082 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 & 2 noted below. Note sample location is on S1-2402 near grids 2/C.3 shown on SK2.			1a) At Ground Level: Provide b = 18" per schedule in 1/S1-5019 for all Type 4-(Y) drag connections.				
1) See SK2 & SK3 and confirm this 18" applies at all locations noted as "Y" on plans as this will place the bolts exceedingly outside the supporting beam profile.			2b) At Second Level: There are 14 locations between GL 2 and GL 3 where Type 4-(Y) drag connections per Detail 1/S1-5019 are to be provided. At 8 of these 14 locations the supporting girder is a W30x99. At these 8 locations, provide b such that the beam end is 1" outside of the W30x99 flange as indicated in SK3 of the RFI. Provide b = 2" at the remaining 6 locations.				
2) Please clarify which plan drawings this note applies to.			2) Note applies to Ground Level plans.				
T-0855	SSS - Double Angled Connection	Closed	10/25/2013	11/04/2013	10/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
For the double angle connection at the Transfer girders per detail 12/S1-5010 please refer to sketch CD RFI 085 SK1 for the following question.			Confirmed. It is acceptable to use 1) 1" gap between the face of the girder web and end of the beam and 2) 2" distance between the bolt centerline and the beam end as shown in SK1.				
Based on the 3" bolt location from the face of girder web, confirm it is acceptable to use a 1" gap between the girder web and the end of the beam with a 2" end distance on the beam.							
T-0856	SSS - Skewed Beam Connections	Closed	10/25/2013	11/04/2013	11/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
For the skewed beam connections up to 15 degrees per detail 7/S1-5011 see sketch CD RFI 087 SK1 for items 1 to 3 noted below.			1) Acceptable.				
1) Confirm it is acceptable to typically locate the bolts 2 3/4" as shown to minimize the number of shear plate			2) Acceptable.				
			3) Acceptable provided that weld sizes in Detail 7/S1-5011 are adjusted to account for the root opening				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1314 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	marks.						
	2) Confirm it is acceptable to cut the end of the skewed beams square and clip the flange as shown.						
	3) Confirm it is acceptable to cut the shear plates square as shown and apply the welds per schedule in detail 7/S1-5011.						
T-0856.1	SSS - Skewed Beam Connections	Closed	02/07/2014	02/17/2014	02/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: For skewed beam connections per detail 7&8/S1-5011 please confirm our fabricators proposed weld detail as per Herrick sketches 3-SK2 is acceptable. Also for reference please refer to the response to RFI T-0856 for the approval of square cut shear plates.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable, See red marks noted on the attached sketch.	
T-0857	SSS- Gusset Plate Fouling W24 Beam	Closed	10/25/2013	11/04/2013	10/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: 1). On S1-2602 to S1-2607 along the north & south perimeter lines the gusset plates required for the MC10x41.1 Link braces per detail 5/S1-4205 are fouling the bottom of the revised beam size W24x55 beam flanges as noted on sketches CD RFI 089 SK1 & SK2. Please verify the bottom of the W24 beam can be coped to clear the gusset plate as an alternate solution. Please note the bottom of the beam flange will be partially coped to clear the MC10 channels per the response to Webcor RFI # T-0763 (SK RFI # 032). 2). On sketch SK1 to establish the gusset plate shape please verify the 8 3/8 to 12 bevel (scaled) noted on the gusset plate.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	1) It is acceptable to cope the bottom flange of the W24 beam as shown in SK-2 to clear the gusset plate (stiffener) and the double channel. 2) The 8 3/8 inch to 12 inch bevel on the gusset plate (stiffener) as shown in SK-1 is acceptable.	

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>In attached drawings S1-7108, S1-7136 and S1-7137, we have highlighted structural members we consider are part of TG07.1R scope around elevators PE502 and PE503. Please confirm.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>All structural steel shown in your contract drawings are included in your scope. This is including, but not limited to, all the highlighted members noted in this RFI. The beams marked "NIC" are not excluded from your contract.</p>		
T-0860	<p>BGP - Area 3 Drill and Epoxy Walls</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference: Contract Dwg. A1-2122 to A1-2123, and attached sketch</p> <p>Rebar dowels were installed for future partition walls at gridlines A-F/1-6 during Area 3 mat slab pour on September 7, 2013. Due to conflicts with equipment access for the removal of Level C and D shoring struts and walers, selected rebar areas as shown on the attached drawing will need to be cut at and removed. Any additional walls that are found to be blocking access once operations have begun will be analyzed on an as needed basis. Please confirm it is acceptable to cut rebar dowels in the partition walls as shown on the attached sketch and on an as needed basis, with exception to columns and wall pilasters, then return to drill and bond after bracing procedures are complete. Scanning will be included.</p>	<p>Closed</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>10/25/2013</p> <p>11/04/2013</p> <p>11/07/2013</p> <p>Potentially <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>George Metzger 11/6/2013</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>It is not acceptable to cut the inquired (interior partition & water tank) wall dowels and re-instate them with drill and epoxy method.</p> <p>Contractor may cut the inquired wall dowels and reinstate the bars with Type 2 couplers. Note that this is limited to the walls inquired in this RFI. Contractor SHALL coordinate with the work of other packages per General Note GR-3 and GR-22 on S-0005.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1317 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0861	BGP - Interior Wall Thickness Change Clarification in Area 8 & 11	Closed	10/28/2013	11/07/2013	11/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-2054, S1-2055 and attached excerpt drawings from submittal package T0600-0103. Per the submittal review notes found on drawing sheet S108.2 and S111.1 from submittal package TG0600-0103, the train platform future interior wall thicknesses have been increased from 10" to 1'-0" and 1'-2" to 1'-4", respectively. In addition to the revised wall thicknesses, the following noted was included: "For 1'-4" walls use same coupler reinf as 14" walls. Coordinate with RFI T-0587." The note does not include 12" walls which were previously 10". Please confirm the now 12" wall is to use the same coupler reinforcing as the 10" walls.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/6/2013 RESPONSE: Bars for 12" thick walls are per contract detail 5/S1-3205.		
T-0861.1	BGP - GL 15.4/E Partition Wall Formsavers in Area 8	Closed	11/07/2013	11/17/2013	11/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-2054, TG0600-103 and RFI T-0861. The response to RFI T-0861 confirms that the train platform future interior wall near GL 15.4/E which was changed from 10" thick to 12" thick requires the bars to be #6 @ 8" O.C. E.F. per detail 5/S1- 3205; however, the # 6 epoxy coated formsavers are not available for the Area 8 pour. Please confirm it is acceptable to use # 5 @ 8" O.C. E.F. in lieu of the # 6 @ 8" O.C. E. F. in Area 8 as shown in 5/S1-3205.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/12/2013 RESPONSE: Contractor-proposed use of #5 bar couplers/dowels is acceptable for the scope of this RFI only.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0862	SSS -Full Height Stiffener Detail Clarifications	Closed	10/28/2013	10/28/2013	11/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please reference detail 1/S1-5013 regarding the full height fitted stiffener detail and confirm the following:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) Confirm it is acceptable to provide a 2" end distance typically at beams with 7/8" dia. bolts in lieu of the 1 3/4" end distance noted by the "2db" dimension.					1.) Acceptable.		
2) Confirm the stiffener width is to equal the beam "a" dimension, defined as [bf - tw]/2, thus the noted dimension should read "2db min."					2.) Confirmed.		
T-0863	SSS - Double Angled Connections at TPG1 & TPG3	Closed	10/28/2013	11/07/2013	11/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
For the double angle beam connections per detail 1/S1-5010 into the TPG1 & TPG3 roof girders on detail 1/S1-4200 are problematic due to the thick flanges. See sketches CD RFI 091 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2 below for proposed modified connection.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) Confirm it is acceptable to reduce the end distance on the connection angles to 1 1/4" per A.I.S.C.13th Edition Table J3.4 in order to fit the connection angles inside the beams at the TPG1 & TPG3 girders.					For connections to TPG1:		
2) Confirm it is acceptable to cut the beam flanges flush as shown when the connection angles encroach into the beam "k" area beyond A.I.S.C. allowable limits.					1) a) W14x22: Provide one less bolt than that required by 1/S1-5010. All other connection parameters including edge distance on the connection angles shall be per 1/S1-5010. b) For all other beam sizes noted on SK1, our response is "Acceptable".		
					2) a) W14x22: Cutting the beam bottom flange is not required with the reduction in number of bolts per (see 1a). b) W24x68, W27x84, W30x90, W33x118, W36x135, W40x297: The encroachment of the angle into the "k" region is less than the maximum allowed per AISC 360-05, Figure 10-3. Cutting the bottom flange flush as shown in the RFI is not required and not acceptable. c) W40x149, W40x183, W40x199: Acceptable.		
					For connections to TPG3:		
					1) a) W14x22: Provide one less bolt than that required		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1319 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
				by 1/S1-5010. All other connection parameters including edge distance on the connection angles shall be per 1/S1-5010. b) W24x68: Acceptable. c) W27x84: There is no W27x84 framing into a TPG3. d) W40x392: The connection is per detail 8/S1-5032 as noted on Sheet S1-2604 near GL 14/D. In addition, gravity moment connection is shown at the ends of these beams where they connect TPG3. Therefore, flanges of the W40X392s are to be welded to TPG3 per detail 4D/S1-5010.			
				2) a) W14x22: Cutting the beam bottom flange is not required with the reduction in number of bolts (see 1a). b) W24x68: The encroachment of the angle into the "k" region is less than the maximum allowed per AISC 360-05, Figure 10-3. Cutting the bottom flange flush as shown in the RFI is not required and not acceptable. c) W27x84: See 1c. d) W40x392: See 1d.			
T-0864	SSS - Beam to Column Connection at Roof Level	Closed	10/28/2013	11/07/2013	11/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference sheet S1-2606 for the BU beam to column connection at grids 31/D.4 and 31/E.6. Please confirm it is acceptable to reduce the "Lev" dimension indicated on 3/S1-5011 from 5" to 2 ¾" in order to clear the BU flange to web weld as indicated in CD RFI 092 SK1 & SK2.				Provide 10 bolt rows ("M" = 10) and vertical bolt edge distance, Lev = 4" for connections at all BU56 beams where 3/S1-5011 is applicable.			
If this is not acceptable, please provide an alternate detail for this condition.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0865	SSS - Clarifications for Kicker Brace at Ground Level	Closed	10/28/2013	11/07/2013	11/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please refer to detail 6/S1-5022 and verify the kicker brace requirements at ground level as noted on CD RFI 093 SK1 to SK3 and in the items below:			1) Locate the top gusset plate such that the centerline of kicker angle divides the gusset plate into a 1:3 ratio (3":9") at the top of the plate.				
1) Confirm the alternate bracing connection proposed in CD RFI 093 SK1 is acceptable.			2) Provide a weld size of 5/16" with a minimum length of 4" on each side of the kicker angles.				
2) Supply the weld size and length for brace angles to ½" plate.			3) Confirmed.				
3) Confirm the work point location indicated is acceptable (intended to match S1-5015 details).			4) Correct references are S1-2304 and S1-2306 (updated in ASI 106 drawings).				
4) Confirm the reference to S1-2304 should be added to the referenced detail and the reference to S1-2307 should be deleted.			5) Detail 6/S1-5022 is applicable at Gridlines 16.9 and 27.1 at Ground Level. Detail 9/S1-5022 is applicable at Gridlines 19.1 and 24.9.				
5) Confirm detail 6/S1-5022 applies only to grid lines 16.9, 19.1, 24.9 & 27.1 on the Ground Level as referenced on plans.			6) Refer to SKS-0297 (attached) that shows applicable bracing type along GL 16.9 transfer girder. As indicated in the sketch, the bracing along GL16.9 is either transfer girder brace per 5/S1-5015 or kicker brace per 6/S1-5022. Same sketch can be used to identify the bracing type along 19.1 transfer girder by replacing 6/S1-5022 with 9/S1-5022.				
6) Confirm detail 6/S1-5022 is typical for all braces along grid line 16.9, similar to grid line 19.1.			7) Refer to SKS-0298 (attached) that shows applicable bracing type along GL 24.9 and GL 27.1 transfer girders. As indicated in the sketch, the bracing along GL 27.1 is either transfer girder brace per 5/S1-5015 or kicker brace per 6/S1-5022. Similarly, the bracing along GL 24.9 is either transfer girder brace per 5/S1-5015 or kicker brace per 9/S1-5022.				
7) Confirm detail 6/S1-5022 is typical for all braces along grid line 27.1, similar to grid line 19.1.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1321 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0866	SSS - Bending Radius at Skewed Beam Connections	Closed	10/28/2013	11/07/2013	11/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Robert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Refer to details 7 & 8/S1-5010 regarding bending radius requirements for skewed beam connections. The radius indicated in CD RFI 095 SK2 is per A.I.S.C. (2.5t for A572 GR50 material). Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed per this criteria.			The minimum inside bending radius for a A572 GR 50 plate up to t = 1" is 1.5t per AISC 360-10 Table 10-13, if the bend line is perpendicular to final direction of rolling. These values need to be increased 50% if the bend lines are parallel to the final direction of rolling. 2.5t inside bending radius proposed by the contractor is acceptable for the condition presented in SK2, where t = 1/2". In general, it is acceptable to proceed with the minimum bending radii specified in AISC 360-10 Table 10-13.				
T-0867	SSS - W24 Skewed Beam Connections at Grid 6.C.3	Closed	10/28/2013	11/07/2013	11/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Robert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Refer to drawing S1-2303 (CD RFI 096 SK1) indicating the portion of the W24x68 running between GL C.3 and GL 6. CD RFI 096 SK2 shows the tight design requirements for this beam run connecting to TR6. Please advise if this portion of the W24x68 beam can be eliminated due to the tight design requirements. If eliminating this portion of the beam is not acceptable, please provide an alternate connection detail to TR6, as detail 8/S1-5010 will not work at this location.			The portion of the W24x68 beam indicated in the RFI can be eliminated.				
T-0868	SSS - Framing Clarification for W21 Beams at Ground Level	Closed	10/28/2013	11/07/2013	11/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Robert Kjome</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Refer to the areas indicated on S1-2303 between grids 10.1 & 11 and D & F (CD RFI 097 SK1). Please confirm the noted W21x50 beams are at top of steel elevation 19'-1 5/8" and the BU-WT's are not required.			The noted W21x50 beams support the depressed escalator pit slab (Slab S4). T/Slab for Slab S4 is 17.44' as indicated in Sheet S1-2303 and T/Steel for these two beams is 6 1/4" below the T/Slab for S4 as indicated in Sheet Note 2 on S1-2302. Therefore, these two beams support slabs with different elevations and BU-WTs are required.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0868.1	SSS - Framing Clarification for W21 Beams at Ground Level	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	12/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Per the response to W/O RFI T-0868 (SK RFI 135), the TOS for the W21 should be at 16'-11" and the BU-WTs are required to support the slab at 19'-9 1/8". Based on this response, please confirm the following: 1) The difference between the TOS elevations per the response to SK RFI 135 requires a BU-WT with a total height of 2'-2 5/8", exceeding the maximum height dimension indicated on 5/S1-5002. Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed with detail 5/S1-5002 and the required BU-WT height of 2'-2 5/8" at this location. 2) Please confirm it is acceptable to stop the BU-WTs 1" clear from the edge of the transfer girder flange to allow for erection clearance or advise if the BU-WTs are required to extend to the face of the transfer girder web for deck support. (Reference CD RFI 097.1 SK1) 3) The W21 connection to the transfer girder at grid line 11 fouls the bottom flange of the girder and cap plate of the train box columns as indicated on CD RFI 097.1 SK1. Please provide an alternate connection detail at this location. 4) As indicated on CD RFI 097.1 SK2, there is no support down for the escalator slab perpendicular to the W21 near the edge of the knock-out slab and the W21 supporting the S4 escalator slab. Please advise if deck support is required at this location and, if so, please provide details as required.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) It is acceptable to stop the BU-WTs 1" clear from the edge of the transfer girder flange. 3) Cope the top of the W21 beam and provide a double angle connection per 1/S1-7604 with 3 bolts. The connection plates shown in 1/S1-7604 are to be welded to bottom of the trainbox column cap plate. In addition, provide web stiffener plates on each side of the beam web at the coped section per 12/S1-5010. Extend the stiffener plate beyond the coped section a distance equal to the depth of the cope. 4) There is no deck at the highlighted location. The pit slab edge is the same as the knock-out slab edge only it is lower. Refer to detail 4/A1-7550 that shows the slab and escalator enclosure assembly at this location. Note that detail 6/S-7660 is called out on 1/S1-7302 (partial plan of this location). Detail 6/S-7660 applies at the north and east edges of the E305 escalator pit but not at the knock-out slab edge. Similarly detail 6/S-7660 applies at the south and east edges of the E304 escalator pit but not at the knock-out slab edge.				
T-0868.2	SSS - Escalator Pit Framing Details GL10.1	Closed	03/24/2014	04/03/2014	04/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-0868.1 (SK 135.1, CD 097.1) See attached CD RFI # 097.2 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 3: 1) The section looking west on SK1 as modeled on SK2 is		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Provide bent plate per typical edge of slab detail 8/S1-5000.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1323 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>not what is shown in detail 4/A1-7550 (SK3) as referenced in T-0868.1 #4 response. Confirm the structural drawing SK1 & SK2 as shown are correct.</p> <p>2) As per Thornton Tomasetti's revised email response to RFI T-0868.1 (see SK4), the bent plate should be added at knock-out slab edge as shown on 4/A1-7550 (SK3). Please confirm.</p> <p>3) On 4/A1-7550 (SK3) there is gauge or bent plate shown at the pit slab edge. Please verify if bent plate should be provided or will this be gauge plate?</p>						
T-0869	SSS - Coping Brace Beam Bottom Flange	Closed	10/29/2013	11/08/2013	11/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per details 1&2/S1-5016 refer to sketch CD RFI 056.1 SK1 and confirm it is acceptable to cope the beam as shown to be able to erect the beam with the double shear plates permanently shop welded.				It is acceptable to cope the beams in details 1&2/S1-5016 as indicated in SK1 of the RFI, except that cope the bottom flange only (flush with the beam web) and cope shall be 1" max beyond the shop welded shear plates. In these details, contractor proposed gap between the two shear plates (beam web thickness + doubler plates + 1/16") is acceptable.			
The gap between the shear plates will be the beam web thickness, the doubler plate(s) + 1/16" ~ confirm.							
<hr/>							
T-0870	SSS - Skewed Beam Connections	Closed	10/30/2013	10/30/2013	11/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
For skewed beam connections per detail 8/S1-5011 please verify the skewed beams may be cut square with the flange clipped as shown on sketch CD RFI 088 SK1.				Acceptable.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0871	SSS - Type 4 Drag Connection Stiffener Clarification	Closed	10/30/2013	11/09/2013	11/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference drawing S1-2303 and CD RFI 115 SK1 highlighting the W40x149 beam connection along grid line F, between grid lines 9.9 and 10.1. Per detail 1/S1-5019, the web stiffener plate is to be 31" long at each end. Due to the length of this beam, the web stiffeners will foul each other. This same condition occurs on S1-2303 along grid line D between 9.9 and 10.1.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm it is acceptable to supply one continuous web stiffener plate at the two locations identified as indicated in CD RFI 115 SK2.					Acceptable		
T-0872	SSS - Drag Connection Clarification for Kicker Brace	Closed	10/30/2013	11/09/2013	11/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference drawing S1-2303 and CD RFI 116 SK1 indicating the W40 beam connection to TR11 at Grid F.11. This detail requires a full height shear plate per 1/S1-5019 and bracing per 5/S1-5015. (Reference CD RFI 116 SK2). This same condition occurs on S1-2303 along grid D.11.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm it is acceptable to connect the required kicker brace to the 1 ½" full depth shear plate and increase the gusset plate below the beam to 1 ½" thick. Otherwise, please provide an acceptable detail for this condition.					1-) It is acceptable to connect the kicker brace to the 1-1/2" thick full depth shear plate at the location highlighted in the RFI and at other similar instances. Length of the fillet weld between the kicker and the shear plate shall be 7" min each side as indicated in detail 5/S1-5015.		
					2-) It is acceptable to increase the thickness of the gusset plate at the top of the kicker to 1-1/2".		
T-0873	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 8	Closed	10/30/2013	10/30/2013	11/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 8 for location plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north and south					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					George Metzger 11/6/2013 RESPONSE: Contractor proposed modifications to the Lower Concourse spandrel beams within Area 8 are		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1325 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>elevations due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall due to encroachment of the CDSM beams as well as typical cross sections of the revised spandrel beams. RFI T - 724 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of Area 8.</p> <p>Please confirm that this modification as outlined at these locations is acceptable.</p>						
T-0874	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 9	Closed	10/31/2013	11/10/2013	11/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 8 for location plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north and south elevations due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall due to encroachment of the CDSM beams as well as typical cross sections of the revised spandrel beams. RFI T - 742 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of Area 9. Please confirm that this modification as outlined at these locations is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/11/2013 RESPONSE: Contractor proposed modifications to the Lower Concourse spandrel beams within Area 9 are acceptable. Proper lap splices shall be provided where the beam rebar is transitioned from the spacing in the construction drawings to the modified spacing at the encroached wall sections. Note that Area 9 foundation wall thinning shown in RFI T-0874 (2-3/8") and RFI T-0742 (2") are not consistent. Contractor to reconcile the discrepancy and prepare/update shop drawings accordingly.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1326 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0875	BGP- Trestle piles No 20 & 21 in conflict with beams at Lower Concourse level	Closed	11/01/2013	11/11/2013	11/07/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Following a review and discussion with Thornton Tomasetti on the trestle pile locations, it has been noted that trestle pile numbers 20 and 21 (see sketches attached) are in conflict with beams (B4A) at the escalator pits on the lower concourse slab elevation between gridline 11-12, D-F. The contractor is proposing to blackout a section of slab as shown on the sketch, this blackout section would then be infilled once the trestle pile has been removed. The contractor is to insure that the appropriate reinforcement lap splices are present between these concrete pours. Please confirm if this option would be acceptable			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/7/2013 RESPONSE: Contractor proposed approach is acceptable. Note that the trestle pile also encroaches on the pit slab as well and will have to be addressed. Include proposed reinforcement in rebar submittal for review.		
T-0876	RFI T-0876 BGP- Trestle piles No 10,12 & 14 are in conflict with a step in the slab a	Closed	11/01/2013	11/11/2013	11/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Following a review and discussion with Thornton Tomasetti on the trestle pile locations, it was noted that trestle pile numbers 10, 12 and 14 (see sketches attached) are in conflict with a step in the slab on the lower concourse elevation between gridline 06-08, E-F. Thornton Tomasetti noted it may be possible to move this step clear of the trestle pile blackout locations. Please confirm if this option on moving the step location is still possible.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/26/2013 RESPONSE: The plan location of the drop shall remain. In order facilitate temporary conditions, such as support of the slab transition without shoring, Detail 2/S1-3501 may be modified increasing the distance "6D" to allow additional reinforcing bars to replace bars interrupted by the blackout in the temporary condition. Additional simplifications to the temperature steel continuity may be allowed. The specific details of the blackout shall be provided by the contractor in accordance with General Note GR-9 on S-0005 and shall provide continuity of longitudinal and temperature steel in the final condition.		
T-0877	SSS - Light Column Blockout at GL 23	Closed	11/04/2013	11/14/2013	11/08/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1327 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference sketches: SK1 and SK2 1. Please supply the angle to locate the anchor bolts as referenced in SK1 2. Please supply the material grade of the stiffeners, shear tabs, and welded shear keys as referenced in SK1 3. Please confirm a 6"x6" corner clip is acceptable or supply the dimensions as referenced in SK1 4. Please confirm a 2" set back from the edge of the base plate to the edge of stiffener plate is acceptable or supply the dimension. 5. Please supply oversize hole criteria as referenced in SK2			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Question 1: Angle as indicated in SK1 = 8.18 degrees Question 2: Material grade of stiffeners, shear tabs, and welded shear keys as referenced in SK1 is ASTM A572 Gr. 50 Question 3: 6" x 6" corner clip as referenced in SK1 is ok Question 4: Set back from the edge of the base plate to the edge of stiffener plate is 2" (note: as shown in dim. line on 3/S1-6008). Question 5: As referenced in SK2, oversized hole diameter = 6-1/2"				
T-0878	BGP - All of Lower Concourse Slab Edge Dimension Discrepancies	Closed	11/04/2013	11/14/2013	11/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please refer to similar RFI T-0838 and T-0838.1. The structural drawings for the lower concourse (SI-2202 through SI-2207, framing plans) do not include dimensions for the slab openings. Scaled dimensions from these drawings conflict with many of the dimensions provided on the architectural slab edge plans (AI-2842 through AI-2847). Please see attached for observed conflicts (highlighted). Please confirm that the dimensions shown on the architectural plans at the slab openings are correct.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/18/2013 RESPONSE: The attached SKAs are provided to clarify and confirm current slab openings as well as setting out of couplers at the Lower Concourse Level. 1. For setting out of slab openings at the Lower Concourse Level, refer to the Lower Concourse Level Slab Edge Plans (SKA-2916 to SKA-2923). 2. For Setting out of PH1 walls at the Lower Concourse Level, refer to the Lower Concourse Level Zone Plans (SKA-2900 to SKA-2907) and Enlarged Plans (SKA-2924 to SKA-2945). 3. For setting out of couplers for PH2 walls, refer to the Lower Concourse Level Wall Plans (SKA-2908 to SKA-2915). Note: The "Wall Plans" show wall starter couplers installed in the Below Grade Package, however the "Wall Plans" provide coupler setting out dimension for				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1328 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0879.1	BGP - Conflict of Elevator Opening Embed and Future Walls	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	12/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: SCCI is in receipt of RFI response T-0879. TT's response does not fully address the conflict brought up in the original RFI. TG06.0 contract drawings do not show a curb at the edge of the elevator openings at the lower concourse level. Please address and provide details regarding the embed in question in RFI T-0879.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 12/6/2013 RESPONSE: As indicated in the response to RFI T-0879, the end of the beam and the embed will be cast into the wall curb. The sketches provided with the response to RFI T-0879.1 illustrate the relationship of the beam and the future wall curb. The concrete curb on the elevator shaft walls in Phase 1 will be extended under the future W-5 cladding and its supporting walls in Phase 2. The HSS rail support embed is within the concrete curb zone for both phases. Refer to the following attached SKAs: 1. SKA-2958 to SKA-2962 - Lower Concourse Zone Plans showing locations of the Service and Passenger Elevators. 2. SKA-2963 to SKA-2967 - Enlarged Plans of Service and Passenger Elevators showing Partition Types with Concrete Curbs. 3. SKA-2968 - Section Detail at Service Elevator Shaft at Pit showing HSS elevator rail support beam. 4. SKA-2969 - Concrete Curb Schedule.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1330 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0880	BGP - Receptacle Requirements at Elevator Pits Near GL 19/E and 20/G	Closed	11/04/2013	11/14/2013	11/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing E1-2024 and E1-2025 There are elevator pits in the mat slab at approximate grid lines 19/E and 20/G. The drawings E1-2024 and E1-2025 do not show any receptacles being supplied to these pits. Please confirm this is correct.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/13/2013 RESPONSE: These receptacles are not required within the BGP package. The only active elevator in Phase 1 is PE203 at the west end. The elevator pits in question will be provided with power in Phase 2. Provisions have been made to run conduit at that time.				
T-0881	BGP - Vehicle Ramp Wall Embedded Supports	Closed	11/05/2013	11/15/2013	11/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Please reference attached detail6 S1-3203, attached detail10 S1-3204, RFI Response T-0453.1, RFI Response T-0835 and attached SKA-2863. RFI Response T-0835 confirmed that the vehicle bike ramp wall intersects the foundation wall at a 97 degree angle. Where this ramp wall intersects the foundation wall, embeds per detail 6 on S 1-3203 and detail 10 S 1-3204 are required. SCCI and its embed supplier has a constructability concern with these embeds. A similar constructability concern was brought up in RFI T -0453.1, stating that if an angle member of such thickness is bent to achieve an angle other than that member's stock angle, it will structurally stress that member. 1. Please confirm it is acceptable to weld two (2) 8"x24"x1" plates together in order to achieve angle prescribed in RFI Response T-0835. Reference SKA-2863 for the acute and obtuse angles required. Forthcoming shop drawings will show all welds.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/17/2013 RESPONSE: Contractor proposal to weld 2 plates to create an angle is acceptable as presented in the RFI.				
T-0882	BGP - Column Tie Change from T9 to T12	Closed	11/05/2013	11/15/2013	11/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1331 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-3304 to S1-3306. Please confirm if it is acceptable to replace the typical T9 column ties (90° or 135° bend on either end) with T12 ties (135° bends on both ends). See the attached SCCI sketch SK-101 for further details.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: George Metzger 11/12/2013 RESPONSE: It is acceptable to replace T9 column ties with T12 for Column Types C1 and C2. Note that the location of the second cross-tie from each end is not shown correctly in SK-101. In SK-101, these two cross-ties shall be flipped to clear the shear plates for the steel column base plate at Lower Concourse Level. Refer to Sheet S1-3304 of the construction drawings where the column reinforcement details Type A1 (for Column C1) and Type A2 (for Column C2) are shown. Refer to Sheet S1-5051 of the construction drawings for information on steel column base plate details.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-0883	SSS - Brace Beam Connection Details	Closed	11/05/2013	11/15/2013	11/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: RESPONSE: 1) Acceptable. See response to RFI T-0869 for the extents of the bottom flange cope. 2) Moving the web connection plate on the other side of the beam is acceptable however, the shear plate shall still be welded to the north-south girder not the east-west running beams as shown in SK1 of this RFI. With this modification, the diagonal beam centerline will not coincide with the connection work point. This eccentricity shall be minimized as permitted by the connection geometry and shall not exceed 1". The question regarding flange coping is not clear, please provide a sketch that shows the intended coping. Note that there are bolted flange plates top and bottom. 3) Use of PJP welding (full web thickness) is acceptable where the shear plates are welded to the girder web. See also response to 2nd question.			
REQUEST: Please review sketch CD RFI 059 SK1 and details 1/S1-5016 and 1/S1-5018 for type 1 - drag connection details on brace beams at the Bus Deck Level framing plan. 1). Please verify the bottom flange of brace beams noted in detail 1/S1-5016 can be cut flush to the beam web on both sides of web allowing beam to be erected between the shop welded connection plates on the cast node. 2). Verify the diagonal bracing beam web connection plate noted in detail 1/S1-5018 can be shifted to the acute angle side of the connection as indicated in the attached sketch and bottom flange cut flush to the web to allow beam to be dropped into location in the field. 3). Please provide welding details for the relocated web connection plate to the supporting grid beam as connection plates will overlap at these locations. 4). Please verify if additional bolts are required connecting the flange plate where the dimension to the plate edge and		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1333 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0885	BGP - Field Realignment of Concrete Reinforcement per CRSI	Closed	11/06/2013	11/16/2013	11/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jackson Tukuafu</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please refer Contract Specification Section 03 20 00-3.1.A.6.b and attached excerpt from CRSI Chapter 11				George Metzger 11/17/2013			
Contract Specification 03 20 00-3.1.A.6.b states, "No field bending of bars partially embedded in concrete is permitted, unless specifically approved by the TJPA Representative and tested by Independent Testing Laboratory for cracks."				RESPONSE:		Field bending, including field realignment, of partially embedded reinforcing shall be subject to the approval of the SEOR on a case-by-case basis.	
1. Please clarify if the statement applies to field realignment as defined in CRSI Chapter 11.							
2. Please confirm if it is acceptable to field realign bars per the parameters described in CRSI Chapter 11.							
T-0886	BGP - Round Column Tie-Hook Modification	Closed	11/07/2013	11/17/2013	11/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jackson Tukuafu</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please refer to drawing S1-3304.				George Metzger 11/14/2013			
In the round columns (type AI, A2, A3, BI, B2 and B3), Gerdau proposes to change the 90° hooks to 135° hooks in order to allow for more room to install the vertical bars and their couplers. Please refer to attached SCCI sketch SK-RFI-373 for reference of proposed detail.				RESPONSE:		Proposed 135 degree hooks are acceptable for the columns indicated in the RFI. The hooks shall be "Seismic hook" per ACI 318-08 and overlap min 6" as called out in Construction Drawings (See Sheet S1-3304).	
Please confirm if this is acceptable.							
T-0887	SSS - Moment Beam to Column Web Connection Clarifications	Closed	11/07/2013	11/17/2013	11/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please refer to the moment beam to column web connection details on 5/S1-5012, 10/S1-5013, and 2/S1-5019 in regards to the following:				RESPONSE:		1) Confirmed.	
1) Please confirm the dimensions and weld prep noted are acceptable. [Reference CD RFI 080 SK1]						2) Typically (unless otherwise noted), moment frame continuity plates are per Detail 5/S1-4202 and	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1335 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Increasing the continuity thickness provides a reasonable land for back up material for the fill penetration weld required in the field (see attached sketch SK1 for clarification) Please confirm it is acceptable to increase the bottom continuity plates by 1/4".						
T-0888	SSS - Rebar Holes and Headed Stud Details	Closed	11/07/2013	11/17/2013	11/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference detail 9/S1-3701 and the noted grid lines G.9.9 and G.10.1 on S1-2303 and provide clarification on the following items. Refer to CD RFI 105 SK1 through SK3 for additional information.		TT's response:					
1) Confirm the headed studs in the transfer girder per 11/S1-3701 may be located as shown.		1). Confirmed					
2) Confirm the slope of MFB 6 is 1.097° as indicated in CD RFI 105 SK2 or advise otherwise.		2). 1.06 degree					
3) Provide the vertical dimension indicated on CD RFI 105 SK2 to located PL 1 ½" x 14" x 2'-6" (added in ASI 106).		3). Center line of the plate at EL.15.66 (for bottom bars in 48' deep beam)					
4) Confirm it is acceptable to locate the first row of holes 6" above the underside of the transfer girder as indicated in CD RFI 105 SK2.		4). Confirmed					
5) Provide the vertical dimension required to locate the row of 3" dia. holes indicated in CD RFI 105 SK2.		5). Center line of the holes are at EL. 14.66 (for bottom bars in 60" deep beam).					
6) The hole indicated fouls the stiffener as shown in CD RFI 105 SK3. Confirm the spacing may be reduced to 5" at this location to clear the stiffeners and weld for the stiffeners to the beam web.		6). Confirmed					
7) The two holes indicated on CD RFI 105 SK3 are located directly adjacent to the stiffeners with no clearance. Please advise if this condition is acceptable or if the holes are to be shifted to avoid the stiffeners.		7). Confirmed that the holes are to be shifted to clear the stiffeners.					
8) Provide the vertical dimension required to locate the 3" dia. holes as indicated in CD RFI 105 SK2. Please verify the other holes in this row are to be located per the angle and spacing in items 2 & 7.		8). The 2 holes in column can be shifted as noted in item 7). The holes in this row may be located per items 2 & 7 (following the slope of the concrete beam, center line of the hole at 1.75" above the bottom of the MFB6.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1336 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0889	SSS - Rebar Hole Clarifications For TR11	Closed	11/08/2013	11/18/2013	11/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please reference grid G.11 on S1-2303 and provide clarification on the following items per detail 8/S1-3702. 1) Provide the vertical dimension required to locate PL 1 ½" x 14" x 2'-6" in alignment with the lenton couplers as indicated in CD RFI 107 SK 2. 2) Provide the vertical dimension required to locate the hole indicated in CD RFI 107 SK2, which is shown to be 3" from the end of TR11. Please confirm the other holes in this row are to be located per the spacing shown and the angle confirmed in item 3. 3) Confirm the slope of MFB 5 is 1.057° as indicated in CD RFI 107 SK 2 or advise otherwise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RESPONSE: 1). Center line of the 2 1/2" plate at EL. 15.58" (4" above the bottom of the 48" concrete beam). 2). Center line of the hole is at EL. 15.476" (1.75" above the bottom of the 48" concrete beam). 3). Slope is 1.09 degree. Slope shall be calculated based on the top of concrete slab elevation shown on the drawings, not relying on the Revit model or other electronic files.				
T-0890	SSS - Rebar Hole Clarifications for Transfer Girders	Closed	11/08/2013	11/18/2013	11/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please reference grid C.9 & C.11 at the ends of the transfer girders shown on S1-2303 and provide clarification on the following: 1) Confirm the noted angle (1.23°) is the correct slope of MFB1 & MFB12 (per Revit Model). If not, provide the correct angle. 2) Provide the vertical dimension indicated on CD RFI 109 SK2 required to located the first hole and confirm the remaining holes are to be located per the angle noted in item 1 and the spacing indicated on detail 6/S1-3702. 3) Confirm the 3" dimension shown to locate the first hole is acceptable or provide an alternate dimension.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Confirmed. 2) The center of the bottom holes are to be 1.75" above the bottom of the 48" concrete beam. 3) Confirmed.				
T-0891	SSS - Detail Clarifications for TR to MFB1 at C.9.9	Closed	11/08/2013	11/18/2013	11/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1337 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0892	<p>Please reference grid C.9.9 and C10.1 for the transfer girder to moment beam connection shown on S1-2303 and provide clarification on the following:</p> <p>1) Confirm the noted angle (1.2°) is the correct slope for MFB 1 (per Revit Model). If not, please provide the correct angle. [Reference CD RFI 110 SK1 & SK2]</p> <p>2) Confirm the depth of MFB1 is 48" at this location in accordance with 6/S1-3600. [Reference CD RFI 110 SK2]</p> <p>3) Confirm the noted elevation. [Reference CD RFI 110 SK2]</p> <p>4) Provide the width and length of vertical slots to be provided at the 18" stiffeners. [Reference CD RFI 110 SK2]</p> <p>5) Provide the vertical dimension required to locate the #10 bar shown and subsequently the 2" dia. holes through the beam web (SK3), the vertical slots through the 18" stiffeners, and the 3" diameter holes through the 2'-9" stiffeners.</p> <p>6) Confirm the bar indicated represents the beam top bar and that the dimension indicated (3 1/16") is correct. Note this dimension is based on 5/S1-3600. [Reference CD RFI 110 SK2]</p> <p>7) Confirm detail 6/S1-3705 accurately reflects the number of headed studs and spacing required. Otherwise, please provide the requested A, B, C, & D dimensions.</p> <p>8) Detail 4/S1-3705 indicates that 3-3" diameter holes are to be provided in the web stiffeners on each side while only two #10 bars with terminators are indicated to be provided. Further, the section cut 6/S1-3705 (issued with ASI 106) calls for #9 bars at this location. Please clarify the intent of this detail as it pertains to the rebar configuration and stiffener hole details.</p> <p>9) Provide the dimension required to located the first 2" dia. hole from the end of TR9.9 and TR10.1 and confirm the spacing of the remaining holes is to be 8" OC as noted on 6/S1-3705.</p> <p>10) Confirm the dimensions indicated are accurate or provide the required dimensions at this location. The dimensions shown are based on detail 5/S1-3600 and should be confirmed based on the answer provided in Item 8.</p>	Closed	11/08/2013	11/18/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>1). The slope shall be 1.30 degree at Grid 9.9 and 1.16 degree at Grid 10.1 per top of concrete slab elevations noted on the plan. Revit model (and other electronic files) shall not be used for establish dimensions.</p> <p>2). Confirmed that the MFB1 is 48" deep per beam schedule on S1-3600.</p> <p>3) Top of concrete is at 17.59 at Grid 9.9 and 17.55 at Grid 10.1</p> <p>4). The bottom of the slots are at 2" from the bottom of the concrete beam to allow the beam bottom bars to go through.</p> <p>5). The center line of the beam bottom bars shall be at 2.375" above the bottom of the concrete beam (1 1/2' cover + diameter of the ties + 1/2 of the longitudinal bar diameter).</p> <p>6). The dimension shall be 3.8125" per 5/S1-3600 (2 3/4" cover+ tie diameter+ 1/2" longitudinal bar diameter)</p> <p>7). A=15", B=5, C= 12", D= 16".</p> <p>8). Only one hole each side is needed in vertical stiffeners to allow the #10 bars to go through. See 6/S1-3705 for locations of the hole.</p> <p>9). First hole is 6" from the end of beam. The holes are at 8" on center to match with the tie spacing noted on beam schedule.</p> <p>10). The 2 9/16" dimension noted shall be changed to 3", the 1'-07/17" dimension shall be changed to 1'-0" (for a total beam width of 30" as noted in the beam schedule).</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1339 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
review.								
T-0893	BGP - F15 Fixtures on Dimmeable or Non-Dimmeable Lighting Circuits	Closed	11/11/2013	11/21/2013	11/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Jackson Tukuafu	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture		Bob Garcia						
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please refer to drawing E-0006.				George Metzger 11/12/2013				
General Note N on DWG E-0006 states in part: "Allocate a maximum of three dimmable lighting branch circuits (multiwire) per conduit home run. Allocate a maximum of six non-dimmed lighting circuits per conduit home run." The type F15 fixtures used throughout the job on the train platform level are fed from, Panels designated "EDMH," which are dimming panels.				RESPONSE: Confirmed, circuits feeding type F15 fixtures are dimmable circuits. Provide separate neutral for each branch circuit per requirements of specifications 26 05 19 par. 3.1.I.				
Are the circuits feeding these lights considered dimmable lighting branch circuits? Please advise.								



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1340 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
T-0894	SSS - Double Angle Connection Conflicts Along GL	Closed	11/11/2013	11/21/2013	11/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference CD RFI SK1 to SK3 indicating the plate on the transfer girder which typically fouls the beam to transfer girder connections along grid lines C.3 and F.7. This is typical at the following locations at Ground Level: 2/C.3; 4/C.3; 5/F.7; 6/C.3; 8/C.3; 9.9/C.3 (see SK2 & SK3); 10.1/C.3 (see SK2 & SK3); 12/C.3; 14/C.3; 16/C.3; 19.9/C.3; 20.1/C.3; 21/C.3; 23/C.3; 23/F.7; 24/C.3 & 24/F.7					Confirmed. Shear plate connection details provided in the response to the RFI T-0820 may be used in lieu of double angle connections at the locations noted in the RFI where the intermediate transfer girder plate fouls the double angle connection. For W16 and deeper beams, the total number of bolts at a shear plate connection shall be per schedule on 2/S1-5011. Provide two bolts in the top shear plate and remaining bolts in the bottom shear plate. For W14 and shallower beams provide two bolts with only the top shear plate. Bolt edge distances, shear plate thickness and welds shall be per 2/S1-5011 with the exception of W40 beams where the vertical bolt edge distance may be reduced to 1 3/4".			
Please confirm that the response and details provided in W/O RFI T-0820 can be applied at these locations, thus shear plates may be used in lieu of double angle connections. (W/O RFI T-08020 response is attached for reference.)								
<hr/>								
T-0895	BGP - Concrete Curb Schedule on Drawing A-0022	Closed	11/18/2013	11/22/2013	11/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
ASI #107 released updates to drawing set A1-2122 to A1-2127 with the changed note at the top right of page. Previously, CC= concrete curb were stated as "CC- Cone curb not in TG06." In ASI 107, this note was revised to "Cone curb ref to A-0022 for cone curb schedule. Ref to struct dwgs for coupler details".					George Metzger 11/218/2013 RESPONSE:			
1. Drawing sheet A-0022 is not a part of issuance in ASI 107. Please provide referenced drawing for coordination.					AAI Response:			
2. Please provide details on how to install CC in Area 3 where the concrete has been placed with no coupler/ dowels.					1. Refer to Attached SKA-2950, which is based on A-0022, showing the Concrete Curb Schedule.			
					TT Response:			
					2. Refer to Detail 2 of S1-3002 for curbs where concrete has been placed without couplers or dowels.			
<hr/>								
T-0896	SSS - Shear Connection detail at Transfer Girder	Closed	11/11/2013	11/21/2013	11/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer					
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1342 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0897	SSS - NE Coordinate Accuracy	Closed	11/12/2013	11/22/2013	11/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Reference is made to drawing C-0100, "TTC Grid and Alignment Control." The northing and easting coordinates are provided with only two decimal places, producing a considerable amount of calculated error between the coordinates and the gridline dimensions. Please provide the N/E coordinates with at least four decimal places to reduce the calculated error from the gridline dimensions. Additionally, the N/E coordinates provided at Grid 2/W appear to intersect with Grid 2/G. Please advise if these grid lines intersect and if the N/E coordinates provided also apply to 2/G.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RESPONSE: Two decimal places are adequate. Assume there are an infinite number of zeros after the two decimal digits. The N/E at the intersection of grids 2/W also apply to the intersection of grids 2/G.			
T-0898	SSS - Weld Access Hole and Weld Tab Sizes at CJP	Closed	11/12/2013	11/22/2013	11/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please reference detail 4/S1-4205 indicating the EBF Link Beam cross section, also detailed in OIW sketch 2770-SKTH01 attached. 1) The specified 1" x 5" weld access hole does not allow for weld runoff tabs to be added as specified in AWS D1.8 paragraph 6.11.1. a. Please confirm that the 1.5" x 5' weld access holes detailed in OIW SK 2770-SK-TH01 are acceptable to accommodate the 1" weld tabs. b. Please confirm that the weld tabs are to remain after welding as allowed by AWS D1.8 paragraph 6.11. 2) The specified CJP weld using a backing fillet and welded substantially from one side increases weld distortion compared to a balanced weld. Please confirm that the proposed double bevel CJP weld is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1a) Modifying the weld access hole geometry is not acceptable. At this location, weld ends can be cascaded as shown in Figure C-6.3 of AWS D1.8, similar to continuity plate welding details. 1b) Weld tabs not required, see response to 1a. 2) Double bevel CJP weld (DCW) as proposed by the contractor is acceptable.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0898.1	SSS - Weld Access Hole and Weld Tab Sizes at CJP	Closed	12/06/2013	12/16/2013	12/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Per the response to Webcor/Obayashi RFI T-0898 (SK 146), weld tabs are not required for stiffeners at EBF girders and it is acceptable for weld ends to be cascaded down as down in Figure C-6.3 of AWS D1.8. In accordance with this response, please reference SK-TH01 attached and confirm that the "extent of CJP weld/UT testing" and "cascaded weld area" detailed are acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-0899	BGP - Electrical Room Dimensions in RFI 778.1,780.1,781.1 & 782.1	Closed	11/12/2013	11/19/2013	11/15/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: The AAI mark ups included in the responses to RFI 778.1, RFI 780.1, RFI 781.1 and RFI 782.1 do not reflect dimensions in the latest ASI 107 documents or submittal review comments in the Comprehensive Mat Slab Drawings in submittal drawings package TG0600-0103. For example, the face of wall of Electrical Room B2460 per Response to RFI 780.1 is shown as 4'-0" from GL 15, however the latest drawing issued in ASI 107 A1-2124 shows the face of wall to this room as 3'-7 5/8" from GL 15. Shimmick has poured this area(Area 8) per ASI 104 which shows this dimension to be 3'-8". The next area to be impacted by these discrepancies will be placed on 11/24/2013. This discrepancy is present in all of the dimensions issued in the mark-ups included in the RFI responses (attached) and the rooms shown in RFI 781.1 and 782.1 are scheduled to pour on 11/24/13. Please provide a conformed drawing that shows the current layout for the following Electrical Rooms: B2640, B2461, B2441, B2560.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: George Metzger 11/14/2013 RESPONSE: The attached SKAs clarify and confirm current layouts/dimensions of Electrical Rooms mentioned in RFI T-0899 as well as setting out of all other PH1 walls at the Train Platform Level. 1. For setting out of PH1 walls above the Train Platform Matt Slab Level, refer to the Zone Plans (SKA-2871 to SKA-2878) and Enlarged Plans (SKA-2893 to SKA-2894). 2. For Setting out of knee walls under the Train Platform Level, refer to the Train Platform Level Slab edge plans (SKA-2885 to SKA-2892) and Detail Section (SKA-2895). 3. For setting out of couplers for PH2 walls, refer to the Train Platform Level Wall Plans (SKA-2879 to SKA-2884). Note that Detail Section 1 on SKA-2895 shows that for the platform MEP rooms, the edge of slab, dimensioned on the Train Platform Level Slab Edge Plans, aligns with the face of wall for the room. However, the face of the knee wall below is set 4"		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0900	SSS - Weld Test Requirements for Castings	Closed	11/13/2013	11/23/2013	11/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The cast node material is not a prequalified base material, thus a PQR test for all welds to the cast material is required. The cast node manufacturer, Bradken, has indicated that all test materials will be supplied in flat plate form only. While AWS D1.1 Table 4.1, Note b qualifies that pipe diameters greater than or equal to 24" may be tested on flat plate, AWS D1.1 Table 4.1 requires that all pipes under 24" must be tested in tubular form. Please confirm it is acceptable to perform all PQR testing for castings less than 24" in diameter, including the 16" diameter castings at the Light Column, on flat cast plate material.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			Ground, Bus Deck and Roof Castings are welded to 32" diameter pipes therefore per Table 4.1 of AWS, PQR can be performed with flat cast plate material. For the light column upper cast node which connects a 28inch tube with a 16inch tube, we confirm that the PQR can be performed with flat cast plate material.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1345 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0901	SSS - Edge of Slab Support Clarifications	Closed	11/13/2013	11/23/2013	11/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) Please confirm the weld indicated is intended to be an overhead weld from the outstanding leg of the L5x5x3/8 angle to the underside of the bent plate.					1) Confirmed.		
2) Provide required weld size and minimum weld lengths as indicated in CD RFI 112 SK1.					2) Use a 3/16" double sided fillet weld between the gusset plates and beam web/flange. Weld shall be provided for the entire length of the gusset plate in contact with the wide flange beam.		
3) Confirm it is acceptable to hold the L5x5x3/8 angle 1" back from the edge of slab.					3) Confirmed. Note that the 1:1 slope requirement on the kicker angle supporting the cantilevered portion of the slab is not required.		
4) Provide minimum required size of gusset plate and welding information as indicated in CD RFI 112 SK1.					4) Provide a top gusset plate with a minimum length of 5" and		
5) Confirm it is acceptable to typically locate the bolts 3" from the edge of the gusset plate as shown on CD RFI 112 SK1.					a) the centerline line of the kicker angle intersects the center of the gusset plate length at the top of the plate. Provide 3/16" double sided fillet weld between the top gusset plate and beam flange. Provide bottom gusset plates with minimum dimensions of 5"x 5". A minimum bolt edge distance of 1.5" shall be provided at the kicker angles with the bolts centered on the angle legs.		
					b) edge distance to the bolt is 1.5" min on all sides.		
T-0902	BSE - Repair of damaged column rebar at Area 7 south of the trestle	Closed	11/13/2013	11/23/2013	11/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
During level D bracing removal in area 7, a column rebar dowel was bent, as shown in the attached photograph.					Contractor to resubmit RFI with all information contained. RFI was submitted for review to the Design Team and then Contractor requested to add additional information.		
BBII proposes to:							
1. Abandon the bent rebar							
2. Drill and Hypoxy							
3. Leave the dowel as is, couple the bar onto it and bring it back in line as the bar continues vertically. Place an additional equal size bar along side the damaged bar as a replacement, possibly a 90 degrees hook at the base (Sketch 1 attached)							
4. Concrete around the rebar to be removed. The bar would be cut and a bar lock would be used to couple the							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1346 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	rebar .(Sketch 2 attached)						
	Please advise on which option is acceptable.						
T-0902.1	BSE - Repair of Damaged Column Rebar at Area 7 south of the Trestle	Closed	11/18/2013	11/28/2013	11/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
During level D bracing removal at area 7,a column rebar dowel was bent, as shown in the attached photograph.		Option 3 is acceptable with the following notes:					
Please see below repair options:		1. Damaged rebar shall be cut off at slab level.					
1. Abandon the bent rebar leave it in its current position projecting 5' above the mat slab, place and additional equal size bar alongside the damaged bar as a replacement with possibly a 90 degrees hook at the base		2. New starter bar to be doweled with approved adhesive.					
2. Leave the dowel as is, couple the upper section of the bar onto it and bring it back in line as the bar continues vertically		3. New starter bar shall be placed as close as possible to original bar location and bar location to be approved by SEOR.					
3. Drill and epoxy in a new same sized bar beside the damaged one, the slab would have to be scanned for rebar location and new location pick to avoid damaging the existing reinforcement.		4. Remaining column starter bars and mat reinforcing shall be avoided.					
4. Concrete around the rebar to be removed the bar would then be cut and a new bar welded to it.		5. Mat cover concrete may be removed locally to abandoned bar.					
5. Concrete around the rebar to be removed .The bar would be cut and a barlock would be used to couple the rebar this could be difficult to achieve due to congestion with the top mat reinforcement and the depth required for the bar lock to be fitted		6. Minimum embedment shall be 45".					
Please advise on which option is acceptable.		7. Starter bar to be shop bent no greater than 1:6 (sim 4/S1-3001) so that column reinforcing geometry is resumed per S1-3304.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1347 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0903	SSS - Location of Roof Beams for W-1 Glazing	Closed	11/14/2013	11/24/2013	11/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
1) The W-1 glazing system wireframe transmitted by Webcor/Obayashi locates the beams that back up the W-1 glazing system supports. At the roof level on S1-2602 to S1-2607, refer to sketches CD RFI 133 SK1 to SK6 and verify the clouded dimensions in red which locate the beams in question based on the structural wireframe model transmitted.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
2) Once the beam locations in question are confirmed, it is requested that any revisions that impact the location of any beam be addressed in a written or marked up formation in lieu of a revised wireframe model. Please confirm this is acceptable.					RESPONSE: 1) RFI is not the correct format for the Design Team to review this information. Please submit shop drawing submittal of this work to allow for a thorough submission and review of this scope of work. 2) The proposed method of future beam revisions in this RFI is not acceptable. Please provide information per Project Database Administration in Division 01 specifications and architectural drawings A-0008 and A-0009.		
T-0903.1	SSS - Location of Roof Beams for W-1 Glazing	Closed	12/06/2013	12/16/2013	12/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Per the discussion at the Structural RFI Meeting 12/5/13, please provide a revised response to the following RFI:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) The W-1 glazing system wireframe transmitted by Webcor/Obayashi locates the beams that back up the W-1 glazing system supports. At the roof level on S1-2602 to S1-2607, refer to sketches CD RFI 133 SK1 to SK6 and verify the clouded dimensions in red which locate the beams in question based on the structural wireframe model transmitted.					RFI voided. Dimensions to be reviewed and confirmed via submittal.		
2) Once the beam locations in question are confirmed, it is requested that any revisions that impact the location of any beam be addressed in a written or marked up formation in lieu of a revised wireframe model. Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-0904	SSS - W-1 Glazing Connection Clarifications	Closed	11/14/2013	11/24/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1348 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Reference is made to the W-1 glazing support connection details indicated on 1 &4/S1-8001 and CD RFI 136 SK1 to SK3 in regards to the following: 1) Confirm the hole locations for the W-1 glazing "CP1" locations are acceptable as shown or supply alternate locations. 2) Confirm the holes for W-1 glazing connections are to be 1 9/16" dia. 3) Confirm the hole locations for W-1 glazing "CP2" locations are acceptable as shown or supply alternate locations. 4) Confirm the holes for the W-1 glazing connections are to be 1 9/16" dia. as indicated. 5) The 1" plate located between the beam web and the 2 ½" plate has been detailed to terminate 5" below and above the beam flanges as indicated in 7/S1-8001. This places the edge of the plate near the center of the W1 "CP2" connection bolts as shown on CD RFI 136 SK3. Please confirm this is the intent for the 1" plate at this location.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Location of the holes shall be as shown in the sketch SKS 0302 enclosed. 2. See response #1. 3. See response #1 4. Confirmed. 5. The 1 ½ plates are to be welded (1/2 ½ double fillet weld) to the beam top and bottom flange as shown in detail 1A/S1-8001		
T-0904.1	SSS - W-1 Glazing Connection Clarifications	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
	REQUEST: As a follow-up to Webcor/Obayashi RFI T-0904 (SK RFI 182), please see attached CD RFI 136.1 SK1 and SK2 in reference to the following: 1) T-0904 Item 5: The response references the stiffener in detail 1A/S1-8001, while the question is regarding the 1" plate wedged between the BU-Beam web and the 2 ½" thick plate per detail 7/S1-8001. The top and bottom edges of the 1" plate are close to the bolts as shown on SK2. If this is the intent, confirm items 1a and 1b on SK2: a. Confirm the 1" edge distance is sufficient. b. Confirm it is acceptable to notch the 1" plate with partial 1 9/16 dia. holes at 4 locations to accommodate the bolts. 2) T-0904 Item 2: The response does not clarify the requested hole diameters. Please confirm the holes are 1	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) No, the 5" dimension shall be changed to 1". 2) Hole diameter shall be 2 1/16" to allow 1/2" erection tolerance. Also, refer to Detail 1/S1-6097 for the center line of the bolt group.		



9/16" diameter for "CP2" connections.		
T-0905	BGP - Light Column Anchor Bolts Conflict with Rebar	Closed
From: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	11/15/2013 11/25/2013 11/27/2013 Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Please refer to attached drawing S1-3009, S1-6008.		George Metzger
SCCI encountered potential conflict between anchor bolts		11/25/2013
of light column (layout depicted in 2/S1-6008) with light		RESPONSE:
column rebar as shown in 1/S 1-3009. Please find		In order to avoid conflict with the light column anchor
attached model depicting conflict between bundles of 2 ea		bars detailed on S1-6008, the bundled #11 bars
rebar #11 @ 16" OC with the layout of the anchor bolt.		depicted in Section 1/S1-3009 may have their number
Please advise and provide parameters with which the		take precedence over spacing. Any bundle may be
rebar may be moved to clear the anchor bolts.		moved from the typical 1'-4" module by up to 11-
		7/8". The minimum clear spacing between any two
		adjacent bundles shall be 1-3/8". The maximum
		spacing between any two adjacent bundles shall be
		23-3/4".
		The particular arrangement of bundled bars is at the
		contractor's option per the rules described above.
		One potential allowable arrangement is presented in
		the Sketch SKS-0299 (attached).



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1350 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0906	BGP - Omitting the Grout Port at all Applicable Column Base Plates	Closed	11/15/2013	11/25/2013	12/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference column base plate details on Sheet S1-5051. SCCI proposes to permanently remove the grout ports used to grout the column base plate as shown in A/S1-5051 . SCCI believes the 2" grout holes and 3" perimeter clearance is sufficient to grout voids underneath and around the base plate and shear keys. The blockouts will be grouted from the holes and/or perimeter and the hose removed as the voids are filled up. Please confirm it is acceptable to remove the grout port depicted in A/S1-5051, typical at applicable column base plates.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/19/2013 RESPONSE: Contractor proposed grout procedure is acceptable, pending on the successful grout procedure mock up.		
T-0907	BGP - Haunch Reinforcement Embedment Detail in Area 9	Closed	11/15/2013	11/25/2013	11/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-3201 and attached SCCI sketch SK-RFI-383. The haunch bars in Area 9 were fabricated to a shorter length than required. Per discussions with TT Engineer in the field, Gerdau proposes to raise the lowest point of the haunch bar 6" from the designed location. As a result, the haunch would have a 64" embedment into the mat slab and 29" minimum embedment into the foundation wall. Refer to attached sketch for further details. Please confirm the revised haunch reinforcement detail in Area 9 as depicted in the attached sketch is acceptable .			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/18/2013 RESPONSE: The reduction in length is acceptable for use in Area 9 with the following conditions: 1. The top of bar embedment into the wall shall comply with RFI T-0702 and T-0716. 2. The bottom of the bar shall be chaired as required above the lower mat. 3. Embedment into the mat shall conform to RFI T-0710 and T-0762.		
T-0908	BGP - Column Base Plate Shear Key Block-out DImension	Closed	11/15/2013	11/25/2013	11/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: City and County of San Francisco Sheryl Bregman							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1351 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>Please refe to attached detail A on sheet S1-5051.</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable to reduce the overall 14" shear key block-out dimension to 10"; therfore, allowing for 2-inches of clearance all around the shear key as discused and coordinated during the 11/12/2013 mock-up review. See attached detail A/S1-5051 for mark-ups.</p> <p>Please note the revised column base plate block-out is typical for Type I and II.</p>						
T-0908.1	<p>BGP - Concrete Beam Top Bar Spacing and Layering</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please refer to drawing S1-3400 and RFI T-0908.</p> <p>In order to clear the 10" shear key block-out as approved in RFI T-908, please confirm it is acceptable to place the additional short bars in a typical concrete beam in a second layer. Also, please confirm it is acceptable to increase the space between the top and short bars near the center of the beam to 10".</p> <p>Please reference the attached photo for more details.</p>	Closed	11/22/2013	12/02/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>						
			<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>George Metzger 12/3/2013 RESPONSE:</p> <p>- This response addresses Lower Concourse Level concrete beams framed to concrete columns with steel columns above only. Reinforcement information for these beams is provided in Sheet S1-3400.</p> <p>- Where the beam has more than 6 top bars over the column, place the top bars in 2 layers. A minimum of 6 bars (long bars placed first) shall be placed in the top layer and the remaining bars shall be placed in the 2nd layer. When the concrete beam and the steel column centerlines coincide or slightly offset from each other, It is acceptable to increase the space between concrete beam top bars to 10" to clear the shear key block out.</p> <p>- For beams B30, B66, B71 and B76 provide 6-#11 Right End Top LONG Bars and 6-#11 Right End Top SHORT Bars. Place short bars in second layer, with a clear distance of 1" or db, whichever is greater.</p> <p>- All other conditions shall be reviewed separately.</p>				
			<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				

Page: 1352 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1353 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>part of main package (TG-10.2) plumbing scope installation. Doweling and pourback details to be designed by TG-10.2 plumbing trade contractor.</p> <p>For floor drains (FD) shown cast into Lower Concourse structural slab CM/GC proposes to block out 12"x12" square centered on center of fixture. Propose using detail 1/S-3501 for trimming rebars should they encroach into the blockout. Fixture to be placed and grouted back in as part of main package (TG-10.2) plumbing scope installation. Doweling and pourback details to be designed by TG-10.2 plumbing trade contractor.</p> <p>Please confirm the above proposed scope is structurally acceptable.</p>						<p>un-cut until the time of fixture installation when the bars can then be cut to a close fit. This method will eliminate potential required dowels to support the grout and mitigate the number of bars required to be cut should there be small changes in the location of the fixture. Contractor shall coordinate the sizes and locations of all blockouts with the actual fixtures selected and the approved drawings for that scope of work.</p>
T-0910	BGP - Mechanical Couplers at Top of Partition Walls	Closed	11/18/2013	11/28/2013	12/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Please refer to attached drawing excerpts from sheet S1-2052 and 4/S1-3205.</p> <p>The typical wall section shown on S1/-2025 for the tank walls directs the reader to section 4 on S1-3205. When reviewing this section the design calls for mechanical couplers at the tops of the walls per detail 6/S1-3001. The formsaver coupler depicted within this detail is a threaded product that will not support a hooked or bent bar because the specific orientation of the hook is not possible.</p> <p>Please provide direction on how to proceed.</p>			<p>1. To maintain the formsaver coupler but modify the male bars with hooked ends, potentially use HRC 555 heads</p> <p>2. Eliminate the coupler and use a drill and dowel method of installation for the follow on bar into the soffit</p> <p>3. Modify the vertical bar from contract TG06 to extend out of the concrete with the desired hooks oriented correctly for the follow on contract work.</p> <p>4. Modify the coupler type by using a formsaver style coupler that attaches the male dowel with epoxy adhesive. This would provide no extension of the bar above the TG06 contact line and provide a pre-determined layout for the follow on bars with the ability to orientate the hooks as required.</p>			<p>RESPONSE: RFI T-0910 BGP - Mechanical Couplers at Top of Partition Walls</p> <p>George Metzger 11/27/2013</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>At the tops of the water tank walls, maintain the formsaver couplers in anticipation of headed reinforcing in lieu of hooks.</p>	
T-0911	BGP - Seismic Joint Specification Clarifications	Closed	11/18/2013	11/24/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1354 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference Specification Section 07 09 16 - 2.6.A.1. The aforementioned section states, "Provide joint assemblies in single lengths between changes in direction with vulcanized, mitered comers where joint changes directions or abuts other materials." 1. Please confirm that this is in reference to the Omega Seal gasket, and not the clamping system and embedded steel. 2. Please confirm that it is acceptable to use clamping components with 4'-0" maximum lengths with butt joints not to exceed 1/8". 3. Please confirm that it is acceptable to use 14' max lengths on steel embed with butt joints not to exceed 1/8".		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/25/2013 RESPONSE: AAI Response: 1. Confirmed. The Specifications Section 07 09 16-2.6.A.1 refers to the Seal gaskets and not the clamping system and embedded steel. 2. For Clamping component lengths, contractor to coordinate with manufacturer of Double Seismic Joint Seal complete with clamping assembly. TT Response: 3. Acceptable.			
T-0912	SSS - GFRC Drawings	Closed	11/18/2013	11/28/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On the Type 2 (M) Drag connection per detail 1/S1-5017 refer to sketch CD RFI 117 SK1 for the GFRC question below. Note 4 references GFRC drawings. The connections in the clouded areas cannot be completed until the GFRC information is issued. Please supply the necessary information.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> "For Reference Only" see the attached "In-Progress & Draft" 3D Digital files containing geometry control information and related 2D drawings. These documents may be updated prior to issue and will be issued for construction in the future, however the CMGC can use the data to coordinate the work of adjacent trades.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0913	BGP - Seismic Joint Detail Clarifications	Closed	11/18/2013	11/24/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jackson Tukuafu</div></div> <div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch</div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Please reference details 7/A1-8881 (ASI #107) and 4/S1-3010 (ASI #100).</div> <div><div>1. Detail 7/A1-8881 calls for a "neoprene gasket compressed by bar and bolt typ." Please provide sizes for tabs and bolts. Also, provide welding instructions (if necessary).</div><div>2. The same detail shows pipe penetrations through the seismic joint at both levels. Plumbing drawings show a 4" "SAN/ AD" running parallel to the seismic joint. Please confirm this pipe penetrates the joint. If so, provide locations off of grid and pipe sleeve dimensions. Also, provide details on how to seal this penetration (watertight).</div><div>3. Detail 4/S1-3010 shows a 3/4" dia Headed Stud at 12" oc, with 6" embed. Is this to be one row as the drawing shows?</div><div>4. Detail 4/S1-3010 also calls for 4" diameter hole at 2'-0" oc. What is the purpose of these holes? If the clamping system is continuous, then what will support the rod at the hole locations? Please clarify.</div></div>			<div>SUGGESTION:</div> <div></div> <div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>AAI Response:</div> <div><div>1. For size of tabs and bolts for the neoprene gasket, refer to Specification Section 07 09 16 - Seismic Joint Assemblies - Below Grade Package. Fastening device types and sizes required are to be engineered to suit and ensure compliance with the specification. Contractor to coordinate components specified under this section, including Double SJ Seal c/w Clamping Assembly, SJ Cast-in Galv Steel Frame and Stud Assembly, and Waterproofing Assembly, which are closely integrated with materials and assemblies specified in other Specification sections and require close trade coordination to complete the overall Seismic Joint Assembly.</div><div>2. For Seismic Joint Drain locations, refer to SKA-2949. Pipe sleeves are not required around the pipe penetration. Drains to be provided with clamp frames / flanges for clamping the waterproofing system, creating a seal around the pipe penetration at the Seismic Joint.</div></div> <div>TT Response:</div> <div><div>3. Confirmed.</div><div>4. The holes are to ensure that concrete fills all the way up to into the curb and allows for the use of a concrete vibrator. Refer to Double Seismic Joint Seal with Clamping Assembly Manufacturer for bolt spacing. Coordinate concrete fill holes to avoid interference with bolts of the clamping system.</div></div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1356 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0914	SSS - Detail Clarifications for Edge of Slab Supports	Closed	11/18/2013	11/18/2013		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference details 2, 3, 7, and 9 on S1-5001 and CD RFI 120 SK1-SK2 for the following items: 1) Details 2 & 7/S1-5001 appear to indicate the same condition, however the required deck angle supports are different. Detail 2 shows the configuration of 3/8" bent plates while Detail 7 shows a different configuration. of L6x4x5/16 angles. Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed with the deck supports per detail 7. 2) If detail 7/S1-5001 is acceptable, confirm the deck support angles can be held back 1" from the edge of slab. 3) If detail 2/S1-5001 is preferred, please provide additional information on the indicated members with horizontal and vertical leg dimensions. 4) Details 3 & 9/S1-5001 appear to indicate the same condition, however the required deck angle supports are different. Detail 3 shows the configuration of 3/8" bent plates while Detail 9 shows a different configuration. of L6x4x5/16 angles. Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed with the deck supports per detail 9. 5) If detail 9/S1-5001 is acceptable, confirm the deck support angles can be held back 1" from the edge of slab. 6) If detail 3/S1-5001 is preferred, please provide additional information on the indicated members with horizontal and vertical leg dimensions.				1) Detail 2 shows deck support at exterior column while Detail 7 is to show the slab reinforcement. However, for deck support, either the deck support shown on detail 7 can be used to replace the 3/8" angle shown on Detail 2 at contractor's discretion. 2) Confirmed 3) Horizontal leg to have a dimension so that the edge angle will have 1 ½" bearing similar to detail 8/S1-5000.Vertical leg shall be not less than 4". 4) Confirmed 5) Confirmed 6) See response to item 3.			
<hr/>							
T-0915	SSS - Connection Clarifications For Beam Cope	Closed	11/18/2013	11/28/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
At sample locations on S1-2303 along line 9 between grids D & F and refer to sketches CD RFI 118 SK1 to SK3 for items 1, 2 & 3 for beam cope clearance. 1) The 1/2" max clearance per 1/S1-5010 is not sufficient to clear the k of the W40x183. Confirm it is acceptable to increase the clearance to 1 11/16" to avoid coping the beam inside the k. 2) The 1/2" max clearance per 12/S1-5010 is not sufficient to clear the k of the W24x68. Confirm it is acceptable to increase the clearance to 15/16" to avoid coping the beam inside the k. 3) Confirm it is typically acceptable to increase the 1/2"				1) Acceptable. 2) Acceptable. 3) Acceptable at other similar connections where 12/S1-5010 applies.			
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1358 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0918	SSS - Connection Clarifications for Offset Beams	Closed	11/18/2013	11/18/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2503 along line 9 between grids E & F refer to sketches CD RFI 124 SK1 & SK2. With the beam spacing per S1-2503 (SK1), there will be a 3" offset between the noted beams. The double angle connection per S1-5010 will not work as the bolts will foul the beam web on the opposite side. We propose to relocate the beam per the proposed dimensions shown or connect these beams with shear plates per S1-5011. Please review and advise how to proceed.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The W21x50 beam between GL E.2 and E.6 may be moved to align with the W24x68 on other side of GL 9 as shown on SK2. However note that the location of the W24x68 beam east of GL 9 and between E.6 and F is incorrectly shown on SK2. The W24x68 beam is 7' 6" from GL F and is aligned with the W21x50 on the west side of GL 9. Similarly, the W24x68 and W24x55 beams on the two sides of GL 9 between GL D.4 and D are aligned.		
T-0919	SSS - Beam Bottom Flange Bracing Connection	Closed	11/18/2013	11/28/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Refer to the beam bottom flange bracing connection detailed on 8/S1-5015 and CD RFI 127 SK1 & SK2 for the following items: 1) In order to support erection requirements, please confirm it is acceptable to: a. Typically locate the bolts shown 3" from the underside of the top flange and 3" from the face of the beam web as indicated in CD RFI 127 SK2. b. Typically locate the bolt 3" from the top of the flange indicated. c. Typically locate the bolt outside the beam profile as shown to make the brace erectable. 2) Confirm the stitch plates should be ½" thick to match the ½" thick gusset plates at each end. 3) Please confirm that it is acceptable to provide slotted holes in the brace at the end connections.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) It is acceptable to typically locate bolts as shown in SK2. However, the slope of the kicker angle shall be such that the centerline of the angle should pass through the centerlines of the beam web and flange similar to that shown in 7/S1-5015 at both top and bottom ends. 2) Confirmed. 3) Slotted holes are not acceptable. Bottom flange bracing detail 8/S1-5015 applies only at beams with the "dashed arrow" symbol (See Note 1 on 8/S1-5015). Bottom flange bracing of 2nd floor and bus deck level spandrel beams is to be provided per S1-8020 as noted on typical sheet notes on S1-2402 and S1-2502 (See Note 3).		
T-0919.1	SSS - Detail Clarification at Angle Brace	Closed	12/31/2013	01/10/2014	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1359 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>The braces per detail 8/S1-5015 have been added in the model for the area between grids 1.4 to 19.9 as shown on attached SK2. Please see attached CD RFI 127.1 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2:</p> <p>1.) Work with SK1 & SK2 and confirm the request in the response to RFI T-0919 (SK 173 & CD 127) item 1 to have the work points for the braces located at the intersection of the top/bottom of beams on center of beams.</p> <p>2.) If the response to item 1 above is yes, please supply the size of the gusset plates as the dimensioning proposed in CD RFI 127 will not work with the revised work point locations.</p>						
T-0919.2	SSS - Detail Clarification at Angle Brace	Closed	02/06/2014	02/16/2014	02/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
This is a follow-up to Webcor RFI # T-0919.1 (SK RFI # 173.1 & CD RFI # 127.1)		Confirmed that the work points shown on CD RFI 127.2 SK1 and SK2 are the design intent. The work points shown on CD RFI 127.2 SK3 previous submitted are also acceptable. There shall be no cost and time increase for this one.					
Per the conference call discussion on 1/16/14 with Webcor, Skanska & Thornton Tomasetti, Candraft was to layout the bracing work points to the underside of the top beam flange superseding the response to locate the work at the top of the beam. Please review the attached two sketches CD RFI 127.2 SK1 & SK2 showing the revised work point locations and confirm this is the intent of the design parameters. Note that the bracing work points are not indicated on 8/S1-5015 and we feel that the original sketch CD RFI 127 SK2 (Relabeled CD RFI 127.2 SK3) conforms to the design with the bolt closer to the inside profile of the beam members and would like to use as modeled.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0920	SSS - Kicker Connection Clarification	Closed	11/18/2013	11/28/2013	11/22/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Refer to sketches CD RFI 126 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 4:				1) Acceptable. 2) Acceptable. 3) Acceptable. 4) Acceptable. One general comment that is applicable to all sketches include in this RFI is that where shallower beams are supported by deeper girders. Coping the bottom flange of the shallow beam is not allowed per details 1/S1-5010 and 1/S1-5011.			
1) Confirm it is acceptable to locate the brace at the bevel shown to fit the steel framing in lieu of the 2:1 bevel per 5/S1-5015.							
2) Confirm it is acceptable to locate the brace at the bevel shown to fit the steel framing in lieu of the 2:1 bevel per 5/S1-5015.							
3) Confirm it is acceptable to increase the thickness of the full depth shear plate to 1" per 5/S1-5015 and connect the kicker brace to the full depth shear plate as shown.							
4) Confirm that it is acceptable to typically apply item 3 at other similar conditions.							
T-0920.1	SSS - Kicker Connection Clarifications	Closed	12/11/2013	12/21/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per the response to Webcor RFI T-0920 (SK RFI # 172) it was confirmed acceptable to increase the full depth shear plate from 3/8" to 1". Upon further review of this location there would be an issue where a 1" thick shear plate would foul the bolts connecting the top flange of the Transfer Girder to the Cruciform column base plate.				1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. 4) Confirmed. 5) See responses to 1) through 4). Further comments may be provided on a case by case basis during shop drawings review			
1). Please confirm it is acceptable to center the 3/8" shear between the bolts and move the beam 5/8" south from its original location.							
2). Please confirm the 1" gusset plate welded to the bottom flange of the beam can be moved off the center line of the beam to line up with the 3/8" full depth shear plate. The gusset would move 7/16" from the centerline at this location.							
3). If it is acceptable to line up the gusset with the full depth shear plate, there will be a 5/8" discrepancy between the two plates. Please confirm if stitch plates with varying thicknesses can be used to make up the difference.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1361 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	4). Confirm that it is acceptable to typically apply the above items at other similar conditions.						
	5). If any of the above suggestions will not work, please provide an alternate detail for these conditions.						
T-0920.2	SSS - Kicker Connection Clarifications	Closed	12/16/2013	12/26/2013	01/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per the response to Webcor RFI T-0920 (SK RFI # 172) clarification is required regarding the last statement where "Coping the bottom flange of the shallow beam is not allowed" and also per the response to Webcor RFI T-0934 (SK RFI # 187) clarification is required regarding the last statement where coping the bottom flange of the shallow beam shall not exceed 1" from the end of the beam.				1). Coping the bottom flange 4- 4 1/2" long will affect the block shear of the connection design in some cases. Contractor shall prepared the shop drawings satisfying the require tightening clearance and cloud the coped area requesting approval by the Engineer on a case by case basis.			
1). Per detail 1/S1-5010 where there is a double sided beam connection, the bottom flange is required to be coped in the shallow beam in order to allow for installation of the bolts from the shallow beam side. Note the bolts cannot be torqued if erected from the other side and would also foul the shallow bottom beam flange in question. On the attached sketches CD RFI # 126.1 SK1 to SK4 show some typical sample conditions illustrating the clearance required. The beam flange cope lengths required will range from 4" long in most cases to 4 1/2" at larger web thicknesses. Please verify the shallow bottom beam flanges can be coped for bolt clearance and erection of the beams as noted on SK2 to SK4.				2) Confirmed.			
2). Per detail 9/S1-5010 where the WT on the top of the beam flange is required to extend to the end of the beam please verify the beam flange can be coped back to the "k1" of the beam in order to get full bearing and weld for the WT and to clear bolts as noted on SK2.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1362 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0921	SSS - Detail Clarifications For Edge of Slab Supports	Closed	11/18/2013	11/28/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Per details 8 & 10/S1-5001, refer to sketches CD RFI 121 SK1 for items 1 & 2:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) Confirm the noted area indicates that the concrete slab is not required and the edge plates may be terminated as shown.					The noted area does require concrete slab. Note that this detail is for the slab reinforcement at an edge column condition and the detail note references to ¿see typical slab edge details for additional information¿. Refer to detail 2/S1-5001 for additional info regarding edge of deck at exterior columns.		
2) Confirm the noted area indicates that the concrete slab is not required and the edge plates may be terminated as shown.					The noted corner area does require concrete slab. Note that this detail is for slab reinforcement at a corner column condition and the detail note references to ¿see typical slab edge details for additional information¿. Refer to detail 3/S1-5001 for additional info regarding edge of deck at exterior corner columns.		
T-0922	SSS - W-1 Support Connection Clarifications at Bus Deck	Closed	11/18/2013	11/28/2013	12/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Refer to CK RFI 125 SK1, SK2A, SK2B, SK3, and SK4 requesting clarification at the Bus Deck level on the following:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) Confirm the noted connection should be a moment connection.					1. Yes, the connections shall be a moment connection as shown on Detail 1/S1-8003 and as denoted on the plans.		
2) At the noted location, two supports for CP5 connections are required adjacent to Grid 9. Based on the CP5 detail requirements, a 1 ¼" horizontal stiffener should span from shear plate to shear plate per 1B/S1-8003; however, because these two connection points span the same beam, the horizontal stiffener would foul the incoming beam to shear plate connection, as there is a horizontal stiffener welded on both sides of the shear plate. Please provide a solution for this condition.					2. The horizontal plates shown on 1B/S1-8003 are eliminated (see ASI 109).		
3) Confirm the vertical spacing of the 1 ¼" horizontal stiffeners is acceptable to accommodate the connection bolts on the incoming beams.					3. See response to item 2)		
4) In the beam connection shown in detail 1/S1-8003, the required shear plate will foul the 2" web reinforcement plate required per 1/S1-5017. Please confirm the shear plate is to be welded to the 2" web reinforcement plate with a ½" double fillet weld per 1/S1-8003 or provide an					4. Is this question related to the vertical shear plate? If so, Confirmed that the shear plate may be welded to the 2" web reinforcement plate with 1/2" double fillet weld as shown.		
					5. 3/4" partial pen weld at the bottom flange called out may be replaced by a partial penetration weld with an 3/4" fillet weld overlay built-up.		
					6. Confirmed.		
					7. Confirmed.		
					8. Confirmed.		
					9. See ASI 109 for bolt hole dimensions.		
					10. Use 2 1/16" holes for 1 ½" bolts to allow for ½" field tolerance.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1363 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>alternate connection detail.</p> <p>5) A CJP weld is required at the flange connections shown on CD RFI 125 SK2A and SK2B; however, the indicated flanges are out of alignment per the dimensions shown. Please advise on the welding or connection requirements at this condition.</p> <p>6) Confirm the noted 1" stiffener plate per 1/S1-8003 may be welded to the 2" web reinforcement plate as shown in SK2A and SK3.</p> <p>7) Due to the placement of the 1/14" horizontal stiffener plates and required ½" fillet weld, the bolts for the beam connections will not be erectable. Please confirm it is acceptable to clip the horizontal stiffener plates as shown to accommodate the erection bolts or supply an alternate solution.</p> <p>8) Confirm it is acceptable to cut the 1 ¼" horizontal stiffener plates as shown to avoid fouling the 2" web reinforcement plate or supply an alternate solution.</p> <p>9) Confirm the hole locations for the W-1 glazing system per 1/S1-8003 are acceptable as shown or supply alternate locations.</p> <p>10) Confirm 1 9/16" dia. holes are acceptable or provide alternate hole size.</p>						
T-0922.1	SSS - W-1 Connection Clarifications	Closed	01/17/2014	01/27/2014	02/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-0922 (SK 171 CD 125) See attached CD RFI # 125.1 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 3:							
1.) The 2" stiffener per 1/S1-8003 (ASI 109) and the beam connection shear plate foul each other as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to offset the 2" stiffener as required and use it as the shear plate for the beam connection. If not, supply an alternate solution.		1). The 2" vertical stiffeners are to be located 1'0" from the center of the W1 connection as shown in Detail 1/S1-8003 in order to make to the W1 connection. Where the beam connection shear plate fault the 2" plate, the 2" plate may be used as the shear plate.					
2.) Please supply missing dimensions.		2). See 12/S1-6091 for bolt spacing.					
3.) The noted dimensions per 1/S1-8003 in ASI 109 (SK4) will result in the bottom holes fouling the beam flange.		3). Change the 4" dimension to 3 1/4", and change the 8" dimension to 6 1/2".					
		4). The 3/4" PJP weld at the top flange may be replaced with CJP weld to allow for fit up tolerance. The weld at the bottom flange may be changed to a double fillet weld as shown on the attached sketch					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1364 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Please issue revised hole locations to suit the beam sizes.		SKS-324.				
	See attached CD RFI # 125.2 SK1 to SK3 for item #4:						
	4.) The RFI T-0922 item 5 instruction to supply a PJP weld with a 3/4" fillet weld on top as shown is not possible as there is only 9/16" of material remaining on top as shown. A PJP weld requires a 0" gap which is not possible as there is no erection clearance. Please supply an alternate weld.						
T-0922.2	SSS - W-1 Connection Clarifications	Closed	01/17/2014	01/27/2014	01/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:	Webcor Construction LP	Gregory Kemerer		
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-0922 item 5 (SK 171 CD 125) See attached CD RFI # 125.2 SK1 to SK3: The RFI T-0922 item 5 instruction to supply a PJP weld with a 3/4" fillet weld on top as shown is not possible as there is only 9/16" of material remaining on top as shown. Also, a PJP weld requires a 0" gap and this is not possible as there is no erection clearance. Please supply an alternate weld.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Combined with RFI T-0922.1	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0923	SSS - W-1 Glazing System CP6 Connections	Closed	11/19/2013	11/29/2013	12/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Refer to CD RFI 128 SK1 through SK4 in response to the following regarding the W-1 glazing system connection "CP6" at the bus deck level: 1) The indicated CP6 connections foul the beam connections as indicated in SK3A and SK3B. Please provide a solution to this condition. 2) Confirm the holes for the "CP6" connections may be typically located as shown in SK4 along Grids B & H. 3) Confirm the connection holes for "CP6" are 1 9/16" diameter or provide the required hole diameter.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The double stiffeners (1" thick) shown on 4/S1-8003 will be revised to single 1 ½" thick stiffener (centered to the W1 support). If the connection for the beam supporting crash rail posts fouls the stiffener and kicker for W1 support, adjust the beam supporting the crash rail post slightly (less than 3") so it is in line with the W1 support. In this case, the kicker is no longer needed. 2. The center line of the bolt shall be 2'-0 1/8" from the top of the beam (2'-0 ¼" shown on SK4). The vertical spacing of the bolt shall be 10 ½"(10" shown on SK4) and the horizontal spacing of the bolt shall be 5 ½"(4 1/2" shown on SK4). 3. Confirmed that 1 9/16" dia. hole is fine for 1" bolt to allow for field tolerance.		
T-0923.1	SSS - Dimension Clarification for W-1 Glazing	Closed	01/06/2014	01/16/2014	01/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 128.1 SK1 & SK2: RFI T-0923 SK4 was submitted with the center of "CP6" down 2'-0 1/4 from the top of steel. The 2'-0 1/4 dimension was taken from the Rhino model. The response to RFI T-0923 item 2 has changed the 2'-0 1/4 dimension to 2'-0 1/8. 1) Confirm the 2'-0 1/4 dimension from the Rhino model is correct. 2) Confirm the locations for all connections for the W-1 glazing system on the Bus Level may be taken from the Rhino model.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Per RFI T-0923 the center line of the bolt shall be 2'-0 1/4 from the top of the beam. 2. The Rhino model is the geometry control for the W-1 elements as defined in the Contract Documents.		
T-0923.2	SSS - W-1 Glazing System CP6 Connections	Closed	05/13/2014	05/23/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1366 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton

REQUEST:

See attached CD RFI # 128.2 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2:

1) The 1 1/2" thick plate per 4/S1-8003 with the 1/2" fillet welds will interfere with the "CP6" bolts if the beam is placed on the center of the CP6 connection per RFI T-0923 (SK1). Confirm it is acceptable to place the 1 1/2" thick plate on the center of the "CP6" connection and off-set the beam accordingly.

2) Detail 4/S1-8003 calls for the PL 1 1/2" to be 9" wide. Confirm it is acceptable to make the PL 5 1/2" wide as shown to avoid interference with the bolts for the safety handrail post.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

1. Confirmed.

2. Proposed change of the stiffener is not acceptable. The stiffener shall be welded to the beam web and flange as shown on the contract document. Adjust safety handrail post as needed to avoid conflict.

T-0924 **BGP - Column Stirrups and Ties at Top of Concourse (Mock-Up Review)** **Closed**

From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu

To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch

11/19/2013 **11/19/2013** **11/22/2013** **Potentially** ☐

Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger

Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto

REQUEST:

Please refer to drawing S1-3304, 3305 and 5051.

Please confirm that it is acceptable to install the top column stirrups and tie at 12.5" from the top of concrete at concourse level for the concrete columns with anchor base plates.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

George Metzger
11/22/2013

RESPONSE:

Installing all column stirrups and tie starting at 12.5" from the top of concrete is not acceptable. It is acceptable to eliminate/lower the column ties that interfere with the key blockout. Note that proposed 12.5" would not be sufficient to clear column stirrups/ties from the key blockout at some locations (Base Plate Types 1B and 1C in Sheet S1-5051, base plates embedded within the concrete).



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>TG0600-0025 states that "each section of INJECTO should be pressure tested with water to a minimum pressure of 1 00 psi, to insure migration of water through the entire joint. If excessive water leakage out of joint is observed, this may indicate the presence of honeycombs or voids and should be noted on job report..."</p> <p>In addition, the attached Grace/DeNeef Technical Letter also notes that the INJECTO should be tested with water (not air).</p> <p>Please confirm that it is acceptable to test the integrity of the INJECTO hoses with water as required by the manufacturer.</p>						
T-0927.1	BGP - Injection Hose Testing Criteria	Closed	01/06/2014	01/16/2014	01/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference attached Grace/DeneefTechnical Letter and RFI #T-0927 response.				George Metzger 1/17/2014			
RFI T-0927 response states that "contractor shall use air to test hoses as specified," but the specifications call out several different types of injection hoses. Although, air testing may be suitable for other products specified, Grace/Deneef requires water testing for the INJECTO Tube system. The attached technical letter from Grace/Deneef states that "INJECTO is an open system, and any air pumped in will begin to flow immediately through the 35 micron filter and polypropylene mesh out into the concrete."				RESPONSE: H&B does not disagree with deNeef that air will flow into the concrete. We also assume that water will also flow as readily into the concrete as air. What is the water test intended to demonstrate? The requirement in the specifications was in response to a Webcor comment during the design phase on the system and specification.			
Please review and confirm that water testing is acceptable for the Deneef INJECTO Tube system on the TTC project.				The reason air was specified, rather than water is that the injection hose is flanked with hydrophilic water stops. If the hose leaks, it will activate the water stops and the leaks in the hose will go undetected.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1369 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0927.2	BGP - Injection Hose Testing Criteria	Closed	02/18/2014	02/28/2014	02/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per conference call with design team, please confirm that it is acceptable to test the waterstop injection hoses with water as recommended by manufacturer.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Confirmed.		
T-0928	RFI T-0928 SSS - Detail Clarification at Cast Node Connections	Closed	11/22/2013	12/02/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please reference the cast node connection details 2/S1-4354 and 2/S1-4355 shown on CD RFI 131 SK1 and verify the following. 1) Confirm the indicated 4'-0" radius is acceptable or provide alternate dimension. 2) Confirm the indicated 4'-0" radius is acceptable or provide alternate dimension.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					1) 4 ft radius is confirmed. 2) Radius = 2 ft		
T-0929	SSS - Connection Clarification at Edge of Slab GL 11	Closed	11/22/2013	12/02/2013	12/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Refer to S1-2403 for locations near grids D.11 and F.11 indicated on CD RFI 135 SK1. As detailed in CD RFI 135 SK2, the L5x5 connection angles required per detail 1/S1-5010 will extend beyond the edge of slab by 3/16". Please confirm this is acceptable or provide an alternate detail for this condition.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Shift the W21x50 beams so that they are 6" from edge of slab and the connection angle legs are inside the edge of slab.		
T-0930	SSS - Scope Confirmation at Stairs	Closed	11/22/2013	12/02/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Per the response to TG07.1R-0041, "the scope of work for stair posts, landing framing, stringers, and checkered plate			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					The referenced response to TG07.1R-0041 applies to details 1,3,4,5,6,8, & 10 on S1-7601. This response		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0931	<div>SSS - Connection Clarifications at Isolation Bearings</div> <div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div> <div>To: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch</div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div> <div>REQUEST: Please refer to the isolation bearing details on S1-5021 and CD RFI 138 SK1 & SK2 attached for the following items: 1) Please provide dimensions required to located bolts. 2) Confirm the cap plate may be welded as indicated in the attached sketch. 3) Please provide dimensions required to located bolts. 4) Please provide dimensions required to located bolts. 5) Please provide dimensions required to located bolts. 6) Please provide dimensions required to located bolts.</div>	Closed					
	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>						
	<div>ANSWER:</div>						
	<div>Accept Suggestion:</div>						
	<div>1) Align the bottom bolts with top bolts. 2) Acceptable. 3) Locate bolts per workable gauges provided for wide flange beams in AISC 360-05. Top and bottom bolts shall be aligned to each other. 4) Provide a 3" offset between the bolts and the centerline of the rubber bearing. 5) Provide a 3" offset between the bolts and the centerline of the rubber bearing. 6) Provide a 3" offset between the bolts and the centerline of the rubber bearing.</div>						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0934	SSS - Beam Connection Clarifications	Closed	11/22/2013	12/02/2013	12/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please refer sketches CD RFI 141 SK1 to SK7 for beam to beam connection clarifications required per items 1 to 4 below: 1) On S1-2505 between grids 1.4 & 2, the required (9) bolts per 1/S1-5010 will not fit in the W33 due to the size of the supporting BU beam. Confirm (8) bolts as shown are acceptable or supply an alternate solution. See SK1 & SK2. 2) On S1-2505 near grids 24.9/E, the required (9) bolts per 1/S1-5010 will not fit in the W33 due to the size of the supporting BU beam. Confirm (8) bolts as shown are acceptable or supply an alternate solution. See SK3 & SK4. 3) On S1-2507 near grids 33.2/E, the required (10) bolts per 1/S1-5010 will not fit in the W36 due to the size of the supporting BU beam. Confirm (8) bolts as shown are acceptable or supply an alternate solution. See SK5 & SK6. 4) On S1-2403 at grids 8/D.8, the required (8) bolts per 1/S1-5010 will not fit in the W30 due to the size of the supporting BU beam. Confirm (7) bolts as shown are acceptable or supply an alternate solution. See SK7.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Acceptable. 2) Acceptable. 3) Acceptable. 4) Acceptable. One general comment that applies to all sketches included in this RFI is that where shallower beams are supported by deeper girders, coping the bottom flange of the shallow beam shall not exceed 1" from the end of the beam.	
<hr/>							
T-0935	BGP - Lower Concourse Typical Moment Frame Beam Dimensions	Closed	11/22/2013	12/02/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-2204 and S1-2205. Plan sheets S1-2204 and S1-2205 show 8 Moment Frame Beams (MFB) from GL 14 to GL 20.1 designated as typical. There are no section views of these beams which show the dimensions, as the other MFB have. Please provide both the Width and Depth of the typical MFB in the lower concourse level.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 11/22/2013 RESPONSE: Typical lower concourse moment frame beam details are in Sheet 1/S1-3600. Corresponding cross-section detail is in Detail 2 of the same sheet. Beam width and depth info are provided in the cross-section detail.	
<hr/>							
T-0936	SSS - HSS Hanger Connection Clarification	Closed	11/22/2013	12/02/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0938	BGP - One-Way Slab Shrinkage and Temperature (S&T) Bars at Columns	Closed	11/22/2013	12/02/2013	11/25/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jackson Tukuafu</div></div><div>To: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jackson Tukuafu</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please refer to drawing S1-3500				RESPONSE: RFI T-0938 BGP - One Way Slab Shrinkage and Temperature Bars			
In order to alleviate congestion in a condition where columns cross lower concourse support beams, please confirm that it is acceptable to eliminate the top and bottom shrinkage and temperature bars for the one-way slabs up to 12" from the face of support column.				George Metzger 11/25/2013		RESPONSE: Contractor's proposal to eliminate the one-way slab temperature & shrinkage bars adjacent to the moment frame beams (up to 12" from the face of the beam) is acceptable.	
T-0939	SSS - Connection Clarifications at Moment Beams	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	12/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Refer to CD RFI 132 SK1 to SK4 requiring clarification on the moment beam to beam connections per the following.				1) Acceptable. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. 4) Acceptable. 5) Confirmed. 6) Confirmed. 7) Acceptable. 8) It is acceptable to use a single plate with a slot, however, coping of the beam bottom flange is not allowed at this (or similar) location(s) since there is bottom flange bracing (see 6/S1-5015). It is acceptable to locally cope the beam web for the slotted continuity plate. 9) Confirmed. 10) It is acceptable to apply solutions provided in 1 through 9 at similar locations at Bus Deck Level along GLs 9.9, 10.1, 19.9 and 20.1 only. For all other locations submit a separate RFI for each case.			
1) At the location indicated on CD RFI 132 SK1, the continuity plate will foul the bolts if (8) are provided per 1/S15010. Please confirm it is acceptable to provide (6) bolts in the W30x99 as shown on CD RFI 132 SK2.							
2) Confirm the continuity plate detailed on CD RFI 132 SK2 is correct as shown with tf and bf per W24x68.							
3) Please confirm it is acceptable to provide one continuity plate with a slot 1/8" larger than the beam web and the 3 1/2" beam cope as indicated on CD RFI 132 SK2 to allow for a continuous CJP weld of the continuity plate.							
4) At the location indicated on CD RFI 132 SK1, the continuity plate will foul the bolts if (11) are provided per 1/S1-5010. Please confirm it is acceptable to provide (8) bolts in the W40x277 as shown on CD RFI 132 SK3.							
5) Confirm the continuity plate detailed on CD RFI 132 SK3 is correct as shown with tf and bf per W30x99.							
6) Please confirm it is acceptable to provide one continuity plate with a slot 1/8" larger than the beam web and the 3 1/2" beam cope as indicated on CD RFI 132 SK3 to allow for a continuous CJP weld of the continuity plate.							
7) At the location indicated on CD RFI 132 SK1, the continuity plate will foul the bolts if (9) are provided per							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1375 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>1/S15010. Please confirm it is acceptable to provide (8) bolts in the W33x118 as shown on CD RFI 132 SK4. 8) Please confirm it is acceptable to provide one continuity plate with a slot 1/8" larger than the beam web and the 3 ½" beam cope as indicated on CD RFI 132 SK4 to allow for a continuous CJP weld of the continuity plate. 9) Confirm the continuity plate detailed on CD RFI 132 SK4 is correct as shown with tf and bf per W30x99. 10) Confirm the response to items 1 to 9 may be typically applied at other similar conditions/locations or provide a typical solution for the condition where the required continuity plate extends into the double angle connection of a deeper beam.</div>						
T-0939.1	SSS - Connection Clarifications at Moment Beams	Closed	12/19/2013	12/29/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: At beam to beam moment connections as noted in RFI # T-0939 and other similar locations please confirm if the continuity plate is required when the nominal depth of the beam shown as dimension "X" is 3" or less as per CD RFI 132.1 SK1.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the continuity plate is required as shown on Detail 4G/S1-5010.		
T-0940	SSS - Shear Plate Dimension	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	11/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please confirm that the dimension indicated on CD RFI 130 SK1 at the Type 1 Drag Connection per detail 1/S1-5016 is to be taken from the Thornton Tomasetti Tekla Model.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No, the distance in question as shown on CD RFI 130 SK1 is to be determined based on the contract document Detail 1/S1-5016 (not based on the TEKLA model). The first row of bolt is to be 6 1/2' min (1 1/2" MIN+1" + 4") from the bottom of the connection pad as detailed. The contactor shall also note that the cast node work point was incorrectly shown on RFI 130 SK1. It shall be at the same elevation as the center of the beam.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1376 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0941	SSS - Beam Connection Details	Closed	11/25/2013	11/25/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1- 2604 near grids 16/E (near grid 25 sim.) at the Penthouse column base connections refer to sketches CD RFI 146A SK1 & SK2 for items 1a & 1b noted below. 1a) The noted beams connect to the supporting beam with double angles per S1-5010 but they will not be erectable due to the stiffeners per 11/S1-7630 (SK2). Confirm it is acceptable to use a pulled-out full depth shear plate per 4/S1-5013 at each end. 1b) Similar conditions occur on S1-2606 about grid 25. Confirm the solution in item 1a may be applied at other similar conditions.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1a) Confirmed. 1b) Solution in item 1a will be reviewed on a case by case basis. For other similar conditions submit a separate RFI for each case.	
<hr/>							
T-0941.1	SSS - PE403 & 404 Framing at Roof Level	Closed	03/24/2014	04/03/2014	04/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Confirm the post to beam connections are acceptable as detailed on SK2 for the 3 varying flange widths.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable at locations highlighted on SK1. We assume that for type 2 and type 3 connections the base plates are 1 1/4" thick and the HSS is CJP welded to the base plates similar to type 1 connection on SK2. All bolts shall be 7/8" diameter A325 bolts. Provide stiffener plates below HSS columns per 10/S1-7630.	
<hr/>							
T-0942	SSS - Shaw Alley Bridge Connections	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1- 2403 at the Shaw Alley Bridge refer to sketches CD RFI 104 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 6: 1) Confirm the horizontal long slots in detail 5/S1-5013 apply only at this connection.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. 4) Confirmed the weld is a PJP weld. Root opening and bevel angle at PJP are to be based on the weld	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0944	SSS - Beam Connection Clarification at Edge of Slab	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 60%;"> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Refer to CD RFI 169 SK1 and SK2 showing beam connections into slab openings near grid 11/C on S1-2403.</p> <p>1) The double angle connection required per S1-5010 will extend past the edge of slab as shown on CD RFI 169 SK2. Please confirm it is acceptable to replace these connections with shear plate connections per S1-5011 or provide an alternate solution.</p> <p>2) Confirm it is typically acceptable to replace the double angle connections with shear plate connections when the double angles extend past the edge of slab.</p> </div> <div style="width: 35%;"> <p>SUGGESTION:</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1) Confirmed. 2) Solution in item 1 will be reviewed on a case by case basis. For other similar conditions submit a separate RFI for each case. Note that for beams that are perpendicular to the slab edge (for example W21x44 beams that support the W12x14 beams on SK1), the distance between the beam end and slab edge should not exceed 1 1/2" typically.</p> </div> </div> <p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1379 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0945	SSS - Connection Clarification at Slab Edge	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	12/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Refer to S1-2403 near grid 9/E for slab edge support connections as indicated on CD RFI 170 SK1 and SK2. The backup kicker brace detailed on 9/S1-5000 will fit in condition # 1 as indicated, but it will not fit in conditions #2 and #3 due to the limited difference in beam depth.			1) For condition #2, provide back-up brace per 6/S1-5015 except: a) Use 1/2" plate, instead of 1 1/2" plate shown on 6/S1-5015. b) Weld size for double sided fillet weld is 5/16" instead of 3/4" shown in 6/S1-5015.				
Please confirm it is acceptable to omit the kicker braces at conditions #2 and #3 or provide an alternate detail for these conditions.			2) For condition #3 provide a back-up brace per SKS-0290 submitted with response to RFI T-0824 except: a) Provide a 1'-0" long WT 4x10.5 CJP welded to the bottom as shown on SKS-0290. b) Double sided 3/16" fillet weld between the WT stem and bottom flange of the W21 beam .				
T-0946	Dimension Clarification at Edge of Slab	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Refer to CD RFI 172 SK1 & SK2 regarding the following question along grid lines C & G on Level 2 at the edge of slab. The dimension indicated in CD RFI 172 SK1 is shown as 7" or 8" on S1-2402, S1-2403, and S1-2404 while detail 1/S15032 shows this as a 6" dimension.			Confirmed				
Please confirm the 7" and 8" dimensions currently modeled based on the plan drawings are to be used and the 6" dimension in detail 1/S1-5032 does not apply at specified locations.							
T-0947	SSS - Continuity Plate Foul at Column Web	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Refer to grids 11/D and 11/F on B/S1-4106 at Level 2 as indicated on CD RFI 173 SK 1 & SK2. The continuity plate required per 4/S1-5012 will foul the WT in the column web			At the two locations indicated in the RFI (GL 11/D and 11/F), it is acceptable to provide a single continuity plate placed between the WT and beam bottom				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1380 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0948	SSS - Connection Clarifications at Beams to Transfer Girder	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	12/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
T-0948.1	SSS - Connection Clarifications at Beams to Transfer	Closed	02/03/2014	02/13/2014	02/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
T-0949	SSS - Stair ST304 Framing and Connection Clarifications	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1381 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>For Stair ST304 refer to sketches CD RFI 179 SK to SK6 for items 1 to 6:</p> <p>1) The noted beam flange extends into the slab opening for ST304 by 1/2" as shown. Confirm this is acceptable or supply revised dimensions on 1/S1-7008 or A1-2863.</p> <p>2) This stair post is currently located 1 1/2" from the edge of slab. This does not agree with typical connection detail 1/S1-7600 which shows the stair post extending past the edge of slab 1/2" max. Please confirm this is the intent and supply a new connection detail for the post to the slab or supply revised dimensions for the stair post locations in detail 1/S1-7008 or the slab opening location on drawing A1-2863 to conform to detail 1/S1-7600.</p> <p>3) Similar to item 2 on SK3. Please clarify.</p> <p>4) The noted beam extends into the slab opening for ST304 by 2 1/2" as shown. Confirm this is acceptable or supply revised dimensions.</p> <p>5) Please supply a connection detail for the noted stair post as 1/S1-7600 does not apply and 10/S1-7600 will not work as the BU WT will only partially fit on the TR11 flange.</p> <p>6) Confirm detail 10/S1-7600 may be applied at the noted location to connect the stair post to the supporting beam.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1) Beam locations and slab opening have been changed in ASI 109 and Concrete IFB Addendum #1 drawings. Beam flange does not extend beyond slab edge.</p> <p>2) Edge of opening and stair post locations have changed. See updated ASI 109 drawings and SKS-0312 submitted with response to RFI T-0955.</p> <p>3) See response to 2).</p> <p>4) See response to 1).</p> <p>5) See response to 2).</p> <p>6) See response to 2). Detail 1/S1-7600 shall apply.</p>		
T-0950	<p>SSS - Stair & Elevator Connection Clarifications</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p>	Closed	11/25/2013	12/05/2013	12/09/2013	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>For typical stair & elevator connections refer to sketches CD RFI 180 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 5:</p> <p>1) Confirm this connection may be applied as shown on SK2B (item 2).</p> <p>2) Confirm connection as shown is acceptable. All not shown is per 2/S1-7600).</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1) Acceptable. See 2) for additional notes.</p> <p>2) It is acceptable to typically locate bolts as shown in SK2B. However, the centerline of the kicker angle should pass through the centerlines of the beam web and flange.</p> <p>3) Acceptable. The work point of the brace shall intersect the center of the L5 x 3x3/8.</p> <p>4) Confirmed.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1382 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>3) Confirm it is acceptable to substitute the L3x3 angle with L5x3 angle. The connection with the L3x3x3/8 angle is not possible as the brace angles will foul the horizontal legs as shown.</p> <p>4) Confirm the same dimensions may be used when detail 2D/S1-7600 occurs.</p> <p>5) Confirm this is the correct interpretation of the weld for the angles to the HSS beam.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1383 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>4) Please confirm only steel highlighted in yellow will require bent plate to support the permanent slab? See RFI 185 SK1.</div> <div>5). Please clarify if any slab support is required for the knock-out slab at the edge of the escalator pit as shown on detail 6/S17660, referenced from the escalator plan on 1/S1-7302? Should the knock-out slab be separated in some way from the curb/wall of the escalator pit? See RFI 185 SK1.</div>							
T-0951.1	SSS - Knock-Out Slab Clarification	Closed	03/10/2014	03/20/2014	03/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 325 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the edge plate per T-0951 (SK 232, CD 185) SKS-0315 terminates 1'-0 from Grid 'D' or supply the missing dimension. 2) Confirm the edge plate per T-0951 (SK 232, CD 185) SKS-0315 terminates 8" from Grid 'F' or supply the missing dimension.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The noted dimension shall be 8". 2) Confirmed.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0952	BGP - Use of historical concrete strength test results	Closed	11/27/2013	12/07/2013	12/05/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Further to discussion with Thornton Tomasetti field personnel.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
WOJV is asking for the remainder of the Mat slab pour, that the requirements per specification Section 31 55 00 1.4J may be deemed satisfied after 14 days to start removing the level D bracing based on historical data of the 284 concrete strength test results completed to date.					George Metzger 12/4/2013		
Please confirm if this would be acceptable					RESPONSE: The RFI does not stand as written. The historical mat slab break data is sufficient only to waive the specification requirement that the TJPA Representative review and approve strength test results prior to removal of bracing (Section 31 55 00 1.4J). It is permissible that Webcor-Obayashi review the 14 day results to determine early brace removal provided they establish and submit acceptance criteria. SEOR is awaiting documentation of the procedure and acceptance criteria, which may take the form of an RFI. Language for this RFI has already been discussed with WO and TCCO.		
T-0953	SSS - Pin & Pipe Connections at Bus Deck Level	Closed	12/02/2013	12/12/2013	12/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
On S1-2505 at grids 21 & 22 refer to sketches CD RFI 149 SK1 to SK5 for items 1 to 3:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) The plates for the pin connection per 5/S1-5017 foul the beam connections. See SK5 and confirm it is acceptable to modify the pin location as shown to avoid fouling the beam connections.					1) Do not modify the pin connection. Move the beams away the pin connection slightly to clear the pin connection.		
2) The pipe with connections per 5/S1-5017 at both ends will not be erectable without cutting the flanges on the beam stubs. Confirm it is acceptable to cut the bottom flanges as shown on SK5 or supply an alternate solution.					2) Do not cut the beam bottom flange. The erection issue can be resolved by field welding the bottom flange to beam web as noted in the detail.		
3) The pipe with connections per 5/S1-5017 at both ends will not be erectable without cutting the flanges on the beam stubs. Confirm it is acceptable to cut the bottom flanges as shown on SK5 or supply an alternate solution.					3) See response to item 2)		
T-0953.1	SSS - Pin & Pipe Connections at Bus Deck Level	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 149.1 SK1: The 9'-8 dimension will need to increase to 9'-11 3/4 in order to have sufficient access to insert tension control bolts for the beam connections. Confirm that is acceptable. Note that the BU beam will extend past the edge of slab.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is not acceptable to increase the 9'-8" dimension to 9'-11 3/4". Instead, change the 1'-3" dimension to 11". Please refer to the blue markup on the enclosed sketch CD RFI 149.1 SK1 submitted with this RFI.				
T-0954	SSS - Beam Connections at Skewed BU Girders	Closed	12/02/2013	12/12/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2506 @ line 26 at the skewed BU girder connections refer to sketches CD RFI 176 SK1 & SK2: 1) The double angle connection per S1-5010 for the noted (3) beams will foul the connection per detail 4/S1-5017 as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the noted (3) beams to the 2" plate in detail 4/S1-5017 using shear plates per S1-5011 or supply an alternate detail. 2) The double angle connection per S1-5010 for the noted beam will foul the vertical stiffener per detail 4/S1-5017. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the noted beam using a shear plate per S1-5011 or supply an alternate detail.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A single shear plate (Type 4) drag connection as shown in SKS-0313 shall be provided in lieu of the Type 2 (R) pin connections at the two locations (Total 4 connections) to resolve the issues highlighted in the RFI.				
T-0955	SSS - Stair Post HSS Interference	Closed	12/02/2013	12/12/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On detail 1/S1-7008 at grids 11/C at the Stair post refer to sketches CD RFI 175 SK1 & SK2. The HSS6x6 stair post fouls the BU column as shown. Please advise.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The HSS 6x6 stair post has been moved in ASI 109 drawings so that it does not foul the BU Column. Dimensions to locate HSS columns around Stair 304 have been noted on the attached sketch SKS-0312				
T-0955.1	SSS - Slab Opening Clarification	Closed	01/22/2014	02/01/2014	02/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-0955 (SK 224 CD 175) See attached CD RFI # 175.1 SK1 & SK2: The post locations have been revised with the revised locations provided in RFI T-0955 SKS-0312 (SK 224 CD 175). Confirm the slab opening as shown on A1-2863 (SK2) remains unchanged.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Drawing A1-2863, Revision No. 3, issued as part of TG07.2 Concrete Addendum #1 for revised slab opening dimensions.			
T-0955.2	SSS - HSS Stair Framing ST304	Closed	02/07/2014	02/17/2014	02/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: As per response to RFI T-955 dimensions were indicated on TT drawing SKS-0312 to locate the HSS posts and revised drawings were to be provided in ASI 109. Drawing S1-2303 was provided but no dimensions were indicated, drawing A1-2863 was not provided. The dimensions given to locate the HSS 6x6 post on SK1 conflict with the 6'6" dimension indicated from GL C to the center of the HSS 12x6. Please verify the dimensions to locate the HSS 6x6 indicated on SK1.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 6' - 6" dimension is from GL C to the edge of slab at the opening. The 2' - 3 3/8" dimension is from GL C to centerline of HSS 6x6 while the 4' - 8 3/4" dimension is from centerline of HSS 6x6 to centerline HSS 12x6. Refer to attached sketch SKS-0330 for reference.			



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1389 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0959	SSS - Column Continuity Plate Requirements	Closed	12/03/2013	12/13/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2603 at grid 11/D, refer to sketches CD RFI 189 SK1 to SK3 requesting clarification on the column continuity plate requirements per the following: 1) Detail 5/S1-4202 requires the continuity plate thickness be equal to or greater than the beam flange. Please confirm that the W40x593 beams (replaced with BU plates with 3 1/4" flanges) require 3 1/4" continuity plates per this detail. 2) Due to the continuity plate thickness and double weld preps, please verify the revised corner access hole sizes indicated on SK3 of 2 1/2" and 2 3/4" are acceptable. 3) Please confirm the proposed weld indicated on SK3 for the continuity plate is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Continuity plate per 5/S1-4202 is not required at the highlighted location. Provide 1/2" thick horizontal stiffeners plates at the top on each side of the column web. Provide a CJP weld to column flange and web. Provide a three sided double fillet weld "S" = 5/16" at the bottom horizontal stiffener plate as shown on 3/S1-5013. 2) Acceptable. 3) Confirmed.	
T-0960	SSS - Cast Node Weight and Center of Gravity	Closed	12/03/2013	12/03/2013	12/04/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Galoyan			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: As per drawing S-0007 Note SS-8 Skanska is preparing our erection procedures. In order to accurately incorporate the cast nodes into our calculations please provide the latest weight and center of gravity (in x, y, z) for each of the cast nodes.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> CCX response complete - see attached file.	
T-0961	SSS - Slab Opening Locations at Roof Park Level	Closed	12/04/2013	12/14/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Reference A1-2902 and A1-2903 and provide the slab opening locations for the following items: 1) Provide the missing dimension for the slab opening size as indicated on SK1. 2) Confirm the dimensions noted on SK2 located the west side of the two slab openings. 3) Supply the dimension to locate the north edge of slab			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI response as follows: 1. Refer to attached sketch SKA-2971 for requested dimension. 2. Confirmed 3. Refer to attached sketch SKA-2972 for	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1390 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0962	SSS - Slab Opening Locations at Ground Level From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Refer to A1-2862 and CD RFI 195 SK3 which indicate a slab opening which is not shown on S1-2302 and 3/S1-7004. Please review SK1 through SK3 attached and clarify the slab opening requirement at the location indicated.	Closed To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	12/04/2013	12/14/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Slab opening at ground level per A1-2862 has been added on S1-2302 and S1-7004 in the ASI 109 drawings.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0963	SSS - Edge of Slab Clarifications at Second Level	Closed	12/04/2013	12/14/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Reference CD RFI 196 SK1 to SK3 for edge of slab clarifications required at the second level near grid 11.E as follows: 1) The blue dimensions indicated on SK1 are per A1-2883. Please confirm these dimensions are to be used to locate the steel and edge plates on S1-2403. 2) The blue dimensions indicated on SK2 are per A1-2883. Please confirm these dimensions are to be used to locate the steel and edge plates on 2/S1-7302. 3) Please clarify the dimension discrepancy between A1-2883 and S1-7302 as indicated on SK2. 4) Please clarify the dimension discrepancy between A1-2883 and S1-7302 as indicated on SK2. 5) Confirm the built-up walls are 9" thick as indicated on CD RFI 196 SK2. 6) Confirm the green lines indicated on SK3 represent the edge of slab on S1-2403. 7) Confirm the purple lines indicated on SK3 represent the edge of slab on 2/S1-7302. 8) The adjustment indicated on SK3 and A1-2883 is not shown on S1-2403. Please confirm the dimensions indicated on A1-2883 are correct.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Edge of slab dimension shown on A1-2883 is correct. 4) Edge of slab dimension shown on A1-2883 is correct. 5) The thickness of the built-up wall is determined by the location of the beam relative to the step at these escalator pits. Consider detail 2/S1-7661 that applies at the W21x50 beams north of GL D.4 that are supported by a W36x150 beam on GL 11. The only exception to this detail at these pits is that the lower WT is not required as the lower slabs are supported by beams below. In detail 2/S1-7661 the wall thickness is equal to the distance between the slab step and beam web face. 6) Confirmed. 7) Confirmed. 8) Confirmed.				
T-0964	SSS - Elevator PE202 Dimension Clarifications	Closed	12/04/2013	12/14/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: For elevator PE202, refer to sketches CD RFI 198 SK1 to SK3 for the following items: 1) Confirm the noted dimension should read 4'-8 ½" to match A1-2862 as indicated on SK1 in order to have the elevator posts align with the edge of slab. 2) Confirm the noted dimension should read 8'- 2 ½" to match A1-2862. 3) Confirm the noted dimension should read 3'-7" to match A1-2862 to have the elevator posts align with the edge of slab. 4) Confirm the slab opening is per A1-2882 and the elevator posts align with the edge of slab.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. 4) Confirmed. 5) Confirmed. 6) Confirmed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1393 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0967	Procedure for the removal of the level D bracing	Closed	12/05/2013	12/15/2013	12/09/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Procedure for the removal of the level D bracing: Webcor-Obayashi will review the 14 day compressive strength reports issued by the independent test lab (ISI) for the applicable pour area. In the review WOJV is to ensure that the "lower-bound" concrete strength exceeds 3000psi at 14 days. "Lower-bound" will be understood as the mean minus one standard deviation. If the calculated lower-bound strength <3000 psi, the bracing removal would not continue until results are received satisfying the lower bound criteria. Further, If any single compressive strength test is < 2500 psi, the bracing removal would not continue until results are received satisfying the minimum strength criteria. Please confirm if this would be acceptable			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 12/6/2013 RESPONSE: Confirmed		
T-0968	SSS - Light Column Cast Node Weld Prep	Closed	12/06/2013	12/16/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Following discussions on the light column cast node weld prep, please confirm approval for use of joint B-U4a-GF in the flat position as a shop weld and that this joint is not prohibited under clause 2.18 - Prohibited Joints and Welds.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As per AWS D1.1, clause 2.17, flat position V-groove or U-groove welds are practicable.		
T-0969	SSS - Filler Metal Usage on Group IV Grade HPS70W Material	Closed	12/06/2013	12/16/2013	12/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Observation: Job specifications and Code AWS D1.1, Table 3.1, matching strength filler metal combinations for Group IV material, specifies for use an E91XTX for FCAW and F9XX for SAW process(s).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed under match the base material and filler metal is not acceptable. The AWS electrode specification A5.29 for FCAW doesn't change, so the electrode classification as noted by the D1-code committee (E9xxx) shall stay. The contractors supplier		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Concern: ASTM A709GR 70W material hardening during welding (alloying up) as each weld layer is deposited (in 2" to 4" material thickness). An increased hardness value is expected and the actual concern is that, in this instance, the E91XX specified will create an overmatching filler metal condition during the welding process.</p> <p>Review: The AWS D1.1 2008 edition in table 3.1 for ASTM A709 Grade HPS70W specified a minimum of 70 ksi Yield Point and 90-110 ksi Tensile Range. In comparison, the AWS D1.1 2010 edition, a revision was made on this same material and the Tensile Range was dropped to 85 ksi minimum and maximum to remain at 110 (85-110).</p> <p>Research: Currently for seismic application, the filler metal companies have seismic testing certificates for E81XX and F8XX electrodes. The Tensile test range for AWS D1.8 requirements is 80ksi minimum, but the manufacturers' test results consistently come in at 88 to 95 ksi, which would meet the 85-110 ksi range for the material. The two manufacturers contacted, ESAB and Lincoln, are willing to do seismic testing (test data) for the purpose of supplying AWS D1.8 seismic certificates to meet the E91XX requirements. However, when reviewing the current test data from the manufacturer, the test tensile range is 90-110 ksi, but the results are 97-110 ksi.</p> <p>Conclusion: TMF and their welding consultants believe that starting with a near Minimum Tension ksi (under match in classification/specification) that allows the use of E81TXX or F8XX electrodes with current seismic certificates would be best for the welding of the A709 HPS70W material due to the 2-4" thickness in this application.</p> <p>Please confirm this proposal is acceptable.</p>						
T-0970	SSS - Pretensioned Rods at Moment Columns	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1395 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>Please refer to drawing S1-5052 and S1-5050.</p> <p>Refer to attached sketches CD RFI 099 SK1 & SK2 for items noted below.</p> <p>3) To allow sufficient clearance to position a hydraulic tensioning device we require a dimension of 30"h instead of the 24"h indicated on 3/S1-5050, please confirm this is acceptable.</p> <p>5) Confirm Section C shows the 3" thick plate only.</p> <p>6) Confirm the 2 1/2" thick bearing plate is shaped as shown.</p> <p>7) Confirm the 2 1/2" thick plate is welded on 3 sides as shown. Supply the welding requirement for the 2 1/2" thick plate to the WT below if required.</p> <p>10) To allow sufficient clearance to position a hydraulic tensioning device we require a dimension of 30"h instead of the 24"h indicated on 3/S1-5050, please confirm this is acceptable.</p> <p>12) Provide the weld requirements for the 4" plate to the column web.</p> <p>13) Confirm it is acceptable to increase the 12"h dimension shown on 3/S1-5050 to 18"h to allow for the installation of the coupler below the built up TT only</p> <p>14) Confirm it is acceptable to provide 8x8x2"h plate washers to allow sufficient base for the hydraulic tension device.</p> <p>15) 1-3/4"h dia rods are required to be tensioned to 200kip at two locations. We are unable to find a tensioning system to achieve 200kip. The max capacity for a device used on 1-3/4"h rod is 172kip. We request to use 2-1/2"h dia rods at these two locations.</p> <p>Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>						<p>3.) Please consider the option of pre-tensioning from the bottom. This item may be discussed further in next structural issues conference call.</p> <p>5.) Confirmed.</p> <p>6.) Confirmed.</p> <p>7.) Confirmed. No welding required to WT, direct bearing. WT surface shall be milled as called out in the detail.</p> <p>10.) See our comment to RFI Question #3.</p> <p>12.) No welding required.</p> <p>13.) Confirmed. Note that the coupler should clear the base plate by a minimum of 1-1/2 inches.</p> <p>14.) It is acceptable to use larger washers at Contractor's option.</p> <p>15.) Use of 2-1/2" dia rods is acceptable at the Contractor's option, pretension shall be kept the same. Note that there are some steel rod vendors that can provide larger jacking force for 1-3/4 diameter rods. One example is Dywidag, which shows a jacking force of up to 330 kips in their catalogue for 1-3/4 diameter rods.</p>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0970.1	SSS - Pretensioned Rods at Moment Columns	Closed	01/16/2014	01/26/2014	01/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Following the response to RFI T-0970 and after further review of #3 & 10, we agree the rods can be pretensioned from the bottom. Candraft have run a sanity check at several locations to confirm there is adequate clearance for the tensioning device and will continue to do so as other locations are detailed. Any interference will be addressed in future RFIs. Please confirm it is acceptable to use a standard flat washer in lieu of the plate washer as the holes are not oversized and this will also allow for easier workability during the pretensioning operation from the bottom (see Dyson catalog cut attached). If this is acceptable the 24" dimension indicated from bottom continuity plate to top of built up T & TT (on 3/S1-5050) and the 6x6x2" plate washer under the top nut will not require to be changed (as per #3, 10 & 14 RFI T-0970). Please confirm this proposal is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable to use standard flat washer at the bottom of the pretension rod.		
T-0971	SSS - Column Side Plates Dimension Increase	Closed	12/09/2013	12/09/2013	12/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Arup Rich Coffin							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-2203 and S1-5050. On S1-2203 at grids 9/C refer to sketches CD RFI 161 SK1 & SK2 regarding anchor bolts at column side plates. For the column side plates per detail 4/S1-5050 and anchor bolts it is not possible to insert the nuts & plate washers for the anchor bolts with the 3'-0" side plate dimension. Confirm it is acceptable to increase the noted dimension to 3'-5" or supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The detail referred in the RFI (4/S1-5050) is for column W14X730-SP, which is constructed using a rolled W14X730 as a base and welding side plates on it. However, the decision was that the below grade steel columns will be constructed using plates (built-up shapes), they won't be rolled shapes. Equivalent built up shapes for all rolled shape column types shown on Lower Concourse Plans are provided in Detail 6/S1-5050. These equivalent built up shapes do not require the side plates shown in Detail 4/S1-5050.		
T-0972	SSS - Stair Post Base Detail at GL 11/D	Closed	12/09/2013	12/09/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				





Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0974	SSS - Pin Details in Drawing 1/S1-5017	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Arup		Rich Coffin					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
For Drag connections per detail 1/S1-5017 refer to sketches CD RFI 123 SK1 & SK2 for the following items noted:		TT's response (the original RFI does not use #2, the responses are in the same order as the original RFI):					
1) Confirm the size of the hole required thru the beam web, web stiffeners and shear plates is the diameter of pin +1/32". Confirm if any additional tolerance is allowed for hot dipped galvanized pins.		Tolerance shall be 1/32" per Specification 05 10 00, paragraph 3.2.B.2.					
3) Confirm flanges can be cut flush to the beam web. Note that the flanges need to be cut flush only to the web stiffeners for erection access purposes.		It is contractor's option to either cut the flange flush with beam web or flush with the web reinforcement plate for erection purpose.					
4) Confirm if a radius is required when cutting the flange flush to the beam. If required confirm a radius of 1-1/2" is acceptable.		Confirmed.					
5) On RFI T-0737 Skanska requested to provide a cotter pin to further secure the nuts from backing off. Please confirm it is acceptable to provide one nut with the cotter pin as detailed on SK2.		2 nuts shall be provided as detailed in the contract documents.					
6) Confirm the material grade for the pins and nuts is A668 Class M.		Confirmed.					
7) Confirm all pins and nuts are to be hot dipped galvanized.		Confirmed.					
T-0974.1	SSS - Nut Material Grade	Closed	03/05/2014	03/15/2014	03/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California Dis		Ryan Clayton					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The contract documents do not contain a specific material grade for the nuts for large diameter pin connections (6, 7 and 8" diameter pins). In SK RFI 169A (T-0974), our detailer asked for clarification on the material grade for these nuts. It was confirmed that A668 Cl. M would be acceptable. Given the function of these nuts are to hold the pin in place and not apply a clamping force to the assembly, we do not consider that these nuts need to be a high strength forged material. Please refer to AISC Table 15-8 which shows a thin cap plates for pins overs 10" in diameter which reinforces this position.							
Please confirm it is acceptable to use A572 Gr.50 plate to fabricate these nuts.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0975	SSS - Vertical Clearances at Tapered Girder Kicker Connections in S1-5015	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Arup			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing 4/S1-5015, S1-2602 Please refer to sketch CD RFI # 071 SK1 - SK3 for items 1 & 2: 1) As shown, 11-3/8" is the minimum vertical clearance required to provide the kicker brace connection per 4/S1-5015. Please confirm criteria as shown is acceptable. 2) Per item 1 on CD RFI 071 SK1, detail 4/S1-5015 cannot be applied in the noted case on SK3 and other similar cases when the vertical clearance is less than 11-3/8". Please confirm if bracing is required at these locations, if so supply a typical alternate detail.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Providing a 3' clear distance between the gusset plate shown on SK-1 may be reduced to 1", hence the minimum clearance (11 3/8") required to provide the kicker brace per 4/S1-5015 may be reduced further. 2) Brace is required. The vertical clearance shown on SK3 corresponding to the location shown on SK2 is not correctly determined. The tapered girder is much deeper (about 54" deep) at the brace location shown on SK2. Note that the tapered girder depth increases from 40" at the ends to 60" at the mid span per S1-4200.	
T-0976	SSS - Transfer Girder Kicker Connection Conflicts	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Arup			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing 5/S1-5015. For the Transfer Girder angle connections see sketches CD RFI 063 SK1 to SK4 for items 1, 2, 3 & 4 noted below. 1) The kicker angle fouls the vertical stiffener, this is typical at similar locations. We propose notching the leg of the fouling angle and using a two bolt connection in lieu of welding or provide a typical solution. 2) Due to welding access issues we propose to use a two bolt connection, typical at similar locations. Confirm this is acceptable. 3) The kicker fouls the stiffener and the kicker gusset is too close to the stiffener for welding access. Similar conditions occur at other locations on the Ground Level. Please provide a typical solution. 4) The kicker gusset fouls the stiffener plate. Similar conditions occur at other locations on the Ground Level. Confirm it is acceptable to use the stiffener as the kicker gusset and increase the gusset thickness at the other end to match or provide an alternative detail.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) It is acceptable to typically notch the leg of the fouling angle and provide (2)- 1 1/2" A490X bolts to connect the kicker angle to the bottom gusset plate at the location highlighted in the RFI on SK3 and at other similar locations. Provide a spacing of 3" between the bolts and a bolt edge distance of 2.5". The bolts shall be centered on the kicker angle legs. 2) Submittal shall address all access issues for field welding. It is acceptable to typically provide (2)- 1 1/2" A490X bolts to connect the kicker angle to the bottom gusset plate at the location highlighted in the RFI on SK3 and at similar locations where weld access is not possible. Bolt apacing and edge distance shall meet the requirements in AISC. The bolts shall be in line with the centroid of the kicker angles. 3) Shift the beam to the south so that the same solution in 4) could be applied. 4) Confirmed.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1400 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0977	SSS - Handling Holes at Basket Column Pins	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The clevis pins for basket columns detailed on S1-5133 do not provide means to safely handle the material during manufacturing, coating, and field assembly. To aid in these processes, please advise if it is acceptable to drill and tap 1-8 x 2" deep in the center of the pins at both ends.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please submit a detailed drawing(s) of your proposal to allow us to evaluate the question. The written description is not adequate for us to evaluate the question.		
T-0977.1	SSS - Handling Holes at Basket Column Pins	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	01/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The clevis pins for basket columns detailed on S1-5133 do not provide means to safely handle the material during manufacturing, coating, and field assembly. To aid in these processes, please advise if it is acceptable to drill and tap 1-8 x 2" deep in the center of the pins at both ends. As requested in the response to RFI T-0977, please see the sketch attached for the proposed handling holes.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed handling hole in pin is acceptable.		
T-0978	SSS - Clevis Pin Material at Roof and Bus Deck	Closed	12/09/2013	12/09/2013	04/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Reference drawing S-0007, General Note SS-2, which requires that all clevis pins meet ASTM A668 Class M. Oregon Iron Works is requesting approval to supply these pins from round bar AISI 4340 NQ&T (normalized, quenched, and tempered), produced to ASTM A434 grade BD. Please confirm if this is an acceptable material for clevis pins at the following locations: 1. Roof Level pins for type 71 and 72 castings shown on sheets S1-5131, S1-5132, S1-5133. 2. Bus Deck pins detailed on S1-5017 Detail 1 for Type 2M connections.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI has been withdrawn by Skanska		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1401 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0979	SSS - Curved Connection Detail at Light Column	Closed	12/09/2013	12/09/2013	12/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPGregory KemererTo: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2305 at grids 23/E, refer to sketch CD RFI 103 SK1 and supply a detail showing how to splice the curved W27x84 beams.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The curve beams are to be connected together with a single shear plate connection (see 1/S1-5011).		
T-0979.1	SSS - Curved Connection Detail at Light Column	Closed	01/17/2014	01/27/2014	02/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie AzzolinoTo: Turner Construction CompanyPhil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The response to WOJV RFI T-0979 indicated that the curved W27x84 beams shown on S1-2305 at grid 23/E are to be connected together with a single shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011. The referenced detail shows a beam to beam "T" connection, rather than two rolled shapes butting up to each other. Please clarify how the connection shown on 1/S1-5011 is to be applied to curved beam connections.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Use a 3/8" single shear plate with 2 rows of 7/8" dia A325N bolts (14 total), connecting 2-W27 at web.		
T-0980	SSS - BU Girders Connection Clarifications at Ground Level	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPRobert KjomeTo: Turner Construction CompanyGary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The W40x503 beams along grids C & G on the Ground Level have been substituted with BU beams per RFI # T-0704.1. This changes the flange copes in details 3 & 7/S1-4350. Please refer to attached CD RFI 162 SK1 & SK2 for the following items: 1) Please confirm it is acceptable to extend the web plate above the BU beam and cut the top flange plate flush to the web plate as shown. Confirm the CJP weld indicated is acceptable to weld the top flange to the web plate. The web to flange fillet welds per RFI T-0704.1 will be applied beyond the shown CJP welds. 2) Confirm it is acceptable to stop the bottom flange plate of the BU WT short as shown, extend the web plate of the			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. Weld joint detail will be reviewed during shop drawings stage after the weld procedure has been submitted and approved. 2) Confirmed. Weld joint detail will be reviewed during shop drawings stage after the weld procedure has been submitted and approved. 3) Confirmed. 4) Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1402 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>BU WT to the web plate of the BU beam and weld as shown. The web to flange fillet welds per RFI # T- 0704.1 will be applied beyond the shown CJP welds.</p> <p>3) Confirm it is acceptable to have a continuous 4" vertical bolt spacing in lieu of the pattern interruption as shown in detail 3/S1-4350 to avoid cutting the bottom flange of the BU beam. This may mean that the holes for the 1 1/2" dia. bolts near the WT to BU beam web weld will have to be drilled after the weld is made.</p> <p>4) Confirm it is acceptable to have a continuous 4" vertical bolt spacing in lieu of the pattern interruption as shown in detail 7/S1-4350 to avoid the bolts fouling the web to flange fillet welds. This may mean that the holes for the 1 1/2" dia. bolts near the WT to BU beam web weld will have to be drilled after the weld is made.</p>						
T-0981	SSS - Cast Node Erection and Fabrication Work Points	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>It is requested that work points be added to the Cast Connex machine drawings and Bradken Cast Nodes as outlined on the marked up Cast Node drawings attached. These external "physical" work points will be used to reestablish the "non-physical" internal work points set during the pre-machining of Cast Nodes at Bradken. These external work points will be used to aid the following construction activities:</p> <p>1) Shop fabrication of shear plates and pipe columns</p> <p>2) Shop trial assembly and QC dimensional inspections</p> <p>3) Field assembly and final QC dimensional inspections</p> <p>Please confirm each work point will be precision punch marked and highlighted with paint marker for easy identification.</p>				<p>Webcor needs to liaise with Bradken to determine if they are willing and able to punch these marks on the castings, and what (if any) the cost and schedule impact would be. If Bradken can complete the work, then Cast Connex is willing and able to update the machining drawings (at Skanska's cost). The cost for Bradken's additional work will have to be taken care of between Skanska and Bradken and not the TJPA.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1403 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0982	SSS - Elevator Rail Support Connection Clarifications	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	01/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please refer to Elevator Rail Support drawings S1-7130 through S1-7139 and provide clarification on the following: 1) At locations where the HSS members span two equally sized support beams, please confirm connection detail 1/S1-7630 typically applies and the HSS member is to be located direction under the beams. Refer to SK1, SK2, SK5, SK6, and SK7 for reference. 2) At locations where the lower HSS member spans two unequally sized beams, it is assumed that the HSS member will connect to the shallower beam per detail 1/S1-7630. Please confirm and provide a typical connection detail for the HSS member to the deeper beam. Reference SK1, SK2, SK5, SK6 for reference. 3) Confirm the HSS beams indicated on SK1, SK2, and SK7 are located flush with the top of slab per 1/S1-7630. 4) Confirm the plates indicated on SK3 & SK4 may be cut as shown on details 1&4/S1-7630 to achieve an effective weld along the full length. 5) Provide a connection detail for the HSS 12x6 to the W21, W24, and W36 beams at the locations indicated on SK7. 6) Provide the elevation of the lower HSS 12x6 indicated on SK RFI 239 SK2 and the connection details required at each end. 7) Confirm the elevation of the W21s indicated on SK5. 8) Provide a connection detail for upper and lower HSS12x6 to HSS12x6 at locations with no floor slab on SK5. 9) Provide a connection detail for upper and lower HSS12x6 to W16 at locations with no floor slab on SK5. 10) Provide a connection detail for HSS12x6 at the W21 indicated on SK5 where there is no edge plate as shown on detail 1//S1-7130.					See attached comments on RFI sketches, RFI_T_0982 sketches w comment.pdf 1. See TT comments on RFI sketches. 2. When HSS is to connected to bottom of W beam use detail 1/S1-7630. At the end where HSS is framed into the web of a beam, provide a double angle connection with 3- 1" dia A325 bolts (with pipe spacer inside the HSS). Alternatively, a welded connection similar to 1/S1-7630 may be used. 3. See TT comments on RFI sketches. 4. Confirmed. 5. See TT comments on RFI sketches. 6. See TT comments on RFI sketches. 7. See TT comments on RFI sketches. 8. See TT comments on RFI sketches. 9. See TT comment on RFI sketches. 10. See TT comment on RFI sketches		
T-0983	SSS - ST201 and PE201 Anchor Bolt Clarifications	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Refer to CD RFI 203 SK1 to SK3 requesting clarification on Stair ST201 and Elevator PE201 per the following:					1) Acceptable. 2) Confirmed. 3) See 4/S1-7605 and attached sketch SKS-0322 for		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0985	<p>column cap/base plate. See CD RFI 204 SK1 to SK3. 2) If a shear plate connection is acceptable at these locations, please verify plate thickness & welding per 2/S15011. See CD RFI 204 SK1 to SK3. 3) The numbers of bolts in a single row per the schedule on 2/S1-5011 cannot be provided if bolt spacing and edge distance are to be maintained due to the difference in elevation between the Transfer girder and W33 beam. Please verify if it is acceptable to provide a double row with a total of 12 - 1" A325N bolts. See CD RFI 204 SK1 to SK3. 4) On S1-2303 there is bracing shown at the end of the W33 beams to the Transfer Girder. These brace members cannot be provided as the bottom of the W33 beam and the bottom of the Transfer Girder flange nearly line up, there will be nothing to connect the braces to. Please verify that the braces shown per plan are not required at these locations. See CD RFI 204 SK1 & SK2.</p> <p>SSS - Elevator Connection Clarifications</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Refer to detail 6/S1-7630 and advise how the vertical posts are intended to attach to the double horizontal HSS10x10 as no bolts or welds are indicated.</p>	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The vertical HSS is welded to the L3x3x1/2 with a three sided 5/16 fillet weld at the vertical leg of the L3x3x1/2. Provide the same three sided weld between the other leg of the L3x3x1/2 and horizontal HSS. Note that there are two L3x3x1/2 per vertical post as noted in detail 6/S1-7630.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-0986	SSS - Connection Clarifications at Bus Deck Level	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: At a sample location on S1-2503 near grid 10.1/C, refer to CD RFI 197 SK1 & SK2 requesting clarification on the following: 1) The double angle connection per S1-5010 for the W12x40's fouls the connection from the W30x99 to the column. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W12x40's to the W30x99 with shear plate connections per S1- 5011. 2) This condition occurs at grids C/9.9, G9.9, G/10.1, C/19.9, C/20.1, G/19.9, and G/20.1. Please confirm the solution for item 1 may be applied at these locations.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.		
T-0987	SSS - Elevator PE202 Dimension and Connection Clarifications	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	01/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Refer to CD RFI 199 SK1 requesting clarifications for dimensions and connections at Elevator PE202 as follows: 1) Detail 8/S1-5004 shows the edge of slab is to be 1'-0" from the toe of the WF beam, but based on the dimensions shown on S1-2502, the 1'-0" requirement is met only on the west side of the elevator opening. The north, south, and east sides do not meet the 1'-0" requirement. Confirm the dimensions to locate the elevator opening WF perimeter beams are correct as indicated on S1-2502. 2) Please supply the missing dimensions to locate the HSS 12x6x1/2 on four (4) sides of the elevator opening. 3) Please clarify how the HSS12x6x1/2 perimeter members are supported and connected to each other at the corners. 4) Confirm edge plate per 8/S1-5000 is required on 4 sides of the elevator opening as none are indicated on detail 8/S1-5004.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Please refer to the attached A1-2892 2014JAN06 for the dimension of the raised elevator cap and EOS 2). See the green markups on the sketch submitted with RFI T-0987 3). The HSS 12 x 6 shall be supported by W16 at the south and W27 at the north. The TOS for the HSS 12 x 6 shall be at 1-1/4" below the TOP of the W27. Use double angle bolted connection (L 4x4x3/8" with 3-1" dia A325 bolts, which pipe sleeve inside the HSS to allow for pretension). Similar double angle connections may be used to connect the HSS at the corner, except one side of the double angle shall be welded to the face of the HSS with 5/16" fillet weld with 5/8" return. 4). Confirmed		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1407 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0987.1	SSS - Elevator PE202 Dimension and Connection Clarifications	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	07/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 199.1 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 4: 1) The noted dimension per S1-2502 places the beam inside the slab opening. Please provide the location of the beam to suit the slab opening per A1-2892 (SK1). 2) Confirm dimensions per T-0987 are still correct with revised opening location/size on A1-2892 or supply new dimensions. 3) Confirm dimensions per T-0987 are still correct with revised opening location/size on A1-2892 or supply new dimensions. 4) Confirm the connection details as shown are correct at the noted locations.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The noted dimension shall be 6'. 2) See attached sketch SKS-0375 for correct dimensions. 3) See attached sketch SKS-0375 for correct dimensions. 4) Confirmed.			
T-0987.2	SSS - Framing at top of Elevator PE202	Closed	03/09/2015	03/18/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-7205 Location: PE 202 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 199.2 SK1 Information Requested: This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-0987 (SK 250, CD 199) item 3 See attached CD RFI 199.2 SK1: The Snapshot on SK1 reflects the current model per the noted RFI response. Per Otis request for an elevation of 56'-8 3/4 there is no steel to frame to therefore please give the final framing information for the top of PE202 in response to this request. NOTE: The steel is sequence WS6 has been issued to the fabricator for fabrication.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> To provide minimum 1' -7" space between the roof slab and the machine support beams: 1) Shift the elevator roof slab up by 5" from its current elevation, 2) Reduce slab thickness to 9", and 3) Shift the T/steel of the machine beams downwards by 2" to 54' - 11 3/4". Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with the reason for request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as change to be issued in future bulletin.			
T-0988	SSS - W21 Full Depth Connection at Transfer Girder	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>On S1-2303 there is a W21x50 beam just south of grid D that connects to the Transfer Girder along grid line 10.1. There is a similar W21x50 along 10.1 north of grid F that is shown with a full depth shear connection to the Transfer Girder.</p> <p>Please advise if the W21x50 near grid D should also be a full depth shear plate connection. See CD RFI 207 SK1.</p>						
T-0988.1	SSS - W21 to Transfer Girder Connection	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	Per the response to Webcor RFI # T-0988 (SK RFI # 258), on S1-2303 the double angle beam connection near grids 10.1/D will foul stiffener plates at the Transfer girders, same as near grid 10.1/F. On sketch CD RFI 207.1 SK1 shows the stiffener plates at this location on line 10.1 north of grid line D. Please verify a shear plate can be used as request ed or provide an alternate connection.		Confirmed that a shear plate can be used as requested.				
T-0989	SSS - Beam to Column Connection at Bus Deck	Closed	12/09/2013	12/19/2013	12/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	1) On S1-2503 at grids 11/C "H < D" indicating that detail 5/S1-5011 would apply. Based on the "H" and "D" dimension indicated on SK2, please verify detail 4/S1-5011 can be used at this condition as noted on sketches CD RFI 208 SK1 & SK2. 2) Based on a review of the project conditions, please verify that detail 5/S1-5011 will only be applied at grids 20.1/C, 20.1/G, 21/C, 21/G, 22/C & 22/G at the Bus deck level per note # 3 on 4/S1-5011.		1) Acceptable. 2) Detail 5/S1-5011 applies not only at 20.1/C, 20.1/G, 21/C, 21/G, 22/C & 22/G but at other locations as well. For example, it is applicable at 3/D.4, 3/E.6, 4/D, 4/F, 16/C, 16/G, 32.4/C, 32.4/G. Note that the bottom continuity plate shown in detail 5/S1-5011 corresponds to the shallower of the MF beams at the MF column. For example at GL 3/D.4 H=30" corresponding to the BU 30 MF beam and D = 32.9 resulting in H				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1410 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>dowel that should have been a shorter bar (L) but was installed as a longer bar (H) and casted in the mat foundation concrete. This does not allow for the stagger pattern as required. See the attached sketch SK-RFI-114 for more details. Gerdau proposes to leave the bar as-is.</div> <div>Please confirm if this is acceptable.</div>							
T-0993	SSS - Deck Support at Columns	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California Dis Ryan Clayton		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Detail 9/S1-5000 provides a typical detail for slab edge supports. However, no detail is provided for slab edge support at columns. On S1-2403 @ sample grid locations 10.1/C & 10.1/D for slab edge supports, refer to sketches CD RFI 219 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the connections for the angles to the column flange are acceptable as shown or supply a new detail. Note all not shown is per 9/S1-5000 & RFI T-0901. 2) Confirm the connections for the angles to the column web are acceptable as shown or supply a new detail. Note all not shown is per 9/S1-5000 & RFI T-0901.				1) Detail @Grid C (SK-2) shall be similar to SK-3, with the outrigger angle at the edge of the slab, not at the flange of the column. 2) Confirmed.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-0994	SSS - Lateral Bracing Clarifications at Ground Level	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
At the Lateral brace detail 3/S1-3503 refer to sketch CD RFI 213 SK1 for items 1 to 3:				1) Confirmed			
1) Since detail 3/S1-3503 does not occur along grid 'C' and does at grid 'G', confirm the correct detail reference should read 1/S1-5022.				2) Confirmed			
2) Referenced detail 8/S1-5015 does not show a full depth stiffener at the brace to beam connection. Confirm it is acceptable to proceed with the connection as shown in 8/S1-5015 & RFI T-0919. If not, supply the thickness and width of the full depth stiffener including welding for the stiffener.				3) Confirmed			
3) Confirm the gusset dimensions as shown are acceptable.							
T-0995	SSS - Concrete Beam to Drag Beam Detail	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
1) Per details 1 & 4/S1-5022 shown on sketch CD RFI 214 SK1, please confirm the noted 1" stiffeners on detail 4/S1-5022 are also required in detail 1/S1-5022 along grid 'G'.				The note calls for 1" stiffener plates in Section 4/S1-5022 should be deleted. No stiffener is required for both Section 1 and 4/S1-5022.			
2) Please provide the weld for the 1" stiffeners indicated on detail 4/S1-5022.							
T-0996	SSS - Beam to Beam Connection Clarification	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
On S1-2403 at grids 11/C refer to sketches CD RFI 156 SK1 & SK2.				The W12x14 beam has been moved as shown in ASI 109 drawings so that the double angle connection of the W12x14 does not conflict with the shear plate connection of the W30x99.			
After applying the double angle connection per S1-5010 for the W12x14 to the W30x99, there is insufficient room to connect the W30x99 to the column flange per 8/S1-5012.							
Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W12x14 to the W30x99 using a shear plate per S1-5011 or supply an							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1412 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
alternate solution at this location.							
T-0997	SSS - Steel Framing Clarification	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2604 near grids 16/D refer to sketches CD RFI 158 SK1 & SK2 and confirm the (3) W16x26 beams are not required and may be deleted as the edge of slab is located only 1'-3" east of grid 16 per A1-2904 as shown on SK2.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The three highlighted W16 beams have been removed in ASI 109 drawings.			
T-0998	SSS - Thread Diamter at Pretensioned Rod Detail	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Arup Rich Coffin							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-5052. On 3/S1-5052 @ the Pretensioned Rod detail refer to sketches CD RFI 229 SK1 & SK2. The actual major thread diameters of the pre-tensioned rods in detail 3/S1-5052 do not equal the nominal diameters shown. See the actual diameters on SK2 and confirm the holes in all elements that the anchor rods pass thru as shown in details 2 & 6/S1-5052 will be 1/16" over the major thread diameter. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the elements that the rods pass through, the proposed hole diameter of rod diameter + 1/16" is acceptable in concept. Contractor to verify the actual hole size for allowing the rod to stretch during pre-tensioning. We cannot comment on the Dyson bars included in this RFI as it has not formally submitted for approval. Note that we cannot locate RFI SK 086 (CD RFI #053) which is referred from this RFI. In future, include all referred information within the RFI.			



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-0999	SSS - Stair Detail Reference Clarification	Closed	12/10/2013	12/10/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On detail 3/S1-7008 refer to sketch CD RFI 164 SK1 and review the noted detail reference does not appear to be the correct detail at the noted location. Should this read 6/S1-7601 and not 3/S1-7601? Please clarify.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 3/S1-7601 shall apply as called out on 3/S1-7008. Detail 3/S1-7601 has been updated in ASI 109 drawings to reflect the condition at that location.		
T-1000	SSS - Machine Lower Nozzles Perpendicular to Pipe	Closed	12/10/2013	12/10/2013	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author: Arup Rich Coffin							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-5111 thru S1-5133. In recent meetings, Webcor/Obayashi has made it clear that the same Bus Deck Cast Node geometry will be used at multiple locations even though the angle of the lower Basket Columns changes at each Node. This adds a level of complexity and cost to the joint between the Cast Node and Basket Column Pipe due to the kink imposed on that joint as a result of the following: - The Lower Pipe Columns will be required to be "miter cut" instead of a traditional square cut end. (Please note Spec Section OS 10 00, paragraph 3.2.M.1 states "Bearing ends of columns shall be milled or sawn square perpendicular to axis of the column.") - Miter cut Pipe will have an ellipse cross section and will not match the circular Casting Node. - Backing bars used to full pen weld the Pipe Column to the Cast Node would need to be custom machined to match the ellipse Pipe and circular Node to eliminate weld gaps. This significantly increases the complexity and risk for successfully welding the joint, and reduces the adjustability for fit up of these joints in the shop and the field. This kink can be accommodated either by machining the nozzle of the Cast Node to be perpendicular to the pipe, or by machining the pipe end at a mitered angle to match the Cast Node. Since this joint on the Cast Node is already being machined, Skanska/OIW believes that the more desirable			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The contract drawings at bid time clearly showed that the centerline of the pipe is not in line with the centerline of the cast node nozzle, that the same cast node is to be used at multiple locations, and that the cast nodes were not miter cut to be perpendicular to the incoming pipe. The reference to Spec section 05 10 00 noted in this RFI regarding bearing ends does not apply for this condition as the pipe to cast node connections are not \angle bearing \angle connections, they are a fully welded connections as shown on the contract documents. This \angle kink \angle between the topside of the ground floor basket column and the bottom-side of the bus deck cast node \angle resulting from the building's geometry and the use of the same cast node type in multiple locations \angle can be accommodated by either miter cutting the pipe or the cast node. However, the contract documents, including those available during bid, clearly show that the bus deck cast nodes were not going to be miter cut, and so miter cutting of the basket column pipe members by the Steel Contractor is necessary to accommodate the building's geometry. The specified miter angle does not exceed 1.5-degrees in any location. Miter cutting a 32-inch diameter steel pipe by 1.5 degrees results in an elliptical cross-section having a major diameter of $32 / \cos (1.5^\circ) = 32.011$ -inches and a minor diameter of 32-inches. This results in a minimal mismatch in cross-sectional dimension / shape between the		

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>and less expensive option is to machine the nozzle of the Cast Node perpendicular to the axis of the Basket Column Pipe . As the nozzles will each be custom machined regardless, machining them to match the pipe axis should be a relatively low cost change .</p> <p>Skanska/OIW requests that the lower nozzle of each Bus Deck Cast Nodes to be machined perpendicular to the axis of the adjoining lower Basket Column Pipe. A negative response will result in a cost increase and a time increase.</p>						
						<p>outside and inside faces of a mitred pipe member and the cast node. Based on this geometry, a two-inch wide backer bar sized properly would only show a gap of about 2/100ths of an inch, nominally. A split-ring backer bar could also be employed, which would provide some additional adjustability for this joint in the field.</p> <p>There is no objection structurally or architecturally for the miter machining of either the nozzle of the bus deck cast node to be perpendicular to the pipe, or miter machining the pipe end at an angle to match the Cast Node. However, if Skanska seeks this additional miter machining of the bus deck lower nozzles on the Cast Nodes, all related costs and schedule will be the responsibility of Skanska. Skanska would need to provide the requested miter angle for each Cast Node for incorporation into the casting machining drawings. Additional costs including drawing time would need to be paid for by Skanska.</p> <p>Skanska will be responsible for all costs associated with the miter machining of either the nozzle of the Cast Node or the pipe to be perpendicular or coplanar. If Skanska opts to have the lower nozzle ends of the bus deck nodes mitered, Skanska will need to coordinate with the CM/GC to make an agreement with Bradken for this change to Bradken's scope of machining work for the bus deck cast nodes. Skanska will also be responsible to absorb any schedule impact without delaying the overall project schedule. NOTE: If miter cutting the bus deck cast node nozzle is selected, machining would need to be performed by a third party as Bradken does not have this capability. Be aware that those costs for machining, trucking, and for handling the cast nodes would be Skanska's. Custom miter cutting each nozzle end would also require additional geometric inspection of the cast nodes, the cost for which would be borne by Skanska.</p>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1001	SSS - Shear Plate Weld Connection Clarification	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2603 at grids 11/D for the W40 beam connections into the column web call for details 3/S1-5011 with 3 & 4/S15013 to be used. On sketches CD RFI 218 SK1 & SK2 please verify the large 2 3/8" single sided PJP weld for the 2 1/2" thick shear plate required at this location.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per Detail 3/S1-5013, the two shear plates highlighted on SK2 in the RFI shall be welded with a 3 sided PJP weld with 1 1/8" effective weld.		
<hr/>							
T-1002	SSS - Web to Flange Welds at EBF Girders	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Arup Rich Coffin							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-4205. Please see Plan Sheet S1-4205 Detail 1 for typical details at EBF Link Beams. The typical arrangement specifies a transition from CJP weld to fillet welds and incorporates a weld access hole to separate the 2 welds. In an effort to reduce the number of weld access holes and the inherent issues that can arise with them, Oregon Iron Works is proposing to extend the CJP welds to the end of the girders thus removing the weld access holes at the weld transition point. Please see attached OIW sketch 2770-SK-TH02 representing a typical EBF Blank Beam Fabrication. It is Skanska/OIW's intent to extend the UT testing 1'-0" beyond the specified CJP weld zone. The balance of the weld will be MT/VT tested as required by Contract Documents. Please confirm that the proposed welding and NDE is acceptable for all EBF link Beams at the roof perimeter. There is no cost or time impact with this change.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the proposed welding and NDE is acceptable for all EBF link beams at the roof perimeter. Also, please note the special CVN requirements for the weld materials for this EBF link beam CJP weld noted in Specification 05 12 10, paragraph 2.1.C.2.		
<hr/>							
T-1003	SSS - Connection Clarification at Sloping Moment Beams	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Arup Rich Coffin							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1416 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: At a sample location on S1-2503 at grids 9/F refer to sketches CD RFI 150 SK1 & SK2 as noted below. As the sloping BU beam rises 1/2" above the opposite BU beam, the thickness of the top continuity plate will be increased to 3-1/4". Confirm this is the design intent and should be applied typically at similar conditions.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					For the conditions described in the RFI, continuity plate thickness shall be per construction drawings (no need to increase thickness). At the condition described in the RFI (1/2" difference between the top of flange elevations), line the continuity plate up with the non-sloping MF beam. At Bus Deck Level joints at GL 2/D.4, 2/E.6, 3/D.4 and 3/D.6, the difference in elevation of MF beams on each side of the column is 2". At these joints, slope the continuity plate between the top flanges of the two beams (no need to increase thickness).		
T-1004	SSS - Pins at Roof Clevises and Perimeter Bus Deck	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: Please refer to the the following: S1-5017, S1-5131, S1-5132, S1-5133, 05 10 00 - 2.3.J & 3.2.B.2. Paragraph 3.2.B.2 specifies the holes for the pins shall be no more than 1/32" over the diameter of the pin. Paragraph 2.3.J specifies the pins to be Hot Dip Galvanized (HDG). This combination will lead to interference at assembly due to the following factors: 1) Tolerance in bored hole diameter of 0.010 (+0/-0.010) 2) Tolerance of Pin diameter of 0.010 (+/-0.005) 3) Tolerance of galvanize thickness at pin of 0.012 (+/-0.006/side x 2) 4) Tolerance in thickness of primer at pin holes of 0.002 (+/-0.001/side x 2) The stack-up of tolerances is 0.034" which is greater than the specified 1/32" maximum clearance. Skanska/Oregon Iron Works is requesting approval to supply the pins and bored holes to the following nominal values and within the tolerance identified above. These values are measured after machining and prior to coating. 1. 7" diameter pins: a. Pin diameter = 6.906" (bored holes -1/8") b. Bored holes = 7.032" 2. 8" diameter pins:	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Per Specification 05 10 00, the pin is to be measured by a ring gage after galvanizing. The 1/32" tolerance is for pin after galvanizing. We don't feel a chrome coating is equal to the specified galvanized coating. Chrome coatings do not have the construction industry track record that galvanizing has. Skanska has not provided a substitution request with technical data showing a chrome coating has the same performance as galvanizing.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<div>a. Pin diameter = 7.906 (bored holes -1/8") b. Bored holes = 8.032" Note that zinc coating is not a hardened material, and the coating on the pins will be prone to galling while attempting to install in a horizontal position. Skanska/OIW suggests investigating alternate pin coatings; for example, a hardened chrome coating has tightly controlled thickness tolerance and will not gall.</div>						
T-1004.1	SSS - Pin Diameter	Closed	01/29/2014	02/08/2014	02/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: We have identified a fit-up issue with the basket column pin connections at roof node and Type 2M drag connections. Spec section 05 10 00-13 3.2B states that the diameter of the pin hole shall not be more than 0.03125" greater than the diameter of the pin. The response to SK RFI 293 (T-1004) clarifies that the 0.03125" erection tolerance is for the pin after galvanizing. Therefore, to make this pin connection work, the pin must be machined below the 8" nominal dimension stated in the contract drawings (Ref S1-5133). We have determined the maximum allowable pin diameter as follows; Data: Min Bored Hole Diameter: 8.0313 - 0.01 = 8.0213"..... Source: Ref 1 Max Roof Node Bored Holes Concentric Offset: 0.0156"..... Source: Ref 2 Max Galvanizing Thickness: 0.010" (each side)..... Source: Ref 3 Erection Tolerance: 0.03125".....Source: Ref 4		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to machine the pin to 7.953" (+0, - 0.01"), i.e., 0.047" less than the nominal diameter of the pin diameter specified, however, the specified 1/32" tolerance for the pin hole shall not be exceeded.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1418 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Maximum Allowable Pin Diameter: X (pin must be machined and so we have applied a reasonable industry standard machining tolerance of +0,-0.010")</p> <p>Calc (inches): (8.0213-0.0156) - (X+2(0.01)) = 0.03125 X = 7.953" (+0,-0.010") Data used above is for 8" diameter pin. Similar for 7" pin (i.e 6.953"). Please confirm it is acceptable to machine the pins to the diameters specified above.</p> <p>References; 1 - CN-0126 and CN-0127 2 - CN-0126 and CN-0127 3 - The maximum galvanizing thickness was provided by the galvanizing shop that will be coating these pins. Based on their experience they estimate a minimum of 0.008" and a maximum of 0.02" on the diameter of the pin. 4 - Section 05 10 00-13</p> <p>Please also note that A153 1.2 states that this specification is intended to be applicable to hardware items that are centrifuged or otherwise handled to remove excess galvanizing bath metal. This is not practical with an 8" diameter pin and should be taken into consideration.</p>						
T-1005	SSS - Relocate Beam to Suit Double Angle Connection	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
On S1-2303 near grids 10.1/F refer to sketch CD RFI 151 SK1 and confirm it is acceptable to relocate the W16x26 per dimensions shown to align the beam with the W21x50 as the double angle connection per S1-5010 will not work with the offset if the EQ/EQ dimensions are maintained as the bolts will foul the beam web on the opposite side. If			Confirmed				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1419 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
not, supply an alternate solution.							
T-1006	SSS - Re-Align Beam for Double Angle Connection	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/31/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-2603. On S1-2603 near grids 9/F refer to sketch CD RFI 153 SK1 and confirm it is acceptable to align the noted W30x108 with the W30x90 on the south side of PE302. This will give us an off-set of 6 3/4" on the east end between the W30x108 & W24x76, which will allow a double angle connection per S1-5010. If not, supply an alternate solution as a double angle connection cannot be applied with the current beam locations because the bolts will foul the beam web on the opposite side.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the W 24x 76 may be moved to be in line with the W30x108 (moving W24, not W30, note that there is a typo in text description of this RFI).				
T-1007	SSS - Framing & Connection Clarifications	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2303 near grids 12/C refer to sketches CD RFI 221 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 4: 1) It appears the plan shows diagonal braces similar to 12/S1-3703 but details 3/S1-3705 & 5/S1-3705 do not show the bracing. Are braces required? If braces are required, please see items 2, 3 & 4. 2) Supply the location of the braces from grid 'C' considering the dimensions on TR12 shown on SK2 and the connection to the girder per 8/S1-5005. 3) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace located per dimension supplied in item 2. 4) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace located per dimension supplied in item 2.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Yes, braces are required per 12/S1-3703. 2) Braces may be located at one of the stiffener plate shown on 9/S1-3702. 3) Underside of the slab elevation is 18.24 (T/Slab 19.07 minus 10" slab thickness). 4) see response #3.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1007.1	SSS - Framing & Connection Clarifications	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1007: Per the response to item #1 a dimension of 40' 4-3/4" was provided that differed to the dimension indicated on the Revit model. Candraft & Skanska have reviewed the Structural and Architectural drawings provided and cannot come up with this dimension. This is typical at every location where we are required to calculate the slope of the slab to locate the kicker angles connected to the underside of the slab. Please provide the dimensions indicated on SK1 thru SK4 or clearly direct Skanska as to where to find this information.			ANSWER: <input type="checkbox"/> Accept Suggestion:				
			1) The T/slab elevation is called out at the slab step just north of GL G and west of GL 1. A slope of 1.7% and the direction of the slope is called out on A1-2862. From this information, the T/Concrete elevation can be calculated at the highlighted location.				
			2) The T/slab elevation is called out at the slab step at GL 2 and south of GL G. A slope of 1.7% and the direction of the slope is called out on A1-2862. From this information, the T/Concrete elevation can be calculated at the highlighted location.				
			3) The method described in 2) can be applied to get the T/Concrete elevation at the highlighted location. Note that the slope changes from 1.7% to 2% across the step along GL X.				
			4) The method described in 2) can be applied to get the T/Concrete elevation at the highlighted location.				
			5) The method described in 2) can be applied to get the T/Concrete elevation at the highlighted location.				
			6) Confirmed.				
			7) Confirmed.				
			8) The method described in 2) can be applied to get the T/Concrete elevation at the highlighted location.				
			9) The method described in 2) can be applied to get the T/Concrete elevation at the highlighted location.				
			10) The method described in 2) can be applied to get the T/Concrete elevation at the highlighted location.				
			11) The method described in 2) can be applied to get the T/Concrete elevation along the B88 beam.				
			12) There is no perimeter concrete beam. The MFB beams frame into the foundation wall. See 1/S1-3201 for reference. Yes, the foundation wall slopes between GLs. The T/slab elevations at the foundation wall edge between gridlines can be obtained by the method described in 2) or can be interpolated between the				

<i><u>Number</u></i>	<i><u>Subject</u></i>	<i><u>Status</u></i>	<i><u>Date Created</u></i>	<i><u>Date Required</u></i>	<i><u>Date Answered</u></i>	<i><u>Cost Impact</u></i>	<i><u>Proceed</u></i>
							values shown at gridlines.
							<p>13) Three work points are noted on plans along foundation wall edge and offset from gridlines are shown on A1-2110, A1-2103 and A1-2104. The foundation wall curves between the first two work points with a radius of curvature of 637' - 7 1/2" and is a straight line between the second and third work points. From this information the coordinates of the foundation wall edge can be established along the portion of the wall that is not aligned to gridline J and the requested dimension can be calculated. The T/slab elevations are shown on plans at two ends of the MFB beams i.e. at edge of the foundation wall and at the slab step south of GL G. The slab step is dimensioned from GL G on architectural drawing A1-2863. The slope of the MFB beams can be calculated based on the T/slab elevations at these two points and the distance between them.</p> <p>14) See response to 13).</p> <p>15) See response to 13).</p> <p>16) See response to 13).</p> <p>17) See response to 13).</p> <p>18) See response to 13).</p> <p>19) RCS 16 slab is 10" thick. See reinforced concrete slab schedule on S1-3500.</p>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1422 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1008	SSS - Framing & Connection Clarifications	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	01/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2303 near grids 12/G refer to sketches CD RFI 222 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 5: 1) Confirm this dimension is correct (from Revit model) to be used to determine the slope of MFB4. If not, supply the dimension. 2) Work with SK2 and confirm the location of the braces to avoid fouling connection on TR12. 3) Supply dimension (to be used to locate PL 2 1/2 x 9 x 2'-6). 4) Supply the underside of slab dimension at the location of the brace per item 2. 5) Supply the underside of slab dimension at the location of the brace per item 2.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The 5'-2" dimension (End of TR12) is confirmed. The 42'-0 5/16" shall be 40'-4 ¾". 2) Location of the braces confirmed. 3) Centerline of the 2 ½" plate is 2 5/8" above the bottom of the concrete beam per Detail 5/S1-3600. 4) The elevation of the underside of the slab equal to top of slab elevation minus slab thickness (10"). 5) See response #4.				
T-1009	SSS - Shear Plate Connection at Weak Axis Column Web	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2603 near grids 9/D the grid locations for the note indicating to use detail 3/S1-5011 at the weak axis at MF columns is unclear. On sketch CD RFI 227 SK1 please verify detail 3/S1-5011 only applies to grid lines 9/D & 9/F.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 3/S1-5011 applies at beams framing into weak axis of moment frame columns at all North-South gridlines on roof level except otherwise noted. As the note calls out, moment frame columns are either located on GLs D and F or D.4 and E.6. Detail 3/S1-5011 is called out once per sheet on all roof plan sheets S1-2602 through S1-2607.				
T-1010	SSS - Detail Clarification & Locations for Concrete Beams & Plate Connections	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: At the ground level for the concrete beam locations and 1" plate requirements refer to sketches CD RFI 230 SK1 to SK7 for items 1 to 5: Note the structural & architectural drawings do not locate these members in question. 1) Confirm all dimensions for the spacing of the concrete are correct as shown. 2) Supply all clouded concrete beam location dimensions.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Confirmed. 2. For all "clouded" dimensions, refer to architectural slab edge plans for location of the slab openings. 3. The 1" stiffener plates are no longer needed. 4. See response to item 3 5. See response to item 3				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1423 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>				
	3) Confirm the intended location for the 1" stiffener plates is correct as shown. 4) Confirm the welding for the 1" stiffeners is acceptable as shown. 5) Confirm the noted stiffeners are also required in detail 4B.										
T-1010.1	SSS - Concrete Beam Location for Slab Support From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton	Closed	01/24/2014	02/03/2014	02/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	REQUEST: This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1010 (SK 287 CD 230) See attached CD RFI # 230.1 SK1 to SK6 for SK1 to SK6 for items 1 to 9: 1) Shown are concrete beam locations to suit slab opening dimensions on A1-2862. Confirm the dimensions are correct. 2) Shown are concrete beam locations to suit retractable bollard locations on A1-2862 & A1-2863. Confirm the dimensions are correct. 3) Shown are concrete beam locations to suit slab opening dimensions on A1-2863. Confirm the dimensions are correct. 4) Shown are concrete beam locations to suit retractable bollard locations on A1-2864. Confirm the dimensions are correct. 5) There is no information on A1-2864 to assist in locating the noted MFB1. Please supply dimension. 6) There is no information on A1-2864 to assist in locating the noted MFB1. Please supply dimension. 7) There is no information on A1-2865 to assist in locating the noted MFB1. Please supply dimension. 8) Shown are concrete beam locations to suit slab opening dimensions on A1-2865. Confirm the dimensions are correct. 9)There is no information on A1-2867 to assist in locating the noted MFB1's.Please supply dimensions	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>							
			1) Dimensions okay as noted (AAI).	2) Dimensions okay as noted (AAI).	3) Dimensions okay as noted (AAI).	4) Dimensions okay as noted (AAI).	5) Dimension to be 8'-0" (TT)	6) Dimension to be 8'-0" (TT)	7) Dimension to be 8'-0" (TT)	8) Dimensions okay as noted (AAI).	9) Please mark the question on the plan so we know which MFB1 is in question.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1424 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1011	SSS - Slab Dimension at Seismic Joints	Closed	12/11/2013	12/21/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Plan drawings S1-2503 and S1-2505 indicated a Type S8 floor type at the seismic joints at the Bus Deck level. Based on the Type S8 floor type detailed on detail 4/S1-5003, please confirm the dimensions indicated on CD RFI 202 SK1 for the structural slab and architectural topping thicknesses are accurate.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1012	SSS - Connection for BU Girder into W40 Beam	Closed	12/11/2013	12/21/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2503 at grids 9.9/B, 10.1/B, 9.9/H, and 10.1/H, please verify the shear plate connections for the BU girder framing into the W40x277 and W40x297 beams. Reference CD RFI SK1 & SK2 for locations in question.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Connection highlighted in the RFI shall be a double angle connection with 11 bolts per Detail 1/S1-5010 and not a shear plate connection. This applies to connections at GL 9.9/B, 9.9/H, 10.1/B, 10.1/H, 19.9/B, 19.9/H, 20.1/B and 20.1/H.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1013	SSS - Connection Clarification at Braced Beams	Closed	12/11/2013	12/21/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Arup Rich Coffin							
REQUEST: Refer to sketches CD RFI # 059B.1 SK1 to SK5 for items 1 to 3: 1) This diagonal beam will typically have to be erected from the top due to the slope of the pipe at the perimeter node connection. This will require the top gusset plate to be shipped loose per CD RFI 059B response and the bottom flange of the beam cut flush to the web to slide past the shear plate on the gusset plate end. Please review attached sketches and confirm. 2) This diagonal beam will typically have to be erected from the bottom due to the slope of the pipe at the perimeter node connection. This will require the bottom gusset plate to be shipped loose contrary to CD RFI 059B response and the top flange of the beam cut flush to the			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: This RFI is a follow up to RFI T-0883 and 0883.1. 1) Confirmed that the end connecting to the cast node may have the bottom flange cut flush to the web as noted in RFI T-0883. Shipping the gusset plate loose is a means and methods issue. 2) Confirmed that the end connecting to the cast node may have the top flange cut flush to the web as noted in RFI T-0883, shipping the gusset plate loose is a means and methods issue. 3) Confirmed that the top flange of this beam at both ends may be coped to clear the connection plates.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1425 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>web to slide past the shear plate on the gusset plate end. Please review attached sketches and confirm.</p> <p>3) This beam will have to be typically erected from the bottom due to the slope of the pipe at the node connection. This will require the top flange of the beam to be coped at both end the clear the connection plates. Please review and confirm.</p>						
T-1014	BGP - Moment Frame Beam Tie Configuration	Closed	12/11/2013	12/21/2013	12/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Please refer to detail 2/S1-3600.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Due to the possibility of limited access during the installation of the individual moment frame hairpins as detailed in 2/S1-3600, SCCI/Gerdau proposes to modify the typical moment frame beam tie configuration to what is shown in the attached SCCI sketch SK-RFI-399.				George Metzger 12/12/2013			
Please confirm if this is acceptable.				RESPONSE: The proposed configuration containing hairpins with 555 t-heads is acceptable for the 48" deep moment frame beams only in regions further than 96" from the face of supporting vertical elements. For locations within 96", the stirrup configuration may remain as proposed; however, the 555 t-heads shall be replaced with hairpins conforming to those of Detail 2/S1-3600. Note that all ties (including cap ties) which contain both 90 and 135 hooks shall have their hooks alternated for all locations.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1015	BGP - Moment Frame Cap Ties at shear Key Blockout	Closed	12/11/2013	12/21/2013	12/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
In order to avoid the shear key blockout and anchor bolts in the MF joint, SCCI/Gerdau proposes to eliminate up to two cap ties where the spacing is 4" and one cap tie where the spacing is 6". Cap ties will resume at regular spacing no further than 1" from the beyond the anchor bolts or blockout.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference the attached photo for more details. Is this acceptable?					George Metzger 12/12/2013 RESPONSE: RFI proposal is acceptable for the Type I and Type II column base plates of S1-5051 at Lower Concourse.		
T-1016	BGP - Concourse Slab Elevation at NW Corner of Area 3/Zone 1	Closed	12/11/2013	12/21/2013	12/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please refer to attached drawing S1-2202.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please clarify the concourse slab thickness in gridline area 1-2 and A-C. It is unclear if the area is marked as RCS8 or RCS1.					George Metzger 12/12/2013 RESPONSE: The lower concourse area identified is confirmed to be RCS1 as indicated by slab symbol (reference legend on S-0010) with double arrows which symbolize "extent to edge of deck." The RCS8 slab mark uses single arrows which point to the actual "edge of deck".		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1427 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1017	SSS - Location Clarification for Lateral Bracing	Closed	12/11/2013	12/21/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2303 (S1-2302 sim.) at the lateral bracing south of line G, the concrete locations cannot be determined using the structural and architectural drawings. Please refer to CD RFI 216 SK1 & SK2 requesting clarification on the following: 1) Provide the requested dimensions X1, X2, X3, X4, and X5 to determine the length and bevel of braces. 2) Provide the requested elevations to the underside of the slab edge to determine the length and bevel of braces X1, X2, X3, X4, and X5. 3) Supply the elevation to the underside of slab at the edge of concrete beam for each brace to determine the length and bevel of the braces between grids 1.4-9 south of grid G. 4) Supply the information to determine the slope of the slab at each steel to concrete beam brace.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Braces are equally spaced between Grids 9 & 9.9. 2) The bottom of the slab is equal to the top of slab elevation minus the slab thickness (10"). Top of the slab elevations may be determined assuming that the slab has a constant slope between the elevation points noted on the plan. 3) See response to item 2) 4) See response to item 2)				
T-1018	SSS - Perimeter Protection Detail	Closed	12/11/2013	12/21/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: In order to comply with OSHA regulation 1926.501 - 'Duty to Have Fall Protection', Skanska has directed our modeling contractor, Candraft, to incorporate holes in new framing members to facilitate installation of the guard rail systems and life lines. Please see the attached sketches, SK 6 A-F, SK 7-8 and SK R-4, which are consistent with the National Institute of Steel Detailing standards for safety holes on beams and columns, and confirm that the EOR takes no exceptions to our proposal. Particular attention is drawn to the note on our proposal that states 'No Holes or Welded Tabs will be located in the protected zones of the new members.' All open holes will be filled with high strength bolts upon removal of the safety systems.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The holes for erection safety railing are acceptable in concept. The holes shall be detailed on the shop drawings submitted for review as a part of review process. The holes shall not be in any steel exposed to view in the completed design and there may be other areas that are not acceptable once the holes are shown on the shop drawings. Any holes in galvanized steel shall have the galvanized finish repaired.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1019	SSS - Transfer Girder CJP Web-Flange Welds	Closed	12/11/2013	12/21/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: In orThe web to flange T-joint CJP welds for the transfer girders shown on drawings S1-4300 to S1-4308 do not indicate that a reinforcing fillet weld is required. Note 1 on 4/S1-4202 calls for reinforcing fillets to T-joint groove welds of SLRS members. Please confirm that a reinforcing fillet weld in not required for the transfer girder web to flange T-joint CJP welds.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			The T-joint CJP welds for the transfer girders shown on drawings S1-4300 to S1-4308 are double side CJP weld, not requiring reinforcing fillet weld. Detail 4/S1-4202 is for single side CJP weld at beam flange to column moment connection, therefore, Note 1 in Detail 4/S1-4202 does not apply.				
<hr/>							
T-1020	SSS - Type 2 Drag Connection Clarifications	Closed	12/11/2013	12/21/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: For Type 2 Drag Connection Clarifications refer to sketches CD RFI 148 SK1 to SK2 for items 1 to 5: 1) Supply erection gap between web reinforcement plate and shear plate on column. 2) Supply erection gap between 2" plate and shear plate on column. 3) Supply erection gap between 1 1/2" web doubler plate and 2" thick plate. 4) Supply erection gap between beam web and shear plate on column. 5) Supply erection gap between 2.5" plate and shear plate on column.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			Erecting gaps between plates should be typically 1/16" If wider gap is required at certain locations, submit the gap width for approval.				
<hr/>							
T-1021	SSS - Rebar Holes and Headed Stud Details at Ground Level	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Refer to sketch CD RFI 105.1 SK1. The 2 1/2 x 14 x 2'-6" plate has been set per the elevation given in RFI # T-0888 item 3 and the 3" dia. rebar holes have been set at 1 3/4" above the underside of MFB 6 per RFI # T0888 item 8. This results in the plate fouling the rebar holes as shown.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			First rebar hole fouling the 2 ½" plate may be deleted. This response applies at Grid 10.1 as well.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1429 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
<p>Please advise.</p> <p>Note: the same occurs at grid 10.1.</p>							
T-1022	SSS - Headed Stud and Hole Clarifications at Transfer Girders	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
This is a follow-up RFI to Webcor RFI #T-0890 (SK RFI # 150 & CD RFI # 109) Refer to sketches CD RFI 109.1 SK1 to SK3. The response in Webcor RFI # T-0890 has been applied at grid 11 as shown on SK2 but the response to T-0890 with the information shown in details 6/S1-3702 & 2/S1-3705 cannot be applied at grid 9 as shown on SK3. There insufficient space to fit the (50) headed studs as requested.				For the condition at Grid 9, change the vertical spacing of the studs to 4" so the 3rd row can clear the holes for stirrups. Move the 4th and 5th rows studs to the beam top flange (4" on center in the direction perpendicular to the beam axis, 6" on center spacing in the direction parallel to the beam axis).			
Please supply a new detail for the TR9 location.							

T-1023	SSS - Deck Support Angle Spacing	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
At a sample location on S1-2403 between grids D & F west of line 10 refer to sketches CD RFI 155 SK1 & SK2 for angle spacing question below.				Confirmed that the framing as shown on S1-2403 is acceptable. No need to add more deck support outrigger and bracing.			
Detail 9/S1-5000 (see SK2) states that the maximum spacing for the deck support angles and bracing is 8'-0. As shown, the spacing of the steel framing on S1-2403 (SK1) exceeds 8'-0. Confirm the framing as shown on S1-2403 is acceptable and no further action is required or supply a revised partial plan to show the revised framing to meet the criteria in detail 9/S1-5000.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1024	SSS - Transfer Girder Studs and Rebar Holes	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
At TR8 near grid line G refer to sketches CD RFI 220 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 3:		1) Confirmed.					
1) Confirm the headed studs as shown are correct (work with item 2).		2) Head studs placement shall be based on detail shown on SK-2.					
2) Detail 2/S1-5023 is referenced with a "SIM" designation and it is not clear what is required on grid 8 for the additional headed studs shown in detail 2/S1-5023.		3a) Confirmed					
Confirm the headed studs as shown on SK3 are acceptable or supply a clarifying detail specifically for this location showing the stud locations.		3b) Holes are to be on 6" spacing as shown in detail 7/S1-3701					
3a) Confirm the 2" dia. hole locations as shown on SK3 are acceptable to clear the bolts in the bottom flange and the stiffeners.		3c) 3" holes for concrete beam B57 bottom bars are needed per section 52/S1-5023.					
3b) Detail 2/S1-5023 shows the holes at 5" OC but this contradicts the 6" OC shown in detail 7/S1-3701. Confirm the spacing shown in item 3a above is acceptable.							
3c) Confirm the 3" dia holes are not required at grid 8 as they are not shown in detail 7/S1-3701. Supply location dimensions if they are required.							
<hr/>							
T-1025	SSS - Transfer Girder Stud & Rebar	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
At Transfer Girders TR16.9 & TR19.1 near grids C & G @ detail 1/S1-3703 refer to sketches CD RFI 223 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2:		1) Confirmed.					
1) Confirm the spacing for the headed studs as shown on SK2 is acceptable or supply spacing.		2a) Confirmed					
2a) Confirm it is acceptable to supply 2" dia. holes for the rebar's or supply a diameter.		2b) Confirmed					
2b) Confirm it is acceptable to locate the rebar holes 4" up from the top of the bottom flange as shown on SK2 or supply the dimension.		2c) Confirmed. It appears that one holes for stirrup will foul the stiffeners. Adjust the hole as needed (not more than 2") to clear the stiffeners.					
2c) Confirm it is acceptable to locate the rebar holes as shown on SK2 from the end of the Transfer Girders to avoid fouling the stiffeners.							
<hr/>							
T-1026	SSS - Transfer Girder Rebar Hole Locations	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1432 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On 2 & 6/S1-5052 @ the Pretensioned Rod details refer to sketches CD RFI 228 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) The WT surface below will be milled to bear against the 2 1/2" thick plate. Work with item 2 below as shown on SK2 and confirm welding at this joint is not required as none is shown. 2) Similar to detail 2/S1-5052 as shown on SK1 (item 1 above), the contact surface will be milled for bearing as requested. Please confirm the noted 1/2" fillet welds for the built-up TT section to the 4" thick plate are to be applied as shown.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1031	SSS - Typical Deck Support Details at Columns	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: 1/S1-5001 refer to sketch CD RFI 119 SK1 & SK2. Confirm the specified L3x3x12GA deck support angles are adequate given the approximate length of these angles will be 3' 9-1/2". The contractor proposes to use A36 L3x3x5/16" at these typica l details. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: L 3 x 3x 12 gage deck support is adequate as shown. It is acceptable to use L3 x 3 x5/16 as proposed.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-1032	SSS - Detail Clarification at Bent Plate to Sloping Beams	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Refer to sketch CD RFI 231 SK1 and confirm it is acceptable to fabricate the double bent deck support plate as shown when the beam is sloping and the underside of slab is horizontal, resulting in a variable height along the deck support plate. It is not possible to model a double bent plate with a variable height in Tekla.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Acceptable to fabricate the double bent deck support angle as proposed, but the weld shall be a continuous 1/4" double fillet weld, not a 3" long weld at 12" on center. Note that the lower horizontal plate needs to be welded according to welds shown in detail 4B.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1433 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1033	SSS - Weld Clarifications at Light Columns	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Per detail At the light column bases refer to sketch CD RFI 167 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the CJP weld designation applies to the 1" thick web and the 2" thick flanges to the column base plates. 2) Supply the weld requirements for the 1" shear key web to the 2" shear key flanges.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) confirmed. 2) Weld requirement for the 1" shear key web to the 2" shear key flanges: double fillet welds with w = 0.5" on each side.		
<hr/>							
T-1034	SSS - Material Grade and CVN Requirements	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/12/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: 1. At 1/S1-4205 EBF LINK BEAM DETAIL, there is a section 4/S1-4205 that cuts an EBF LINK BEAM CROSS SECTION. The same section 4/S1-4205 is cut on 2/S1-4205 BRACE DETAIL. Please confirm that EBF link beams are where the 4/S1-4205 section is shown, and that they will be ASTM A709 grade 50 and other built-up beams at the roof park perimeter will be ASTM A572 grade 50 per SS-1/S-0007. 2. Please verify if bus deck built-up plates that are ASTM A709 grade 50 plates less than 2" thick part of the SLRS should be CVN tested 25 ft.-lb @ 70 degrees F. 3. Please supply CVN testing requirements, if any, for secondary material steel (i.e. stiffeners, connection plate, continuity plates, etc.).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The requirements for ASTM A709 Grade 50 material for the link beam is for the region between the diagonal work point as shown in Detail 1/ S1-4205. At the contractor's option, steel plate beyond the splice point outside of the A709 grade 50 plate may be ASTM A572, grade 50. 2. CVN should be per requirements in the respective ASTM specification and Specification 05 10 00. For a member that is a part of SLRS (or SFRS), see 05 12 10 for additional requirement for CVN testing. Also, the testing temperature for weld metal is not 70 deg F, it should be in accordance with AWS D1.1 and 1.8 (for SLRS), assuming LAST=25 deg F per specification 05 12 10, paragraph 2.1.C.3. 3. CVN requirement for stiffeners, connection plate, continuity plates shall be in accordance with their respective ASTM specification.		
<hr/>							
T-1035	SSS - Ground Level Cast Node to 3" Connection Plate Weld	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: 1. Please verify weld configuration at 3/S1-4350, similar			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed that the weld configuration at 3/S1-4350		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1434 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1036	<p>SSS - Flange Plate between Tapered Girder and Built Up Edge Girder</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>The 1 1/4" top flange plate per 6/S1-5010 & 7/S1-5032 will require bending due to the sloping TPG girders on the roof and a 5/16" shim will be required to fill the gap as shown in CD RFI 154 SK1&2. Confirm it is acceptable to bend the top flange plate at the edge of the BU beams on grid lines B & H and supply a 5/16" shim plate to fit the profile of the top flange plate to be welded all around to the TPG girders with 1/4" fillet weld. If not, supply an alternate solution.</p>	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
						<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>It is acceptable to bend the 1 1/4" plate and add shims to match the profile of the sloping tapered girders. Note that T/steel of tapered girder is not correctly shown on SK2. T/steel of the tapered girder should match the T/steel of the BU girder at the flange edge of the BU girder.</p> <p>- End of Response -</p> <p>Turner disputes the claim that there is a probable cost increase as noted in this RFI. The top of steel of the beams connected are shown in the contract document. The necessity of bending the connection plate due to beam slope should be anticipated by the contractor.</p>	



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1037	SSS - Typical Kicker Brace Detail	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Reference the bracing connection details provided on S1-5015. At conditions where a full depth shear plate and bracing are required, there is consistently a conflict between the bottom gusset plate and shear plate. Based on the weld requirements for the kicker brace connection, the following is proposed to avoid this conflict: 1) Connect the kicker directly to the shear plate 2) Eliminate the bottom gusset 3) Offset the top gusset (below the beam) by the width of the beam web to align with the shear plate 4) Match the thickness of the gusset and stitch plates to the shear plate thickness 5) Shape the bottom of the shear plate, where necessary, to achieve the required angle brace weld Please confirm this is an acceptable typical solution for the conditions shown in the sketches attached and at other typical locations where bracing and a full depth shear plate are required.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Acceptable. 2) Acceptable. 3) Acceptable. 4) Reducing the top gusset plate thickness to match the full depth shear plate thickness is not acceptable. See response to RFI T-0920.1 where stitch plates with varying thickness were allowed to be used when the full depth shear plate and gusset plate thickness did not match. The same solution can be applied at all similar locations. Alternatively, the full depth shear plate thickness can be increased to match the gusset plate thickness. 5) Acceptable. It is typically acceptable to apply solutions 1) through 5) at locations where there is a conflict between the bottom gusset plate and full depth shear plate at the transfer girders.	
<hr/>							
T-1038	Spandrel Beam Reinforcement clarification Area 1-9	Closed	12/13/2013	12/23/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Further to discussion with Thornton Tomasetti design Engineer Kerem Gulec on the responses to the RFI received to date on the spandrel Beams modifications for area's 1-9 which include: RFI's T-0707, 708, 713, 717, 718, 719, 873 & 874 the response to these RFI's specified that a "lap splices shall be provided where the beam rebar is transitioned from the spacing in the construction drawings to the modified spacing" However following discussion this now will change to "Horizontal Rebar Bar spacing between modified spacing and construction drawings spacing will transitions over a distance of 6' on either side of the modified cross-section and thus removing the need to provide the additional lap splices. See a typical example attached. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 12/18/2013 RESPONSE Confirmed.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1436 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1039	SSS - Stitch Bolts on Kicker Braces	Closed	12/16/2013	12/26/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Details 4, 5 & 7/S1-5015 do not show a stitch bolt requirement for the kicker braces. At a sample location and detail shown on sketches CD RFI 066 SK1 & SK2 please confirm none are required or supply the necessary information.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Section 3/S1-3703 that is just above the SK2 section cut, where the Section RFI 066-SK2 was cut. In addition to Section 3/S1-3703 refer to Section 6/S1-5022, which provides information on the stitch plate.		
T-1039.1	SSS - Stitch Bolts on Kicker Braces	Closed	02/03/2014	02/13/2014	02/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The response to T-1039 references details 3/S1-3703 & 6/S1-5022 for stitch plate information although these sections are only cut at Ground Level at Fremont & First Street. Ple ase confirm the response is intended to indicate stitch plat es are required at all kicker brace locations including detail s 4, 5 & 7/S1-5015 as per details 3/S1-3703 & 6/S1-5022. If so pleases confirm detail 8/S1-5015 can also be used for the stitch plate detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Stitch plates are required for kickers where Details 4, 5 and 7/S1-5015 are applicable, except where the kicker is shorter than 1.5'. Stitch plate details provided in 8/S1-5015 can be used at locations where kickers are required except that the stitch plate thicknesses shall match those of the gusset plates in the details. Stitch plates can be either welded (as shown in 8/S1-5015) or bolted (as shown in 6/S1-5022) to the kicker angles. For kickers shorter than 3' but longer than 1.5', provide a single stitch plate centered on the kicker angles.		
T-1040	BGP - Width and Depth of Intermediate Beam in Lower Concourse at GL E.6/7	Closed	12/17/2013	12/27/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference contract drawing S1-2203. Plan sheet S1-2203 shows an intermediate beam at gridline E.6 from gridline 6 to gridline 8 (see highlighted area attached). The Section 2/S1-3400 does not give the specific dimensions for a beam with change in slab elevation. Please provide both width and depth of the beam at this location in the lower concourse.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 12/19/2013 RESPONSE: There is no beam at Grid E.6 between Grids 6 and 8 of the Lower Concourse. The hidden line shown on S1-2203 is a step in the soffit that corresponds to a change in top of slab elevation. Refer to Detail 2/S1-3501 for dimensions and reinforcing. Detail 2/S1-3400 does not apply at this location. See RFI T-876 response for additional information.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1437 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1041	SSS - CJP Weld Prep between Ground Level Cast Node and Transfer Girder	Closed	12/17/2013	12/27/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Compy Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Our fabricator Thompson Metal Fab has requested a 2" 45° bevel be incorporated into the ground level cast node machining drawings. This weld is detailed on 6/S1-4350. See attached sketch for bevel detail. Please confirm approval for weld prep detailed in attached sketches.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 2" 45 degree bevel to the ground cast nodes is acceptable to incorporate into the machined drawings per CCX. The additional Cast Connex detailing, Bradken additional machining, and any other follow on expenses or schedule delays due to this change will be borne by Skanska and not the TJPA. George Metzger 12/18/2013 RESPONSE: Cast Connex, It makes sense to have Bradken to put in this bevel as detailed on the structural drawings. Please coordinate with Bradken for this work.		
<hr/>							
T-1042	BGP - Geothermal Manifold Locations for Fields 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10	Closed	12/17/2013	12/27/2013	01/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Per the drawings, the manifold is to be located at an elevation no greater than 14' below finish grade (street) elevation. Per conversations in the preparatory DFOV meeting and other coordination meetings, the Engineer planned to have the manifold in a specific location. Attached are elevation drawings for Field 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 Manifolds. Please confirm that the attached elevation details work with the desgner's intent for the manifold locations for said Fields. Note that Riser 10 has been relocated approximately 4' East between piles 231 and 232 to allow for the required 10' minimum spacing for future column installation.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 1/7/2014 RESPONSE: Riser penetrations into the building must occur within the beam space of the ceiling of the lower concourse level. The elevations shown on the sketches fall below the beam pockets and conflict with future emergency ventilation ducts within the building. Elevations shall be modified and resubmitted to verify that the pipes enter the building within the beam space. Risers 7 & 8 may be greater than 14'-0" below finished grade and should be reviewed by ARUP for confirmation.		
<hr/>							
T-1043	BGP - Elevator Sill Support Angle Dimensions	Closed	12/17/2013	12/27/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1439 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1045	BSE - Micropile Relocations -Zone 3	Closed	12/17/2013	12/27/2013	01/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Fourteen (14) micropiles located under Span 3.7 and 3.8 in Zone 3 have to be relocated in the field due to their proximity to the Trestle Deck. Micropiles E343/E354/E363/E375/E390/ E401/E411 have to be relocated 5' to the North and micropiles E340/E353/E362/E371/E386/ E400/E410 5' to the South. See attached sketch of micropiles in question.				TT field engineer's observation of pile layout staking and trestle configuration does not support that micropiles have to be relocated as stated in the RFI. The low-overhead rig appears very capable of installing piles per plan.			
Please confirm these relocations are acceptable.				The proposed relocations are not acceptable.			
<hr/>							
T-1045.1	Micropile Relocations -Zone 3 & 4	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	01/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
BBII is proposing to move 49 micropiles located within Zone 3 & 4 due to their close proximity to the Trestle/bridge Deck. Micropiles E375/E390/ E401/E411/E654/E670/E704/E738/E769/E800/E815/E826 would all be relocated 5' to the North, micropiles E492/E512/E537/E564/E587/E610/E630 would also relocated 3' north. The micropiles E371/E386/E400/E410/E488/E526/E534/E559/E578/E605 /E622/E650/E666/E700/E734 /E765/E796/E811/E825 would also be relocated 5' to the South. Micropiles E416/E417/E418/E419/E420/E426/E427/E428/E429/E430 /E431 would also be relocated 3' to the West. See attached sketch of micro piles in question.				Based on a reanalysis of the mat slab with the proposed micropile relocations contained in the RFI, the proposed relocations are determined to be acceptable. No modifications to the mat slab are required to accommodate the proposed micropile layout.			
Please confirm this is acceptable							
<hr/>							
T-1046	SSS - Transfer Girder Weld Access Holes	Closed	12/17/2013	12/27/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please confirm the weld access holes detailed on SK1 are				The attached sketch SK-1 did not provide sufficient			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1441 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1048.1	SSS - Elevator Rail Supports Erection Aids	Closed	01/08/2014	01/18/2014	01/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 183.1 SK1A, SK1B, SK2A & SK2B for items 1 & 2: 1.) Confirm the elevator rail support connection with erection aids is acceptable as shown. 2.) Confirm the elevator rail support connection with erection aids is acceptable as shown.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFI number changed to RFI T-1105			
T-1049	BGP - Column Base Plate Clearance Lower Concourse Slab	Closed	01/14/2014		01/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Adib Sassine To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: 1 and 3/S1-5051, S1-3600, S1-2205 To erect and plumb Lower Concourse Column with base plates Types I as shown on schedule 1/S1-5051 and II at 7/F.8 shown on detail 5A/S1-5051, erection aids will be required at the base plate. However, due to the depression, rebar running thru the depression and based on our experience with the grouting at column base plate mock-up, allowable clearances to set these base plates may not be adequate. As an example, column at GL C/24.9, the bottom of type I C base plate is within 1" from the top of rebar and does not have adequate area for shim packs. Question # 1: To provide adequate erection aids, please review the following options and advise as to which one is acceptable: Option 1: Lower rebar around the base plate area by 1" to allow for 2" clear between rebar and bottom of base plate. Install 4 shim packs for erection purposes under each corner of the base plate on top of level concrete surface.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Question 1, Option 1: Lowering the MF Beam reinforcing is not acceptable. Erection aids are contractor's means and methods. Question 1, Option 2: The reinforcing adjustments allowed are contained in RFIs 908.1, 917, 924, 925 and 1015. Erection aids are contractor's means and methods. Question 1, Option 3: Raising the column base plates is not acceptable. Erection aids are contractor's means and methods. Question 2: Increasing the plan dimension of the column base plate block-out to 6" all around is acceptable.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1442 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Option 2: Stop or adjust reinforcing steel under the base plate and use shim packs for erection on top of level concrete surface.</p> <p>Option 3: Do not modify rebar, raise base plate elevation by 1" to provide minimum of 2" clearance under the base plate. Locate two shim packs next to key plates and install two additional erection aid threaded bolts with leveling nut drilled in concrete by Skanska as shown on the attached sketch SK-2.</p> <p>Question # 2: There is a 3" dimension between edge of steel plate and edge of depressed slab. Pls confirm if 6" dimension is acceptable in lieu of 3" around the base plates Type I C , I B and Type II at 7/F.8.</p>						
T-1050	SSS - Field Splice Framing Interference	Closed	12/19/2013	12/29/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
At two locations, TR5 & TR33.2 the framing beam end con nections foul the Transfer girder field splices. Please verify beam framing adjustments shown on CD RFI # 163 SK3 & SK10 are acceptable.				1) Do not move the W40x211 beam. The transfer girder splice may be move toward south 1'-0" to be in line with the step of the transfer girder.			
				2) Do not move the W21x44 beam. The transfer girder spice may be move south slightly to clear the W21 and W33 connections.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1443 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1051	SSS - BRB Gusset Plate Connections	Closed	12/19/2013	12/29/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Turner Construction Com Gary Krutsch				
REQUEST: The details on S1-4206 & S1-4207 do not provide the information required to finalize the shape of the BRB gusset plates. Please see questions below and noted on sketches CD RFI 236 SK1 & SK2. 1) Please provide a typ. minimum dimension to maintain from the edge of the Clevis plate to the corners of the gusset. See SK1 & SK2. 2) Please verify the typ. length for the gussets on 1 & 5/S1-4206, 1/S1-4207, see SK1. 3) Please verify the typ. length for the gusset on 2/S1-4206, see SK2. 4) Please verify if a typ. minimum width for the gusset on 2/S1-4206 is to be maintained or the shape of the gusset can be based from the offset of the edge of the Clevis plate to the corners of the gusset? See SK2. 5) Please verify if the 1/2" stiffener should maintain a minimum width or should the stiffener extend to the edge of the beam flange? also please verify if the corners of the stiffeners should be shaped? if so, please provide details. See SK2.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The dimensions requested are pending on the geometry of the end connections of the BRB brace. Skanska to submit BRB Technical Submittals per specification 05 12 50. 2) See response #1 3) See response #1 4) See response #1 5) Stiffeners shall match the width of the beam. Corners of the stiffener plates do not need to be shaped.	
<hr/>							
T-1052	SSS - W10 Detail Clarifications	Closed	12/19/2013	12/29/2013	01/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
REQUEST: 1. Confirm the dimensions as shown are correct and match the W-10 system. 2. The noted elevation shown on 87'-4" in details 1,4,9/S1-8008 conflicts with A1-2903. Please verify correct elevation. 3. Supply the offset from top of curb to determine the location of the 3/8" x 6" x 6" stiffener plates. 4. The 5/16" fillet weld all around is only possible on one side of the post due to the 10 1/8" flange width on the W27x114 and the limited remaining distance on the end of the beam as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to supply a 5/16" PJP weld on 3 sides.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). The clouded dimensions shall be determined from the W-10 3d model, TTC_SBP_STR_WRF_MST_NFC_W10-WIREFRAME_131010, which WOJV has as part of the current bid documents. 2). The top of concrete curb elevation is 87'-4 1/2" (Also see Detail 5/S1-6011). 3). The clouded dimension (center line of the rebar to face of sloping concrete wall) is 1 1/2". 4). The 5/16" fillet weld is on 2 sides only (not all around as stated in this RFI). The width of the stiffeners can be reduce to match the W27 beam flange width. Don't see a problem in performing the	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1444 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1052.1	SSS - W10 Detail Clarifications	Closed	01/16/2014	01/26/2014	01/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:		The response to RFI T-1052 (SK RFI 309.1), states that "The 5/16" fillet weld is on 2 sides only (not all around as stated in this RFI). The width of the stiffeners can be reduced to match the W27 beam flange width. Don't see a problem in performing the double fillet weld, however, a CJP weld to replace the double fillet weld is acceptable." The original question asked permission to use a PJP weld in lieu of the double fillet weld, not a CJP weld. Please clarify the following:		Questions 1 and 2 appear to be asking the same thing.			
1) Skanska disagrees with the note that the referenced weld is shown as being required on 2 sides only. Please review the attached SK2 and confirm the welding locations as shown are acceptable.		2.) As there is insufficient landing to perform the 5/16" fillet as originally detailed, please confirm the welding as per CD RFI 240.1 SK2 is acceptable.		Welding per SK2 is will be acceptable.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1445 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1053	SSS - Roof Park Level W40 to BU Girder Connections	Closed	12/19/2013	12/29/2013	12/31/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On S1-2602 to S1-2607 along lines B & H the bottom flanges of the sloping W40x264 moment beams are deeper than the BU 40 girders by 5/16" of an inch as noted on sketch CD RFI # 217 SK1. 1). To accommodate for the depth discrepancy verify a 1/2" plate can be added to the bottom of the BU 40 girders and the welds as noted on sketch SK1. 2). Also for the top & bottom flange welds for the W40x264 sloping beams verify the CJP weld noted on the sketch SK1. 3). Option # 2 is to move the work points of the W40x264 beams up 5/16" thus flanges would then be flush for both W40 & BU 40 members.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The top of steel for the slope W40 may be set to match the BU40 girder at the tip of the flange, thus, avoid the need for the 1/2" connection plate. 2) 1 3/4" bevel for 1 1/2" effective PJP weld is acceptable. 3) See response to Item 1).		
T-1053.1	SSS - Roof Park Level W40 to BU Girder Connections	Closed	01/21/2014	01/31/2014	01/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Reference the response to RFI T-1053. Per the conversation during the 1/21/14 Structural Issues Meeting, please address the following: 1) Please confirm that a 1/2" plate is acceptable as described in RFI T-1053, item #1 2) Please confirm that a CJP weld will be acceptable in lieu of a PJP weld, as described in RFI T-1053, item #2			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.		
T-1054	SSS - Light Column Reference Detail Clarifications	Closed	12/19/2013	12/29/2013	12/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: ASI 0106 changed the majority of the detail and section references on drawing S1-6005 that result in incomplete or incorrect traceability. These changes were not clouded. Two possible issues exist as a result of these changes:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI references the outdated drawings in ASI 106. Please reference the updated drawings in ASI 108 & 109 and clarify your question.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page:1446 of 3091

Date:06/17/2015

Time:02:27 PM

Job:30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>1) Some of the revised detail/section references were revised in error, and/or</div> <div>2) Some of the revised detail/section references are correct and the referenced drawing requires either a revision to match the sourced reference or the addition of a new detail/section.</div> <div>Please advise.</div>						
T-1055	SSS - Tapered Girder Connections	Closed	12/19/2013	12/29/2013	12/30/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: <div>At the roof Tapered girders refer to sketches CD RFI 238 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 & 2. The proposed erection method for the Tapered Girders on the roof is to shop attach both connection angles at the roof perimeter (See SK3), tip the girder into the connected position on the perimeter BU-Girders and then lower the left end between the double shear plates on the columns (see SK2). In order to erect these girders confirm the dimensions may be increased as noted:</div> <div>1) With the connection angles tight against the BU-Girder on the right end, the 2" clear dimension per detail 2/S1-5016 will need to increase to 3 1/2" assuming the back-up bar will not exceed 3/4" thick. Confirm it is acceptable to increase the dimension as noted for all Tapered Girders.</div> <div>2) This 1" dimension will need to increase to 2 1/2" to be able to erect the girder as described on SK1. Confirm this is acceptable.</div>		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> <div>1) See response to Item 2 and 3</div> <div>2) Confirmed that the 2" gap may be increased to 3 1/2". The RFI SK149 (CD108) was not included in this RFI, so we cannot figure out the meaning of "assuming the back-up bar per RFI SK149(CD 108) will not exceed 3.4" thick"</div> <div>3) If the bottom flange is to be coped for erection purpose, extend the web stiffener plate (L=17" in Detail 2E/S1-5016) the same distance equal to the length of the flange cope.</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1447 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1056	SSS - Edge Plate Clarifications	Closed	12/20/2013	12/20/2013	12/31/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
On S1-2604 & 2605 between grids 17 to 24 & D to F refer to sketches CD RFI 159 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 & 2 for edge plate clarification. Detail 1/S1-8000 and details 1, 3 & 4/S1-8016 show edge plate on the beam. Please confirm/clarify the following items: 1) Confirm the edge plates on the noted details is per 8/S1-5000. 2) The vertical leg of the edge plate appears to extend above the slab but does not extend up to the construction joint. Confirm the vertical leg terminates at the top of roof slab or clarify the vertical height.				1). Confirmed the detail is per 8/S1-5000, but the angle thickness shall be 3/8". 2). Confirmed that the vertical leg terminates at the top of roof slab.			

T-1056.1	SSS - Edge Plate Clarifications	Closed	03/24/2014	04/03/2014	04/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 352 SK1: 1) S1-8008 ~ Sequence 'CS2' approval drawings 4769, 4770, 4815, 4816 & 4919 request that the slab edge plate be extended up to the 1st concrete pour but 'CS2' approval drawings 4777 & 4823 do not have the comment. Note that the details on S1-8008 do not show the edge plate extending up to the concrete construction joint (1st concrete pour). Detail 9/S1-8008 does not show the concrete construction joint. RFI T-1056 (SK 210, CD 159) confirmed that the details on S1-8008 remain as shown and that the edge plate terminates at the top of slab. Please clarify the designer's requirement for this edge of slab bent plate. 2) S1-8006 ~ Detail 1 shows the edge plate extending up to the top of slab and not to the 1st concrete pour. Please review RFI T-1056 (SK 210, CD 159) and confirm that remains the intent. If not, issue a revised detail showing the vertical dimension locating the construction joint (1st concrete pour). 3) S1-8016 ~ RFI T-1056 (SK 210, CD 159) confirmed that the edge plate terminates on top of the slab as shown in details 1,3,4/S1-8016. Confirm this remains the intent. If not, issue a revised detail showing the vertical dimension				1) The vertical leg of the bent plate shall extend only up to the top of the slab per response to RFI T-1056. Comments on CS2 shop drawing sheets regarding length of vertical leg of the bent plate may be ignored. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1448 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
locating the construction joint (1st concrete pour).							
T-1057	SSS - Bus Deck Level Edge of Slab Plate Clarification	Closed	12/20/2013	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: For edge for slab framing @ slab notch refer to sketches CD RFI 234 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 3: 1) Work with SK2 & SK3 and supply the location, angle orientation and connection detail for the L6x6x3/8 in light of the beam flange cut-back as shown. 2) Supply the location, angle orientation and a connection detail for the L6x6x3/8 in detail 2 & 4/S1-2550. 3) Supply the location, angle orientation and a connection detail for the (2) L6x6x3/8 in detail 6/S1-2550.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The L6x6x3/8 is to be laid parallel to the Grid B, as close to the cast node as possible. The vertical leg of the angle is to be clipped, and laid flat on top of the beam, no connection is needed. 2) See the response #1 3) See the response #1				
T-1057.1	SSS - Bus Deck Level Edge of Slab Plate Clarification	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1057 (SK 300, CD 234) See attached CD RFI # 234.1 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3: 1) Confirm the noted detail reference should read 6/S1-2550 Sim. 2) Confirm the angles may typically be located 1/2" from end of top beam flange as shown. 3) Supply a connection detail for the end of the angle.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Cope the horizontal leg of the angle, extend the vertical leg of the angle to the web of the beam, and weld the angle to the beam web and flange (similar to detail 1/S1-5001).				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1058	SSS - Brace Detail Clarifications at Spandrel Beams	Closed	12/20/2013	12/30/2013	01/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: At 2nd level & Bus deck level Spandrel beams refer to sketches CD RFI 235 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 8: 1) Detail 1/S1-8020 is not referenced on the structural Bus Deck Level plans. Please clarify where this detail applies. 2) Detail 4/S1-8020 is not referenced on the structural Second Level plans. Please clarify where this detail applies. 3) Supply the information showing the W-2 mullion locations to help locate the angle braces in details 1 & 4/S1-8020. 4) Confirm the work point for the brace is on beam center at top of bottom flange in details 1 & 4/S1-8020. 5) Supply the work point location for the brace from top of beam in details 1 & 4/S1-8020. 6) Confirm the noted plate size in details 1 & 4/S1-8020 is a minimum size and may be increased to facilitate the connection. 7) Supply stitch plate requirements in details 1 & 4/S1-8020. 8) Confirm the brace in detail 1/S1-8020 may be connected beyond the beam flange as shown in 4/S1-8020 (SK2) to facilitate the erection of the brace.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Detail 1/S1-8020 was referenced in the Plan Note #3, Sheet S1-2402. See architectural drawings A1-2302 thru A1-2304 for the locations of W-2 system. 2). Detail 4/S1-8020 was referenced in the Plan Note #3, Sheet S1-2402. See architectural drawings A1-2302 thru A1-2304 for the locations of W-2 system. 3). The W-2 design documents are in-progress and have not been issued for bid. The dimensions requested should be obtained from the W-2 Shop Drawings as the exact final mullion placement will be determined by the W-2 trade subcontractor. 4). Confirmed. 5). Work point to be located at the intersection of the beam centerline and bottom face of the flange. 6). Confirmed. 7). Stitch plates shall not be spaced more than 4'-0" on center with 1 -3/4" dia A-325 bolt. 8). Confirmed.				
T-1058.1	SSS - Brace Detail Clarifications at Spandrel Beams	Closed	01/29/2014	02/08/2014	02/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: This is a follow-up RFI for RFI T-1058 (SK 301 CD 235) Please confirm the following for RFI T-1058 responses: Item 1: Confirm the correct architectural drawings showing the W-2 system on the Bus Level are A1-2502 thru A12504 and not as noted in the response.. Item 2: Confirm the correct architectural drawings showing the W-2 system on the Second Level are A1-2402 thru A1-2404 and not as noted in the response.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI is rejected per 01 10 40 1.6 C 2. f. "The TJPA will reject requests for interpretations or clarifications of the Contract Documents which can reasonably be derived from a review of the Contract Documents".				
T-1058.2	SSS - Brace Detail Clarifications at Spandrel Beams	Closed	02/06/2014	02/16/2014	02/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1058.3	<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author:</div></div>	Closed	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Per item (3) on RFI T-1058, please supply the information showing the W-2 mullion locations to help locate the angle braces in details 1 & 4/S1-8020.</div>		<div>SUGGESTION:</div> <div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>See drawings posted as ASI No. 0111 for Transit Center Building [140]</div>				
	<div>SSS - W-2 Bracing Clarifications</div>		03/17/2014	03/27/2014	04/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
T-1058.3	<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>	Closed	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson				
	<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>As a follow up to SK RFI 301, 301.1, and ASI 111, please review the following requesting further clarification for the W2 kicker brace locations: 1) (SK1 & SK2) Detail 1/A1-8151 indicates mullions on the W-2 curtain wall from grade level to the bus deck level. However, the section cut 2/A1-8151 only shows bracing and stiffeners at the Bus Deck level framing, not the Second Level framing. Please confirm no kicker braces or stiffeners are required at W-2 mullions at the second level. 2) (SK1) Please advise if Bus Deck Level mullion spacing shown on A1-8155 is to be pulled from grid line 10 or 10.1. It appears that the spacing is typically for a 42'-6" bay. 3) (SK3) Per A1-8151, kicker braces per 4/S1-8020 are required as shown. Please confirm. 4) (SK5) Per A1-8152, kicker braces per 4/S1-8020 are required as shown. Please confirm. 5) The mullion locations on A1-8157 cannot be located with the information provided. Please supply the dimensions off grid lines to locate the bracing and mullions. 6) It appears that W-2 mullions occur along the entire wall on grid line 1.4, however A1-8157 only shows mullions between grid lines C and D.4. If mullions occur south of GL D.4, please provide the dimensions required to locate the mullions, braces, and stiffeners. 7) A1-8158 is shown on grid line 2.5. Please advise if A1-8158 is to be mirrored on GL 3.5 or provide the required mullion spacing. 8) A1-8158 does not provide the locations of the mullions. Please supply the required dimensions off grid lines. 9) A1-8159 is shown on grid 8.5. Please advise if this elevation also applies on grid 9.5 or provide the required</div>		<div>SUGGESTION:</div> <div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>WOJV has requested the secondary steel in support of the W-2 System to be removed from the TG07.1R contract. Forthcoming PCO seeking a credit from Skanska.</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1451 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>mullion spacing.</p> <p>10) The locations of the mullions cannot be located with the information provided on A1-8159. Please provide a reference dimension off a grid line to locate the mullions.</p> <p>11) A1-8152 is reference on A1-8150 between grid lines 2 and 3, with grid lines 2 and 3 shown on the elevation. Please confirm this detail also applies at the corners on grid lines 4, 8, 10, 12, and 14.</p> <p>12) Please confirm details 1 and 4 on S1-8020 do not apply to drawings A1-8156, A1-8165, A1-8166.</p> <p>13) A1-5167 is reference on the south portion of grid 16.9. Please advise if this detail also applies on the north portion of grid 16.9.</p> <p>14) It appears that partial dimensions are provided (between grid lines E.6-F.7) for the mullion locations on A1-8161 along grid line 27 on the Second Level. Please provide the remaining dimensions required to locate the mullions along the remainder of grid line 27.</p> <p>15) No detail reference is provided on the north half of grid line 27 and grid line 32.5. Please provide the mullion spacing requirements at these locations.</p> <p>16) A1-8156 is referenced on grid line F.7 between grid lines 27 and 32.5 on the Second Level, but this detail does not appear to be correct. Please confirm the reference should be A1-8160 or provide the corrected reference.</p>						
T-1059	SSS - EOS Closure Details at Columns	Closed	12/20/2013	12/30/2013	01/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
At the 2nd level at sample locations on S1-2403 @ grids 9.9/C & G please verify the edge of slab closure detail at the column grid lines per detail 1/S1-5004 shown on sketch CD RFI 246 SK1 is acceptable.				Confirmed that the detail shown on sketch CD RFI 246 SK1 is acceptable. Provide welding between the vertical leg and horizontal leg of the bent plate.			
<hr/>							
T-1060	SSS - Shop Primer Coat Exclusion Areas	Closed	12/20/2013	12/30/2013	12/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
REQUEST: Specification section 05 10 003.2 P.3b specifically excludes shop paint from areas to be enclosed in concrete and cementitious fireproofing. Drawing A-8662 matrix shows 3 different types of fireproofing, SFRM, IFRM-1 and IFRM-2. Please confirm which of these are cement based so we can determine shop painting limits.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Prep and prime all steel that is to receive fireproofing per the fireproofing manufacturer's recommendations. Fireproofing type SFRM-1 is cementitious fireproofing. For reference only, see the attached in-progress specification sections 07 81 00 (SFRM-1) and 07 81 23 (IFRM-1 & IFRM-2).				
T-1060.1	SSS - Shop Primer Coat Exclusion Areas	Closed	01/06/2014	01/16/2014	01/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: While specification section 05 10 00-3.2 .P.3b excludes shop paint from areas to receive cementitious fireproofing, the response to SK RFI 319 (WOJV T-1060) indicates that all steel is to be prepped per the manufacturer's recommendations. The response to WOJV T-1060 provided three potential manufacturers for the SFRM-1 per the preliminary specification section 07 81 00-2.3.A. 1.) Based on the product data sheets published for the Grace Monokote Z-146 and Cafco Fendolite M-II products, Skanska understands that these products are recommended to be applied to bare steel that is free of oil, grease, excess rolling compounds, lubricants, loose mill scale, excess rust,..., or any other substance that will impair proper adhesion. Please confirm this interpretation is acceptable and the potential use of these products is intended for application on bare steel. 2.) The Carboline Pyrocrete 40 product does not require the use of a primer, however the published data sheets state that "Pyrocrete 40 neither promotes nor prevents corrosion". It is understood that the manufacturer finds application of Pyrocrete 40 to bare steel to be acceptable on the building interior, but recommends the Owner's consideration of a primer on steel exposed to corrosion. Please advise which areas, if any, are required to be primed prior to application of the Carboline Pyrocrete 40 product. Please note that application of a primer for areas receiving		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1.) Confirmed. 2.) The two manufacturers described in item 1 above meet the technical performance requirements specified. The third product on item 2 should match the technical performance requirements specified in section 07 81 00 without requiring additional treatments to meet the specified requirements. If the manufacturer of this product deems it necessary to add corrosion protection for meeting the requirements, they should add this to their bid. As an additional measure prior to issuing specification section 07 81 00 for bid, we will add "or equal" to the Materials listing of Specification Section 07 81 00.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1453 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	any of the three SFRM-1 products will incur additional costs and schedule impacts, as these areas were originally specified to be bare steel per 05 10 00-3.2.P.3b.						
T-1060.2	SSS - Shop Primer Coat Exclusion Areas	Closed	01/27/2014	02/06/2014	02/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
Details 5, 6, and 7/A1-8662 indicate "12 inches of fireproofing required on stiffener fins, typical."			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
1) Please provide a UL assembly # and details for conditions where cruciform columns are enclosed with exterior wall cladding or interior furred-out walls.			1) Refer to 'Fire Protection Matrix & Schedule' per attached A1-8662 for UL Assembly listings. Refer to drawings A1-9317, A1-9351 and A1-9354 for related details.				
2) Structural drawings reference cruciform columns while A1-8662 references "stiffener fins." Please advise if the A1-8662 drawings are intended to show the cruciform columns, and provide revised drawings as necessary. Please provide the applicable UL assembly for cruciform columns with any revised details.			2) The 'stiffener fins' as noted on sheet A1-8662 are added to the Ground Level columns to increase weak axis bending stiffness of what are known as the cruciform columns on the Structural drawings. These stiffeners are provided for vibration control and being non-load carrying elements they do not require fire protection from a code perspective. As typically recommended by the fire protection manufacturer, non-load carrying attachments be fire proofed to the same level as the protected structural elements to mitigate 'thermal bridging'.				
3) Please advise if the cruciform columns are to be fireproofed SFRM-1 per spec section 07 81 00			3) Confirmed				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1455 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
and radius in the column webs is acceptable.							
T-1061.1	SSS - Weld Access Holes at Columns Cap Plates	Closed	02/24/2014	03/06/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Per the response to Webcor's RFI # T-1061 (SK RFI # 180B.1) we have complied with the geometry for the weld access hole size per AWS D1.8, section 6.10. Using this formula we have shown the connection on CD RFI # 134.2 SK1 for a BU column with a 3 1/2" thick web. Please confirm the remaining 5 1/2" web material as shown on SK1 is acceptable.				Confirmed that it is acceptable to use AWS D1.8 for WAH geometry and confirmed that the 5 1/2" remaining web material for the column with 3 1/2" web thickness is acceptable.			
T-1062	BSE - Timber Pile Removal from CDSM Wall	Closed	01/03/2014	01/02/2014	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Danny Walsh							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
BBII has located portions of timber piles in several CDSM wall panels along gridline A in zone 3 at excavation levels 4 and 5, between soldier piles 255-257 and 259-261. BBII believes any attempt to remove the piles has the potential to damage the CDSM wall. Given that there is no issue with water intrusion at the pile locations and the CDSM material is in good condition, BBII believes the best course of action is to leave them in place. To ensure a smooth surface for waterproofing, the piles have been ground down so that they are recessed from the face of wall. BBII will then patch over the panel to bring it flush with the CDSM piles. (Patching has already occurred on a portion of the affected areas - see attached photos of panels before and after the above procedure.)				ARUP Response: We take no exception. Adamson Associates, Inc. Response: The CM/GC shall confirm the waterproofing subcontractor/manufacturer and the contractor's waterproofing system designer accept the site conditions			
Please confirm this is acceptable							



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1063	BSE - Micropile E335 Relocation	Closed	12/26/2013	01/05/2014	01/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Kelly Phariss			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
REQUEST: Micropiles E335 cannot be installed as laid out due to a dewatering well. BBII proposes moving E335 North 3' and West 2'. See attached sketch. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Confirmed.				
T-1064	BGP - Fire Alarm Conduits at Column D.8/12	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing A1-9204. Detail A on A1-9204 calls for embedded junction boxes on GL D.8 from GL 13 to GL 33.2. A set of (3) 1" fire alarm conduits were erroneously installed embedded at the column on D.8/12 rather than stubbing up outside the column. An embedded junction box was installed flush with the face of the column at a height of 13'-9" to center per Detail A. If future devices are to be installed on that column at a different height, then an extension box can be installed, and conduit can be run from the extension box on the surface of the column. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			George Metzger 1/9/2014 RESPONSE: 1) For the condition described in the RFI, the Contractor should include an extension box with blank faceplate, box depth of 2-3/4" (which will be flush with the finished face of the future column cladding). 2) Extension box shall have knockout provisions for the conduit extension to the strobe to be concealed within the finished column wrap. 3) The as-built condition and detail shall be documented on the as-built drawings.				
T-1065	BGP - Elevation Discrepancy at Escalator Pit near GL 21/E.2	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	01/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing S1-2205, S1-7660 and SKA-2919. The depth from the concourse TOC to the TOC in the pit conflicts in Details 10 and 11 of drawing sheet S1-7660. Detail 11 shows a distance of 4-feet from the concourse finished floor to the TOC in the pit. As drawn, this			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			The details are not in conflict. Detail 11: FF=-7'-9" minus 4'-0" = -11'-9". Detail 10: TOC=-8'-2" minus 3'-7" = -11'-9". Pit depth relative to FF = 4'-0". Pit depth relative to TOC = 3'-7". Refer to Sheet A1-2205.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1457 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1066	<p>indicates a concourse TOC to pit TOC depth of 3'-9". Detail 10 shows the dimensions between the concourse TOC and the bottom of the slab in the pit as 4-feet, and this indicates a concourse TOC to pit TOC depth of 3'-7". Elevations provided in SK2919 also indicate the concourse TOC to pit TOC distance is 3'-7".</p> <p>Please clarify the correct depth dimensions for the pits represented in Details 10 and 11 of S1-7660.</p> <p>BGP - Moment Frame Beam and Column Conflict GL 21</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</p> <p>REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing S1-2025, S1-3304 and S1-3621.</p> <p>Please confirm that the moment frame beam at GL 21 is 66-inches. Columns at GL C21 and G21 are 68-inches which make them 2-inches wider than the moment frame beam.</p>	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	01/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
		Increase GL21 moment frame beam width from 66" to 72" per sketch SKS-0323. Required revisions to the rebar detailing is also provided in the same sketch.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1067	SSS - Stair and Elevator Connections	Closed	12/30/2013	12/30/2013	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Arup Rich Coffin							
REQUEST: For typical stair & elevator connections refer to sketches CD RFI 181 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 11: 1. Please consider attached detail (CD RFI 181 SK4) as an alternative for elevator post bases shown in 1/S1-7600 and 10/S1-7600. 2. Confirm a 1/16" gap between post and angle on each side is acceptable (CD RFI 181 SK1). 3. Plate washers are not shown for the slotted holes for 1" dia. A307 bolts. Are they required? (CD RFI 181 SK1) 4. Supply dimensions for kicker brace connections to composite deck requested on (CD RFI 181 SK2) 5. Confirm gusset and hole dimensions at top of kicker brace (Detail E) are same as shown for bottom of brace connection shown in CD RFI 181 SK2B.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The Design Team cannot accept the proposed detail as shown in CD RFI 181 SK4 because required fire protection and separation of the structural beam and slab is not able to be maintained. Note that the HSS is to align with the EOS and not be set off the EOS by the noted 1/2" dimension in CD RFI 181 SK4. 2. Confirmed. 3. No. 4. For detail 2D/S1-7600, the width of the plate is the length required to capture 2 flutes as shown in detail. Fasteners shall be centered on deck bottom flute. For detail 2B/S1-7600, fasteners shall be 3" from the ends of the plate/angle and 6" min between fasteners. 5. Confirmed with the following exception: The centerline of bolt to end of kicker angle at bottom flange of beam and top of brace at the L5x5 shall be 2".			
<hr/>							
T-1067.1	SSS - Stair and Elevator Connections	Closed	03/18/2014	03/28/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached SK1 & 2 for items 1 & 2: 1) Details B, C & D are not practical as it is not known where the deck bottom flutes will be located at the time of modeling this project. As designed it is not possible to position the brace so the anchor bolts will be located on the centers of bottom flutes. Please confirm it is acceptable to model an oversized plate with additional staggered holes to account for the unknown position of the bottom flutes or supply an alternate detail. 2) Confirm a vertical short slot can be provided in the angle of the top bolted connection to allow for fabrication tolerances of the WF beam.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Detail B, C, D cover possible conditions where the brace hits the metal deck. This types of detail is usually field adjusted, and does not require pre-fabrication. Skanska please confirm. 2) A vertical short slot in the HSS10x4 is acceptable. No need to increase the size of the angle.			
<hr/>							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1067.2	SSS - Stair and Elevator Connections	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: As per the response to T-1067.1 Skanska confirms these details will require field adjustment and proposes the following as per SK1: 1) Confirm it is acceptable to (a) field weld the bottom connection after aligning the top connection to center of low flutes when deck flutes are parallel to kicker and (b) field drill the top connection after aligning the L6 to center of low flutes when deck flutes are perpendicular to the kicker. 2) Confirm the diameter of expansion bolt required. 3) Confirm the field drilled top connection is acceptable at deck flutes perpendicular to the kicker as this will vary from the direction in T-1067 #5.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1a, 1b) We don't take any exception to the erection approach outlined by the Contractor. Regarding SK1 of the RFI, it is acceptable to field align braces with the closest deck flutes. 2) Confirmed. 3) It is unclear how the 2" bolt edge distance requirement to the edge of the angle brace per response to item 5 of RFI T-1067 affects the distances noted as "6 inch" and "varies" on SK1. Please add this item to the agenda of an upcoming structural coordination meeting.			
T-1068	SSS - Perimeter Connections at GL C&G	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Details 7 & 8/S1-3703 are shown on sheet S1-2305 as typical sections for beams connecting perpendicular to the perimeter BU & WF beams at grid lines C & G. These sections reflect the varying elevation differences between the two members. In most conditions, the remaining depth of the beam framing into the perimeter BU or WF will only allow for a two bolt connection as shown in details 7 & 8/S1-3703. 1) Please confirm it is acceptable to use a two bolt shear plate connection for any beam size where the remaining depth of the connecting beam will only allow for two bolts. The shear plate thickness and welding will be per the schedule on 1/S1-5011. 2) Please confirm at some locations it is acceptable to cut the flange flush on one side of the beam to maintain edge distance. 3) Please confirm edge distance can be reduced where needed to complete connection. 4) Please confirm a double angle connection should be used when the varying elevations will allow for more than a two bolt connection. The angle size & thickness will be per		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Details 7 & 8 /S1-3703 showing 2 bolt shear connection are applicable to the condition where the sections are cut and similar condition. 2). Confirmed. Specific application of this detail will be reviewed on a case by case basis during shop drawing review. 3). AISC minimum edge distance shall be maintained. 4). Confirmed. 5). Confirmed. Specific application of the approach stated will be reviewed on a case by case basis during shop drawing review.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: At the Bus deck level (S1-2503) @ grids D/9.9 & 10.1 and F/9.9 & 10.1 the 3/8" edge of slab bent plate protrudes 3'-4" & 2'-3" from grid lines 9.9 & 10.1 respectively as shown on sketch CD RFI 244 SK1. Due to the 5'-0 protected zone at these lo cations the angle supports per detail 9/S1-5000 cannot be attached due to no welding is allowed in this area. Please advise on this non supported area and other similar type areas where no welding is allowed in the protected zones.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> At grids D/9.9 & 10.1 and F/9.9 & 10.1, run an L5x5X3/8 parallel to the moment frame beam between the two outriggers, namely, the cantilever W30x90 (gravity moment connected to the MF beam) and the support angle at the moment frame column. Attach the angle legs to each support using fillet welds (1/4" thk, 2" long), cope the angle as needed. Note that seam welding to be provided where the bent plate width changes.				
T-1071.1	SSS - Edge of slab support @ protected zones	Closed	02/11/2014	02/21/2014	02/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: 1). Per the response to Webcor RFI # T-1071 (SK RFI # 313) please verify the bolted end connections for the new L5x5x3/8 angle now required as shown on sketch CD RFI # 244.1 SK1. 2). To eliminate any overhead field welding confirm the bent plate required will be shop attached to the angle.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The intent for the RFI T-1071.0 is further clarified on the attached sketch. Either bolted or welded connection is acceptable. 2). Skanska should verify whether the bent plate is to be shop welded. Shop welded bent plate might affect the weld access of the moment connection at the beam bottom flange if a "wild cat" position is to be used.				
<hr/>							
T-1072	SSS - Clarify Beam Connections at Protected Zones	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	01/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch					
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: At the Bus deck level near grids 10.1/F & 10.1/D please verify the double angle connections for the W16 beams can partially connect into the protected zones for the BU moment girders as shown on sketch CD RFI 247 SK1. If not please supply an alternate connection.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The encroachments into the protected zones by the double angle connections at the two locations indicated the RFI are acceptable. Note that the W16X26s indicated in the RFI have been revised to W21X50s in 12/13/13 package (TG 7.2 IFB, Addendum #1 package).				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1073	SSS - North Exit Mezzanine Support	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	01/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please refer to detail 1/S1-2252 in regards to the following clarifications for the North Exit Mezzanine: 1.) Please provide connection details for MC4x13.8 channels framing into the W12x40 beam, CMU wall, and adjacent MC4x13.8 members. 2.) Please confirm how MC4x13.8 channel, east of GL 24, is supported at east end. 3.) Please provide the required dimension to locate the east end of the W12x40 member. 4.) Bracing for the W12x40 appears to be located slightly west of CL 23. Please provide the indicated dimension to locate bracing. Verify that this is the only location to receive bracing along the length of the W12x40. 5.) a. Please confirm the splice locations indicated on SK1 for the W12x40 beam are acceptable. Note that the splice just west of CL 23 may need to be shifted slightly depending on the response to item #3. b. Please provide a splice detail for the W12x40. Note that bolted splice connections are preferred.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. For MC4 to W12, weld channel with 5/16 fillet weld to 3/8" thick plate welded to underside of W12 beam (use 1/4" fillet weld, NS/FS). See 4/S1-5032 for graphic reference. For MC4 to CMU wall refer to updated version of sheet dated 12/13/2013 Issued for Bid Addendum #1. For MC4 to perpendicular MC4, use 1/4" fillet weld all around. 2. Refer to 12/S1-9001. 3. End of W12 is at EOS. Refer to architectural drawings for EOS. 4. Dimension to locate bracing in SK1 is 2'-9" west of gridline 23. Locate second set of bracing at 6'-9" west of gridline 24. 5a. Acceptable, however adjust as necessary for brace locations identified in response 4. Locate splice in middle third of spans between hanger locations and avoid locations 3 ft within brace locations. 5b. Refer to T-0979 SSS RFI response for splice information.	
<hr/>							
T-1073.1	SSS - North Exit Mezzanine Support	Closed	12/08/2014	12/18/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 1/S1-2252 Location: Zone 3, Mezzanine Grid Line: B & 23 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 206.1 SK1, RFI T-1073 Response RFI T-1073 requested connection details for the MC4x13.8 channels froming into the W12x40 beam, CMU wall, and adjacent MC4x13.8 members. The response to for the channel to channel connection is			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1463 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>inadequate. Fillet welding the connection all around is not workable, as the top and bottom surfaces are flush.</p> <p>Confirm the connection as shown in SK1 is acceptable or supply another workable connection.</p>						
T-1074	SSS - Crash Rail at Bus Deck	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
On the Bus deck level, at the Crash Rail detail 1/S1-8000, refer to sketches CD RFI 242 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 3:				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1.) Confirm the noted weld is acceptable.				1). Confirmed			
2.) Confirm the noted weld is acceptable.							
3.) Please confirm it is acceptable to provide a 7/8" plate in lieu of a 13/16" plate, as a 13/16" plate to match the flange thickness is not available. Note this creates a 1/16" gap between the top of the stiffener and underside of the beam flange as indicated in SK3. Please confirm this is acceptable or provide an alternate solution.				2). Confirmed			
				3). Confirm using 7/8" plate is acceptable. Provide shim plate at the bolt connection. Confirmed the 1/16" gap at the stiffener plate is acceptable. Adjust the fillet weld size per AWS code to account for the 1/16".			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1464 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1075	SSS - Girder Weld Details	Closed	12/31/2013	01/10/2014	01/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: For girder weld details, refer to detail 7/S1-4202 & CD RFI 241 SK1 for the following: 1). Please verify that holes are not required in the built up members as shown on CD RFI SK1. 2). Please verify the noted welds as shown on CD RFI SK1. 3). Please verify the weld transition as shown on CD RFI SK1.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1.) If the contractor chooses to splice the beam flanges at these weld transitions, then these holes would serve as weld access holes. Otherwise these holes are not required. 2.) To be reviewed as part of shop drawings, following submittal and review of welding procedures. 3.) If no hole used, weld transition should comply with AWS D1.1 Section 2.8.2. Fillet weld shall start at the transition line shown in the construction drawings (i.e., fillet weld to overlap with tapering CJP).		
T-1076	SSS - Transfer Girder Stiffener & Shear Plates	Closed	12/31/2013	01/10/2014	01/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: 1). At the Transfer girder stiffener & shear plates noted on S1-5052 & 2/S1-4350 verify the plates corner access hole size with a 1/2" radius when the stiffener & shear plates are welded with a CJP prep as noted on sketch CD RFI # 166.1 SK1 is acceptable. 2). At the Transfer girder stiffener & shear plates noted on S1-5052 & 2/S1-4350 verify the plates corner clip size when the stiffener & shear plates are welded with a fillet weld as noted on sketch CD RFI # 166.1 SK2 is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1.) Acceptable. 2.) Acceptable. Note that a minimum clear distance of ½ inch shall be provided between the access hole and fillet welds connecting the stiffener (or shear plate) to beam web.		
T-1077	Bracing removal/re-bracing sequence on the west end of Zone 1	Closed	01/02/2014	01/12/2014	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Bracing removal/re-bracing sequence on the west end of Zone 1			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed method is not acceptable. Both sets of diagonal bracing, on the north side and the south side,		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

WOJV is proposing the following sequence for the re-bracing/ Bracing removal for the west side of Zone 1 See sketches SK-1, 2 & 3 attached.

For level C strut removal see sequence on attached sketch SK1. WOJV is proposing to remove level C bracing in three defined areas.

1. Remove level C Cross lot struts and walers from east to west direction once the walls and RB re-bracing is installed and stressed.
2. Remove level C struts and walers from south west corner once the walls and RB re-bracing rakers beneath are installed.
3. Remove level C struts and walers from north west corner once the walls and RB rakers beneath have been installed.

For level B strut removal see sequence and defined areas on attached sketch SK2

1. Remove level B struts and walers from east to west direction once the lower concourse slab beneath has been place, cured and reached the required design strength.
2. Remove level B struts and walers from south west and north west corner once the lower concourse slab beneath has been place, cured and reached the required design strength.

For level A strut removal see sequence on attached sketch SK3

1. Remove level A cross lot struts and walers from east to west direction once the RA re-bracing is installed and stressed.
2. Remove level A struts and walers from south west corner once all the RA re-bracing rakers and +7.00' diaphragm slab beneath have been installed.
3. Remove level A struts and walers from north west corner once the RA re-bracing rakers beneath have been installed.

Please confirm if this sequence would be acceptable

and the first few cross lot braces work in conjunction as a group. Any one part cannot be removed until the rebracing is complete for the entire group.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1467 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>In so doing, there is potential that the "minimum 1-inch extrusion" called out for the drag pads on the bus deck nodes on the structural drawings may be violated in some cases (refer to 1/S1-5121 attached).</p> <p>Assuming that this minimum dimension was provided to accommodate fabrication, and given that the responsibility for fabrication and erection is with Skanska, please confirm that it would be acceptable for Skanska to violate the 1inch minimum extrusion with machining of the pad.</p> <p>With the design team's approval, Skanska hereby proposes to move forward with machining of the pads without the submission of RFIs for every bus deck node. RFIs will only be submitted for those cases where the planned machining of the pad may slightly undercut an adjacent pad or where the planned machining may slightly bite into the main body of the node.</p>						
T-1079	Bracing removal-rebracing sequence on the East end of Zone 4	Closed	01/02/2014	01/12/2014	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<p>Bracing removal/re-bracing sequence on the East end of Zone 4</p> <p>WOJV is proposing the following sequence for the re-bracing/ Bracing removal for the East side of Zone 4 See sketches SK1, 2, 3 & 4 attached.</p> <p>For level D strut removal see sequence on attached sketch SK1. WOJV is proposing to remove level D bracing in two defined areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Remove level D Cross lot struts and walers from west to east direction once the mat slab beneath has been place, cured and reached adequate strength.2. Remove level D struts and walers from south east and north east corner's once the mat slab beneath has been place, cured and reached adequate strength. <p>For level C strut removal see sequence and defined areas</p>					<p>The propopsed method is not acceptable. Both sets of diagonal bracing, on the north side and the south side, and the first few cross lot braces work in conjunction as a group. Any one part cannot be removed until the rebracing is complete for the entire group.</p>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1468 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>on attached sketch SK2</p> <p>1. Remove level C Cross lot struts and walers from west to east direction once the walls and RB re-bracing is installed and stressed.</p> <p>2. Remove level C struts and walers from South East and North West corner's once the walls and RB re-bracing rakers beneath are installed.</p> <p>For level B strut removal see sequence and defined areas on attached sketch SK3</p> <p>1. Remove level B struts and walers from west to east direction once the lower concourse slab beneath has been place, cured and reached the required design strength.</p> <p>2. Remove level B struts and walers from South East and North West corner's once the lower concourse slab beneath has been place, cured and reached the required design strength.</p> <p>For level A strut removal see sequence on attached sketch SK4</p> <p>1. Remove level A cross lot struts and walers from west to east direction once the RA re-bracing is installed and stressed.</p> <p>2. Remove level A struts and walers from South East and North West corner's once all the RA re-bracing rakers beneath have been installed.</p> <p>Please confirm if this sequence would be acceptable</p>						
T-1080	SSS - Double Angle Connection Clarification	Closed	01/02/2014	01/12/2014	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 250 SK1 & SK2 and confirm the 3/4x6 stiffener per 1/S1-7604 may be omitted on the noted side as it will foul the double angle connection for the W33x130.				It is acceptable to omit the stiffener on one side of the beam as noted in the RFI			
If not, supply an alternate detail.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1469 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1081	BGP - Shear Wall Horizontal Hooks Near GL 1.4-K	Closed	01/03/2014	01/13/2014	01/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
At the shear wall (first lift) near grids 1.4/K, the tails to the horizontal hooks which terminate at the columns were erroneously cut in the field and no longer provide the proper development length. See the attached sketch for specific portions of the shear wall affected. Per field discussions with the TT engineer on site, Gerdau proposes to leave the hooks that have been cut "as-is" and to add a standard 180° #9 hook to allow for proper development of the horizontal bar. Please confirm if this is acceptable					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					George Metzger 1/6/2014 RESPONSE: Confirmed		
T-1083	BGP - Geothermal Riser Pressure Gauge Location	Closed	01/06/2014	12/30/2013	01/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Previous geothermal fields and risers had a "cat walk" behind the risers at grade. Additional pipe and 90s were added to bring the gauges up to grade to allow for pressure monitoring from this "catwalk." At fields 09-15 no cat walk exists, thus no location to access these gauges from.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please provide the location for the geothermal riser gauges for inspection from Field 09 through Field 15.					George Metzger 1/15/2014 RESPONSE: Gauges shall be located at the top of the risers. Monitoring of the gauges to confirm that the piping system has not been damaged is the means and methods of the contractor.		
T-1084	SSS - Connection Clarification	Closed	01/06/2014	01/16/2014	01/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached CD RFI # 250 SK1 & SK2 and supply the welding for the noted connection as S+t per 8/S1-5012 will result in 1 5/8" fillet welds.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Weld size shall be as detailed on 8/S1-5012. As noted on the detail, "s" is per schedule on 1/S1-5011, and "t" is the thickness of the shim plate.		
T-1085	SSS - Framing Clarifications	Closed	01/06/2014	01/16/2014	01/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California Dis	Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company	Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 252 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1.) Confirm the 3" drag plate typically extends from the column to the W24x55 as shown. 2.) Confirm detail 8/S1-5020 may be modified as shown to suit the actual condition. If not, supply a new detail showing the drag plate in its sloped position.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.				
	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>					
T-1086	SSS - Missing Brace Locations	Closed	01/06/2014	01/16/2014	01/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California Dis	Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company	Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 253 SK1 & SK2 and please confirm the kicker brace locations as shown are acceptable. If not, supply the location from a grid line.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: CONFIRMED				
			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1087	SSS - Connection Clarifications for Skewed Beams	Closed	01/07/2014	01/17/2014	01/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Reference details 7 & 8/S1-5010 and CD RFI 094 SK1 to SK7 for clarifications required on skewed beam connections as noted below.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
1.) Refer to S1-2303 and CD RFI SK1 indicating an example location where a skewed beam and standard beam connection occur at the same location on the support beam. As noted on CD RFI 094 SK4, the connections foul at this typical condition. Please confirm it is typically acceptable to replace one of the connections with a shear plate connection per detail 1/S1-5011 or supply an alternate typical solution.			1) No, it is not typically acceptable to replace one of the double angle connection with a shear plate connection. Shear plate connection might be able to use for some short span beam if specifically approved during the shop drawings review. The conflict shown on CD RFI 094 SK4 might be resolved by using an bent plate with longer leg.				
2.) Refer to S1-2303 and CD RFI SK1 indicating an example location for two-sided skewed beam connections. As noted on CD RFI 094 SK5, the non -symmetrical bolt locations in detail 7/S1-5050 will not work at two-sided connections. Please confirm it is typically acceptable to locate the bolts as shown at two-sided connections or provide an alternate detail for this condition.			2) Confirmed.				
3.) Refer to S1-2305 and CD RFI SK2 indicating an example location of a two-sided skewed beam connection. As noted on CD RFI 094 SK 6, the non-symmetrical bolt location in detail 8/S1-5010 will not work at two-sided connections. Please supply a typical alternate detail for these conditions.			3) At this specific location, A single shear plate connection per Detail 1/S1-5011 may be used for W16 x 26 beam.				
4.) Detail 8/S1-5010 shows the shear plate on the obtuse side. Confirm it is acceptable to locate the shear plate on the acute side for beam erection access purposes as noted on CD RFI 094 SK 6.			4) Confirmed.				
5.) Refer to S1-2303 and CD RFI 094 SK3 indicating an example location where details 7 & 8/S1-5010 occur at the same location based on the angles of the skewed beams. Please confirm that one of the connections may be typically replaced with a skewed shear plate per 1/S1-5011 to avoid the conflict shown on CD RFI 094 SK7, or supply a new typical alternate detail.			5) It is not typically acceptable to replace one of the double angle connection with a shear plate connection. Shear plate connection might be able to use for some short span beam if specifically approved during the shop drawings review.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1472 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1087.1	SSS - Connection Clarifications for Skewed Beams	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 094.1 SK1: The response in RFI T-1087 (SK 122, CD 094) item 3 does not work as the bolts/shear plate foul each other as shown. Supply an alternate typical detail for skewed 2 sided beam to beam connections.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The W24x55 beam shall be moved by a few inches towards GL F to clear the bolts of the W21x44 connection. This solution may be applied at three other similar instances around the light column. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request. We categorize this as a no cost clarification.				
T-1088	BGP - Shear Wall Corbel Tie Spacing at W190C, D and E	Closed	01/07/2014	01/17/2014	01/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: In the first lift (up to EL -20.56) of the 190C to 190E shear walls, the #6 ties were installed at 5-inches O.C. instead 4-inches O.C. Please confirm if it is acceptable to leave the corbels as-installed. If not acceptable, Gerdau proposes to install additional T9 (hairpin) ties between every 4ea - #6 ties on the Western face of the corbel. See attached SCCI sketch SK-RFI 410 for details. Please confirm if this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to leave the corbels as installed (5" tie spacing) without adding additional hairpins.				
T-1089	BGP - Concourse Beam Added Bar Congestion at GL 10.1 to 12	Closed	01/07/2014	01/17/2014	01/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing S1-2203, S1-3400. In the lower concourse, where four beam pairs consisting of C68 and C69 between GL 10.1 and 12, the added short bars at the top and bottom intrude into the laps of typical bars. This would mean per plans, SCCI would have 14 bars at the top location and 18 bars at the bottom location. Gerdau proposes to move the additional short bars into their own layer to alleviate congestion. Please confirm if this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor proposal to place additional short bars at B68 and B69 beams between GL10.1 and 12 in a second layer is acceptable. Place bars in second layer with 1.5" clear distance between the 1st layer.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1473 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1090	BGP - Elevator Opening Embed Dimensions at GL 2/E, 8/E and 23/E	Closed	01/07/2014	01/07/2014	01/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawings: SK.A-2916, SK.A-2917, SK.A-2921, SI-7004, SI-7104, SI-7111, and S 1-7600. Details for the pits located at grid lines 2/E, 8/E, and 23/E are missing dimensions. Please provide dimensions for installation of the embed per detail 11/S1-7600 at above referenced grid lines.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketch "20140117 RFI T-1090 SSS sketch comments" for the requested dimensions for installation of the embed plate.		
T-1091	SSS - Transfer Girder Rebar Hole Spacing	Closed	01/08/2014	01/18/2014	01/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 258 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 3: 1.) The spacing for the #4 stirrups is given as 5 1/2" & 8". Confirm 5 1/2" is correct. 2.) Confirm the first holes for the #4 stirrup may be located 5 3/4" from the end of girder (centered between the headed studs). 3.) The 2" dia. holes for the #4 stirrups foul the stiffeners at (4) locations. Confirm it is acceptable to move the holes as shown.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Spacing shall be 8" as shown on 5/S1-3705. 2). Confirmed. 3). The hole may be moved slightly to clear the stiffeners. Holes at the top and bottom shall be in line, so where one hole is moved, the hole on the opposite side shall be moved accordingly also.		
T-1092	SSS - Ground Level Cast Nodes	Closed	01/09/2014	01/19/2014	01/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: In recent meetings, Webcor/Obayashi has made it clear that the same Ground Level Cast Node geometry will be used at multiple locations even though the angle of the lower Basket Columns changes at each Node. This adds a level of complexity and cost to the joint between the Cast Node and Basket Column Pipe due to the kink imposed on that joint as a result of the following:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per Contract, RFIs shall not be used as a vehicle for requesting cost and schedule increases which appears to be the purpose of this Skanska/OIW statements; "A negative response will result in a cost increase and a time increase" are examples. The contract drawings at bid time clearly showed that		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1474 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>- The Lower Pipe Columns will be required to be limiter cut" instead of a traditional square cut end. (Please note Spec Section OS 10 00, paragraph 3.2.M.1 states 11Bearing ends of columns shall be milled or sawn square perpendicular to axis of the column.")</p> <p>-Miter cut Pipe will have an ellipse cross section and will not match the circular Casting Node.</p> <p>- Backing bars used to full pen weld the Pipe Column to the Cast Node would need to be custom machined to match the ellipse Pipe and circular Node to eliminate weld gaps. This significantly increases the complexity and risk for successfully welding the joint, and reduces the adjustability for fit up of these joints in the shop and the field.</p> <p>This kink can be accommodated either by machining the nozzle of the Cast Node to be perpendicular to the pipe, or by machining the pipe end at a mitered angle to match the Cast Node.</p> <p>Since this joint on the Cast Node is already being machined, OIW believes that the more desirable and less expensive option is to machine the nozzle of the Cast Node perpendicular to the axis of the Basket Column Pipe. As the nozzles will each be custom machined regardless, machining them to match the pipe axis should be a relatively low cost change.</p> <p>OIW requests that the nozzles of each Ground Level Cast Nodes to be machined perpendicular to the axis of the adjoining lower Basket Column Pipe.</p> <p>A negative response will result in a cost increase and a time increase.</p>						
T-1093	BGP - Foundation Wall Mix Placed in Shear Wall	Closed	01/09/2014	01/19/2014	01/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please reference TG06.0 technical specs section				Contractor-proposed mix design variance for			
				the centerline of the pipe is not in line with the centerline of the cast node nozzle, and that the cast nodes were not miter cut to be perpendicular to the incoming pipe. The reference to Spec section 05 10 00 noted in this RFI regarding bearing ends does not apply for this condition as the pipe to cast node connections are not "bearing" connections, they are a fully welded connections as shown on the contract documents.			
				This "kink" between the bottom-side of the ground floor basket column and the top-side of the ground floor cast node - resulting from the building's geometry and the use of the same cast node type in multiple locations - can be accommodated by miter cutting either the pipe or the cast node. However, the contract documents, including those cast node shop drawings available during bid, clearly show that the ground floor cast nodes were not going to be miter cut, so miter cutting of the basket column pipe members by the Steel Contractor is necessary to accommodate the building's geometry.			
				Miter cut of the cast node is not acceptable architecturally. The specified miter angle of the pipe does not exceed 1.5-degrees in any location.. Even though Miter cut Pipe will have an ellipse cross section, the lips created by the ellipse cross section is very small (1/160"), which can be ground smooth as a part of weld grinding for meeting AESS requirements. Weld assist devices like backing bars, a contractor means and methods for joints fit up in the shop and the field, are the responsibility of Skanska.			

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1095	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL14G	Closed	01/09/2014	01/19/2014	01/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 262 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 6: 1.) Supply the slope angle for MFB4. 2.) Confirm the noted information is the correct information to determine the top end of MFB4. 3.) Supply the noted dimension (to be used to locate PL 2 1/2 x 9 x 2'-6). 4.) Confirm the braces shown on S1-2304 (SK1) may be located as shown to avoid fouling the stiffeners in Girder TR14. 5.) Supply the underside of slab dimension at the location of the brace per item 4. 6.) Supply the underside of slab dimension at the location of the brace per item 4.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). The slope of the beam can be calculated from the Top of Slab Elevations given at each end of the beam. 2). Confirmed. 3). Centerline of the welded coupler is at the elevation that is equal to the bottom of the beam minus the clear cover (see 5/S1-3600) minus diameter of the stirrups minus 1/2 of the rebar diameter. 4). Confirmed. 5). Underside of the slab is 10" below the top of slab, which can be calculated based on the spot elevations given (also see response #1). 6). See response #5.			
T-1097	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL19.9 & 20.1G	Closed	01/09/2014	01/19/2014	01/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 264 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 8: 1.) Supply the slope angle for MFB1. 2.) Confirm the noted information is the correct information to determine the top end of MFB1. 3.) Supply the noted dimension (to be used to locate PL 2 1/2 x 9 x 2'-6). 4.) The braces per 5/S1-5015 as shown on plan (SK1) will cross each other between Grids 19.9 & 20.1 as shown on SK3 & SK4. There is insufficient room on Girders TR19.9 & TR20.1 to accommodate these brace connections without the braces fouling each other. Please work with SK3 & SK4 and provide a solution. 5.) Supply the underside of slab dimension at the location of the brace per item 4. 6.) Supply the underside of slab dimension at the location of the brace per item 4.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). The slope of the beam can be calculated from the Top of Slab Elevation at each end of the beam. 2). Confirmed. 3). Centerline of the welded coupler is at the elevation that is equal to the bottom of the beam minus the clear cover (see 5/S1-3600) minus diameter of the stirrups minus 1/2 of the rebar diameter. 4). The cross brace between 19.9 and 20.1 may be replaced by a single horizontal brace. 5). Underside of the slab is 10" below the top of slab, which can be calculated based on the spot elevations given (also see response #1) 6) See response #5 7) See response #5 8) See response #5			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1477 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	7.) Supply the underside of slab dimension at the location of the brace per item 4. 8.) Supply the underside of slab dimension at the location of the brace per item 4.						
T-1097.1	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL19.9 & 20.1G	Closed	03/12/2014	03/22/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 264.1 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 4: At GL 22/G detail 9/S1-3702 is noted as typical at Grids 19.9 & 20.1 on S1-2305. However, TR19.9 & TR20.1 do not match the information as shown in detail 9/S1-3702 due to the MFB1 concrete beam & BU girder depth. See SK3 for the outline of the MFB1 and please provide direction for the following items at Grids 19.9 & 20.1. 1) The number of headed studs requested in detail 9/S1-3702 will not fit TR19.9 & TR20.1. Supply the number of headed studs required with location dimensions. 2) The PL 2 1/2 x 9 x 2'-6 cannot be welded as shown in detail 9/S1-3702. Please advise. 3) The 2" diameter holes at the bottom of MFB1 thru the webs of TR19.9 & TR20.1 cannot be supplied as requested. Please advise. 4) The L8x4x1/2x2'-0 cannot be supplied as shown. Please advise.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
		The top of the beam is at 16.07', and the bottom of the concrete beam is at 12.07'. The top of Transfer Girder is at 17.60', which allows 5.3' high region for 5 rows of studs at 6" spacing (out to out distance of 2'-0"). Lower the stud group so that that top row is 6" below the top of concrete beam. 2). The 2 1/2" plate is incorrectly shown graphically. The end of the plate is to flush with the end of the transfer girder web. 3). 2" dia holes are to be provided. The center of the hole is to be 2" above the bottom of the concrete beam. 4). The angle may be deleted.					



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1097.2	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL19.9 & 20.1G	Closed	05/23/2014	06/02/2014	06/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 264.2 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 3: 1. The group of headed studs has been lowered to 6" below the concrete beam per response in RFI T-1097.1 (SK 340.1, CD 264.1). Please confirm the headed studs may be moved as necessary to clear the stiffeners. 2. Please clarify the vertical location for the PL 2 1/2 x 9 x 2'-6. 3. The 2" dia. holes cannot be located 2" above the bottom of the concrete beam as requested in RFI T-1097.1 (SK 340.1, CD 264.1) as the concrete beam is below TR19.9 as shown. Please clarify where the 2" dia. holes are to be placed.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Confirmed. 2). PL 2 1/2" x 9" x 2'-6" may be deleted and the couplers may be welded to the bottom flange of the transfer girder directly. 3). The holes are to be located above the bottom flange (as close as possible to the flange).			
T-1098	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL16C	Closed	01/09/2014	01/19/2014	01/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 266 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3: 1.) Supply the location of the braces from grid 'C' considering the dimensions on TR16 shown on SK2 and the connection for the braces to the girder per 8/S1-5015. 2.) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace located per dimension supplied in item 1. 3.) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace located per dimension supplied in item 1.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Brace may be similarly located per RFI T-1095 (Skanska RFI 338). 2) The bottom of slab elevation is 10" below the top of slab, which can be calculated using the spot elevations at each end of the beam given. 3) See response to item 2).			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1479 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1099	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL14C	Closed	01/09/2014	01/19/2014	01/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 265 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3: 1.) Supply the location of the braces from grid 'C' considering the dimensions on TR14 shown on SK2 and the connection for the braces to the girder per 8/S1-5015. 2.) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace located per dimension supplied in item 1. 3.) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace located per dimension supplied in item 1.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). The braces may be connected to the first Transfer girder bottom flange stiffeners away from the column. 2). The bottom of slab elevation equal to top of slab (16.81' as noted on the plan) minus 10" 3). See response #2.				
T-1100	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL19.9 & 20.1C	Closed	01/10/2014	01/20/2014	01/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 267 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1.) Supply the location of the braces from Grid C considering the dimensions on TR19.9 & TR20.1 per 3/S1-3705 as shown on SK2 and the connections for the braces to the Girders per 8/S1-5015. 2.) Supply the underside of slab elevations at each brace located per dimensions supplied in item 1.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). See response #1 for RFI T-1099. 2). The bottom of the slab is 10" below top of the slab (16.07' as noted on plan).				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1100.1	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL19.9 & 20.1C	Closed	03/12/2014	03/22/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached CD RFI # 267.1 SK1 for items 1 to 3: At GL 22/C detail 3/S1-3705 is noted as typical at Grids 19.9 & 20.1 on S1-2305. However, TR19.9 & TR20.1 do not match the information as shown in detail 3/S1-3705. See SK1 for the outline of the MFB1 and please provide direction for the following items at Grids 19.9 & 20.1.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) The 112 headed studs requested in detail 3/S1-3705 will not fit inside the MFB1 as is shown. Confirm it is acceptable to eliminate the top row of headed studs and supply a total of 98 headed studs (49 per side) or supply an alternate solution.					1). The top row shall not be eliminated. Those studs will be casted inside a concrete pad.		
2) The 2" diameter holes for the #4 stirrups will not fit inside TR19.9 & TR20.1. Give direction on the bottom stirrup holes and confirm the top stirrup holes are still to be supplied as shown.					2). The top row of 2" dia holes is to be located 3" from the top of the concrete beam.		
3) Confirm the 2 1/2" diameter holes in the bottom stiffeners are no longer required as they will foul the bottom flange of TR19.9 & TR20.1.					The bottom 2" holes shall be located similar to Section 7/S1-3704		
					3). Holes still be needed in the vertical stiffeners. See 7/S1-3704 for hole detail and lenton couplers.		
T-1101	SSS - Connections for Rigging Schemes	Closed	01/10/2014	01/20/2014	02/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Skanska is reviewing the rigging schemes required to erect the Transfer Girders, Built-up Columns and Tapered Roof Girders. Please confirm drilling holes for the bolted connection in the following members is acceptable so Candraft can incorporate them into the model as per:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) Transfer Girders sketches R-1A & R-1B.					Rigging is a means and methods issue, the Design Team does not have specific comment on the proposed rigging scheme, however, the rigging scheme for the transfer girder shall consider the weight of the cast node as it is to be shop welded to the transfer girders.		
2) Built-up Columns sketches R-2A, R-2B & R-2C.							
3) Tapered Roof Girders sketches R-5A & R-5B.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1481 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1102	SSS - Type III Column Base Embedded Plate	Closed	01/09/2014	01/20/2014	01/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Galoyan			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Type III column base detail 8/S1-5051 indicates an embedded plate, as the package delineation line shows the ½" thick embedded plate is not in Skanska's scope of work. TG06 trade subcontractor will be required to coordinate locating the shear studs to clear the congested rebar at these locations. The embedded plates will be supplied and installed by others and Skanska will field weld the L4x3 to the embedded plate as indicated on SK1. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1103	BGP - Increased Slump Specification Limit for Mixes with High-Range Water Redu	Closed	01/13/2014	01/23/2014	01/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference attached letter Authored by Robert Foley, CEMEX QC Manager, dated 1/2/2014 and TG06.0 technical spec section 033020.2.3.F.1.b. SCCI and CEMEX are proposing the following guidelines regarding slump of cast-in-place mix designs that contain 30% or higher fly-ash (CM) and HRWR: 1. Maximum 8-inch slump will continue to be the target slump for delivery of concrete mixes with HRWR. 2. 9-inch and higher slump will be considered an action limit. Whenever slump of consecutive loads exceeds 9 inches, actions will be taken to reduce subsequent slump measurements. 3. Batches with slump as high as 10.5 inches will be accepted provided the batch weights are evaluated to verify the batch did not include water content that exceeds mix design w/c ratio; and the concrete is not visibly segregating. Are these revised guidelines acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: George Metzger 1/15/2014 RESPONSE: The revised guidelines are not acceptable. Acceptability is governed by the limits in the approved mix design submittals and the project Specification within ACI 117 tolerances.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



T-1104.1	BGP - Increase Concourse Construction Joint Spacing	Closed	12/15/2014	12/25/2014	12/18/2014	Potentially
From:	Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher	To:	Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto						
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: 03 30 20 3.2A.4 Location: Lower Concourse Grid Line: 30-35 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1104 Please reference TG06.0 contract spec section 033020.3.2.A.4, RFI T-1104 RESPONSE BGP - Increase Concourse Slab Maximum Construction Joint Spacing, and attached drawing showing proposed CJ layout. SCCI is proposing to increase the allowable maximum construction joint spacing in the lower concourse slab from 96' in Area 15 & 16. Maximum construction joint spacing would be 100' for Area 15 and 99' for Area 16. Joint location will always land on wall joint location below per 033002.3.2.A.4.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Construction joint layout submittal TG0600-030 will be				The contractor-proposed Lower Concourse slab CJs presented in the RFI are acceptable.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
<div>revised and resubmitted to reflect any change made to currently approved layout.</div> <div>Is this acceptable?</div>							
T-1105	SSS - Elevator Rail Supports Erection Aids	Closed	01/14/2014	01/24/2014	01/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 183.1 SK1A, SK1B, SK2A & SK2B for items 1 & 2:				1). a. Connections for elevator guide rail support (HSS Beams) are updated in the MEP/TE/SE/VT Issue for bid package dated 1/23/2014. Refer to the revised drawings in the package for guide rail support and their connection details.			
1.) Confirm the elevator rail support connection with erection aids is acceptable as shown.				b. Erection aids for elevator guide rail support are contractor's means and methods.			
2.) Confirm the elevator rail support connection with erection aids is acceptable as shown.				2). See response to item 1)			
T-1105.1	SSS - Elevator Rail Support Details	Closed	02/12/2014	02/22/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
RFI # changed to T-1105.2							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1105.2	SSS - Elevator Rail Support Details	Closed	02/12/2014	02/22/2014	02/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
The response to RFI T-1105 directs the contractor to issued for bid drawings. Please advise if the new details 7/S17630 & 8/S1-7630 are intended to be for construction, if so please indicate which ASI package these revised drawings will be formally issued with.				Yes, details 7/S1-7630 and 8/S1-7630 are intended for construction. The documents have now been issued to TJPA as and ASI.			
T-1106	SSS - Pretensioned Rod Bearing Plate Hole Dia	Closed	01/14/2014	01/24/2014	01/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
With reference to detail 6/S1-5052 (attached) please review the following:				Contractor proposed use of anchor bolt hole sizes per Table 14-2 of AISC Manual for the pre-tensioned rods in SLRS columns is not acceptable.			
Due to the limited access at the top of the built-up TT please confirm it is acceptable to increase the diameter of the hole in the 4" bearing plate to the maximum allowable size of 3-3/4" as per ASIC table 14-2 (attached) to allow for additional tolerance and workability when installing the 2-1/2" diameter 18' rod. The oversized side hole will only be required at the 17 built-up TT locations and the 6x6x2" plate washer hole will remain the major diameter of the rod + 1/16".							
Please confirm this proposal is acceptable.							
T-1107	SSS - Connection Clarification at Roof Level GL 11	Closed	01/14/2014	01/24/2014	01/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 256 SK1 & SK2.				Confirmed.			
Due to the thick flanges of the W40x593, it is not possible to provide the required 10 bolts in the W36x160 per S1-5010.							
Please confirm it is acceptable to provide 9 bolts as shown or supply a new detail.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1485 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1108	SSS - Edge of Slab Location Clarification	Closed	01/14/2014	01/24/2014	01/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 261 SK1 to SK4: S1-2503 (SK1) shows the beam as 9" from the edge of slab. 1/S1-7303 (SK2) shows the edge of slab as 31'-11 1/2 from Grid 11 but A1-2893 (SK3) shows the edge of slab as 31'-11 from Grid 11. SK4 shows what is currently in the model. Please advise of any correction that needs to be made in the model due to the discrepancy for the edge of slab location.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The dimensions shown on SK-4 are correct. See additional comments noted on the attached sketches RFI T-1108 SSS-Edge of Slab Location Clarification-AAI.pdf.				
T-1109	SSS - Pretension Rod Finish Requirement	Closed	01/14/2014	01/24/2014	01/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: With reference to pretensioned rods required as per schedule 3/S1-5052 please review the following: As the pretensioned rods on the cruciform columns are to receive a fireproof coating please confirm the rods are to be supplied plain (no finish required) as per General Note SS-10 - All steel members and embedded steel angles and plates not painted, coated with fireproofing, nor protected by concrete cover, shall be hot-dipped galvanized. Please confirm this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the pre-tensioned rods are to receive fire proofing; they shall not be galvanized.				
T-1109.1	SSS - Pretension Rod Finish Requirement	Closed	01/27/2014	02/06/2014	02/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: The response to RFI T-1109 (attached) indicates that the pretensioned rods are to receive fireproofing.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The pre-tensioned rods are to increase the bending stiffness of the column in a seismic condition and are considered non-gravity load carrying elements which				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1486 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	1) Please provide the UL assembly for the rod fireproofing. 2) Please confirm that the rods will be Sprayed Fire Resistive Materials SFRM-1 to match the column fireproofing system.					do not require fire protection from a code perspective. As typically recommended by the fire protection manufacturer, non-gravity load carrying attachments be fire proofed to the same level as the protected structural elements.	
						Confirmed.	
T-1110	SSS - Welded Reinforcement at Light Column Tendons	Closed	01/14/2014	01/24/2014	02/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference details 1 and 5 on S1-6008 which indicate that welded reinforcement bars are "to be determined by post-tensioning system supplier." Per detail 4/S1-6008, the PT anchor bolt supplier is Dywidag.				TT has confirmed that the mat slab has a concrete strength of 5 ksi. As per the anchor plate size specified by Bryan Lampe of DSI USA, only 4 ksi concrete strength is required for the anchor plate without additional reinforcing bars. Therefore, we agree that the helical reinforcement can be eliminated at the Light Column anchor rods.			
Per the email attached, Dywidag's representative states that additional reinforcing bars are not required provided the concrete strength is sufficient and that the anchorages are not located particularly close to an exterior concrete face.							
Based on the maximum permissible jacking load and associated maximum bearing stress of 3.8ksi, please confirm the concrete strength is sufficient and that the reinforcing bars can be eliminated at the Light Column tendons.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1487 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1111	SSS - Framing & Connection Clarifications	Closed	01/14/2014	01/24/2014	01/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached CD RFI # 254 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 7:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1.) It appears the noted section references do not apply on the noted level of steel but the detail should be applied on S1-2403. Work with SK1 & SK4 and confirm or clarify how the detail is to be applied at this level.					1). Confirmed that Section 1/S1-7661 is to be applied to S1-2403.		
2.)If detail 1/S1-7661 is to be applied on the noted level, please respond to the following:					2). a. Confirmed.		
a.) Confirm 1/S1-7661 applies within the 10'-11 area.					b. See response to Item 3). The distance from EOS to centerline of the beam varies.		
b.) Supply information for how to apply 1/S1-7661 at the 2 1/4" slab transition per A1-2883 as documented in RFI T-0963 (SK 247 & CD 196)					3). See the attached sketch RFI T-1111 SSS-Framing Connection Clarification -AAL.pdf for the dimensions requested.		
3.)Confirm noted dimensions are correct.					4). Confirmed		
4.) Confirm the L8x8x3/4 does not need to be welded to the plate and/or to the L8x4x1/2. If yes, supply the welding requirement.					5). Use 3/8" plate with weld to beam flange per Detail 8/S1-5000.		
5.)The noted information is not clear. Please supply information for the plate and welding.					6). Provide CJP weld the horizontal leg of L8x4 to beam flange.		
6.)Confirm the horizontal leg of the L8x4x1/2 does not need to be welded to the beam flange. If yes, supply the welding requirement.					7). Confirmed.		
7.)Confirm a slab closure plate per 8/S1-5000 is required on center of beam or clarify the edge of slab along this beam.							
T-1112	SSS - Detail Clarifications	Closed	01/14/2014	01/24/2014	01/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached CD RFI # 259 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1.) The 1" MAX is not achievable with the hole locations shown. The actual gap will be 1 13/16 as shown on SK2. Confirm this is acceptable.					1). Confirmed.		
2.)The stitch plate will foul the web of the WT20x105.5 above if it is located at mid-span. Confirm it is acceptable to locate the stitch plate 7/16" clear of the WT as shown on SK2.					2). Confirmed.		
3.)It is not clear what is meant by the noted size of the shim plates. Confirm it is acceptable to locate the corner of the MC10 2 7/16" below the top of the WT20x105.5 to clear the "k" and to have the shim plates match the profile of the MC10 as shown on SK2. The shim plate size is 10"					3). Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1488 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1113	SSS - Light Column Template Air Gap	Closed	01/14/2014	01/14/2014	01/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Installation of the template at the base of the light column DYWIDAG anchor rod will result in a 1/16" air gap (see SK1). Please confirm it will be acceptable to fill this air gap with either Teflon tape or caulking.				The proposed template detail is ok. SBP has no objections to anything below the loaded anchor.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1114	BGP - Concrete Samples for Columns	Closed	01/15/2014	01/25/2014	01/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Spec: 03 30 20-3.a.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
"The TJPA Representative shall conduct tests of concrete as follows:					George Metzger 1/17/2014 RESPONSE:		
a. Testing frequency: Sample sets for all tests listed below of each concrete design mix placed each day shall be taken not less than once a day, nor less than once for each 100 cubic yards of concrete, nor less than once for each 5000 square feet of surface area for the mat, cast-in-place formed concrete slabs or walls. Additional tests shall be performed if deemed necessary by the TJPA Representative. Sample each column, regardless of other frequencies listed above."					The requirement that samples be taken for every column may be relaxed to a single sample set for every two columns placed contemporaneously with the same pump.		
We request that the last sentence "Sample each column, regardless of other frequencies listed above", be deleted. The current testing of columns would fall under the statement to test "..not less than once a day, nor less than once for each 100 cubic yards". As the current schedule shows two columns to be poured per day, this will produce one set per day for testing.							
<hr/>							
T-1115	BSE -Alternate Micropile Method in Buttress Area	Closed	01/16/2014	01/26/2014	01/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Kelly Phariss			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
DTDS is concerned about delays and extra costs resulting from drilling Micropiles adjacent to buttress piles from Gridlines 26.5 to 30. As stated in our Contract Change Order request (CCO #04) regarding "Final Micropile Layout - Additional Micropiles" (attached for reference), drilling for the micropiles may encounter overbreak pile concrete and grout placed during buttress pile remediation. The current drilling system cannot be used to drill through the pile overbreak and/or remediation grout.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					This is not an acceptable alternate at this time. If serious delays begin to be encountered, the design team, Turner, Webcor and their subcontractors should meet to discuss this issue immediately.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1490 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>The reduced pile spacing from 10 feet on center to 5 feet and less may also cause problems such as communication between piles.</p> <p>Significant additional costs and schedule delays will result should DTDS have to change our procedure and/or equipment to drill through buttress pile concrete and/or remediation grout. Delays will also be realized should DTDS have to change our drilling sequence to mitigate problems that may arise from the reduced pile spacing.</p> <p>Should detrimental issues arise, DTDS proposes to drill, install, and grout micropile dowels in the center of the existing buttress piles as an alternative to drilling adjacent to buttress piles. A micropile dowel could take the place of a micropile as necessary. A dowel would consist of the same #20 Gr. 80 reinforcing bar used for the micropiles. A six- inch diameter, 20 foot long hole would be drilled in the center of the buttress pile. An additional drill rig will be required to perform the drilling. A 25' bar would be set with centralizers and tremie grouted with the same grout used for the micropiles. Based on an assumed minimum Buttress pile concrete and grout strength of 3,000 psi, the developmental length (ld) of a #20 bar is 182.5 inches (15.2 feet). 20 feet embedded would develop the yield strength of the #20 bar (393 kip) and exceed the design micropile load of 308 kips.</p> <p>ld = (80,000 psi/ (20 * sqrt(3000 psi))*2.5 in = 182.5 in.</p> <p>Accepting this alternative would mitigate delays and extra costs that will result should buttress pile concrete and/or grout be encountered while drilling adjacent to these piles.</p> <p>Please confirm that this alternative micropile procedure is acceptable.</p>						
T-1116	BSE - Micropile Removal and Relocation in Buttress Area	Closed	01/16/2014	01/26/2014	01/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Robert Kjome	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.		Kelly Phariss					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1491 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>WOJV recieved FO T-00008 9/07/2012 which added micropiles within the footprint of the buttress shafts. RFI T-0323.1 returned 10/24/12 directed BBII to install buttress shaft E4, which is in direct conflict with Micropile E520.</p> <p>BBII proposes to:</p> <p>Option 1. Remove Micropile E520 Option 2. Drill Micropile E520 into the center of the buttress shaft as proposed in RFI T-1115 Option 3. Relocate Micropile E520 to a location provided by the design team.</p> <p>Also, BBII is requesting that they be permitted to relocate Micropile E519, 1' to the South, to allow further clearance form Buttress Shaft E4.</p>				<p>Option 1 and 2 are not acceptable (also see response to RFI T-1115) Option 3: Move E520 toward east or west (approximately 6'+/-), in the space between 2 buttress piles.</p> <p>Relocate E519 as proposed is acceptable.</p>		
T-1117	<p>BGP - Geothermal Trench Backfill and Compaction Requirements in Zones 3 & 4 Closed</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>There are areas in Zone 3 (and perhaps in Zone 4) that Geothermal trenches will be trenched through that Arup identified as unsuitable soils (high in bay mud) , which is of such nature as to be incapable of being compacted to specific density using ordinary methods of optimum moisture content. Additionally, there are areas in Zone 3 (and perhaps in Zone 4) that Geothermal trenches will be trenched through that Arup identified as in-situ suitable, which are incapable of being compacted.</p> <p>- Spec. 23-57-34 Ground Loop Heat Exchanger states "placing and compacting soils the loop installation, the trenches shall be back filled per IGSHPA with loose soil minimizing air gaps or voids and then marked with warning tape. After bedding around the loop and header piping, the backfill shall be watered to settle the loose soil to ensure there are no air gaps along the length of the pipe."</p>				<p>01/16/2014 01/26/2014 01/24/2014 Potentially <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>George Metzger 1/23/2014 RESPONSE: Backfill with Native Soil to replace the unsuitable material is acceptable to WSP. Reference RFI 356.1 for relaxation of wetting requirement.</p>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>- Spec. 31-23-34 Trenching and Backfill states "All backfill will be placed in horizontal layers not more than (8) inches thick before compaction, and each layer shall be satisfactorily compacted by mechanical means. Flooding or jetting will not be allowed. Compact soil to not less than 95 percent maximum dry density according to ASTM D1557.</p> <p>Is the following procedure acceptable for placing and compacting soils in the Geothermal Piping trenches in the areas with unsuitable soils (high amounts of bay mud), and suitable in-situ non-compactable as identified by Arup?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. After the Geothermal piping is installed and tested, these trenches will be filled with available approved suitable materials from onsite excavations or 300 psi CLSM as approved by the TJPA Rep.2. Geothermal piping trenches soils will be placed per Geothermal Spec. 23-57-34 Ground Loop Heat Exchanger which states "the trenches shall be back filled per IGSHPA with loose soil minimizing air gaps or voids and then marked with warning tape."3. Soil bedding and backfill around the loop and header piping, shall be placed to ensure there are no air gaps along the length of the pipe (water will not drain well, so will be used sparingly and only if necessary).4. All backfill will be placed in horizontal layers not more than (8) inches thick before compaction, and each layer shall be satisfactorily compacted by mechanical means (e.g. pogo stick/power puff tools) .5. Flooding or jetting will not be allowed.6. Soils will be compacted using steps above and best construction practices.7. Trench fill and adjacent areas will not be tested to verify the "not less than 95 percent maximum dry density" according to ASTM D1557. The TJPA Reps will not perform density and moisture content tests specified in the Trenching and Backfill Spec. 31-23-34. In lieu of testing, the TJPA Geotechnical Inspection and Testing Agency will perform full time inspection of the fill and compaction process to verify procedure steps are followed, the suitability of the fill and that soils compaction is achieved.						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1118	BGP - Knockout Wall Neoprene Pad Width Clarification	Closed	01/17/2014	01/27/2014	01/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing S1-3204. Details 1, 2, and 4 on S1-3204 call out a 1/4-inch x 8-inch continuous neoprene pad to be placed between the shear wall pilaster and the knockout wall. The bearing surface of the pilaster is 12-inches, so the 8-inch pad will no adequately cover the bearing surface. Please confirm that this is the designer's intent. If not, SCCI proposes using a 1/4-inch x 12-inch continuous neoprene pad to provide more adequate coverage of the bearing surface.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The following options are acceptable: 1. As per design documents, an 8" continuous neoprene pad may be used. Center the pad on the supporting corbel. The Knockout wall concrete shall not be permitted to directly contact the supporting corbel concrete. As part of contractor's means and methods, 2" foam (or equivalent) strips may be used on either side of the neoprene pad to prevent concrete to concrete contact. 2. A 12" continuous neoprene pad may be used.				
T-1119	BGP - Column Steel Jacket Details	Closed	01/17/2014	01/27/2014	01/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please refer to submittal package TG0600-905 and RFI T-0693 regarding the "steel jackets" that certain columns are to receive. 1. Please clarify "Coordination" notes shown on attached excerpt drawing S101.0 of TG0600-905 by providing applicable details that show the steel jackets. The applicable architectural drawings currently in the Construction Drawing Set dated 07/17/2013 - Issued for Construction do not show steel column jackets. However, similar drawings issued in Issued For Bid - Addendum #1 dated 12/13/13 (not issued to construction) appear to show column jacket and details. See attached drawing A1-2103 from each drawing update set. 2. Please provide further details that SCCI should be aware of when it comes to these steel jackets and columns to be constructed, including but not limited to, items embedded in the columns that will utilized for steel jacket construction			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 1/27/2014 RESPONSE: 1. Contractor to coordinate surface mounted boxes and embedded conduit routing for columns that receive steel jacketing (ref to TG0600-905 and RFI T-0693). 2. Refer to detail 6/S1-3503 for structural details pertaining to steel jackets issued with ASI 106 dated 09/20/2013. Refer to the following SKA-2922 to SKA-3003 for locations and details of columns with steel jacketing.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1494 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1120	BGP - Horizontal Hooks in Shear Walls 2nd Lift and Above	Closed	01/17/2014	01/27/2014	01/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing 4/S1-3261. Please confirm if it is acceptable to replace the shear wall horizontal bars which have a 90-degree hook with a 180-degree hook. See attached drawing for more details. This change will only be applied to the second lift of shear walls and above (approx. EL. -20.56 and above).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: George Metzger 1/20/2014 RESPONSE: Contractor proposal of 180deg hooks for shear wall horizontal bars is acceptable.		
			Accept Suggestion:		<input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1121	SSS - Bus Deck Level Edge of Slab Plate Clarification	Closed	01/17/2014	01/27/2014	01/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI 233 SK1 to SK3 for reference. After reviewing the structural steel documents for TG 07.1R, a detail is not provided for deck support around the bus deck level cast nodes. Please confirm that the intent is to utilize, 12 gauge sheet metal, in these areas as shown on 1/S1-5001. The sheet metal will follow the contour of the cast node, providing a 1" gap per A1-2893 (SK2).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Architectural slab edge plans A1-2892 to A1-2897 layout all the locations and provide the slab edge heights of the slab edge plate. Additionally detail 4/A1-8376 shows the typical cast node slab edge plan detail and it references section details 4/A1-8675, 3/A1-8376 and 2/A1-8376, which show the conditions around the cast node and gap required - see markup on enclosed CD RFI 233 SK3. Closure plate (curved at the back of the cast node) may be a 12 gage sheet metal, but it should be welded to the end of edge angle at the seam. The edge angle shall be extended to meet with the curved closure plate.		
			Accept Suggestion:		<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1495 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1122	SSS - Edge Plate Detail at Steel Drag Beam	Closed	01/17/2014	01/27/2014	02/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Reference detail 4 on S1-5022 which indicates that where "S" is less than or equal to 3", a double bent plate is to be used. Based on the information provided in SK RFI 266.1 SK2, this cannot be achieved, as the minimum overall height for a Z angle is 4" and the minimum thickness for a Z angle is ½". 1.) Please advise if it is acceptable to use the detail approved in RFI T-1032 (for sloping conditions), shown on SK RFI 266.1 SK1, at all locations where "S" is less than 4". 2.) Please advise if it is acceptable to use a Z angle at all locations where the "S" dimension is greater than or equal to 4" and the required thickness is ½", in lieu of the bolted connection. 3.) Please advise if it is acceptable to use the detail approved in RFI T-1032 (for sloping conditions), shown on SK RFI 266.1 SK1, at locations where "S" is greater than or equal to 4" and the required thickness is 3/8", in lieu of the bolted connection. 4.) Note that based on the bending radius and edge distances shown in 4/S1-5022, the minimum height for bolted connections is 4 ¾" as indicated on CD RFI 215.1 SK1 attached. If the bolted connection is required, please verify the maximum height "S" for the bent plate detail in 4A/S1-5022 may be increased to 4 ¾".			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is acceptable, however, the weld shall be a continuous 1/4" double fillet weld, not a 3" long weld at 12" on center. Note that the lower horizontal plate needs to be welded according to the weld shown on detail 4B/S1-5022. 2). Z section is acceptable, but it limits any field adjustment that the bolted connection can provide. It is Skanska's decision which way is preferable. 3). See Response to #2. 4). Angles can be used in lieu of bent plates to address the clearance issue raised. Also see response to #2 & #3.	
T-1122.1	SSS - Edge Plate Detail at Steel Drag Beam	Closed	02/05/2014	02/15/2014	02/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Detail 4 on S1-5022 calls for a double bent plate for slab support where "S" is less than or equal to 3". However, the minimum overall height for a double bent angle of the required thicknesses is 4" and the minimum overall height for the bolted connections is 4 ¾". Further, it has been determined that the minimum overall height for the detail proposed for sloping conditions is 2". For instances where the difference between the underside of the slab and top of beam is less than 2", please confirm			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). As noted in the response to RFI T-1122.0, the weld of the bent plate to the horizontal plate shall be a continuous 1/4" double fillet weld, not a 3" long weld at 12" on center. 2). For the instance where the difference between the underside of the slab and top of beam is less than 2", follow the detail in the attached sketch.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1496 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	it is acceptable to use an angle as depicted in CD RFI 279 SK2. Otherwise, please provide an alternate detail for this condition. A sample location of this condition has been included in SK1 for reference, where an angle is proposed for the 1" vertical height difference.						
T-1123	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL 7C	Closed	01/17/2014	01/27/2014	02/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 268 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 4: 1) Confirm the noted are acceptable location dimensions f or the headed studs per 7/S1-3702 SIM. 2) Confirm the noted are acceptable location dimensions f or the 2" dia. holes per 7/S1-3702 SIM. 3) Supply the location of the 2" dia. holes from top of girde r as shown. 4) Confirm the headed studs and 2" dia. holes may be mo ved as necessary to avoid fouling the stiffeners.				1). Confirmed 2). Confirmed. 3). Center of the 2" holes is 3'-3 1/2" below top of steel at the beam end, and 3'-0" below top of steel near the end of concrete beam. 4). Confirmed.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1497 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1124.1	SSS - Plate Grade Substitution	Closed	02/21/2014	03/03/2014	03/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
In response to RFI T-1124 & the Structural Coordination Meeting on February 6, 2014:				Acceptable to use ASTM A572 GR42 with 50 ksi min yield strength for moment frame columns. The light column base plate was already called out as ASTM 572 GR42, therefore 42 ksi yield is acceptable as indicated in contract drawings.			
The moment frame columns and light column base plates are identified on the structural drawings for TG07.1R as material grade ASTM A572 Grade 50. Please confirm that it is acceptable to use ASTM A572 Grade 42 modified to achieve a minimum specified yield strength of 50 ksi for all plate exceeding 4 1/2 in thickness at these locations.							
Please note that the mill certification will read ASTM A572-Gr 42 but the reports will indicate a yield strength of 50 ksi.							
T-1125	BGP - Glass Guard Rail Embed A529 Grade 55 Steel in Lieu of A36	Closed	01/21/2014	01/31/2014	01/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPJackson Tukuafu</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please confirm it is acceptable to use A529 Grade 55 steel in lieu of A36 steel for the 3/8 x 7 flat bar portion of the glass guard rail embeds as shown on detail 7 of S1-3410.				George Metzger 1/29/2014 RESPONSE: A529 Grade 55 plate is acceptable as long as proper welding procedure specification is used to match with the A529 steel materials.			
T-1126	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL 6C	Closed	01/21/2014	01/31/2014	02/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 269 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 7: 1) Supply the location of the braces from Grid C considering the end dimensions of TR6 shown on SK2 & SK4 and the connection for the brace to the Girder per 8/S1-5015. 2) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace				1). The brace may be connected to either one of the vertical stiffeners at the beam bottom flange. 2). The underside of the slab elevation is at 10" below the top of slab. The top of slab elevation may be calculated based on the spot elevations given at each end of the beam.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1498 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1126.1	<p>located per dimension supplied in item 1. 3) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace located per dimension supplied in item 1 . 4) Provide the noted dimensions to locate the 2" dia. holes. 5) Provide locations for the 2 1/2" dia. holes from center of TR6 and from top of TR6. 6) Provide dimension to locate the 2" dia. holes. 7a) Confirm it is acceptable to move the headed studs or rebar holes as necessary to avoid fouling the stiffeners. 7b) Provide the minimum clearance between the stiffener and the headed studs.</p> <p>SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL 6C</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST: On RFI T-1126 item 5 we requested the horizontal and vertical locations of the holes in the stiffeners. The horizontal locations were provided but not the vertical locations.</p> <p>Please refer to sketch CD RFI # 269.1 SK1 and supply the vertical locations as shown</p>	Closed	02/24/2014	03/06/2014	03/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>				<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The holes in the stiffener plates shall be located to match with the center of the horizontal beam rebars. The horizontal rebars is to be set at 3.8125" (2 3/4" cover + 1/2" for tie + 1/2 bar diameter) below the top of concrete beam. Please see the green markups on the sketch attached for the vertical dimensions requested.</p>		<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1127	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL 4C	Closed	01/21/2014	01/31/2014	02/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 270 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 7: 1) Supply the location of the braces from Grid C considering the end dimensions of TR4 shown on SK2 and the connection for the brace to the Girder per 8/S1-5015. 2) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace located per dimension supplied in item 1. 3) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace located per dimension supplied in item 1. 4) Provide the noted dimensions to locate the 2" dia. holes. 5) Provide locations for the 2 1/2" dia. holes from center of TR6 and from top of TR6. 6) Provide dimension to locate the 2" dia. holes. 7a) Confirm it is acceptable to move the headed studs or rebar holes as necessary to avoid fouling the stiffeners. 7b) Provide the minimum clearance between the stiffener and the headed studs.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI is similar to T-1126, please see response to T-1126 for response to this RFI.		
<hr/>							
T-1128	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL 2C	Closed	01/21/2014	01/31/2014	02/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 271 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 7: 1) Supply the location of the braces from Grid C considering the end dimensions of TR2 shown on SK2 and the connection for the brace to the Girder per 8/S1-5015. 2) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace located per dimension supplied in item 1. 3) Supply the underside of slab elevation at the brace located per dimension supplied in item 1 . 4) Provide the noted dimensions to locate the 2" dia. holes. 5) Provide locations for the 2 1/2" dia. holes from center of TR6 and from top of TR6. 6) Provide dimension to locate the 2" dia. holes. 7a) Confirm it is acceptable to move the headed studs or rebar holes as necessary to avoid fouling the stiffeners. 7b) Provide the minimum clearance between the stiffener and the headed studs.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI is similar to RFI T-1126, please see response to RFI T-1126 for response to this RFI.		
<hr/>							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1129	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL 5C	Closed	01/21/2014	01/31/2014	02/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 273 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 3: 1) Confirm the noted dimensions for locating the headed studs are acceptable or supply alternate dimensions. 2) Confirm the noted dimensions for locating the 2" dia. holes are acceptable or supply alternate dimensions. 3a) Confirm it is acceptable to move the headed studs or rebar holes as necessary to avoid fouling the stiffeners. 3b) Provide the minimum clearance between the stiffener and the headed studs.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Confirmed 2). Confirmed 3a). Confirmed 3b). Minimum clearance shall be the distance required for welding the headed studs.				
T-1130	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL 3C	Closed	01/21/2014	01/31/2014	02/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 274 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 4: 1) Supply the location for the holes in the stiffeners (information not shown on S1-3600): a) Dimensions from center of TR3 b) Dimension from top of bottom flange of TR3 2) 4/S1-3707 shows 5 1/2" and 6/S1-3702 shows 6" spacing for the headed studs. Confirm 5 1/2" in acceptable. 3) It is not clear where the 2" dia. holes are to be located. 4/S1-3707 shows the concrete extending to the bottom of TR3 and 6/S13702 shows the concrete stopping above the top of the boittom flange of TR3. Please confirm the location of the 2" dia. holes as shown on SK3 are acceptable or supply the location dimensions. 4a) Confirm it is acceptable to move the headed studs or rebar holes as necessary to avoid fouling the stiffeners. 4b) Provide the minimum clearance between the stiffener and the headed studs.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Hole locations can be determine following the rules below: The holes are for MFB11 bottom bars (6-#9). The center of the 6-#9 bars are to be 2 9/16" above the bottom of the beam (1 1/2" cover + stirrup diameter + 1/2 bar diameter). The 6-9" shall be equally spaced witin the concrete beam width (36"), the outside bars shall be 2 9/16" (+/-) from the side of the concrete beam (1 1/2" cover + stirrup diameter + 1/2 bar diameter). 2). Confirmed. 3). The 2" holes are to be located base 1 3/4" above the bottom of the beam per Detail 6/S1-3702. 4a). Confirmed 4b). The headed studs shall be located with sufficient distance away from the stiffeners to facilitate welding of the studs.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1501 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1131	SSS - Transfer Girder Shear Details at GL 1.4	Closed	01/22/2014	02/01/2014	02/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 275 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 & 2: 1) Supply dimensions to locate headed studs at Grids 'D' & 'F'. 2) Supply dimensions to locate headed studs at Grids 'D.4' & 'E.6'.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Locate the head studs such that the center of the group is at the mid depth of the concrete beam. 2). See response to #1.		
<hr/>							
T-1132	SSS - End Transfer Girder Details at GL 1.4C	Closed	01/22/2014	02/01/2014	02/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 276 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 3: 1) Confirm it is acceptable to locate the headed studs as shown or supply alternate dimensions. 2) Confirm it is acceptable to locate the rebar holes as shown or supply alternate dimensions. 3) Confirm it is acceptable to move the noted rebar hole as necessary to avoid fouling the stiffener.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Confirmed 2). Confirmed 3). Confirmed		
<hr/>							
T-1133	SSS - Top of Slab Elevation Clarification	Closed	01/22/2014	02/01/2014	02/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 278 SK1 & SK2: The noted elevation on S1-2304 (SK1) is shown as 18.63' on A1-2864 (SK2) with a slab elevation transition as shown. Confirm A1-2864 is correct.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The top of slab elevation 18.13' shown on the structural is correct. See the attached sketch.		
<hr/>							
T-1134	SSS - Transfer Girder Web Plate Detail at GL 9.9 & 10.1	Closed	01/22/2014	02/01/2014	02/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1503 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1137	SSS - Drag Plate Splice Detail	Closed	01/23/2014	02/02/2014	02/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached sketches SK1 & SK2 for the following: Due to lifting capacity while unloading material, THC will need to order the 3" plate at a maximum of 40'0" length Please confirm a shop splice using CPBG during fabrication to achieve the final lengths of 53'0" and 62'6".		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Shop welded splicing of the 3" drag plate is acceptable. However, the splice shall be located at the far end of the plate away from the columns at Grid D & F.			
T-1138	SSS - Double Angle Connection	Closed	01/24/2014	02/03/2014	02/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 281 SK1 & SK2: There is insufficient room to connect the W16x26 to the W27x84 using the double angle connection per 1/S1-5010. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W16x26 to the W27x84 using a shear plate per 1/S1-5011 as shown or supply an alternate solution.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1504 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1139	SSS - WT Deck Support Requirements	Closed	01/24/2014	02/03/2014	02/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached CD RFI # 282 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 5:			a) The WT does not need to extend beyond the curb that runs north-south (N-S). It should stop short of the N-S curb as shown in detail 6/S1-5002. Note that this also applies to the BU-WT over the W24x76 beam on the east of GL 13 shown in SK1.				
1) The noted WT is shown as stopping short of the concrete curb on S1-2304 (SK1).			1b) The WT will not interfere with the rebar as it stops short of the curb.				
a) Confirm the WT is to extend as shown.			2) See attached sketch SKS-0329 that shows deck support above the W12x14 beam. Provide closure plates at the end of the deck as shown in the sketch.				
b) It appears the WT will interfere with the rebars below the curb per 6/S1-5002 (SK2). Confirm the WT is located as shown and the rebars will be modified.			3) See response to 2).				
2) It is not clear from S1-2304 (SK1) what the deck support requirements are above the noted beam are. Please supply a detail.			4) See responses to 1a) and 1b).				
3) It is not clear from S1-2304 (SK1) what the deck support requirements are above the noted beam are. Please supply a detail.			5) Confirmed.				
4) It appears the WT will interfere with the rebars below the curb per 6/S1-5002 (SK2). Confirm the WT is located as shown and the rebars will be modified.							
5) The items below have been identified at specific locations on S1-2304 but similar conditions appear repeatedly on the Ground Level. Confirm the responses to items 1 to 4 may be applied typically on the Ground Floor at similar conditions.							
<hr/>							
T-1140	SSS - Bus Deck Level Perimeter Weld Prep	Closed	01/24/2014	02/03/2014	02/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached CD RFI # 285 SK1:			Confirmed.				
The flange of the sloping W40x277 is 1/8" below the flange of the flange of the W40x297 at the top and 1/16" below at the bottom, making the requested CJP weld not achievable.							
Confirm the welds with the flange alignments as shown are acceptable.							
Note: moving the sloping W40x277 up to align with the top edge of the W40x297 is not an option as this will move the							
sloping W40x277 out of the normal sloping plane.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1505 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please note that this condition repeats at all the same conditions along Grids B & H.							
T-1141	SSS - AESS at Grand Hall and Shaw Alley Bridge	Closed	01/27/2014	02/06/2014	02/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California Dis		Ryan Clayton					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1. Reference drawing A1-8661, issued for construction, which appears to have information missing for the Grand Hall AESS requirements. Please reference details E, F, and G on A1-8661 attached and clarify the AESS requirements at the noted locations.				1. Refer to attached drawing A1-8661. Details E, F, and G are not used, there are no additional AESS requirements.			
2. Detail C on drawing A1-8661 indicates that the HSS 16x16x5/8" member supporting the Shaw Alley Bridge is AESS. However, details C and D on A1-8662 indicate that the HSS 16x16x5/8" member, BU girder, and HSS 5x1/2" posts at the Shaw Alley Bridge are to receive IFRM-				2. Correct, Detail C on drawing A1-8661 identifies AESS requirements for the Shaw Alley Bridge. To clarify, IFRM-1 coating as indicated on details C and D of sheet A1-8662 for the HSS member, BU girder and HSS posts are the required coatings on these structural members.			
1. Please clarify the coating requirements at the Shaw Alley Bridge.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1142	BGP - Grounding Rod at Buttress Pile in Zone 4	Closed	01/27/2014	02/06/2014	02/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Please refer to drawing E1-2026.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
In Zone 4, an overlapping series of concrete buttress piles were poured along the North Wall of the excavation, extending towards the south wall.			RESPONSE				
In this area, the final grade of the excavation will be the concrete buttress piles. The attached photo shows the buttress pile layout with the grounding ring/ground rods overlayed on it. The ground rods need to be driven 10' deep. Please confirm that the rods which conflict with the buttress piles could be moved away from the north CDSM wall and to the void area of the buttress piles as shown in the attached SCCI sketch SK-SCCI_RFI421.			George Metzger				
			1/31/2014				
			WSP does not object to moving ground rods inward; however, contractor shall maintain separation between ground loop and geothermal piping. The photo submitted does indicate this separation.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1507 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1143	BSE - Reduced Micropile Testing Requirement in Unsuitable Material Areas	Closed	01/27/2014	02/06/2014	01/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP John Reynolds							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Balfour Beatty Infrastructure Inc. (BBII) has experienced complications with micropile testing in geothermal field 11 due to unsuitable material. In an effort to minimize additional cost and maintain schedule, Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture (WOJV) requests the testing requirement be reduced in unsuitable areas to test one (1) in five (5) micropiles. To date, all micropiles have passed the testing requirement. WOJV proposes to test seven (7) of the remaining 31 micropiles in geothermal field 11. The micropiles selected to be tested will be approved by a TJPA representative.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
SUGGESTION:			No. Per discussions with TJPA, AAI and T-T the following response is provided.				
			The contract Specification Section 31-63-33 Drilled Micropiles is clear; All Micropiles shall be proof tested. Paragraph 3.2H Proof and performance Testing in accordance with ASTM D3689 "Standard Test Method for Individual Piles Under Static Axial Tensile Load" SubParagraph 8 states "Proof tensile load testing shall be performed against reaction piles or cribbing in accordance with ASTM-D3689. Existing footings, piles, or other structures shall not be used as reaction points for load testing. An adjacent production micropile in a group may be used as reaction pile. If cribbing is used, the contractor's attention is drawn to the presence of poor bearing soils and underground utilities, which may require special measures to protect against settlement and damage."				
			Also; Requests such as these should be accompanied by the [Drilltech] Pile Test Engineer's written recommendation.				
			1. Pile Test Engineer: A Contractor's engineer who is a registered civil engineer in the State of California.				
			2. The Pile Test Engineer supervises Performance and Proof Testing.				
			3. The working drawings and supplement shall be stamped and signed by the engineer who is licensed as a Civil Engineer in the State of California.				
			4. Micropile Proof Test Plans working drawings and supplement shall be stamped and signed by the engineer who is licensed as a Civil Engineer in the State of California.				
			NOTE: The RFI statement "In an effort to minimize additional cost and maintain schedule" is not an acceptable justification for changing the testing requirements. Per Contract, RFI's shall not be used as a vehicle for requesting cost and schedule increases which appears to be the purpose of this				

[illegible]



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1144	BGP - Lower Concourse Electric Rooms & Lighting Feeds	Closed	01/27/2014	01/27/2014	02/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: <p>ASI 104 changed the feeds for the embedded (Type F15 fixture) lighting boxes in the lower concourse slab. Previously they were to be fed from Electric Rooms in the Train Platform level; as per ASI 104, they are now to be fed from Electric Rooms in the Lower Concourse Level. Some discrepancies have been noted as to electrical panel location, and room locations.</p> <p>DWG E1-4102, Sheet Note J, and E1-4110, Sheet Note I, specify that the type F15 fixtures in Zones 2 and 10 are to be fed from Panel EDMH-B1-A-EMG located in Electric Room B1253. DWG EI-2202 identifies Room B 1253 as Emergency Equipment Storage.</p> <p>DWG EI-4103 indicates the F15 fixtures in Zone 3 up to Gridline 9 are to be fed from Panel EDMH-B1-A-EMG in Electric Room B1496. This is the same panel as indicated in Zones 1 and 10, but a different room is specified. Room B 1496 is not shown on the drawings.</p> <p>DWG EI-4103 and DWG E1-4104 indicate the F15 fixtures in Zone 3 past Grid Line 9, and the F15 fixtures in Zone 4 are to be fed from Panel EDMH-B1-B-EMG in Electric Room B1322. SKE-02-3201 issued with ASI 104 does not have a Panel EDMH-B1-B-EMG in Rm B1322.</p> <p>DWG E1-4105 and DWG E1-4106 indicate the F15 fixtures in Zone 5 and Zone 6 are to be fed from Panel EDMH-B1-C-EMG in Electric Room B1541. Plan sheet E1-3204 Detail 6 referenced does not seem to be included in the contract drawings.</p> <p>DWG E1-4107 indicates the F15 fixtures in zone 7 are to be fed from EDMH-B2-D-EMG in Electric Room in Electric Room B1644 in Lower Concourse. Per the "Equipment Naming" char on DWG E1-0010, the B2 in the panel name indicates that it is on the Train Platform Level. However, the room number indicates that it is indeed on the Lower Concourse level.</p> <p>1. Please provide an enlarged room plan showing the location of each of the following panels: EDMH-B1-A-EMG, EDMH-B1-B-EMG and EDMH-B1-C-EMG</p> <p>2. Please confirm that panel EDMH-B1-D-EMG is in</p>			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			RESPONSE George Metzger 2/5/2014				
			1. Sheets E1-4102 and E1-4110 have been revised. Refer to attached sheets dated 01/23/2014 for revisions. Per Sheet Note J on E1-4102 and Sheet Note I on E1-4110, the type F15 fixtures in Zones 2 and 10 on the Train Platform Level are to be fed from Panel EDMH-B2-A-EMG-1 located in Electric Room B2280 on Train Platform Level.				
			2. Sheet E1-4103 has been revised. Refer to attached sheet dated 01/23/2014 for revisions. Per circuiting note on E1-4103, the type F15 fixtures up to gridline 9 on the Train Platform Level are to be fed from Panel EDMH-B2-A-EMG-1 located in Electric Room B2280 on Train Platform Level.				
			3. Sheets E1-4103 and E1-4104 have been revised. Refer to attached drawings E1-4103 and E1-4104 dated 01/23/2014 for revisions. Type F15 fixtures in Zone 3 and Zone 4 are to be fed from Panel EDMH-B1-B-EMG located in Electric Room B1325 on Lower Concourse Level.				
			4. Sheets E1-4105 and E1-4106 have been revised. Refer to attached sheets E1-4105, E1-4106, and E1-3204, Detail 6 dated 01/23/2014 for revisions. F15 fixtures in Zones 5 and 6 are to be fed from EDMH-B1-C-EMG in Electric Room B1563 on Lower Concourse Level.				
			5. Sheet E1-4107 has been revised. Refer to attached sheet dated 01/23/2014 for revisions. Type F15 fixtures are to be fed from Panel EDMH-B1-D-EMG located in Electric Room B1644 on Lower Concourse Level.				
			6. Refer to attached drawings dated 01/23/2014 for enlarged plans requested (Panels clouded in blue). EDMH-B1-A-EMG is now EDMH-B2-A-EMG-1.				
			7. Refer to revised sheets E1-3203 and E1-4107. Revised sheets dated 01/23/2014 are attached				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1510 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
ROom B1644 per detail E1-3203 (dated 8/30/12) on that the panel was incorrectly labeled EDMH-B2-D-EMG on E1-4107							
T-1144.1	BGP - Electrical Rooms B1222, B1223, B1560 & B1561 Enlarged Plan Sheet Discrepancy		Closed	02/11/2014	02/21/2014	03/21/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titche	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref: E1-2202, E1-3201				The requested updated drawings will be issued in a forthcoming ASI 0112 scheduled for issue on 02/24/14.			
Electric Rooms B1222 and B1223 on plan sheet EI-2202 (Issued in ASI 104) and rooms B1560 and B1561 on plan sheet EI-2205 (Issued in ASI 104) do not match the enlarged room plans shown on EI-3201 (IFC) and EI-3202 (IFC) respectively.							
Please issue revised electrical drawings including, but not limited to EI-3201 and EI-3202.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1512 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>the response (only sleeve schedule was provided). TG06.0 Plumbing drawings are for reference only and not for construction and have not been revised through the current ASI's and SK.A's.</p> <p>Please provide diameter size of plumbing penetrations or revised plumbing drawings coordinated with updated Architectural and Structural drawings.</p>							
T-1145.2	BGP - Plumbing and Floor Drain Drawing Details	Closed	03/11/2014	03/21/2014	03/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titche	To: Turner Construction Company		Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference RFI T-1145.1 BGP - Response - Plumbing and Floor Drain Drawing Discrepancies				Refer to your RFI #T-0909.1 language for block-out sizes for floor drains and floor sinks.			
The diameter size of PLBG callouts were not provided in ASI-112 and ASI-113 referred to by the response.							
Please provide diameter size of PLBG callouts.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1513 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1145.3	BGP - Plumbing and Floor Drain Drawing Details	Closed	03/24/2014	04/03/2014	03/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
As discussed in the 3.24.2014 submittal TG0600-121 comment review meeting, please issue current design drawings P1-2202 through P1-2211 so that the size of plumbing pipes that pass through the concourse slab can be ascertained for the purposes of sizing the plumbing penetration sleeves per PSK-0051 (issued in RFI 1145rev0). The -8.30.2012 Issued for Construction - Below Grade Package- P1-2202 through P1-2211 pipe plans do not match up to the current sleeve layout as shown in sheets A1-2842, A1-2843, A1-2844, A1-2845, A1-2846, A1-2850 & A1-2851.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The size of the Concourse level slab sleeves required in the above mentioned A1-2800 series drawings cannot be determined without the current coordinated plumbing design.					Refer to ASI 112, ASI 113 and Addendum #2 for the most current plumbing drawings as of this date.		
					RESPONSE: 3-28-14 Judy Long: Refer to the attached ASI 112, ASI 113 and Addendum #2 plumbing drawings for the most current plumbing drawings as of this date. These drawings will be issued on April 1, 2013 as "Issued for Construction" documents.		
T-1146	SSS - W16 connection fouls W33 connection at grid 14F	Closed	01/27/2014	02/06/2014	02/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
On S1-2304 there are W16's centered under CMU wall connecting into a W40 along grid F near grid 14. The drag connection for the W33 connecting into the Transfer Girder and the W16 connections will foul each other. Please verify the following: 1. Per the schedule on 1/S1-5010 the W16 connections should be three bolts. Please verify it is acceptable to reduce the bolts from three to two bolts? 2. Please verify it is acceptable to move the drag connection down to clear the two bolt W16 connection? 3. Please verify coping the bottom flange of the W16's to clear the W40 drag connection is acceptable?					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					1) Acceptable. 2) Acceptable. 3) Acceptable.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1514 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1147	SSS - Double Angle Shear Connection	Closed	02/03/2014	02/13/2014	02/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 277 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 3: In order to maintain interior TOS (Top of Steel) elevations shown on the contract documents, the connection detail as shown on 1/S1-5010 needs to be modified along the ground level perimeter beams at certain locations. Please confirm the following: 1) Confirm the proposed connection is acceptable as shown or supply an alternate detail. 2) Confirm the proposed connection is acceptable as shown or supply an alternate detail. 3) Confirm the connections in items 1 & 2 may be applied typically at other similar conditions.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Provide connection details per 6/S1-5011 (similar) at the W12x14 beams highlighted in the RFI. 2) Provide a double angle connection per 1/S1-5010 with 2 bolts at the W16 beams highlighted in the RFI. 3) Solutions in 1) and 2) can be applied typically at other W12 and W16 beams with similar conditions, except at beams with * notations. For beams with * notations provide connection detail per 1/S1-5028 as noted on sheet note 2 on S1-2305.			
T-1147.1	SSS - Ground Level Perimeter Framing Clarification at GL14	Closed	03/17/2014	03/27/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 331 SK1: The connection per RFI T-1147 (SK 356, CD 277) item 2 on SK3 will not work here as the connection angles will foul the Girder connection to the column as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W16 to the W40 per 1/S1-5028 with S < 12" or supply an alternate connection detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide a shear plate connection at the W16 beam per attached sketch SKS-366. The beam and shear plate may be adjusted slightly to avoid the bolts at the W40 drag connection.			
T-1148	SSS - Steel Chemical Composition	Closed	02/03/2014	02/13/2014	02/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Basket column pipes of wall thickness less than or equal to 1" will be produced from rolled and seam welded plate per API-5L (X65 for ground level to bus deck level pipes and X52 for bus deck level to roof level). For wall		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We note that the chemical composition for cast steel provided in the RFI has elements for which max limits exceed those recommended by ASTM 732 or those of API 5L (for example, Mn). The chemistry of the			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1515 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div><p>thicknesses greater than 1", the pipes will be produced using the centrifugal cast process as defined in the project specifications section 05 15 22. Please see attached letter of compliance from the pipe manufacturer confirming chemical composition to meet mechanical requirements. Please confirm this is acceptable.</p></div><div><p>material may be as proposed and submitted by the Contractor provided that all mechanical properties (yield strength, tensile strength, elongation, CVN toughness) of the supplied material meet those outlined in specification 05 15 22 (Centrifugally Cast Steel Pipes). However, the Contractor assumes all responsibility for ensuring that the material is adequate from a weldability perspective. Since this is not a prequalified base material, welded joints will need to be qualified per AWS. We recommend that joint qualification is performed in advance (before pipes are manufactured) in order to minimize risks related to weldability and joint adequacy.</p></div></div>							
T-1149	SSS - Erection Aids for Studded Plate	Closed	02/03/2014	02/13/2014	02/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please confirm the concept of the temporary erection angles required to field weld the studded plates detailed in SK 1 are acceptable and can be incorporated into the model.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1150	BGP - Geothermal Pressure Gauge Monitoring	Closed	02/05/2014	02/15/2014	02/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Spec section 23 57 34, Part 3.2.J the geothermal loops are to be pressurized to 60 psi and monitored during construction to detect possible damage. The geothermal loops will be re-pressurized to 60 psi and the gauges orientated to be viewed from the trestle. Please confirm these gauges can be monitored and documented weekly until the completion of Airco's contract scope.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Piping pressure readings should be per the specification.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1152	SSS - Added Steel Members at Stair 501	Closed	02/05/2014	02/15/2014	02/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Drawing S1-2205 on ASI 106 appears to add steel members at Stair 501 (see SK1) on the lower concourse level. The associated detail, 6/S1-7016, was not updated to reflect this change. Please advise if these members were added in error. If this is an intended change, please provide the appropriate details.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketch SKS-0331 that shows framing sizes at Stair 501 on Lower Concourse Level .		
<hr/>							
T-1153	BGP - Geothermal Riser 11 Location	Closed	02/05/2014	02/15/2014	02/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please confirm the Geothermal Riser 11 can be installed between soldier pile 274 and 275. This location is within 1' of contract drawings. Note that due to schedule constraints, the chipping has already begun at this location.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Location is acceptable.		
<hr/>							
T-1154	BGP - Consolidation of Geothermal Fields 13 14 15	Closed	02/07/2014	02/17/2014	02/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please confirm Airco is to consolidate Fields 13(4 loops), FI4(10 loops) and FI5(6 loops) totaling 20 loops into ONLY Fields 13 and 14 each with 10 loops(20 loops total) per discussion with EOR James Bradshaw on 2/4/14. Please provide direction for the new Riser Locations for Fields 13 and 14: Option A) Field 13- 10ft East of GL 33, Field 14- 10ft West of GL 33 Option B) Field 13- East of GL 31, Field 14- 10' East of GL 33			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, Fields 13, 14 and 15 shall be combined into 2 fields. Option B should be utilized to consolidate loops to 2 fields.		



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1155	BGP - SFPUC Grounding Company Room B1441	Closed	02/07/2014	02/17/2014	02/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titcher</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
There are 5 grounding PUC risers terminating in the SFPUC Grounding EAST room B1441, however Detail 4 on E 1-6006 indicates seven(7) ground rod risers which are to be welded to the mesh ground grid. Please confirm the number of grounding risers in the East room B1441.				Five (5) grounding risers are required to be terminated within east SFPUC room. This clarification was included in detail 5/E1-3212 within Issued for Bid package - Addendum #1, dated 02/21/2014			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1156	BGP - Lighting and Telecom Layout Drawing Discrepancies (A vs E)	Closed	02/07/2014	02/17/2014	02/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
There are some discrepancies between the Train Platform Level Lighting Plans(E Drawings) and the Lower Concourse Level Slab Edge Plans(A Drawings). Please provide direction and revised drawings for the following instances.			Please refer the following SKAs, ESKs and TE1 pdfs:				
1) The Lighting Plans show two exit signs in close proximity, yet on the Slab Edge Plan only one EJB layout is shown: AI-2844/EI-4104 at approximate Grid Lines: -14.5/F -16.6/A.6 -16.7/F AI-2850/EI-4110 at approximate Grid Lines: -2.8/V.8			SKA-3059 to SKA-3066 for Lower Concourse Slab Edge Plans ESK-026 to ESK-033 for Train Platform Level Electrical Lighting Plans TE1-2202 - Lower Concourse Zone 2 Floor Plan TE1-8014 - Telcom Closet Details				
2) The Slab Edge Plan shows EJB layout, yet there are no fixtures on the Lighting Plan: AI-2842/EI-4102 at approximate Grid Lines: -1.6/C.5 -2.7-3.5/C.3 (Three EJBs in a row) -4.5/C.3 (Two EJBs) AI-2846/EI-4106 at approximate Grid Lines: -25.7/F.I -26.6/C.5 -26.7/A.6			1. EJBs on the Lower Concourse slab edge plan A1-2844 were updated and coordinated with Train Platform Level Electrical Lighting Plan E1-4101: see SKA-3061 and ESK-028				
3) The Lighting Plan shows fixtures, yet there is no layout on the Slab Edge Plan: AI-2845/EI-4105 at approximate Grid Lines: -19.2/A.6 -21.2/C.6 -21.2/F			2. EJBs on the Lower Concourse slab edge plan A1-2842 were removed and coordinated with Train Platform Level Electrical Lighting Plan E1-4102: see SKA-3059 and ESK-026 Same with A1-2846, EJBs were coordinated with E1-4106: see SKA-3063 and ESK-030				
4) There was no Train Platform Level Zone 11 Lighting Plan (EI-4111) included with the contract documents, but there is an EJB layout on Lower Concourse Level Zone 11 Slab Edge Plan(AI-2851).			3. EJBs on the Lower Concourse slab edge plan A1-2845 were updated and coordinated with Train Platform Level Electrical Lighting Plan E1-4105: see SKA-3062 and ESK-029				
5) Telecommunications Drawing Lower Concourse Level Zone 2 Floor Plan(TEI-2202) has six(6) 4" conduit sleeves on Grid Line I between GL E and F. the Slab Edge Plan(AI-2842) does not have a layout for these sleeves.			4. For Train Platform Level Zone 11 Lighting Plan: see ESK-033 and SKA-3066				
			5. There are no Telcom conduit penetrations for TELCOM closets along GL 1 between E & F. Please refer to attached TE1-2202 and Detail 1 of TE1-8014				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1519 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1156.1	BGP - Telecom Drawing Discrepancies	Closed	02/25/2014	03/07/2014	03/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: The response to RFI T-1156 provided a number of drawings which were not previously provided. Only TE1 drawings TE1-0000, TE1-2202, TE12203 and TE12207 were issued with the TG06 scope of work. The telecom sleeve locations on SKA-3060, SKA-3063 and SKA-3064 do not match the TE1 contract drawings. The discrepancies between the telecom drawings and the slab edge drawings are: 1) GL 5/A - Telecom sleeves indicated on TEI-2202, no layout dimensions on SKA-3059 2) GL 10/J - Telecom sleeves on TEI-2203 are not shown in the same location as on SKA-3060 3) GL 29.5/A - No TEI drawing provided, however SKA-3063 has layout for three(3) sleeves 4) GL 33/A - Telecom sleeves indicated on TEI-2207, but no layout dimensions on SKA-3064 Please provide an up to date set of ALL TE1 drawings which show telecom sleeves and are consistent with the Lower Concourse Level Slab Edge Drawings.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI Response: For updated Slab Edge Plans coordinated with updated TE1 Plans showing telecom enclosure penetrations at the Lower Concourse Slab. Refer to the following sketches: SKA-3095 to SKA-3102 Lower Concourse Level Slab Edge Plans See also for reference: SKA-3079 to SKA-3086 Lower Concourse Level Zone Plans SKA-3087 to SKA-3094 Lower Concourse Level Wall Plans SMW Response: The attached sketches are based on coordination with updated Lower Concourse Level Slab Edge Drawing provided by AAI. We have adjusted Telecom sleeve locations to match Lower Concourse Level Slab Edge Drawings as well as adjusted Telecom enclosure quantities and locations as needed to match. See attached SMW Response which includes TSK-008, TSK-009, TSK-010, TSK-012, TSK-013.				
T-1157	SSS - Fireproofing Clarification At Light Column	Closed	02/07/2014	02/17/2014	02/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 293 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) Supply the elevation to determine the termination of IFRM-2.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Elevation to determine termination of IFRM-2 is not required at Ground Level as IFRM-2 does not terminate at this location. Extent of IFRM-2 at				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1520 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1158	BGP - Geothermal Field 12 Layout From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto REQUEST: 1Please confirm it is acceptable to decrease the minimum 4-inch center to center dimension required by the specifications to 2-feet center to center in order to install the required 10 loops in Geo Field 12 in the new East to West orientation. The 83-inch diameter will be maintained at the end of the loops. Please note that the 2-foot center to center dimension will require significant hand digging to maintain trench separation and stability. 2. Please confirm it is acceptable to reduce the geothermal 6" clearance around micropiles to 4".	Closed To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello SUGGESTION:	02/07/2014	02/17/2014	02/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			1. As discussed in 2/4/2014 meeting with WSP, AAI Webcor, Schimick and Airco, 2' Center to Center distance is acceptable for Field 12.				
			2. It is acceptable to reduce clearance to 4 inches within this field only.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1521 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1159	SSS- Bracing Requirements at W-1 Connections	Closed	02/07/2014	02/17/2014	02/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See at tached CD RFI # 286 SK1 to SK4: The attached sketches show (2) conditions where the back-up angle braces at the "CP6" (W-1 facade connection) connect ions are very close to the floor beams. Please review and confirm that the braces are required at all noted locations no matter what their proximity to the beams is. If not, supply a maximum/minimum off-set dimension criteria for omitting the braces.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Where a W40 beam connection (as shown on 1A/S1-8000) is within 1'-0" from the CP-6 connection, the 2L 3x3 kicker at the CP-6 connection may be deleted.		
<hr/>							
T-1160	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 10	Closed	02/12/2014	02/22/2014	02/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A - B Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 10 for location plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north and south elevations due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall due to encroachment of the CDSM beams as well as typical cross sections of the revised spandrel beams. RFI T - 0743 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of Area 10. Please confirm that these modifications as outlined at these locations are acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Modifications for the spandrel beam at locations outlined are acceptable.		
<hr/>							
T-1161	BSE- Replacement and Removal of Waler Lookouts GL 9.5 West	Closed	02/11/2014	02/21/2014	02/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Stacy Wilson				
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Danny Walsh							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1523 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1161.1	BSE - Replacement and Removal of Waler Lookouts GL 9.5 West	Closed	02/20/2014	03/02/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titché	To: Turner Construction Company		Phil Militello	Answered By: Turner Construction Company	
Co-Author:						Stacy Wilson	
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Due to a revision in the concourse slab elevation, waler lookouts from gridline 9.5 West must be removed to allow for construction of the slab. BBII's EOR for the internal bracing has approved the use of additional 6x6x3/8" angle braces to replace the lookouts in conflict. Reference the attached RFI response, supplemental calculations, and details from PB&A.				See attached URS response.			
See URS comments 1-3 below on RFI T-1161 also see PB & A response and additional drawing to these comments							
1. The drawings do not show the sequence of installing new items and removing existing items. The construction sequence is required to ensure proper load transfer from removing elements to new load-carrying elements. Information provided for construction must clearly identify details and sequencing. There should be nothing left to interpretation by field personnel. This includes all detailing as well as full identification of what is to be installed and where, and what is to be removed, with clear identification of what is required prior to removal, and when (relative to installation of new bracing elements). The specific degree							



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>of finalization for installation of the new installed bracing elements prior to removal of lookouts is required. This includes identification of the specific inspections required to be complete prior to allowing any removal of existing lookouts to occur.</p> <p>PB & A response :The replacement WF beam or angle shall be installed and special inspections shall be performed on the welding connections prior to the removal of the existing WF lookouts underneath the waler. As per sketch attached</p> <p>2. For welding of an angle brace to a waler, please show clarification of welding to provide full compliance AWS prequalified procedures (weld geometry). For the bottom welding, please verify the weld is accessible with waler beam flange being close to welds. Welding is to include detailing that provides access for performance of welding. All welding must have clearly defined geometry allowing calculation of weld capacities. If this is not achieved, the welding provided cannot be relied upon for transmission of loads. If an angle brace needs to move away from waler beam flange for accessibility, the distance shall be indicated.</p> <p>PB & A response :The replacement WF beams or angles shall be installed on each side of the pipe strut. If an existing angle brace has been installed on the soldier beam on the side of the pipe strut, the replacement WF beam or the angle shall be installed on the adjacent soldier beam away from the pipe strut. The angle brace is move from the waler beam flange for accessibility per sketch SK-1 attached.</p> <p>3. Either an identical WF beam or an angle brace as proposed for a replacement element of the existing lookouts is to be attached to WF soldier pile beams above a waler according to the RFI. However, a number of soldier piles already connect angle braces, and those soldier piles with an existing brace may have a difficulty to accommodate an additional WF beam or angle. Lookouts were placed at least 4 per waler and one on each side of a strut per the drawings and calculations, and the same number and locations of replacement</p>						

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>elements are required.</p> <p>Please verify the existing angle braces are to be used as a part of the lookout replacements or the same number of new angle braces as the existing lookout beams are to be added in addition to the existing angle braces. Please verify the proposed replacement elements can be installed without a conflict of existing angle braces.</p> <p>PB & A response: At least the same number of replacement WF beams as that of the existing lookouts shall be installed. For the replacement angle option, minimum 4 additional angle braces excluding the existing ones are required.</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed with removal of the lookouts per PB&A's RFI response. Note that the RFI response provided by PB&A has been amended to address comments from urs in response to RFU T-1161.</p>						
T-1161.2	BSE - Replacement and Removal of Waler Lookouts GL 9.5 West	Closed	03/24/2014	04/03/2014	03/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>In response to URS' response of RFI T-1161.1, see attached Engineering Calculations.</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed with removal of the lookouts per PB&A's calculations.</p>			<p>Answered By:Turner Construction Com; Stacy Wilson</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>See attached URS response</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1162	SSS - AESS Clarifications	Closed	02/11/2014	02/21/2014	02/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Turner Construction Company Stacy Wilson</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 289 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) Supply the noted elevation to determine the AESS boundary. 2) Supply the noted dimension to the determine the AESS boundary. 3) Supply the noted angle to determine AESS boundary.				Much of the information requested as questions on this RFI are contained in construction documents already submitted and in shop drawings under review. We suggest that the construction team should please consider reviewing drawings in detail and coordinating the shop drawings before submitting RFI's for questions contained in current documentation.			
T-1162.1	SSS - AESS Clarifications	Closed	03/10/2014	03/20/2014	03/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 289 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) Please confirm that the AESS begins immediately above the IFRM-2 areas noted on details A & E/A1-8662 2) Supply the noted dimension to determine the AESS boundary 3) Supply the noted angle to determine the AESS boundary				Refer to enclosed sketch for response to RFI questions.			
T-1163	SSS - Train Box Column Cap Plate Machining	Closed	02/11/2014	02/21/2014	02/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Detail 4/S1-5052 indicates "Grind Surface to Extra Smooth" for the surface finish required for the machined out section of the Train Box Column Cap plate. This is not an industry standard reference. Our fabricator proposes to machine this surface to 125 RA. See attached backup information. Please confirm this is acceptable.				Definition of extra smooth is provided in Specification 05 10 00, Section 1.2.C.8.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1164	SSS - Connection Details at Corner Roof Girders	Closed	02/12/2014	02/22/2014	02/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please see attached Roof Girder Blank drawing submittal returned by WOJV on 1/27/14 "Approved as Noted". The Engineer's directive to change the configuration of the "stub beam" is inconsistent with the current Plan Sheets. Upon further discussions held in the Structural Coordination meeting on 2/6/14, OIW has been directed to proceed with the 2.25" T&B flange at the stub beam, as detailed on 10/S1-8001, and modify the web of the stub beam to align with grid lines 1 and 33.5.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please see attached "preliminary" shop drawings representing the requested changes to the stub beam detail.					Confirmed		
Please confirm the changes to this drawing are consistent with the Engineer's intent. Upon confirmation, OIW will make the appropriate changes to drawings GB107 through GB110 and resubmit for record.							
Please also note that the weld prep in detail 5 on GB107-2 has been modified per the 2/6/14 coordination meeting.							
T-1165	BSE - Relocate Micropiles E872 and E874	Closed	02/12/2014	02/22/2014	02/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
BBII discovered that Micropiles E872 and E874 were in conflict with struts STD-71 and STD-70 respectively. BBII proposes the following:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
- Relocate Micropile W872 3' South West - Relocate Micropile W874 8' South West					Contractor proposed relocation of micropiles is acceptable.		
Please confirm these changes are acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1529 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1169	BGP - Geothermal Manifold Locations for Risers 5 through 10	Closed	02/13/2014	02/23/2014	02/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per discussions with Geothermal EOR (WSP), SCCI was directed to route the geothermal risers below the bottom of the Air Duct and above the top of the conduit rack against the foundation wall. Please confirm the attached sleeve detail for geothermal riser 5 through 10 is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Since piping is not installed per Detail A/M1-5002 With piping tight to slab, install as shown in the attached sketch (file name: WSP Review- RFI_T-1169_BGP - _Geothermal_Manifold_Locations_for_Risers_5_throu gh_10) with the piping and valves mounted as close as possible to the foundation wall.		
<hr/>							
T-1170	SSS - Light Column Base Plate and Corrosion Protection	Closed	02/13/2014	02/23/2014	02/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: As a follow up to review comments provided in Submittal Package TG0701-023.1 SSS - Light Column Anchor Bolts (#1.5E), please review and respond to the following items: 1) Base plate hole oversize and subsequent sizing of the top plate washer As a follow up to the conference call held 1/29/14 for the Light Column anchor bolts, Dywidag provided the following information via the email attached: "If we spec a 50ksi plate and use the full width of the spherical washer, the plate works as-is. Leaving the plate design alone (with the assumed actual contact width of the washer) the plate still works at a 6" hole diameter. This is designing for 95% of the ultimate capacity of the bar." The maximum outside diameter of the HSS tube inside the base plate is 3.5". Within a 6" hole, this allows for 1.25" of clearance all around the tube, which is more than adequate clearance based on the AISC allowable tolerances for installations of anchor-rod groups. Reference AISC Steel Construction Manual, Section 16.7.5.1 attached, which does not allow for any more than ¼" variation between anchor rod groups nor between anchor rod group and column lines. Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed with a 6" base plate hole size to avoid modifications to the top anchor plate grade and geometry.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We have reviewed Dywidag's statement for the top plate washer as well as the corrosion protection of the bar within the galvanized tube and based on this guarantee by Dywidag we find these solutions acceptable.		
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1530 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>2) Adequate corrosion protection of bar with clearance provided between 2.79" bar and 3" galvanized tube</p> <p>See the email attached from Dywidag stating that the provided clearance allows for adequate corrosion protection of the anchor bar. Please confirm the galvanized duct is acceptable as detailed based on this information.</p>						
T-1171	SSS - Galvanizing Steel Composite Deck	Closed	02/13/2014	02/23/2014	02/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: <p>With reference to the galvanizing required for the composite metal deck please clarify the following:</p> <p>a) General Notes drawing S-007 note DK-1 requires deck to conform to ASTM A653 hot dipped galvanized conforming to ASTM A924 G90.</p> <p>b) Detail 2/S1-5000 note 6 requires UNO all floor and roof deck to be galvanized in accordance with ASTM A653 coating class G60. Type 2 deck shall be galvanized in accordance with A653, G90.</p> <p>c) Specifications section 05 30 00 part 2.3A requires before forming, the steel sheet shall be coated with a zinc coating conforming to ASTM A653 Zinc coated per ASTM A653 G90.</p> <p>Please clarify this conflicting information</p>	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> <p>Note 6 of Detail 2/S1-5000 stating that UNO, all floor and roof deck to be galvanized in accordance with ASTM A653, coating class G60. Since both the General Note DK-1 on sheet S-007 and Specification 05 30 00, paragraph 2.3 A call for G90 coating for all metal deck, G90 shall be used.</p>				

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1172	BSE - Geothermal Field 10 & 11	Closed	02/14/2014	02/24/2014	02/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Robert Kjome</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author:</div> <div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Per field discussions with ARUP, Airco is to hand tamp (not use the jumping jack) the geothermal trench only to ensure "tight" compaction. ISI will be onsite to visually verify the compaction efforts.</div><div>Per field walk on 02-13-14 ARUP has classified the top portion of Geothermal Field #10 and #11 as oversaturated/unsuitable/partially contaminated due to the inclement weather (rain from 02.06.14 through 02.09.14). It is recommended to scrape off the top layer immediately prior to the rat slab rebar install.</div><div>Please confirm it is acceptable to pour the rat slab in this area thicker to compensate for the scraped off unsuitable material.</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div></div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>ARUP Response:</div><div>Contractor should first perform the required treatment of wet soils resulting from unfavorable weather conditions specified in Spec. 31-23-34.</div><div>It is acceptable to pour the mud slab in this area thicker to compensate for the scraped off unsuitable material. However; Geothermal Piping must have suitable soils cover of minimum of 6" above top of geothermal piping within header trenches/trenches.</div><div>Adamson Associates Response:</div><div>CMGC shall verify the waterproofing sub-contractor, waterproofing manufacturer, & sub-contractor's waterproofing designer approve the proposal in this RFI to confirm the mud slab will provide a suitable installation surface for the waterproofing system.</div></div></div>							
<hr/>							
T-1173	SSS - Grease at Light Column Anchor Bolts	Closed	02/18/2014	02/28/2014	02/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div> <div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Drawings S1-6008 and S1-6009 as well as the specifications issued with the TG07.1 trade package do not provide requirements for the grease at the light column anchor bolts. Please review the product attached, which has been recommended by the basis of design post-tension anchor bolt supplier, Dywidag. Confirm that the proposed product is acceptable.</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div></div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>We have reviewed the product recommended by the post-tension anchor bolt supplier, Dywidag, and based on this recommendation we find this product acceptable.</div></div></div>							
<hr/>							
T-1174	BGP Horizontal Cast-In Inserts - W111, W165, W164	Closed	02/19/2014	02/19/2014	02/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titcher</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author:</div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1532 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>SCCI is in receipt of RFI response T-0599.1 and ASI 110 drawings.</div><div>1. Please confirm it is acceptable to install 1st lift Horizontal Cast-In inserts at elevations -22.25, - 27.08, & -31.92, except:</div><div>2. Horizontal Cast-In inserts in 1st lift foundation wall 111 & 165 were installed at elevations -22.08, - 26.91 and -31.75 respectively. Please confirm this is acceptable? See attached sketch.</div><div>3. 1st lift wall 164 2nd row up from bottom Horizontal Cast-In insert, was installed at elevation -27.20 for 13'-10" from the East end of Wall 164. Please confirm this is acceptable? Please note the remainder of the Cast-In insert in wall 164 was installed at elevation -27.08 (see #1 above). See attached sketch.</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>					
					<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>1. It is acceptable to install 1st Lift Horizontal Cast-in inserts at elevations -22.25, -27.08, & -31.92.</div><div>2. 1st Lift Horizontal Cast-in inserts at Foundation wall 111 and 165 are confirmed at elevations -22.08, -26.91 and -31.75 respectively.</div><div>3. 1st Lift Horizontal Cast-in insert at Foundation Wall 164, 2nd row is confirmed at -27.20 13'-10" from East end and remainder installed at -27.08.</div></div>		
T-1175	SSS - Rigging Schemes & Connections	Closed	02/19/2014	02/19/2014	02/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<div><div>From:</div>Webcor Construction LP</div> <div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div></div> <div><div>Co-Author:</div>Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>	<div><div>To:</div>Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>			<div><div>Answered By:</div>Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>		
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Skanska is reviewing the rigging schemes required to erect the Train Box Columns, please confirm the concept of drilling additional holes for the bolted connection in the cap plate as detailed in sketches R-3A, R-3B & R-3C is acceptable.</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Proposed holes on the below grade steel column cap plates as detailed in this RFI are acceptable.</div></div>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1533 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1176	SSS - Finish Requirements at BRBs	Closed	02/19/2014	03/01/2014	02/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Detail B/A1-8662 indicates that BRBs at Ground Level between GL D.4/28 and D.4/31 are to receive IFRM-2 fire protection. All other BRBs are to receive SFRM fire protection. Please refer to SK RFI 397 SK1 attached and clarify the following finish requirements for the BRBs:				Item 1. Confirmed and as indicated on the documents referenced.			
1) Details 1, 3, and 5 on S1-4206 indicate that bottom gusset plates are to be galvanized. Please confirm that only the bottom gusset plates are to be galvanized.				Item 2.			
2) For BRBs to receive SFRM fire protection:				a. Extent of SFRM and shop prep as indicated in the documents referenced.			
a. Please confirm the extent of the SFRM at the braces as indicated by the red outline in details 2, 3, and 6. Note that all materials indicated to receive SFRM will be bare steel. Steel will be prepped in accordance with 07 81 00-3.2.B.				b. Extent of SFRM and shop prep as indicated in the documents referenced.			
b. Please confirm the pin, bolts, plates, and top gussets shown in details 2 and 6 are to be bare steel in anticipation of receiving SFRM by others.				Item 3.			
3) For BRBs to receive IFRM fire protection:				a. Extent of IFRM and shop prep as indicated in the documents referenced.			
a. Please confirm the extent of the IFRM at the braces as indicated by the blue outline in details 2, 3, and 6. Materials indicated to receive IFRM will be prepped and primed in accordance with 07 81 23.				b. Confirmed and as indicated on the documents referenced.			
b. Detail B/A1-8662 graphically indicates that only the braces and not the gussets are to receive IFRM. Please confirm the final finish of the bottom gusset plates is to be galvanized and provide the finish requirements for the top gussets.				c. Finish requirements are indicated in referenced drawings and specifications.			
c. Please provide the finish requirements for the pins and 1" thick plates indicated on 6/S1-4206.				d. Finish requirements are indicated in referenced drawings and specifications.			
d. Provide the finish requirements for the bolts indicated in detail 6/S1-4206.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1534 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1176.1	SSS - Finish Requirements at BRBs	Closed	03/18/2014	03/28/2014	03/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Skanska is proceeding as follows for BRBs based on the response to WOJV T-1176:				1. No exception taken.			
1) Bottom gusset plates shall be galvanized.				2.			
2) For BRBs scheduled to receive SFRM fire protection:				a. No exception taken.			
a. Materials in red indicated to receive SFRM will be bare steel. Steel will be prepped in accordance with 07 81 00-3.2.B.				b. No exception taken.			
b. The pins, bolts, plates, and top gussets shown in details 2 and 6 shall be bare steel to receive SFRM.				3.			
3) For BRBs to receive IFRM fire protection:				a. Confirmed			
a. Prime coat for IFRM will be provided to the extent indicated by the blue outline in details 2, 3, and 6.				b. Confirmed			
Materials indicated to receive IFRM will be prepped and primed in accordance with 07 81 23.				c. Confirmed			
b. The response to WOJV T-1176 indicates finishes for top gusset plates shall be per the documents.							
Note that the contract documents and specifications do not indicate whether top gusset plates are to be galvanized, bare steel to receive SFRM, or IFRM.							
Based on the interface between gussets, bracing, and pinned components, it appears that the top gusset plate shall be prepped and primed to receive IFRM. Please confirm.							
c. The response to WOJV T-1176 indicates finishes for the pins, bolts, and 1" thick plates shall be per the documents. Note that the contract documents and specifications do not indicate whether these components are to be galvanized, bare steel to receive SFRM, or IFRM. Based on the interface between gussets, bracing, and pinned components, it appears that the pins, bolts, and 1" thick plates shall be prepped and primed to receive IFRM. Please confirm.							
Please advise if exception is taken to any of the noted finishes.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Per discussions with Geothermal EOR (WSP), SCCI was directed to route the geothermal risers below the bottom of the Air Duct and above the top of the conduit rack against the foundation wall. Due to the location of the Fremont St abutement, the penetration plate has been moved down between the bottom of the abutement and the top of the waler.</div><div>Please confirm the attached sleeve detail for Geothermal Riser 11 is acceptable.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>WSP Response: Since piping is not installed per Detail A/M1-5002 With piping tight to slab, install as shown in the attached sketch (WSP Review-RFI_T-1179_BGP_-_Geothermal_Manifold_Location_for_Riser_11) with the piping and valves mounted as close as possible to the foundation wall.</div> <div>Arup Response: Height of manifold below the top of shoring wall, as shown, is acceptable in this one instance.</div>		
T-1180	<div><div>BGP - Roof Level Support Framing to Drum Cafe</div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyPhil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>	Closed	02/19/2014	03/01/2014	02/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Framing plan S1-2605 in ASI 105 shows support framing at roof level for the W20 Drum Café. A note (see attached sketch) indicates that steel beams are to be "aligned with each drum café column See S1-6100." Please provide the referenced drawing.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>See attached sketch for the location of the W-20 columns.</div>	<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>	
T-1181	<div><div>BGP - Proposed Revised Location of the Reinforcement Lap Splices at the Lower (</div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPClaude Titcher</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyPhil Militello</div><div>Co-Author:</div></div>	Closed	02/21/2014	03/03/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Further to discussion with Thornton Tomasetti design Engineer Kerem Gulec, WOJV is requesting that the horizontal reinforcement lap splices of the spandrel beams and the top horizontal reinforcement of the lower concourse slabs can both be located anywhere within the middle 1/3th span between the moment frame beams.</div><div>Please confirm it would be acceptable</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Confirmed.</div>	<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1537 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1182	BGP - Mat Slab - Top Rebar Splice Location at Light Tower Anchor Bolt	Closed	02/21/2014	03/03/2014	03/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titché</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div> <div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
See attached sketches.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
To accomodate the installation of Light Column Anchor Bolt assemblies, SCCI proposes to locally move the splice location of the top mat slab rebar towards the West.				It is acceptable to locally move the top reinforcing lap splice west as described in the RFI. Along the bars affected it is also acceptable to maintain a lap splice in the original plan location to avoid excessive lengths of bar to the east.			
Please confirm that this is acceptable.							
T-1183	SSS - Interference at GL15	Closed	02/21/2014	03/03/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div> <div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
On the attached sketches CD RFI # 298 SK1 & SK2 the double angle connections per S1-5010 are not possible at the noted location as the W16 & W24 are off-set 2 7/16" from each other.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Confirm it is acceptable to supply full depth shear plates as shown with plate thickness, welding and bolts per S1-5011				Not acceptable. Provide double angle connection per 9/S1-5010 at the W24 beam. Provide shear plate connection at the W16 beam per 2/S1-5011 with 6 bolts (2 vertical rows of 3 bolts each).			
T-1184	SSS - Steel Connection Interference GL 15D	Closed	02/21/2014	03/03/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div> <div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
At grid line D/15, the W40 to column connection will conflict with the W16 connection to the W40 (SK2). Please confirm it is acceptable to connect the W40 (SK1 & SK2) to the indicated column as shown, using 3 rows of 4 bolts in lieu of the 2 rows of 6 bolts per 5/S1-4206.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				Not acceptable. Provide a shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011 at the W16 beams that are next to the W40 drag connection on both sides of GL D. Drag connection at the W40 beam shall be per 5/S1-4206 as noted on construction drawings. Note that the W40 beam is framed into the transfer girder and not a column as stated in the RFI.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1539 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1187	SSS - W16 Connection Detail Between 19.9 & 20.1	Closed	02/21/2014	03/03/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached sketches CD RFI # 302 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3: 1) The line for the noted W16x26 is not shown. Confirm the beam is centered on the wall. 2) Confirm the connection for the W16 to the Transfer Girder is acceptable as shown with plate thickness, welding and bolts per 1/S1-5011. If not, supply a new detail. 3) Confirm the same connection may be used for the W16 to the Transfer Girder on Grid 20.1.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			1) Confirmed. 2) Connection detail proposed for W16 shown on SK2 is acceptable. Provide plate thickness, welding, bolt size and bolt edge distances per Detail 2/S1-5011. 3) Confirmed.				
T-1188	SSS - Finish Requirements at Basket Columns	Closed	02/21/2014	03/03/2014	03/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: A1-8660 conceptually indicates the boundaries of Category 2 and Category 3 AESS requirements for the basket columns. Based on this information and the documents provided for the TG07.1R trade package, SK1 has been provided to depict Skanska's understanding of the basket column finish requirements. Please review the following and confirm the various finish boundaries associated with the basket columns: 1) Confirm the Category 2 AESS boundary is from the Ground Level cast node to the end of the pipe column from the Ground Level to the Bus Deck Level as indicated in SK1. 2) Confirm the Category 3 AESS begins at the Bus Deck level cast node and extends through the pipe column to the Roof Level cast node as indicated in SK1. 3) Confirm the AESS boundary ends at the Roof Level cast nodes and that the Roof Level connection plates are to be delivered on site in the bare steel condition to receive SFRM. 4) Confirm the AESS boundary at the Bus Deck cast nodes extends to the cast node pad, with all shear plates, reinforcement plates, and perimeter beams to receive SFRM as indicated in SK1. 5) Confirm these boundaries can be typically applied to all perimeter basket columns at North, South, East, and West			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			1. Boundaries indicated on SK RFI 418 SK1 generally appear to be OK. However, this information should be confirmed by the CM/GC, as this RFI states "by others", which is information for the CM/GC. All this information should be clearly submitted for review in shop drawing submittal per drawings and specification 05 12 14 Paragraph 1.4. Additionally, see added notes on your SK RFI 418 SK1 attached. The elements currently highlighted in cyan color in the enclosed sketch should be AESS category 3 per A1-8660 and finished per specification section 09 97 16. 2. See response to item 1) above. 3. This statement is incorrect. Cast node connecting plates are AESS members that should be prepped and finished per specification section 09 97 16. SFRM fireproofing should be applied to perimeter beam per A1-8662 and details in sheets A1-8611 and A1-8612. 4. Please submit shop drawings submittals per specification 05 12 14 Paragraph 1.4 and as noted on item 1) above.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1540 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	exterior elevations.						5. See response to item 1) above.
T-1189	SSS - Missing Dimensions and Connection Details	Closed	02/24/2014	03/06/2014	03/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: 1) Work with SK2 and provide the missing dimension. 2) Detail 10/S1-7600 will not work as the noted posts are off-set from the beam. Provide a connection detail. 3) Supply the missing dimensions.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Missing dimensions have been provided on the attached sketch SKS-0332. 2) Beams shall be centered on the highlighted posts and detail 10/S1-7600 shall apply as noted on the drawings. See SKS-0332 for reference. 3) See response to 1).				
T-1190	16" Slab Negative Moments at North-South Walls	Closed	02/24/2014	03/06/2014	02/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please reference attached Memo from seers consulting Engineer. There is a certain concern that once the LL= 150 PSF is imposed on the LCL deck there will be excess negative moments generated at the interface between weak axis of the supported slab and wall-spandrel beam. This may require additional top reinforcement in the weak axis of the one-way slab. Please confirm that there are no additional bars neded at the LCL spandrel/wall interface, and that loading Table from S-1002 applies.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No additional bars are required at the LCL spandrel/wall interface. Loading on S-1002 applies.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1541 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1191	SSS - Elevator Pit Framing Steel	Closed	02/24/2014	03/06/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please confirm it is acceptable to drill (4) holes in the W18 x50 to hold it in position for field welding. See attached sketches CD RFI # 311 SK1 & SK2 for clarification.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
T-1192	BSE - Steel Plate at CDSM Piles 450-451	Closed	02/24/2014	03/06/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Kelly Phariss							
REQUEST: During level 4 and 5 excavation, a high volume leak occurred in zone 4 between CDSM pile 450 and 451. In an effort to stabilize the CDSM panel and repair the leak, BBII installed a steel road plate between soldier piles 167-168 and injected grout behind it. BBII is concerned that removing the plate will likely cause the panel to become destabilized and could reopen the flow of water. BBII survey of the plate indicates that the plate is behind the theoretical face of CDSM wall and does not encroach into the permanent structure - reference the attached drawing. Please confirm it is acceptable to leave this plate in place. The edges of the plate may be grinded to provide a smooth transition to the CDSM wall for waterproofing.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed, it is acceptable to leave the steel plate in place, provided, as stated in the RFI, it does not encroach into the permanent structure and the edges of the plate are ground smooth. This location should be reviewed by the waterproofing manufacturer and details developed for the waterproofing and cushioning layers between the CDSM wall and foundation wall, to ensure a smooth transition for the CDSM wall waterproofing at this condition.			
T-1193	BGP - Gridline Offset Discrepancies	Closed	02/24/2014	03/06/2014	03/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference called out dimensions on S1-2203 and S1-2204 for GL 12-13. SCCI believes that "42'-0" TO GRID 12" on S1-2204 is a typo and that dimensions shown on S1-2203 is accurate, which is consistent with the typical grid lines C-C. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirm that the 42'-6" dimension between Grids 12 and 13 is correct.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1542 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1194	BGP - Unmarked Members on S1-2203	Closed	02/24/2014	03/06/2014	02/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference attached CD S1-2203					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
It is unclear what the clouded member along the South foundation depicts. Is this member a wall of concourse beam?					Clouded members are future walls, as defined by legend on S-0010. Wall size and layout is provided in architectural drawings. See A1-2223 for wall plan and A-0022 for wall type.		
Please clarify, and provide dimensions, offsets, and type.							
T-1194.1	BGP - Unmarked Member on S1-2203	Closed	02/27/2014	03/09/2014	03/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
The response to RFI T-1194 conflicts with Submittal TG0600-364 response.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
RFI T-1194 response noted that the curved member shown is future CMU wall. However, response to TG0600-354 submittal noted that the member is Curved Concrete Beams- CB24, CB55 and CB15.					Response to RFI T-1194 does not conflict with notes on Submittal TG0600-364.		
Please clarify and provide latest drawings to reflect noted change shown in Submittal TG0600-354 if the curved member is a beam.					Curved Concrete Beams CB24, CB55 and CB15 noted on submittal TG0600-364 are members to support future walls.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1543 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1194.2	BGP - Unmarked Member on S1-2203	Closed	03/10/2014	03/20/2014	03/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic							
REQUEST: Refer to RFI's T-1194, T-1194.1, and ASI 106 S1-2203 Based on previous RFI T-1194-series responses SCCI still doesn't have contract drawing that depicts details of the curved members, deck beams along B65 (South spandrel beam). The most current version of S1-2203, that is available to SCCI does not specify beam type, nor radius of these curved members. Please provide details for the curved beams along the South B65, i.e. issue most current version of S 1- 2200-series drawings with beam callouts and offsets (distances and radiuses).		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per Structural Issues Review Meeting 03/13/2014, it was agreed that Sheet S1-2203 would not be re-issued in response to this RFI. The requested information is provided as follows: -Curved CB24 spans between GL 8 and GL 9 -Curved CB55 spans between GL 9 and GL9.9 -Curved CB15 spans between GL10.1 and GL11 As listed in Note 7 on Beam Schedule 1/S1-3401, 'C' before beam mark denotes beam to be centered on CMU or concrete wall. Please see arch drawings for wall layout.			
T-1195	BGP - Geothermal Header Pipe Size at Fields 13 and 14	Closed	02/25/2014	03/07/2014	03/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference attached drawing Geothermal Fields 13, 14, and 15 have been condensed into two(2) fields (Geothermal Fields 13 and 14). Please provide the pipe sizes for the header piping in these two fields.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached Sketch WSP response-RFI_T-1195_BGP_-_Geothermal_Header_pipe_Size_at_Fields_13_and_14 for pipe sizes.			
T-1197	SSS - Weld Access Hole for TG Stiffener Plate	Closed	02/25/2014	03/07/2014	03/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: A weld access hole is required where the direction of the weld changes from horizontal to vertical on detail 3/S1-4350. Please confirm the weld access hole detailed on SK2 is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1544 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1197.1	SSS - Weld Access Hole for TG Shear Plate	Closed	03/24/2014	04/03/2014	04/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On detail 3/S1-4350 due to the weld prep required for a 3" shear plate as indicated on SK1, the weld access hole previously requested in RFI T-1197 will not be adequate. Please confirm Option 1 or Option 2 on SK2 are acceptable or provide an alternative detail. Also please confirm the weld access hole dimensions may be adjusted proportionally for a 4" shear plate as detailed on 3/S1-4351 in accordance AWS weld access hole requirements.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Option #2 on SK2 is acceptable. It is acceptable to apply similar detail (proportionally adjusted for increase in thickness) to the 4" PL in S1-4351.				
T-1198	SSS - Dimension Clarification for W-1 Fitted Stiffeners	Closed	02/25/2014	03/07/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please provide the indicated dimension required to determine the depth of the 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ fitted stiffeners.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The dimension shall be 8 1/2" per Detail 3/S1-6091.				
T-1199	SSS - Bi-Fold Door Support Clarification	Closed	02/25/2014	03/07/2014	03/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached sketches CD RFI # 306 SK1 to SK6 for items 1 to 5: 1) The noted dimension does not match the information in details 9 & 10/S1-5020 (SK2 & SK3), which show 1'-11" from Grid G. Please clarify which dimension is correct. 2) Confirm the L8x8 extends from W27 to W27 as shown in detail 10/S1-5050 (SK3). 3) Supply missing dimension. 4) Confirm the HSS8x8 with PL1x8 at Grid 14 terminates as shown or supply more information. 5) Confirm the HSS8x8 with PL1x8 at Grid 15 terminates as shown or supply more information.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 3/10/2014 1. The noted dimension shall be 1'-11". 2. Confirmed. 3. TJP and WJOV organized the fast track project delivery process and the Design Team has not reviewed the shop drawings of the W-2 Bi-fold door. This information can only be provided upon review of the W-2 Aluminum Curtain Wall and Loading Dock Bi-fold Door combined submittal shop drawings (see Spec Section 08 44 25, 1.7 H), because the components and location of equipment differ per				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1545 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1200	SSS - Doubler Plate Detail Clarification	Closed	02/25/2014	03/07/2014	03/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
REQUEST: See attached sketches CD RFI # 307 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 4: 1) Confirm it is acceptable to cut the doubler plate as shown to clear the double angle connection. 2) Confirm it is acceptable to terminate the doubler plate 1/2" from the beam flange as shown as the beam flange is moment welded. 3) The shear plate connection for the W16 to the W33x221 fouls the bolts as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to increase the 1'-7 dimension to 1'-10 1/2. If not, supply an alternate detail. 4) Confirm the shear plate may be partially welded to the doubler plate and partially welded to the web of the W33x221.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Confirmed. 2). Confirmed. 3). Confirmed. 4). Confirmed.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1200.1	SSS - Doubler Plate Detail Clarification	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 307.1 SK1: The noted W16x26 is not erectable unless the connection plate on the north end is pulled out as shown in SECTION 'B' due to the side plate at the south end. Confirm the connection in SECTION 'B' is acceptable.			Confirmed				
T-1201	SSS - Double Angle Offset Clarification	Closed	02/25/2014	03/07/2014	03/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached sketches CD RFI # 308 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) On S1-2404 the noted beams are offset from each other by 3 1/2" as shown. Confirm the connections as shown are acceptable or supply an alternate solution. 2) On S1-2504 the noted beams are offset from each other by 1 1/2" as shown and the double angle connection is not possible for both beams. Confirm the W24x68's may be connection with a shear plate per 1/S1-5011 as shown.			1) Confirmed. 2) Not acceptable. Move the W24 beams 1 1/2" so that they align with the W27 beams on the other side and use double angle connection.				
T-1202	SSS - Drag Plate Material Clarification	Closed	02/26/2014	03/08/2014	03/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached sketch SK1 for reference: 1) Please confirm the 3" drag plates in detail 8/S1-5020 are A572 GR50 material and that CVN testing is not required. 2) Please confirm that the 3 ½" drag plates welded to the top of the moment frame columns, as shown in RFI T-1085 (SK RFI 325), are A572 GR 50 material and that CVN testing is not required.			1. Confirmed 2. Confirmed				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1547 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1203	SSS - Stair Escalator Framing Detail	Closed	02/26/2014	03/08/2014	03/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On attached sketches CD RFI # 309 SK1 & SK2 confirm the connection for the W21x50 to the top of the W30x90 is acceptable as shown or supply a new detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
T-1204	SSS - Support Steel at Large Slab Openings	Closed	02/26/2014	03/08/2014	03/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The perimeter support steel at large slab openings as detailed on 12/S1-5003 will not work at GL 16.9/D as indicated on SK1 due to the 12" top of slab elevation changes around these openings. Please provide details for the support steel required at this location including all connection details.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: The W33 beam is 1'-0" higher than the W24 as shown on the plan. The metal deck for the slab where those 2 openings occur is set by the low slab (similar to Typical Detail 10/S1-5002). The Typical Detail 12/S1-5003 applies. C8 channel shall have a shear connection per typical detail 1/S1-5011 (2 bolts).	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
T-1205	BGP - Lower Concourse Blockouts to Pour Train Level Partition Walls	Closed	02/26/2014	03/08/2014	03/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SCCI is planning on pouring as much of the Train Level Partition Walls in Area 3 and 4 prior to the Lower Concourse Deck being poured (see attached Structural Drawings for reference). However, some of the partition walls conflict with the Rakers used for bracing. Additionally, there are some partition walls in Areas 6-16 that are added in ASI #110 that is now included in TG06 scope. Since the Rakers will not be removed until after the Lower Concourse Deck is poured, SCCI proposes installing blockouts in the Lower Concourse above the walls in order to complete the concrete pours for the partition walls in Areas 3 and 4. The same blockouts will be installed for the partition walls on the mat slab level in Areas 6-16, added as part of ASI 110. The blockouts will be 6"x 12" for RCS 1 reinforcement and 9"x 12" for RCS8 reinforcement, both at 4' O.C. The blockouts would be positioned in the space			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Conceptually, it is acceptable to provide blockouts in the Lower Concourse slab for the purpose of pouring the concrete partition walls below. It is noted that the RFI does not address the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Cases where a partition wall is below or partially below a parallel Lower Concourse beamCases where a blockout coincides with features above, such as a CMU wallMeans of preparing and pouring back the blockout Contractor shall give due consideration to the above and revise the plan as required. Consideration shall be given to the differing heights of wall pours due to changes in the Lower Concourse soffit such as for perpendicular beams, particularly with regard to consolidation. Minimum separation gaps between top	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1548 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1206	BGP - Geothermal Header Pipe Size at Field 12	Closed	02/27/2014	03/09/2014	03/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached drawing The orientation and layout of Geothermal Field 12 has changed significantly. Please provide the pipe sizes for the header piping in this Field.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached Sketch WSP Response-RFI_T-1206_BGP_-_Geothermal_Header_Pipe_Size_at_Field_12 for pipe sizes.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1550 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1208	SSS - Verify no Bent Plate Welds at Protected Zones	Closed	02/28/2014	03/10/2014	03/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per the approval comment on A2647 and RFI T-1071 occurs North of line D and South of line F along line 10.1 for loose bent plate conditions and does not apply at this location. This beam is between greids D and F. Please verify for the continuous shop attached bent plate condition no weld will occur within the noted protected zones. Note this is the same for A2659 and other similar conditions.					Where the bent plate cross-section is continuous between the two outriggers on each side of the protected zone, it is confirmed that the bent plate shall not be welded to the beam along the protected zone and no additional revision is necessary to brace the bent plate. Response to RFI T-1071 applies where the bent plate cross-section changes within the protected zone for example at Bus Deck Level, south of GL 10.1/F and north of GL 10.1/D.		
T-1209	BGP - Plumbing Sleeve Manufacturer	Closed	02/28/2014	03/10/2014	03/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The response to SCCI Submittal, TG0600-044-BGP-Concourse Plumbing and Piping Sleeves-Product Data and Shop Drawings, states that sleeves and flanges shall be 18 gauge minimum per specs. From the three manufactures, per Spec Section 22 05 30 - 2.1 .B, RK Industries is the only manufacturer that provides plumbing sleeves but with flanges that are 26 gauge only. In order to proceed, please provide a manufacturer that fabricates sleeves according to TG06.0 specs or allow flanges that are 26 gauge to be used.					This RFI (and the submittal) refers to plumbing sleeves to be cast in lower concourse concrete slab. The 18 gauge sleeves with 26 gauge flanges are acceptable.		
T-1211	BGP - Lower Concourse Blockout - Shifted Bars Near Piles	Closed	03/04/2014	03/14/2014	03/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Where trestle piles protrude through the lower concourse deck, block-outs in the concrete slab will be installed and interrupted deck reinforcing will be spliced with formsavers. For bars near the extents of the trestle pile, please confirm if it is acceptable to shift the typical deck bars (#8 and #9) beyond the allowed placing tolerances to avoid interruption of the bar. If acceptable, please provide tolerances for					It is acceptable to shift Lower Concourse reinforcing for the purpose of minimizing the number of reinforcing intersections with openings, block-outs, and other obstructions thereby minimizing the attendant cutting of reinforcing and the addition of trim steel. The following shifts are acceptable:		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	shifting of the bar and minimum clear spacing between rebar similar to conditions listed in the response to RFI T-0631. See attached sketch for details.			1. Any single bar may be shifted to within a bar diameter of an adjacent bar so long as the resulting gap between any two adjacent bars does not exceed 12". 2. Any group of bars may be uniformly shifted to within a bar diameter of an adjacent bar so long as the resulting gap between any two adjacent bars does not exceed 12". 3. Any single bar may be removed from a module so long as it is replaced midway between adjacent modules and the resulting gap between any two adjacent bars does not exceed 12". An equivalent shift of two bars resulting in the same configuration is also allowed. 4. Lap splices may be offset up to 6" provided that the resulting gap between any two adjacent bars does not exceed 12".			
T-1212	BGP - Goethermal Manifold Sleeve Supports	Closed	03/04/2014	03/14/2014	03/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Per discussions with EOR(WSP), please confirm geothermal contractor is to install temporary supports (see attached sketch) to facilitate the installation of the geothermal pipe sleeves(36" long) at the face of finish concrete(which is not in the current concrete package-TG06).						Temporary Supports are the means and methods of the contractor.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1552 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1213	SSS - Transfer Girder End Bracing at 9.9 & 10.1	Closed	03/05/2014	03/15/2014	03/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 324 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) Supply dimensions to locate the braces considering that the braces cannot be connected to the stiffener plates due to rebars. 2) Transfer Girders at other locations also have rebars passing thru the stiffener plates as shown here. Please provide a typical connection detail when this occurs.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Provide braces per Detail 12/S1-3703. Braces are to be connected to the stiffener plates closest to Grid C. Some rebars might interfere with the braces, but they can be adjusted in field slightly. 2). See response to #1.		
<hr/>							
T-1214	SSS - Transfer Girder End Bracing at 9.9 & 10.1	Closed	03/05/2014	03/15/2014	03/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: For the Transfer Girder end bracing at GL 9.9 & 10.1 as indicated on SK1 please confirm the following: 1) The outer braces are to be modeled as per detail 12/S1-3703. 2) The inner braces between 9.9 & 10.1 are to be modeled as per detail 81/S1-5015.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). The outer braces are to be modeled as per detail 12/S1-3703. 2). The inner braces between Grid 9.9 & 10.1 are also to be modeled as per detail 12/S1-3703.		
<hr/>							
T-1215	SSS - Welding clarification	Closed	03/05/2014	03/15/2014	03/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached sketches CD RFI # 303 SK1 & SK2 for item 1: 1) Confirm the weld access hole as shown is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1553 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1216	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 13	Closed	03/14/2014	03/24/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titcher	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:		

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference Documents: Exhibits A - H

This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south wall in mat slab pour Area 13 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 265 to 288 on the north elevation and 495 to 517 to on the south elevation for location Plan see exhibit - A

Exhibit - B, & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching

WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) between CDSM pile 262-263 to 270, 272-273 to 276 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 266 to 270, 274 & 275. Originally these were WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).

Between CDSM piles 280 to 281-282 & 284 to 290, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33" to clear the encroaching SP 281, 284, 285, 286, 288-290. This foundation wall area was originally a WR1 reinforcement area #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit -D).

Between CDSM piles 270 to 272-273 & 281-282 to 283-284, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 32" & 33" respectively to clear the encroaching SP 271, 272 & 282. This foundation wall area was originally a embedment column with reinforcement in this area was a double layer of #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to double layer of #11@5"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.4 option 1 (Exhibit -F).

WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 503 to 506 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1554 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the encroaching SP 504, originally this was a WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings. See Exhibit - G & H showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.</p> <p>These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.</p> <p>Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.</p>						
T-1216.1	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 13	Closed	03/24/2014	03/31/2014	03/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - H				The contractor proposed revisions to foundation wall reinforcement due to encroaching CDSM Piles in Area 13 are acceptable. Update Area 13 shop drawings affected by the shoring encroachment info presented in this RFI and submit them for record.			
This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south wall in mat slab pour Area 13 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 265 to 288 on the north elevation and 495 to 517 to on the south elevation for location Plan see exhibit - A							
Exhibit - B, & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching							
WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) between CDSM pile 262-263 to 270, 272-273 to 276 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 266 to 270, 274 & 275. Originally these were WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).						
	Between CDSM piles 280 to 281-282 & 284 to 290, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33" to clear the encroaching SP 281,284,285,286,288-290. This foundation wall area was originally a WR1 reinforcement area #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit -D).						
	Between CDSM piles 270 to 272-273 & 281-282 to 283-284, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" & 33" respectively to clear the encroaching SP 271,272 & 282. This foundation wall area was originally a embedment column with reinforcement in this area was a double layer of #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to double layer of #11@5"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.4 option 1 (Exhibit -F).						
	WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 503 to 506 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 504, originally this was a WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).						
	In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings. See Exhibit - G & H showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.						
	These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.						
	Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1217	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 14	Closed	03/21/2014	03/31/2014	03/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference Documents: Exhibits A - H
This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south wall in mat slab pour Area 14 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 288 to 318 on the north elevation and 465 to 495 to on the south elevation for location Plan see exhibit - A.
Exhibit - B & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching.

WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 284 to 290, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33" to clear the encroaching SP 284,285,286,288-290. This foundation wall area was originally a WR1 reinforcement area #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit -D).

Between CDSM pile 299 to 301,305 to 312 & 315-316 to 322-323 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33.5" to clear the encroaching SP 299 & 301. Originally these were WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).

Between CDSM piles 290 to 294-295, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33" to clear the encroaching SP 291,292 & 293. Originally this was a WR2 reinforcement areas #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@5"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit - E)

Between CDSM piles 301 to 305, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33.5" to clear the encroaching SP 301,302 & 304. Originally this was a WR2 reinforcement areas #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@5"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

The contractor proposed revisions to foundation wall reinforcement due to encroaching CDSM Piles in Area 14 are acceptable. Update Area 14 shop drawings affected by the shoring encroachment info presented in this RFI and submit them for record.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1557 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>- E)</p> <p>WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 473 to 475 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 474, originally this was a WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings.</p> <p>See Exhibit - F G & H showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.</p> <p>These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.</p> <p>Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.</p>						
T-1218	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 15	Closed	04/02/2014	04/12/2014	04/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - G							
This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south wall in mat slab pour Area 15 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 318 to 343 on the north elevation and 440 to 465 to on the south elevation for location Plan see exhibit - A. Exhibit - B & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching.			The contractor proposed revisions to foundation wall reinforcement due to encroaching CDSM Piles in Area 15 are acceptable. Update Area 15 shop drawings affected by the shoring encroachment info presented in this RFI and submit them for record.				
WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM pile 315-316 to 322-323, 326							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>to 330 & 334 to 337-338. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33.5" to clear the encroaching SP 316 to 322. Originally these were WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>Between CDSM piles 322-323 to 326, 330 to 334 & 337-338 to 341 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33.5" to clear the encroaching SP 323 to 326 & 330 to 335, 338 & 339 Originally this was a WR2 reinforcement areas #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@5"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit -E)</p> <p>WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 438 to 442 & 445-446 to 448 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 441,446 & 447, originally this was a WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings.</p> <p>See Exhibit - F & G showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement. These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.</p> <p>Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.</p>						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1218.1	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 15	Closed	05/02/2014	05/12/2014	05/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference Documents: Exhibits A - G

Due to revised surveying information received it become necessary to revise the area 15 wall encroachments fixes.

This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south wall in mat slab pour Area 15 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 318 to 343 on the north elevation and 440 to 465 to on the south elevation for location Plan see exhibit - A.

Exhibit - B & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching.

WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM pile 315-316 to 322-323, 326 to 330 & 334 to 337-338, 341 to 344. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33.5" to clear the encroaching SP 316 to 322 & 343. Originally these were WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).

Between CDSM piles 322-323 to 326, 330 to 334 & 337-338 to 341 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33.5" to clear the encroaching SP 323 to 326 & 330 to 335, 338 & 339 Originally this was a WR2 reinforcement areas #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@5"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit -E)

WOJV proposal on the South elevation: (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 438 to 442 & 445-446 to 448 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33" to clear the encroaching SP 441,442,445,446 & 447, originally this was a WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

The contractor proposed revisions to foundation wall reinforcement due to encroaching CDSM Piles in Area 15 are acceptable. Update Area 15 shop drawings affected by the shoring encroachment info presented in this RFI and submit them for record.



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>Between CDSM piles 441-442 to 445-446, WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33" to clear the encroaching SP 442 & 445 Originally this was a WR2 reinforcement areas #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@5"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit - E)</p> <p>In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings.</p> <p>See Exhibit - F & G showing details of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.</p> <p>These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings.</p> <p>Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.</p>						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1219	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 11	Closed	04/03/2014	04/13/2014	04/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 11 for location plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north and south elevations due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall due to encroachment of the CDSM beams as well as typical cross sections of the revised spandrel beams. RFI T - 0783 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of Area 11. Please confirm that these modifications as outlined at these locations are acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Modifications for the spandrel beam at locations outlined are acceptable.		
T-1220.1	BGP - SFPUC Grounding Details	Closed	03/24/2014	04/03/2014	03/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: The response to RFI T-1220 stated that drawing E1-3212 had been issued in an ASI. This drawing has not been issued For Construction. Please provide sheet E1-3212			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> WOJV has been provided E1-3212 in a previous bid and ASI package. The document will also be "Issued for Construction" on April 1, 2014. RESPONSE: Judy Long 3-28-14 Drawing E1-3212 is attached for your reference and coordination for construction		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1221	BGP - 36" Pile Sleeve Joint	Closed	03/06/2014	03/16/2014	03/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please reference attached sketch, photo, and Contract Drawings SI-3003 and SI-2025. SCCI welded the 36" pile sleeve (see S 1-2025) vertical CJP as depicted in the attached sketch due to a shop fabrication error (see attached photo). Per AWS DI .1, the pre-qualified joint designation B-U2a-GF for FCAW allows a 65 degree groove angle with detail and fit up tolerances. The welded joint is approximately 15 degrees out of tolerance and is on one side of the sleeve only (2 joints per sleeve). Due to the member considered as non-structural, SCCI requests this joint to be acceptable as welded at this location only. SCCI will adhere to Spec Section 05 50 10 - 2.5.C.2 - "Weld mat foundation sleeve components continuously and test their water tightness by filling with water. Monitor water level for 48 hours minimum. Dry and correct faulty welds and re-test until proven watertight." Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed method and testing described in this RFI is acceptable at this location only.				
T-1222	SSS - Filler plate weld access at CP2 connection	Closed	03/07/2014	03/17/2014	03/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please reference Details 4 and 7 on sheet S1-8001. Detail 7 specifies a 1" thick filler plate between the beam web and the 2 1/2" thick backing plate. Detail 4 Section E notes 1" typical from the edge of the fill plate to the adjoining stiffener or beam web. 1" opening does not allow for adequate access to perform the welding. Oregon Iron Works(OIW) is requesting that all filler plates for CP2 connections have a minimum clearance of 1 1/2" from any adjoining edges. Additionally, OIW is requesting that this minimum clearance be applied to any similar areas that exhibit this limited access for welding.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Welding of the vertical stiffener should be done prior to installing the filler plate, hence there should be no weld access issue. The proposal to increase the 1" gap to 1 1/2" gap is acceptable.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1563 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1223	SSS - Elevator Edge of Slab Clarifications	Closed	03/07/2014	03/17/2014	03/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
At SE401 see attached CD RFI # 317 SK1 to SK5 for items 1 to 7:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) It is not clear what is meant by the noted slope designation.					1) The roof slab does not slope. T/Slab of the elevator shaft roof slab is 56' - 11" as noted on A1-2894.		
Confirm the roof slab slopes and the top of pad slab is EL 56'-11 per A1-2894 (SK3).					2) Confirmed.		
2) Confirm the noted dimension is 1'-2 3/4 per 8/S1-5004 (SK4).					3) The note is pointing to the horizontal steel beams shown on 8/S1-5004 and notes the T/steel of these members.		
3) This note is pointing to the edge of slab and giving a top of steel elevation. Work with SK5 and clarify.					4) No. The 10'- 3" and 1'-3" dimensions noted on A1-2894 are correct. The edge of slab for SE 401 at the top of the elevator shaft size increases at the top of the elevator shaft. Also see revised dimensions in the attached sketch SKS-0333.		
4) Confirm the noted dimensions should read 1'-9 & 9'-2 per 1/S1-7113 & RFI T-0965 (SK251, CD 200). If not, clarify.					5a) Yes, beams are required at these locations. These members shall be W18x50 beams. Refer to attached sketch SKS-0333. Note that there are four beams ,one on each side of the shaft.		
5) The noted HSS members are not shown on S1-2504 (SK1) or 3/S1-7113 (SK2) but this detail is referenced on both plans noted above.					5b) See response to 5a).		
a) Please confirm the HSS members are required.					5c) Centerlines of the W18 beams shall be 3 3/4" from the edge of the elevator shaft opening (see note on sketch SKS-0333) .		
b) If yes, supply the size.					5d) Elevation is 54' - 5" as noted on 3/S1-7113 (see note on sketch SKS-0333). Also see response to 3).		
c) Supply the horizontal locations on plan					5e) Connection at the elevator machine support beams is shown in the attached sketch SKS-0333.		
d) Supply the elevation					5f) See response to 7.		
e) Supply connection details					6) Confirmed.		
f) NOTE: the elevator post connections per 1/S1-7600 may foul the HSS members (work with SK5)					7) The elevator rail posts shall be connected to the depressed W18x50 beams per 1/S1-7600. See detail in attached sketch SKS-0333.		
6) Confirm the slab edge plate terminates below the 10" raised slab as shown.							
7) Confirm detail 1/S1-7600 with the full depth stiffener and kicker brace applies in the noted cases with no elevator post on top of the beam.							
T-1223.1	SSS - SE401 Bus Deck Level Connection Clarification	Closed	04/11/2014	04/21/2014	04/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1223 (SK 426, CD 317) See attached CD RFI # 317.1 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) Confirm the beam locations from the edge of slab as shown are acceptable.					1) Confirmed.		
2) The L5x5 angles will foul the shear plate for the W30 to the column connection if we use the double angle connection per 1/S1-5010 to connect the W16 to the W30. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W16 to the W30					2) Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1564 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
using a shear plate per 1/S1-5011.							
T-1224	BGP - Concourse Top Bars at Column Embedded Plates	Closed	03/10/2014	03/20/2014	03/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Reference: SKS-0324 and SKS-0325 Per SKS-0324 and SKS-0325, where the top bars for the concourse slab intersect type 1 B and 1 C embedded base plates, the bars are to be trimmed and supplemented with a matching slab dowel in MF beam layer 1. The typical deck top reinforcing consists of a continuous run of #9 bars @ 12" and alternates with a #9 x 28'-0" long bars@ 12". See attached sketch for details. To avoid trimming a 28'-0" bar and splicing it with a 17'-0" bar, please confirm if it is acceptable to relocate the #9 x 28'-0" top bars@ 12" to the MF beam layer 1. The continuous #9 bars@ 12" will remain at 3/4" from the top of concrete and trimmed according to SKS-0324 and SKS-0325.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to relocate the discontinuous T2 bars to the lower layer with the typical continuous T1 bars remaining in the top layer. We note that the RFI mentions the matching dowel length as being 17'-0". For RCS1, this would be a #9 bar with a splice length of 122" for Top Bar, Category II. Given a 42" base plate and either a 3" or 6" oversized block-out, the minimum length of the dowel would be 292" (24'-4") or 298" (24'-10"). The appropriate splice category and block-out size shall be considered when determining the length of the matching dowel. Alternatively, the Contractor may place the T2 bars that conflict with the base plate in the lower layer.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Sequence is as follows:</p> <p>1. install re-bracing struts RB-01,02 & 03 within this green clouded area (GL-06 to GL-7.5) area to East already completed.</p> <p>2. install re-bracing rackers RB-01 to 09 within this pink clouded area</p> <p>3. Remove level C struts numbers 77-81 and walers from south west corner once the walls have reached required strength and RB re-bracing rackers are installed per Note 2</p> <p>4. install re-bracing rackers RB-10 to 20 within this red clouded area</p> <p>5. Remove level C struts STC-01 to 12, 78 & 79 and corresponding walers from the walls once the RB re-bracing is completely installed within this area and the walls have reached the required design strength, the sequence for de-stressing the struts should be all diagonals completed prior to the de-stressing of the 3 cross lot struts (10,11 & 12)</p> <p>Please confirm if this sequence would be acceptable for Level C bracing removal.</p>						
T-1225.2	BSE - Level C Bracing Removal Sequence West Side of Zone 1	Closed	03/19/2014	03/29/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See sketch SK -1 attached.			Arup takes no exceptions.				
Sequence is as follows:			RESPONSE:				
1. install re-bracing struts RB-03,04 & 05 within this green clouded area (GL-06 to GL-7.5) area to East already completed.			Judy Long 4/1/2014				
2. install re-bracing rackers RB-01 to 09 within this pink clouded area			URS has no response for the RFI. See attached.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<div>3. Remove level C struts numbers 77-81 and walers from south west corner once the walls have reached required strength and RB re-bracing rackers are installed per Note 2</div> <div>4. install re-bracing rackers RB-10 to 20 within this red clouded area</div> <div>5. Remove level C struts STC-01 to 12, 75 & 76 and corresponding walers from the walls once the RB re-bracing is completely installed within this area and the walls have reached the required design strength, the sequence for de-stressing the struts should be all diagonals completed prior to the de-stressing of the 3 cross lot struts (10,11 & 12)</div> <div>Please confirm if this sequence would be acceptable for Level C bracing removal.</div> <div>BSE - Level C Bracing Removal Sequence West Side of Zone</div>						
T-1226	SSS - Gap between bus deck perimeter beam and cast node	Closed	03/10/2014	03/20/2014	03/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 334 SK1: Per detail 1A/S1-5017 confirm it is acceptable to maintain the existing cut on the beam considering the additional 1/4" machining at the cast nodes. The actual gap is now 1" plus 1/4" for machining.			SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
T-1227	BGP - SFPUC Transformer Pad Grounding	Closed	03/10/2014	03/20/2014	03/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1568 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference sheets E1-2202, E1-2203, E1-2205 and transformer rooms B1223, B1323, B1562.</div><div>Each room requires embedded steel plates for which the future transformers are to be welded to. Are all of the embedded plates tied to the same building ground system as shown for the vault room itself? If so, does SFPUC have a specific requirement for plate grounding?</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div></div><div></div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Yes, SFPUC is requiring steel plates within the transformer vaults to be bonded to the same ground as the 3/0 copper pigtails that are being brought to the vault. There are no other special requirements.</div></div></div></div>							
T-1227.1	BGP - SFPUC Plate Grounding	Closed	04/21/2014	05/01/2014	05/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
<div><div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>See attached Sketch corresponding to sheet E1-2203</div><div>Does the attached sketch clarify the intent of requiring grounding for each SFPUC Transformer mounting plate? If so, is the intent to extend the same grounding conductor type/size from the already contracted embedded conductor? If not, please provide requirement assembly details.</div><div>Additionally, will SFPUC require any testing prior to conductor embedment at the concourse level?</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div></div><div></div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>The proposed connections meet the grounding requirements provided to the WSP from the SFPUC: however, the specific detailing of the grounding electrode system connections within the vaults must be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC representative. Inspection of the grounding installation shall be provided by the SFPUC representative. Refer to note B on sheets E1-3208, E1-3209 and E1-3210.</div></div></div></div>							
T-1228	BGP - Geothermal Riser Location for Field 12	Closed	03/12/2014	03/22/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
<div><div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Please confirm the riser for geothermal field 12 is to be located between soldier piles 316 and 317 (approximately GL 30.4)</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div></div><div></div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div></div></div></div>							
T-1228.1	BGP - Geothermal Riser Location for Field 12	Closed	03/17/2014	03/27/2014	03/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1569 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ryan Brekke							
REQUEST: Per field conversation with ARUP, SCCI was directed to locate the riser for Geothermal Field 12 between Soldier Piles 317 and 318 because of a leak in the CDSM wall between piles 316 and 317. Please confirm this location is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Location is acceptable to WSP.			
T-1229	BGP - As-Built Location of Sump Pit Near GL 14/G	Closed	03/12/2014	03/22/2014	03/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference attached sketch that show as-built location of sump pit near GL 14/G. Please confirm this as-built location is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The RFI and as-built sketch refers to a sump pit at west of Gridline 14-G. However, on comparing with the slab edge and reviewed matt slab submittal drawings, the location reference for the subject sump pit should be west of Gridline 16-G. The sump pit is to serve an escalator which will be installed in Phase 2. The as-built location is not acceptable as the sump pit will not be accessible under the landing for clean-out once the escalator is installed. Please provide a solution to revise the sump location to its correct position.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1570 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1230	SSS - Machined Cap Plate Surface Finish	Closed	03/12/2014	03/22/2014	03/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please confirm it is acceptable to provide the machined surface of the train box column cap plates with a prime coat finish in lieu of the rust inhibiting coating. The surface prep will be SSPC-SP6 commercial blast cleaning with International Interzinc 315B primer (attached).					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					The specified product (Interzinc 315) calls out for a zinc load in the dried film of 83%, where as the proposed product (Interzinc 315B) has only 80%.		
					The Design Team does not object to this substitution as long as the application meets the performance requirements; it meets the SSPC Paint 20 standard for organic zinc rich primers; it is acceptable to the manufacturer and the entire work receives the specified warranty.		
T-1230.1	SSS - Machined Cap Plate Surface Finish	Closed	03/24/2014	04/03/2014	04/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
To clarify, the specifications section 05 10 00 - 3.2.P.2 requires finished bearing surfaces to be protected with a rust-inhibiting coating (which is typically a petroleum/grease or wax based product) which is to be removed immediately prior to erection. The Train Box Column Cap Plate is a finished bearing surface.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					It is acceptable to use the Interzinc 315B coating at the cap plate bearing surface in lieu of a temporary rust-inhibiting coating.		
The Interzinc 315 product referenced in the response to RFI T-1230 is specific to the IFRM Coating System. Skanska/TMF proposed an organic zinc rich primer (Interzinc 315B) as the rust inhibiting coating, which would not need to be removed prior to placement of the TG atop the cap plate. The proposed product meets or exceeds the primer specified in the 05 10 00 - 2.2.A spec section as noted in the attached manufacturer's letter. Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-1231	BGP - Zone 2 Lower Concourse Openings	Closed	03/13/2014	03/23/2014	03/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: There are multiple discrepancies between Zone 2 Lower Concourse Drawings, recently issued in ASI #112 and ASI #113. See attached drawings. The discrepancies have been highlighted in yellow. AI-2842 (Lower Concourse Slab Edge Plan) generally does not show openings at these highlighted areas, while AI-2222 (Lower Concourse Wall Plan) do show openings. Please clarify whether the highlighted areas are openings or plumbing penetration. If they are plumbing penetrations, please provide sizes and sleeve sizes	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the updated slab edge plans, please refer to the Architectural Sketches (SKAs) attached to the response for RFI T-1156.1 BGP.		
T-1232	BGP - CDSM Wall Movement in Area 3 and Area 1 - West Wall	Closed	03/13/2014	03/23/2014	03/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
	REQUEST: SCCI performed a survey of the CDSM Soldier Piles approximately March 2013 for the North of Area 3 and West of Area 3 and Area 1. SCCI re-surveyed the soldier piles again this year (March 2014) and have found that the Soldier Piles in the area have displaced into the structure by approximately 1.5" at both the North Wall and the West wall. Please find attached survey information and the changes noticed in the past year. 1. Please confirm that the additional encroachment and future potential movement of wall into the structure will not cause conflict with current and future rebar installation. 2. Please confirm and demonstrate that the future potential movement will not cause additional stress to the Wall Lift 1, which will be poured in the next week. 3. Please confirm that future potential CDSM movement in this area will not impact any of SCCI's future permanent work.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is requested this RFI be withdrawn as discussed with Turner. WOJV - 4/23/14 In addition to this WOJV request more information and request that each CDSM wall pile is resurveyed after the level C bracing is removed prior to waterproofing . Two points per pile one at top elevation (similar elevation of the previous surveys) and the other at an elevation of approximately -16'. This survey information should then be then sent to both WOJV and the design team highlighting any additional encroachment which has not been already taken in to account with the current RFI for the relevant area.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1234	SSS - Continuity Plate Thickness	Closed	03/14/2014	03/24/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: 1) Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W30x90 to the column with the bolts located as shown and the web extended as shown. 2) Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W12x40 to the W30x90 using a shear plate per 1/S1-5011. 3) At 19.9, gridlines C & G, the top flange of a BU-56x30x1.5x4 and sloping W40x327 weld to the continuity plate at the bus deck level. In order to provide a CJP between the aforementioned members and continuity plate, as well as keeping the moment frame members in line with the continuity plate, the continuity plate will need to be increased by 5/8". Please confirm this plate thickness increase to 4 5/8" is required or provide an alternate detail. 4) Please confirm that the solution provided for 3) can be used at other locations where the continuity plate thickness needs to be increased.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Not acceptable. Taper the top flange of W40 beam to match the top of the continuity plate and provide a CJP weld as shown in attached sketch SKS-0334. The taper angle shall be 1:2-1/2 as shown in the sketch. 4) This condition occurs at total 8 locations: 4 at GL 9.9/10.1 and 4 at GL 19.9/20.1. Solution provided in 3) noted above may be provided at these 8 locations. Note that top of the top 4" thick continuity plate shown on SK3 shall be aligned with top of the top flange of the MF beam.				
T-1235	SSS - Thermally Cut Holes in Transfer Girders	Closed	03/14/2014	03/24/2014	03/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please confirm it is acceptable to thermally cut the rebar holes and the column post-tensioned rod holes in the Transfer Girders using an automated (oxy-fuel) process. All other holes in the primary member will be drilled or punched.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Holes in transfer girder flanges for column post-tension rods shall not be thermally cut. 2). Holes in transfer girder web for rebars may be thermally cut only if the hole is undercut and reamed to the specified size.				
T-1236	SSS - Slab Support Details at GL19E Opening	Closed	03/17/2014	03/27/2014	03/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 327 SK1: The deck support detail per 4/S1-7660 & 10/S1-5002 will not work at the noted location.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For deck support at the W16 beam highlighted on SK1, provide a continuous 8x4x7/16 angle (LLV) welded to the beam bottom flange at the beam web centerline. Weld between the angle and beam flange				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1239	SSS -Deck Support Details at Protected Zones	Closed	03/17/2014	03/27/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 339 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Provide a typical detail showing how the decking for the lower slab is to be supported at the "Protected Zone". 2) Supply a typical detail for deck support across the column flange if required.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Provide L3 x 3 x 12 gage similar to Typical Metal Deck Detail 1/S1-5000. L 3 x 3 is to be supported on W27 on the north end and W24 at the south end (as close as possible to the web of MF beam). 2) Provide 3/8" bent plate at the column flange similar to Detail 3/S1-5000 for deck support.		
<hr/>							
T-1239.1	SSS - Deck Support Details at Protected Zones	Closed	04/02/2014	04/12/2014	04/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: This is a follow-up to the response to RFI T-1239 (SK-454, CD 339): Confirm the Engineer is referring to drawing S1-5001 in his response to question 1 & 2 or provide clarification. 1) Detail 1/S1-5000 is Typical Headed Stud Spacing Detail not Typical Metal Deck Detail 2) Per the latest S1-5000 Rev5 (issued as ASI 114) there is no detail 3/S1-5000.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Reference to 1/S1-5000 is a typo, it should be referenced to 1/S1-5001 2. Reference to 3/S1-5000 is a typo, it should be referenced to 3/S1-5001.		
<hr/>							
T-1239.2	SSS - Deck Support Details at Protected Zones	Closed	04/21/2014	05/01/2014	05/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI T1239 response. The L3x3x12ga proposed to support the deck will have an approximate span of 8'. This is a concern for 12 gauge material to carry 7-1/2" of nominal weight concrete over an 8' span. 1) We propose to span the gauge angle from the L4x4 where it terminates on the girder web at the protected zone, which will shorten the span of the angle by approxi			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Tack weld the closure piece to the metal deck. 3) Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1575 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	ately 3'. See SK1 for clarification. Please confirm this is acceptable. 2) A closure piece will need to be added and tack welded to the girder web. This was previously closed by the removed L4x4. Please confirm this is acceptable. 3) Confirm 1 & 2 are acceptable at similar conditions.						
T-1240	SSS - Bus Deck Level Fouled Beam Connections at GL18	Closed	03/17/2014	03/27/2014	03/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached CD RFI # 329 SK1 & SK2:			Adjust the work point for W21 slightly north to clear the W36 connection.				
The connection for the W36 beams will foul the connection for the W21 to the W40.							
Please provide a solution.							
T-1241	SSS - Ground Level Perimeter Framing Clarification at GL 19.1	Closed	03/17/2014	03/27/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached CD RFI # 330 SK1:			Provide connection at the W14 beam as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0335.				
The connection for the raised W14 beam per detail 1/S1-5028 with S<12" will not work at the noted locations and will foul the W40 beam connection into the Transfer girder.							
Please provide an alternate connection detail.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1576 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1242	BGP - Geothermal Manifold Location for Fields 12, 13, and 14	Closed	03/17/2014	03/27/2014	03/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titché</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please provide exact required elevations for the geothermal riser manifold stub outs for Fields 12, 13 and 14. Please include the exact elevation for the temperature probe in Geo Field 14. Note this information is HOT due to the recovery schedule in Fields 12, 13 and 14.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Manifold stub outs bottom of lower pipe to be 8'-0" minimum above lower concourse level. Temperature probe bottom of pipe to be 8'-0" above lower concourse level.			
T-1243	SSS - Missing beam connection to TPG3 at GL 18, D & F	Closed	03/17/2014	03/27/2014	03/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 332 SK1 & SK2: Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W14x22 to the 2" stiffener plate/4" flange of the TPG3 as shown. If not, supply an alternate connection detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.			
T-1244	SSS - Bus Deck Level Perimeter Framing Clarification at GL 16.9	Closed	03/17/2014	03/27/2014	03/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 340 SK1: Please confirm the beam flanges can remain as shown and a 1:2.5 tapered cut is not required.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Tapered cut is required per AWS D1.8, paragraph 4.2, Transition in Thickness and Width.			
T-1245	SSS - Deviation - Cast Node Type 3 WC0003 - Dimensional Results	Void	03/17/2014	03/27/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titché</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun</div>			Answered By:				
REQUEST: See attached dimensional report and numbered print. Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1577 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>on Cast Node Type 3 PN WC0003.</p> <p>Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable. Please provide disposition on out-of-tolernace conditions.</p>							
T-1246	SSS - Deviation - Cast Node Type LC 202 WC0055 - Dimensional Results	Void	03/17/2014	03/27/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titche	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:		
Co-Author: Bradken, Inc.		Wayne Braun					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached dimensional report and numbered print.							
Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type LC 202 PN WC0055.							
Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable. Please provide disposition on out-of-tolerance conditions.							
<hr/>							
T-1247	SSS - Deviation - Cast Node Type LC 203 WC0056 - Dimensional Results	Void	03/17/2014	03/27/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titche	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:		
Co-Author: Bradken, Inc.		Wayne Braun					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached dimensional report and numbered print.							
Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type LC 203 PN WC0056.							
Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable. Please provide disposition on out of tolerance conditions.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1578 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1248	SSS - Deviation Request Cast Node Type LC 204 WC0057 - Dimensional Results	Void	03/17/2014	03/27/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun			Answered By:				
REQUEST: Please see attached dimensional report and numbered print. Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type LC 204 PN WC0057. Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable. Please provide disposition on out-of-tolerance conditions.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1249	SSS - Second Level HSS Connection Clarification at GL8	Closed	03/17/2014	03/27/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 341 SK1 & SK2: Confirm the closure plates and welding as shown is acceptable at the coped HSS elevator beam.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1250	BGP - Lower Concourse Beam Discrepancies	Closed	03/18/2014	03/28/2014	03/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference attached contract drawings. Latest CDs S1-2203, S1-2210, and S1-2211 have added curved CB16 and CB&B7 downturned beams which appear to be concentric to South spandrel beam B65. However, no dimensions have been provided, i.e. radius, offset etc. Furthermore, CD s1-2211 shows that CB16 and CB&B7 do not follow the same radius. There appears to be an offset between the CB16 and CB/B7 at the MFB at GL 6, and the offset dimensions are not shown. If architectural drawings are used to find the missing radius (reference SKA-3017 and SKA-3026), one can find that the future partition walls at the South corridor have R=647' - 7 1/2" on both East and West side of MFB at GL6. This implies that the partition walls in this area would			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed, there is an offset between CB16 Curved beam and CB7 Curved beam. Please see the attached SKA-3105~SKA-3111 for clouded dimensions. CB16 Curved beam between gridline 5 and 6 to follow radius of curved beam CB16/partition to the west.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1579 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1252	off center (non-concentric), and the South corridor would taper (or narrow) Down towards East. SCCL believes that this was not designer's intent.						
	Please provide accurate and consistent dimensions and offsets for the LCC beams and future partition walls.						
	SSS - Deviation Due to Tooling - Cast Node Type LC 301 WC0058 - Dimensional Re Void		03/18/2014	03/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:				
	Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun						
T-1253	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
	See attached Dimensional report and numbered print.						
	Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type LC 301 PN						
	WC0058. Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.						
	Please provide disposition on out of tolerance conditions						
T-1253	SSS - Deviation Due to Tooling - Cast Node Type LC 303 WC0061 - Dimensional Re Void		03/18/2014	03/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:				
	Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
	See attached Dimensional report and numbered print.						
T-1253	Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type LC 303 PN						
	WC0061. Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.						
	Please provide disposition on out of tolerance conditions						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1580 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1254	SSS - Deviation Due to Tooling - Cast Node Type 7 WC0007 - Dimensional Results Void		03/18/2014	03/18/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached Dimensional report and numbered print.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type 7 PN							
WC0007. Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.							
Please provide disposition on out of tolerance conditions.							
<hr/>							
T-1254.1	SSS - Deviation Due to tooling - Cast Node Type 7 WC0007 - Dimensional Results Void		03/19/2014	03/29/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached dimensional report and numbered print.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type 7 PN WC0007.							
Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.							
<hr/>							
T-1255	SSS - Deviation Due to Tooling - Cast Node Type 15 WC0016 - Dimensional Result Void		03/18/2014	03/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached Dimensional report and numbered print.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type 15 PN							
WC0016. Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.							
Please provide disposition on out of tolerance conditions.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1581 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1256	SSS - Deviation Due to Tooling - Cast Node Type LC 101 WC0050 - Dimensional R Void		03/18/2014	03/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached Dimensional report and numbered print.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type LC 101 PN WC0050 (2 castings - LC 101-1 & LC 101-2).							
Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.							
T-1257	SSS - Deviation Due to Tooling - Cast Node Type LC 103 WC0052 - Dimensional R Void		03/18/2014	03/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached Dimensional report and numbered print.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type LC 103 PN WC0052 (2 castings LC103-1 & LC103-2).							
Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.							
T-1258	SSS - Stair and Elevator SFRM Clarification		Closed	03/18/2014	03/28/2014	03/27/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference is made to the Fire Proofing Schedule on A1-8662 where Note 2 indicates that all elevator and stair structures are to use SFRM. It appears that architectural drawings, issued for reference, indicate various HSS posts are to receive alternate coating systems or finishes. For example:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
- Detail 3 on A1-7576 indicates two HSS "Divider Beams" to be painted to match shaft walls			Not all stair and elevator steel members are to receive SFRM, it is only when a steel member interrupts a rated wall assembly that a fire resistance rating is required for the steel. The various HSS members referenced are not part of the building structural frame nor do they interrupt a rated wall assembly, therefore no fire resistance rating is required at these locations.				
- Detail 1 on A1-7870 indicates HSS outriggers are to be galvanized							
Please confirm that all stair and elevator members are to							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	receive SFRM. This is inclusive of framing which extends above the Roof Level and west of Grid 1.						
T-1259	SSS - Deviation Due to Tooling - Cast Node Type LC 201 WC0054 - Dimensional Re Void		03/18/2014	03/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:				
	Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun						
	REQUEST: See attached Dimensional report and numbered print.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type LC 201 PN WC0054 (2 castings LC201-1 & LC201-2).						
	Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.						
T-1260	SSS - Deviation Due to Tooling - Cast Node Type 6 WC0006 - Dimensional Results Void		03/18/2014	03/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:				
	Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun						
	REQUEST: See attached Dimensional report and numbered print.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type 6 PN WC0054 (6 castings 6-1 thru 6-6).						
	Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1261	SSS - Deviation Due to Tooling - Cast Node Type 5 WC0005 - Dimensional Results	Void	03/18/2014	03/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company</div><div>Phil Militello</div></div></div> <div>Co-Author: Bradken, Inc.</div> <div>Wayne Braun</div>							
REQUEST: See attached Dimensional report and numbered print.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type 5 PN WC0005 (6 castings 5-1 thru 5-6).							
Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.							
T-1262	SSS - Deviation Due to Tooling - Cast Node Type 71 WC0048 - Dimensional Results	Void	03/18/2014	03/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company</div><div>Phil Militello</div></div></div> <div>Co-Author: Bradken, Inc.</div> <div>Wayne Braun</div>							
REQUEST: See attached Dimensional report and numbered print.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type 71 PN WC004 (67 Castings starting with 71-02).							
Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.							
T-1263	SSS - Deviation Due to Tooling - Cast Node Type 72 WC0049 - Dimensional Results	Void	03/18/2014	03/28/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company</div><div>Phil Militello</div></div></div> <div>Co-Author: Bradken, Inc.</div> <div>Wayne Braun</div>							
REQUEST: See attached Dimensional report and numbered print.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Bradken has found dimensional deviations due to tooling on Cast Node Type 72 PN WC0049 (67 Castings starting with 72-02).							
Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1264	SSS - Bus Deck Level Missing Post Sizes at GL 15 & 16	Closed	03/18/2014	03/28/2014	03/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Stacy Wilson				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 342 SK1: Confirm the (12) posts are the same sizes as the ones shown on the Second Level in detail 3/S1-7009.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The TJPA will not reply and has rejected the RFI for the following reason: 01 10 40 1.6 C 2 f. "The TJPA will reject requests for interpretations or clarifications of the Contract Documents which can reasonably be derived from a review of the Contract Documents". Confirmation of these sizes can also be resolved through the shop drawing process.		
T-1265	SSS - Approval Comment Clarification on CS2 Submitted Drawing	Closed	03/19/2014	03/29/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 343 SK1: The approval comment on A4714 (CS2) is contrary to the information issued in RFI T-1111, item #7 (SK 327, CD 254) Confirm the response to RFI T-1111, item #7 is valid and the approval mark-up may be ignored.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1585 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1266	SSS - ST304 Framing Details	Closed	03/20/2014	03/30/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 364 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 4: 1) Confirm the (4) W10x22 beams are located on the center of the supporting posts. If not, supply the location dimensions. 2) Supply the clouded dimensions (4 total). 3a) Confirm the stair stringers do not connect to the W12x14. 3b) If yes, supply a connection detail as 1 or 3/S1-7601 will not work with the 5" offset dimension. 3c) If yes, please supply east/west location dimensions for the stair stringers. 4) Confirm it is acceptable to prep the flanges of the WT5x15 for the 1/4" PJP weld in lieu of the beam flange as shown.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The stair framing is a design/build item and comes under the stair contractor's scope (W/O to verify). The W10 x 22 is to be provided by stair supplier. 2) See response to 1). 3a) Stringer is to be designed by the stair supplier, however, we anticipate that it is to be connected to W12x14. 3b) See response to 1). 3c) See response to 1). 4) Confirmed.	

T-1266.1	SSS - ST304 Framing Details	Closed	04/04/2014	04/14/2014	04/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Galoyan					
REQUEST: Reference RFI T-1266 (attached) and the associated SK1 & SK2 for the following: 1) The (4) W10x22 beams are in Skanska's scope. Only the stringers are design built and provided by the stair supplier. Please confirm these beams are located on the center of the supporting posts or supply the location dimensions. 2) The (6) W10x22 beams in question are also in Skanska's scope. Please supply the requested dimensions (4 total). 3a) W/O agrees that the stringer is to be designed by the stair supplier, however, we anticipate that it is to be connected to the W12x14. Typically the stringer is connected to the bent plate that is part of the W12x14. This member would also include web stiffeners. If a typical detail is not available, please provide stiffener details and leave the stringer connection to be designed by the stair supplier. 3b) See above, the offset dimension for bent plate should work with 3a.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) The east-west dimensions to locate the posts have been noted on 1/S1-7008. The outer north-south W10x22 beams at the landings shall be 8" 7/8" from the centerline of the posts typically. The intermediate moment connected W10x22 beam shall be aligned with the stringer coming from above at the landing per 10/S1-7601. 3a) Stiffener plates are not required at the W12x14 beam. 3b) The W12x14 beam centerline to the edge of slab distance shall be 4". We anticipate that the stringer will be connected to the bent plate. 3c) Refer to Architectural drawings A1-7007, A1-7501, A1-7502, & A1-7503 for stair 304 stringer locations.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1586 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
3c) Please provide location of stringers as requested.							
T-1266.2	SSS - ST304 Framing Details	Closed	04/30/2014	05/10/2014	05/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1266.1 (SK 484 (CD 364)				Confirmed.			
See attached CD RFI # 364.1 SK1:							
The noted dimension is shown on S1-2403 and reflects what is currently shown in the model and shop drawings. RFI T-1266.1 (SK 484, CD 364) states that this dimension is to be 4". Since this steel in CS1 is currently being fabricated, confirm that the beam may remain at 5" from the edge of slab to avoid cost and schedule impacts.							
T-1267	SSS - Weld Detail at Escalator Support	Closed	03/20/2014	03/30/2014	04/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 255.1 SK1: Please supply the welding for the L8x8x3/4 to the PL 3/8".				Provide a double sided 1/4" fillet weld between the 3/8" plate and L8x8x3/4 angle.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1268	SSS - Escalator framing details at gridline 11	Closed	03/21/2014	03/31/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 344 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 5: 1) RFI T-1111 (SK 327, CD 254) confirmed the edge plate to match the thickness of the slab but the approval comment of CS2 drawing 4714 requests a bent plate as shown in SK3. Which is correct? 2) The detail on SK3 is per approval mark-ups on CS2 drawings 4766 & 4767 (noted with an arrow) with references to detail 2/S1-7661 but the approval comments do not occur on the other beams at the yellow walls. Confirm the detail on SK3 applies at all (8) beams next to the concrete walls noted in yellow. 3) Confirm the wall terminates at the lower slab. 4) This detail is per approval mark-ups on CS2 drawings 4766 & 4767 with references to detail 2/S1-7661. Detail 2/S-7661 is not referenced on S1-2403 or 2/S1-7302. Confirm the detail as shown is acceptable. 5) Confirm edge plate per 8/S1-5000 is not required.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Provide edge closure plate per typical detail 8/S1-5000 as noted in response to RFI T-1111. The tall bent plate and 3/8" stiffener plate per comment and markups on CS2 shop drawings are not required. 2) Response in 1) also applies at the 8 beams highlighted in yellow on SK1. 3) Confirmed. 4) See responses to 1) and 2). 5) Confirmed. The edge closure plate is required per typical detail 8/S1-5000, hence, there should be no cost and schedule increase.				
T-1269	SSS - GL 15 Dimension Clarifications	Closed	03/21/2014	03/31/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 346 SK1 to SK3 for items 1, 2 & 3: 1) The noted dimension should be 4'-7 1/2 per A1-2904 (SK2) but 4'-6 is shown in the Revit model which appears to be supported by 1/S1-7010 (SK1) which shows this beam off center from the wall. Confirm 4'-6 is acceptable. 2) The noted beam should be 9" from Grid D per A1-2904 (SK2) but it will foul the W44x290 on Grid D. Confirm the location of the W27x84 is acceptable as shown. 3) The noted W44x290 is to be located 3'-10 1/2 north of Grid D per A1-2904 as shown. However, the shear plate connection fouls the web stiffener plates per 2/S1-5016 on TPG2. Confirm it is acceptable to locate the W44x290 4'-0 1/2 from Grid D to avoid the fouling. NOTE: Items 1, 2 & 3 are symmetrical about Grid E and also occur at Grid F.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The noted dimension shall be 4' - 7 1/2" so that the beam is centered on the wall. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. Note that per contract document the W44x290 should have a double angle connection. However, to avoid conflict at the tapered girder drag connection plate, it is acceptable to provide a shear plate connection. Provide 3 equally spaced bottom flange braces per 8/S1-5015 at the W44x290 beam from the north side (south side for W44 beam near GL F).				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1269.1	SSS - GL 15 Dimension Clarifications	Closed	04/09/2014	04/19/2014	04/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1269 (SK 461, CD 346) See attached CD RFI # 346.1 SK1 & SK2: It is not possible to supply 3 equally spaced bottom flange braces per 8/S1-5015 as requested in the above noted RFI item 3 due to the existing framing. Confirm it is acceptable to supply a brace per 4/S1-5015 at each W27x84 and 1 brace per 8/S1-5015 as shown.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide 3 equally spaced bottom flange braces per response to RFI T-1269. When there is a conflict with the parallel W16 as shown in SK2, provide brace from the other side of the W44 beam.				
T-1270	SSS - ST401 Geometry Clarification	Closed	03/21/2014	03/31/2014	04/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 347 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 & 2: 1) Shown are two versions of the slope geometry for ST401 with the variations noted. Please clarify which geometry is to be used. 2) Confirm a bent deck support plate per 9/S1-5012 will not be required on top of the W12x14 with the beams aligned as shown.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Provide the geometry shown on the top half of SK1. Note that the starting point of slope at the top of the slab which is noted to be 2-7/16" on SK1 has been revised to 5-1/8" in the TG 7.02 IFB Addendum #1 (See A1-2904). Consequently, the slope angle changed to 32.552 degrees with the end of the slope at the bottom terminating at GL D.4. With the new geometry, the S4 slab does not foul the beam flange at GL D. 2) We confirm that bent plate is not required per 9/S1-5012 at the top of W12x14 on GL D.4.				
T-1271	SSS - ST401 Dimension and Connection Clarifications	Closed	03/21/2014	03/31/2014	04/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 348 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 8: 1) Supply location of sloping W16 beams from face of concrete wall. 2) Confirm location of W44x335's is acceptable as shown or supply the location. 3) Confirm HSS8x8x5/8 post locations are acceptable or supply the locations. 4) Clarify/supply edge plate requirements for the 'S4' slab			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Locate the sloping W16x26 beams as close to the center of the concrete walls as possible without conflicting with the W27x84 beams above at the roof level. 2) The noted dimension shall be 1' - 1". Note that the 8x8x5/8 posts are to be connected to the top of the W44x335 per 10C/S1-7630, except that the 8x8x5/8				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1589 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	at EL. 74'-10 as well as the sloping 'S4' slab. 5) Confirm dimension is acceptable or supply dimension. 6) Confirm dimensions per A1-2904. 7) The connection for the W40 to the HSS8x8 per 6/S1-7661 will not work at the corner. Supply an alternate connection. 8) It appears this detail will not work with the elevations noted. Please supply an alternate detail.			posts will be partially welded to the flange due to offset between the posts and the W44 beam centerline. Provide bottom flange bracing for the W44x335 girder per 4/S1-5015 at the W14x61 beams (total 4 locations). 3) Confirmed. 4) Provide edge plate per typical edge of slab details on S1-5000. Also refer to response to RFI T-1279. 5) Confirmed. 6) Confirmed. 7) Connection at the W40 framing into the HSS post shall be similar to 8/S1-5012. 8) Provide a full depth shear plate connection per 1/S1-5013 at the two W10 beams except, 1) cope only one side of beam flange at top and bottom and 2) Provide 4 bolts at the connection (2 vertical rows of 2 bolts each) with a 3" horizontal spacing between the bolts. Bottom flange brace per 2/S1-7604 is not required at these connections.			
T-1271.1	SSS - ST401 Dimension and Connection Clarifications	Closed	05/13/2014	05/23/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached CD RFI # 348.1 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) The connection per 8/S1-5012 fouls the connection for the W27 as shown. Please supply a solution. 2) Verify shim extension and weld.			Provide connection per 3/S1-5012 by moving the shear plate on the other side of the W40 beam web. Provide a shim plate between the shear plate and beam web if required.				
T-1272	SSS - GL 7 Framing Clarification	Closed	03/21/2014	03/31/2014	04/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1590 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 356 SK1 & SK2: Due to the limited space between the top flange of the TR7 and the PL 4", it is not possible to supply the connection for the W40x183 per 1/S1-5011. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W40 to the TR7 as shown. (All not shown is per 1/S1-5011).		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Connection shown on SK2 is acceptable except provide 1" diameter A490-X bolts.			
T-1273	SSS - Bus Deck Level Kicker Brace Material	Closed	03/21/2014	03/31/2014	04/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 362 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) Per S1-0007 (SK2), ASTM A709 applies only to connection material on the Bus Deck Level and braces are not considered connection material. Confirm ASTM A36 is acceptable. 2) Notes: a) The same approval comment occurs on drawings 9233, 9317, 9368 & 9378. b) The approval comment identified above was not included in Sequence CS1. Confirm the response to item 1 applies to all braces on the Bus Deck Level.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1274	SSS - A4786 Edge Distance	Closed	03/21/2014	03/31/2014	04/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 361 SK1: On A4786 (CS2) the connection angles have been located at the top to clear the 'k' of the W40X324 supporting beam. The depth of the bottom cope matches the 'k' of the W40x199. Therefore it is not possible to achieve the requested 1 3/4" edge distance. Confirm the 1 5/16" edge distance is acceptable as it exceeds the 1 1/8" minimum at a gas cut edge.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Confirmed.	
			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
<hr/>							
T-1275	SSS - PE 403404 Dimension Clarifications	Closed	03/21/2014	03/31/2014	04/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 358 SK1: The noted dimensions do not match. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Dimensions marked up on the RFI showing 10'-3" and 17'-11" for PE 403/404 Elevator Pit between GL 16 to 16.9 / E are correct. See also A1-2844 of 100% Main Package Issued for Construction dated March 31, 2014.	
						Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			TT Response: Elevator pit to be located per architectural drawings. Align framing beams with clear opening.				
<hr/>							
T-1276	BGP - Lower Concourse Future Wall and Column Conflicts	Closed	03/21/2014	03/31/2014	04/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ryan Brekke			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: The blockouts for the column steel and baseplates appear to be in conflict with concourse walls at a number of locations, see attached mark-up. Please confirm no formsavers are to be installed at the column locations. In addition, please provide details for the walls at these column locations.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: See attached SKS-0337 for guidelines of partition wall reinforcing at blockout and partition wall dowel conflicts locations at the lower concourse.	
						Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			For those locations that are not included in the sketch, but highlighted as part of the RFI, please provide minimum one curtain of vertical wall reinforcement				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page:1592 of 3091

Date:06/17/2015

Time:02:27 PM

Job:30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1593 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1278	SSS - W40 Moment Connection at Roof Park Level	Closed	03/24/2014	04/03/2014	04/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 363 SK1: Detail 8/S1-5032 applies at the noted locations but a full depth shear plate cannot be supplied due to the moment connection on the W40x392's as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to stop the shear plate as shown or supply an alternate detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1279	SSS - PE403, PE404 Dimension Clarifications	Closed	03/24/2014	04/03/2014	04/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 365 SK1 & SK2: Supply the edge of slab locations as shown.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: See the additional dimensions on the attached drawing.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1280	SSS - ST403 Missing Dimensions and Connections	Closed	03/24/2014	04/03/2014	04/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 366 SK1 to SK5 for items 1 to 6: 1) Supply the missing clouded dimensions at (5) locations shown. 2) The connection for the W10x22 to the HSS post per 3/S1-5012 will interfere with the W10x22 to W10x22 beam connection as well as the WT5x15 per 6/S1-7601 at (6) locations noted. This is a typical condition on all landings in ST403. Please provide a solution. 3) Depending on the noted missing dimension, the beam to HSS6x6 post connection per 3/S1-5012 may not work. Please supply an alternate connection as necessary. 4) Supply the missing clouded dimensions at (5) locations			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: TT's response: 1. See requested dimensions on SKS-0338. 2. Shear plate connection at the W10x22 beam is acceptable at the 6 locations as shown on SK2. It is acceptable to shift the location of the WT10x15 by 1" max to accommodate detail 6/S1-7601. 3. See sketch SKS-0338. 4. See sketch SKS-0338. 5. See sketch SKS-0338. 6. See sketch SKS-0338. Adamson's response: For stringer location refer to detail 4/A1-7502 to be 1"		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1594 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	shown.						
	5) Supply the missing clouded dimensions at (5) locations shown.						
	6) Supply the missing clouded dimensions at (5) locations shown.						
T-1280.1	SSS - ST403 Missing Dimensions and Connections	Closed	06/30/2014	07/10/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
1) The WT5x15 interferes with the connection for the W10x22 to the HSS12x6x5/8 post. Please supply a solution.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
2) Confirm the connection for the W10x22 to the HSS6x6 post is acceptable as shown or supply a new detail.				1) We assume that the "interference" noted in item 1 refers to the accessibility issue for bolt tightening. If the WT5x15 restricts the accessibility for bolt installation, the nuts may be tack welded to the beam web and bolts may inserted from the other side and tightened once the beam is in place. Or, bolts may be tack welded to the beam web on the WT side and nuts may tightened from the other side once the beam is in place.			
				2) Acceptable, except, provide a 1/4" fillet weld on three sides			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1596 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton

REQUEST:

See attached CD RFI # 350.2 SK1:

1). The dimensions provided in 1/S1-6043 and 6/S1-6040 are not the same. Provide the clouded dimensions to the posts from the grids as shown.

2). In conjunction with question # 1 and the response to RFI # T-1281.1, the drawings from TG08.10 DB IFB Addenda # 11 (5/16/14) have not been issued for construction. Please issue these drawings for construction or supply them as sketches in response to this RFI.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

1). CD RFI # 350.2 SK1 is OLD information that was correctly answered in previous RFI.

2. All drawings previously issued with DB Addendum 11, which are in the hands of the CM/GC are being issued "for construction" dated 07/11/14 in ASI 0120.

T-1281.3 **SSS - W8, W12 Connection Clarifications** **Closed**
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer **To:** Turner Construction Company Phil Militello

10/02/2014 **10/12/2014** **11/03/2014** **Potentially** ☐
Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger

Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton

REQUEST:

See attached CD RFI # 350.3 SK1 & SK2:
S1-6030 does not show the noted dimensions as shown on SK2. Please supply the dimensions to locate the beam/post on center of the curb above.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Please refer to enclosed markup of sheet A1-2905 for general explanation of dimensioning. Refer to sheet S1-6032 for W-8 shear key dimensions.

Refer to SKS-0422 for W-12 Ring Beam and curb wall shear key location and details.



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
T-1281.4	SSS - W8, W12 Connection Clarifications	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton								
REQUEST: Please refer to sketches SK1, SK2, SK3, and SKS-0422, and attached drawings provided in response to RFI T-1281.3 1) S1-6030 does not show the noted dimensions as shown on SK2. Please supply the dimensions to locate the beam/post on center of the curb above. Supply the requested dimensions or confirm that posts are not required between 22-23. 2) The model and the drawings match the clouded dimensions on drawings A1-2905 included with the response in RFI T-1281.3. Clarify the reason why this drawing was included in the response. 3) "Refer to sheet S1-6032 for W-8 shear key dimensions" on the cover sheet of RFI T-1281.3 is confusing. Confirm W8should read W-12 as S1-6032 shows only W-12 details. 4) Confirm the revisions to 4/S1-8016 on SK-0422 apply only to Grid 23. Note that 4/S1-8016 is not shown on the current S1-2605. 5) 4/S1-8016 does not reflect what is occurring on Grid 23. Please review and clarify the discrepancy. 6) 4/S1-8016 on SK-0422 shows insufficient information to provide shop drawings: a) How is the solid 12" x 12" bar welded to the base beam? b) Does the solid 12" x 12" bar extend the full height of the HSS14x14? c) Supply dimensions to locate the rebar holes in the HSS14x14. d) Supply the size of the rebar holes. 7) Currently the HSS10x10 posts per 1 & 3/S1-8016 have been located on the center of the 1'-6 thick curb per RFI T1281 (SK467, CD 350) item 5. Note that the revised dimensions were not marked on the CS10, ES1, or ES2 returned approval submittals. Confirm the posts locations must be revised as noted in RFI T-1281.3. 8) Supply the post locations in 1/S1-8008. Refer to SK3			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed, no post required between GL 22-23, as per S1-6030 workpoints. [SBP] The W30X90 beam should align with the concrete counterfort wall above, which can be located by Architectural Slab Edge Plan A1-2905. See the attached sketch SKA-4328. [AAI] 2) SK1 in RFI T-1281.3 highlighted all posts between GL 19.1 to GL 24. The contractor appeared to be asking for these dimensions, the drawing was included to indicate them. [AAI] 3) Confirmed. W-8 is a typo, as S1-6032 applies to W-12 details only. [AAI] 4) Revisions to 4/S1-8016 apply at three locations; two along GL 23 and one at GL 24/E. Detail 4/S1-8016 is called out near GL 24/E on S1-2605. Detail callouts at the two locations along GL 23 will be added in ASI 128. [TT] 5) Intent of 4/S1-8016 is to show details in the concrete wall and curbs. Rebar details in the concrete wall and curbs are the same at the 3 locations noted in 4). [TT] 6a) The HSS post is welded to the base beam not the solid bar shear key. [TT] The solid 12" x 12" shear key is welded to the 2" base plate, as shown in details 2 and 4 on S1-6025 (to be issued in ASI 128), which is part of the W-4 & W-12 design-build glazing systems. [SBP] 6b) No, the solid bar does not extend the full height of the HSS14x14. Solid bar shear key embedment depth = 8 inches. [SBP] 6c) Horizontal rebar in the wall is spaced at 12¿ OC. Place first horizontal bar 1¿ above the construction joint in the wall. Holes in the HSS wall can be located accordingly. Coordinate location of construction joint in the wall with Shimmick. [TT] 6d) Holes in the HSS shall be d + 1/4¿ in diameter where, d is the rebar diameter. [TT]		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1598 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1281.5A	SSS - Missing Connection Information at HSS Post GL 24	Closed	7) Revisions were only made to detail 4/S1-8016 which applies at three locations noted in 4). Details 1 and 3/S1-8016 are unaffected. Changes per RFI T-1281.3 do not apply to HSS posts shown on CS10, ES1 and ES2 submittals. [TT]				
			8) For clarification of workpoint locations, please see attached sketch. [SBP]				
T-1281.5A	SSS - Missing Connection Information at HSS Post GL 24	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2605, 4/S1-8016 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Gridline: E/24 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1281.3, SKS-0422, CD RFI # 624.1 SK1					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please see the attached Skanska RFI 838.1A					1a) The solid bar 12" x 12" is part of the design-build glazing systems scope. It does NOT attach to the beam below. It is welded to the base plate and it's embedment depth is only 8 inches. Refer to detail 4/S1-6025 in ASI 128.		
RFI T-1281.3 SKS-0422 revised the post size/type in detail 4/S1-8016.					1b) The solid bar 12" x 12" is welded to the base plate, thus, it begins at the workpoint above the top of the HSS 14x14. Refer to the response to question 1a.		
The sketch SKS-0422 for the revision to detail 4/S1-8016 did not provide all necessary information.					1c) Information on size and location of rebar holes has been provided in response to RFI T-1281.4. See response to items 6c) and 6d) in RFI T-1281.4.		
Please supply the following information: a. How is the Solid Bar 12x12 attached to the beam? b. Does the Solid Bar 12x12 extend to the top of the HSS 14x14? c. The size and location of rebar holes.							
T-1281.5B	SSS - Missing Connection Information at HSS Post GL 24	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2605, 4/S1-8016 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Gridline: E/24 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1281.3, SKS-0422, CD RFI # 624.1 SK1 Please see the attached Skanska RFI 838.1A RFI T-1281.3 SKS-0422 revised the location of detail 4/S1-8016. The sketch SKS-0422 places the post off the end of the beam as shown in CD RFI # 624.1 SK1. Please provide a solution.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reduce the top flange cope of the W30x173 beam as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0446 and provide all around fillet welds between the HSS and beam flange per 1/S1-8016. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				
T-1281.6	SSS - W-12 Missing Information at Construction Joints GL 23-24	Closed	01/19/2015	01/29/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: T-1281.4, S1-2605 & 4/S1-8016 Location: GL 23-24 Add'l Doc Ref: CD RFI 350.6 SK1 This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1281.4 (SK 467.5, CD 350.5). Please provide the following: 1) Supply dimension to locate first rebar above construction joint. 2) Supply location of construction joint. 3) Supply the diameter of the rebars.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) First horizontal rebar layer shall be placed 1" above the construction joint in the wall per response to item 6c) in RFI T-1281.4. 2) The construction joint may be located similar to that shown on 2/S1-3282. General Contractor shall help coordinate the location of the construction joint between different sub-contractors. 3) Horizontal and vertical bars in the wall shall be similar to that shown on 1/S1-8006. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-1282	BGP - Lower Concourse - Latest Drawing Request	Closed	03/25/2014	04/04/2014	03/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Per the meeting between TCCO, WOJV, SCCI, and AAI on Monday 3/24/14, it was made clear that AAI believes that all documents have been issued to WOJV in order for construction of the lower concourse deck. WOJV stated that there are currently drawings out to bidders (for TG 07.2 /TG10 MEPS Series) and in Pre-Construction, but that WOJV has not been provided direction by TJPA/TCCO to proceed with construction in the field, nor to utilize the most current drawing sets. Prior to this meeting, WOJV requested that all IFB drawings be issued as an ASI's in order to coordinate with current and continuing construction. ASI's 112 and 113 drawings were issued, however they are not complete per our initial request. AAI has responded to RFI's and submittals referring to sheets that have yet to be issued for construction. This has caused confusion and frustration for all parties. Therefore, in lieu of continuing to request ASI's to address this specific issue at the lower concourse, WOJV/Turner have agreed to utilize the RFI process to construct the lower concourse deck.

For the list of series of drawings below, please note and/or provide the latest drawings or ASI(s) that should be used to construct the lower concourse deck. We understand that there are drawings issued for pre-construction, that will not be issued for construction for multiple bid packages. For those cases, TJPA/TCCO needs to inform and provide WOJV with the set of the most current and coordinated drawings to be used for construction of the lower concourse, including (but not limited to) blockouts, deck penetrations (such as MEPS), beams, dowel/formsaver locations, and electrical conduit locations.

- Architectural Drawings : A1-2200 Series
- Architectural Drawings : A1-2800 Series
- Architectural Drawings : All sheets providing complete wall dimensions whether floor plan/wall plan/ or enlarged details
- Structural Drawings : S1-2200 Series
- Plumbing Drawings : P1-2200 Series
- Electrical Drawings : E1-2200 Series and E1-3200 Series
- TE Drawings : TE-2200 Series

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

See the "Issued for Construction" drawings dated April 1, 2014 for the most current drawings.

RESPONSE:

Judy Long 3/28/14
The drawings, some issued with ASI 115, forthcoming CR-104, are attached for your use and coordination with construction.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1601 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1283	SSS - Drag Beam Double Connection	Closed	03/25/2014	04/04/2014	04/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached CD RFI # 354 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 & 2:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) Confirm the double angle connection per 5v/S1-5026 (SK2) occurs at all locations noted with an arrow on SK1 (16 total).					1) Confirmed.		
2) The double angle connection per 5v/S1-5026 & 6/S1-5026 does not allow access to install the threaded rod nuts (4-3/4" long x 4-1/2" wide) and washers in the field. Please confirm it is acceptable to provide two elongated hand holes (6" wide x 10" long) in each full height shear plate either side of the beam. Due to the restricted access, the post tensioning operation will need to be done from the top of the rod, contrary to the response to RFI T-0970.1. This will require the 6x6" oversized washer to be installed at the bottom and the standard flat washer to be installed at the top. Please confirm this is acceptable					2) Providing a hole in the stiffener plates for access to threaded rod nuts is acceptable in concept. Hole shall not be located near the top of the stiffener plate. Final review of the hole location to be done with review of shop drawings. Cloud the hole locations on shop drawings to call the attention of the reviewer. Post tensioning from the top of the rod is acceptable at these locations.		
T-1284	SSS - Erection of Drag Beam at Double Connection	Closed	03/25/2014	04/04/2014	04/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached CD RFI # 355 SK1 & SK2:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The connection per 5v/S1-5026 creates erectability issues for the beams on Grids C & G. Please confirm it is acceptable to cope the bottom flange of the drag beam to clear the double angles.					It is acceptable to cope the bottom flange of the drag beam up to 8" from the bolt centerline at locations highlighted on SK1.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1285	BGP - Anchor Bolt Placement Tolerance	Closed	03/26/2014	04/05/2014	03/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Shimmick Construction Comp Sylvia Hartanto				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Spencer Sayles				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>Under the Below Grade Concrete TG-06 Contract, SCCI is bound by concrete standard for Anchor Bolt placement. Concrete industry standard, ASI 117-90, Section 2.3 allows a tolerance of vertical, lateral and level alignment of +/- 1".</p> <p>Per Anchor Bolt DFOW meeting on 11/29/2014, SCCI proposed to use ASCC (American Society of Concrete Contractors) "Anchor Bolt Tolerances" Position Statement #14 (attached) with the following tolerance for each bolt location:</p> <p>- 3/4 and 7/8 diameter bolts : +/- 1/4in - 1-, 1-1/4, and 1-1/2in diameter bolts: +/- 3/8in ; and - 1-3/4, 2-, and 2-1/2-in diameter bolts: +/- 1/2in</p> <p>Please confirm that the proposed anchor bolt placement tolerance as prescribed by ASCC "Anchor Bolt Tolerances" Position Statement #14 is acceptable. Please note that this tolerance is more stringent than ACI Concrete Standard ACI 17-90, Section 2.3.</p>					<p>Under TG06 contract SCCI is required to place all light column and steel column anchor bolts supplied by TG07.1 in accordance with the contract documents.</p> <p>- 03 20 00 Concrete Reinforcement and Embedded Assemblies - Section 3.2 A. 1 States: "Set and secure embedments, including embedded plates, bearing plates, and anchor bolts per approved setting drawings and in such a manner to prevent movement during placement of concrete and to allow removal of formwork without damage." - 03 10 00 Concrete Formwork - Section 3.1 B. 1. a. States: "Use setting drawings, diagrams, instructions and directions by suppliers of items to be attached." - Structural Drawing Sheet S-0005, GR-2 lists both ACI and AISC reference standards for this project. At the bottom of GR-2 it states: "THE MORE STRINGENT REQUIREMENT IN THE CODES LISTED ABOVE GOVERNS". - 01 10 90 References - ASCC reference standard discussed in SCCI RFI 452 is not listed in project standards. - ACI 117-10 - 1.1.2 States: "Tolerances in this specification are for typical concrete construction and construction procedures and are applicable to exposed concrete and to architectural concrete. Materials that interface with or connect to concrete elements may have tolerance requirements that are not compatible with those contained in this document." - AISC requirements for anchor bolts are more stringent and govern. - 1.1.3 States: "A series of preconstruction tolerance coordination meetings shall be scheduled and held prior to the commencement of the work. The Contractor, subcontractors, material suppliers, and other key parties shall attend. All parties shall be given the opportunity to identify any tolerance questions and conflicts that are applicable to the work with materials, prefabricated elements, and Work assembled/installed in the field by the contractor."</p> <p>At the 3.5.2014 meeting Skanska stated that the ASCC Position Paper would not be acceptable for the installation of their structural elements over the anchor</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1288	BGP - Lower Concourse Testing and Curing Conflict	Closed	03/26/2014	04/05/2014	04/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please reference Specification Section 03 30 20 - Cast-In-Place Concrete.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Spec Section 03 30 20 - 3.6.A.3 states "For shored floor construction: Floor flatness/floor levelness tolerance compliance testing is to be performed prior to the removal of shores and forms but not later than 72 hours of concrete placement by the TJP A Representative." SCCI intends on providing a moist cure on the concourse slab per Spec Section 03 30 20 - 3.7.A.5.b.3 - cover concrete surface with specified absorptive cover, thoroughly saturate cover with water, and keep continuously wet. The absorptive cover is to remain for 10 days for type II cement (Mix #1558218) per Spec Section 03 30 20 - 3.7.A.2 and is to be installed as soon as free water has disappeared from concrete surface and finishing has been completed. The FF/FL 72 hour testing requirement is in conflict with the immediate installation of the moist cure cover requirement.					Neither request is acceptable. FF/FL testing within the 72 hour time limit and curing are not mutually exclusive.		
SCCI requests either of the following:							
1. Waiving the FF /FL requirement on the lower concourse slab due to the later installation of the 5" topping slab it will receive. SCCI will maintain its adherence to dimensional tolerances per ACI 117 and flatness variance per ACI 318 and provide a stiff broom finish per Spec Section 03 30 20 -3.6.B.1.c. (similar to mat slab).							
2. Extending the FF/FL 72 hour requirement out past the 10 day cure time requirement. SCCI does not want to compromise the immediate moist cure cover installation due to the sensitivity for potential shrinkage cracking in the slab.							
Are either of these requests acceptable?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1605 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1289	SSS - ST401 Missing Dimensions and Connections	Closed	03/26/2014	04/05/2014	04/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 367 SK1 to SK6 for items 1 to 13: 1) Review all the east/west post location dimensions on SK1 to SK6 and confirm they are correct as RFI T-1189 (SK419, CD 313) does not show the dimensions at all Levels. 2) The 18'-6 dimension to the edge of slab minus the 6" set-back dimension per S1-2304 locates the beam 18'-0 from Grid 15. This does not match the 18'-8 supplied in RFI T-1189 (SK 419, CD 313). Please clarify the discrepancy in beam and edge of slab location. 3) Confirm the noted section reference is correct. 4) The actual condition does not reflect what is requested in detail 3/S1-7601. Please clarify what is required. 5) Supply the missing clouded dimensions at (4) locations shown. 6) The detail shows the minimum offset dimension from the center of posts to the W10x22's in order to make the requested connections. Please review this with the actual dimensions and supply revised connection details as necessary. 7) Supply the missing clouded dimensions at (8) locations shown. 8) Supply the missing clouded dimensions at (8) locations shown. 9) Supply the missing clouded dimensions at (8) locations shown. 10) Connection section references are missing. Confirm they are correct as shown. 11) Supply the missing clouded dimensions at (8) locations shown. 12) Connection section references are missing. Confirm they are correct as shown. 13) Supply the missing clouded dimensions at (8) locations shown.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) All East/West post location dimensions are correct as noted on SK1 through SK4. On SK5 and SK6, the dimensions noted as 2' - 1" and 8' - 7 1/8" shall be 1' - 10" and 8' - 10 1/8", respectively. 2) The 18' - 8" dimension was specified in response to RFI T-1189 for the HSS 12x6x5/8 posts and the W12x14 and W14x22 beams only. The W12x26 beam shall be 18' - 2 3/4" from GL 15 so that the flange edge aligns with the edge of slab at the opening. 3) The detail reference shall be 11/S1-7601. 4) See response to 2). Detail 3/S1-7601 will reflect the actual condition at the location. 5) See attached sketch SKS-0341 for dimensions. Refer to Architectural drawings A1-7011, A1-7012, & A1-7013 for locations of all stair stringers. 6) Shear plate connections may be provided at the W10 beams and at similar locations at this stair if the double angle connection cannot fit within the available distance. 7) See attached sketch SKS-0341 for dimensions. 8) See attached sketch SKS-0342 for dimensions. 9) See attached sketch SKS-0342 for dimensions. 10) Confirmed. 11) Dimensions are the same as those at the level below. See attached sketch SKS-0342 for dimensions. 12) Confirmed. 13) Dimensions are the same as those at the level below. See attached sketch SKS-0342 for dimensions		
T-1289.1	SSS - Stair ST401 dimension clarification	Closed	05/23/2014	06/02/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. Erick del Angel				
REQUEST: This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1289 (SK 487, CD 367)			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1/CD RFI 367.1 SK1: The dimensions noted on this detail are not correct, see the original SSK-0341		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page:1606 of 3091

Date:06/17/2015

Time:02:27 PM

Job:30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>See attached CD RFI # 367.1 SK1 to SK3: The indicated dimensions between the stair stringers supplied in above noted RFI SSK-0341 & SSK-0342 (see SK1 & SK2) will not work. The width of the flange on the C12x20.7 = 3" and therefore the stringers will foul with the 2 3/4" dimensions supplied. See SK3 and clarify the dimensions between the stringers.</p>						
	<p>issued in response to T-1289.0 where the dimensions from gridline to stringer face of web is noted as 4 ¼". Architectural detail 8/A1-7503 notes the stringer clear spacing as 2 ½". The Stringer having a 3" width, the total dimension from face of web to face of web equals 8 ½". See response 4 below for clarification on the 7" dimension. 2/CD RFI 367.1 SK1: The 2 ¾" dimensions are noting the location (center line) of the W10x22, not the stringer web face. To locate stringers refer to response 1. 3/CD RFI 367.1 SK2: The 2 ¾" dimensions are noting the location (center line) of the W10x22, not the stringer web face. To locate stringers refer to response 1. 4/CD RFI 367.1 SK2: The 2 ¾" dimensions are noting the location (center line) of the W10x22, not the stringer web face. To locate stringers refer to response 1. CD RFI 367.1 SK3: (the added sketch information is not correct. (Refer also to 8/A1-7503) The 7" highlighted dimension locates the outside face of the guardrail, not the web face of the stringer. Total dimension from stringer face of web to stringer face of web is 8 ½".</p>						
T-1290	<p>SSS - Mean Temperature in Service</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>The contract specifications state that steel fabrication and erection are to: "Compensate for the difference between the temperature at the time of fabrication and the mean temperature in service." - Spec 05 10 00 - 3.2.B.1 "Compensate for the difference between the temperature at the time of erection and the mean temperature in service." - Spec. 05 10 00 - 3.3.A</p> <p>Mean service temperature is referenced, but not defined. So that we are coordinated in our efforts, please identify</p>	<p>Closed</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>03/26/2014</p> <p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>	<p>04/05/2014</p>	<p>04/01/2014</p>	<p>Potentially</p> <div></div>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1607 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
the "Mean Service Temperature."							
T-1291	SSS - Engineer's Comments on 643AC & 645AC	Closed	03/26/2014	04/05/2014	04/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 372 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: Drawings 643AC and 645AC from TG0701-075 SSS - Structural Steel Shop DWG (CS3) GL 12-13 are attached for your reference 1) The noted approval comment does not help as the plate will foul the rebar holes when located 11" down. See SK2 and confirm the 8 7/8" dimension is acceptable or supply a workable solution. 2) The weld is not missing. It is shown in Detail 1 on drawing 643AC as WD1Q, which is correct per 6/S1-4350 as the weld is non-DCW. NOTE: The same applies to drawing 645AC.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Agree the 8 7/8" dimension as detail is okay to clear the holes. 2). Noted. WD1Q is okay, but we still think that it is more appropriate to show the weld on sheet 643AC, not in Detail 1.				
T-1292	BGP - Lower Concourse Electrical Room Layout	Closed	03/26/2014	04/05/2014	03/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please see attached layouts for Lower Concourse Electrical Rooms B2280, B1563, B1644 and B1325. Please confirm the layouts are exceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For confirmation of the equipment layouts, please document on shop drawings. All further layout confirmations for panels and conduits should be submitted in shop drawing format. Please refer to the attached sketch when documenting shop drawings for submittal.				
T-1293	BGP - Lower Concourse Shear Wall Inconsistency	Closed	03/27/2014	04/06/2014	04/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

See attached Contract Documents, A1-2202 and S1-2202.

An inconsistency was discovered between drawing A1-2202 and drawing S1-2202 regarding the West Throat Shear wall above the Lower Concourse. Sheet A1-2202 shows the shear wall stopping at the corridor, sheet S1-2202 shows the shear wall penetrating the corridor.

Please confirm which drawing, A1-2202 or S1-2202 governs.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Wall to be located per A1-2202. Please see attached SKS-0339 and SKS-0340 updates to the west throat shear wall above the lower concourse level.

T-1293.1	BGP - Lower Concourse Shearwall Inconsistency	Closed	05/19/2014	05/29/2014	05/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

RFI T-1293 response directed Webcor to modify the boundary of West Throat Shearwall W191F above the Lower Concourse per SKS-0339 and SKS-0340 to match drawing A1-2202. The response did not address the impact to Column C17 shown on 1/S1-2250. Please confirm that SKS-0348, SKS-0351, and SKS-0352 will be used in lieu of the RFI-1293 response and accompanying sketches.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Confirmed.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1610 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1296	BGP - Concrete Plant Recertification Test Batch From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto REQUEST: The 4th review comment to SUBM TG0600-095 (document enclosed as reference) states after plant recertification a "test batch" will be prepared and tested for accuracy. Attached is SCCI's concrete supplier (CEMEX) responses to the submittal review comments. Regarding the test batch, is it acceptable to either: 1) Have an Owner's representative perform a plant visit during production operations to observe batching tolerance during normal business hours? or 2) Neither perform the test barch nor plant visit?	Closed	03/31/2014	04/10/2014	04/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> After further discussion with Bob Foley of CEMEX, we are satisfied with the corrective actions CEMEX has already taken. The proposed plant visit and batch constituent verification are not required.				
T-1297	SSS - EoS Bent Plate at Knock-out Slab GL11-12 From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 378 SK1 & SK2: The knock-out slab extends 1 1/4" onto the flange as shown. Confirm that is acceptable or provide alternate direction.	Closed	03/31/2014	04/10/2014	04/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Move the East-West direction W21x50 beams to GLs D.8 and E.2 so that the slab will overhang the beam flange.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1298	SSS - Lift Eyes on Ground Cast Nodes	Closed	03/31/2014	04/10/2014	04/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The contract drawings indicate that lift eyes will be provided for shop handling: "Provide picking eye(s) as required for the handling of the cast node in the foundry AND the shop of the steel fabricator. Picking eye(s) to be located withing the interior of the casting's nozzle(s)" The lift eyes that were cast into the back side of the ground level cast nodes have now been machined off by Bradken, leaving only the lift eyes inside the nozzles. In order to safely handle these castings, new lift features need to be added to the back side to replace those that were machined off. OIW notes that if the castings are picked using only the lift eyes inside the nozzle, the center of gravity causes the castings to rotate into an unworkable position. Some other manner of rigging must be employed in order to manipulate the castings into positions required for shop fabrication work. CastConnex noted exactly the same issue in their Release 1 Pre Shipping Inspection Summary, even noting that the improvised and awkward handling was causing damage to the castings: "The lifting lugs are located inside the nozzle-end on these parts making the machined nodes difficult to manipulate. Often the parts have to be lifted using straps thru the pin hole causing some broken edges on the radius of the pin hole." To facilitate handling the cast nodes in the shop in a way that is safe and that avoids damaging the castings, OIW proposes that drilled and tapped holes be added. The attached sketches (2773-SK-401 and 2773-SK-402) show a proposed arrangment of these holes. Note that the proposed locations are in areas that will not be visable in the final product, and also are in areas of minimal stress. OIW requests that the engineer of record review the attached drawings and determine if the proposed modifications to the cast node are acceptable.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 4/9/2014 Taping holes at the back side of the cast node for erection is a means and methods issue. Stacy Wilson 4/9/2014 To note, the referenced Cast Connex report was in regards to the roof nodes, not the ground floor nodes. In addition, the contract drawings never called for eyes on the backside of the ground floor nodes, therefore at the contractor's option, the addition of drilled and tapped holes shall come at no cost to the TJPA.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1612 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1299	SSS - Off-Set Beam Connection Modification at PE 403/404	Closed	04/02/2014	04/12/2014	04/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 377 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the connections as shown are acceptable at the noted off-set beam locations. If not, supply an alternate connection detail. 2) Confirm the details shown on SK2 may be applied typically at future similar cases. If not, supply the missing detail for off-set beam connections with double angles per 1/S1-5010.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.			
T-1300	SSS - Carboline AESS Primer	Closed	04/02/2014	04/12/2014	04/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Turner Construction Comp Stacy Wilson							
REQUEST: Specification section 05 10 00-2.2.B.2.b indicates that Carboline Carbozinc 621 is to be used for non-galvanized steel to receive high performance coating. Reference is made to the letter provided by Carboline attached, which publishes that this (nearly obsolete) product has a recoat window of only 2-3 hours, which cannot be achieved on the Transbay project since subsequent overcoats will be installed in the field by others. Carboline has provided information and validation for use of the Carbozinc 859 Organic Zinc Rich Epoxy as a replacement for Carbozinc 621, which provides protection and performance equal to or greater than Carbozinc 621. The Carbozinc 859 product provides an unlimited recoat window, allowing for intermediate and top coats to be applied by others in the field, in accordance with the project's schedule and contractual requirements. Please confirm the Carbozinc 859 product is acceptable for use as the AESS primer. Note: Specification section 09 97 16-2.2.A states that the		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFI is rejected per Specification Section 01 10 40 1.6 C 2 a. "RFIs shall not be used for the following; the TJPA will not reply and will reject the RFI: Product or material Substitution".			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1613 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>listed manufacturers are acceptable subject to conformance to requirements of Drawings, Schedules and Specifications. For this reason, Carbozinc 859 is proposed as the recommended product by the basis of design manufacturer, Carboline, rather than a product substitution.</div>							
T-1301	SSS - Erection Aid at Roof Spandrel Beams	Closed	04/02/2014	04/12/2014	04/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference SK-4.7 attached, which details the erection aid for the perimeter roof beams. The connection plate shown in A/SK-4.7 and B/SK-4.7 will also serve as the back-up bar for the CJP weld at the beam web.				Not acceptable. Please note Detail 1/S1-5014 requires a double bevel weld.			
Our intent is to leave the connection plate/back-up bar in place after welding. Please confirm this is acceptable.							
<hr/>							
T-1302	SSS - CP5 Connection Points	Closed	04/02/2014	04/12/2014	04/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Detail 1/S1-8003 shows a corner to corner joint between the 2.5" mounting plate and the two supporting vertical stiffeners and the single horizontal stiffener on top.				Confirmed.			
Please confirm the two vertical stiffeners can be repositioned 1/4" in towards the center of the connection as well as lowering the horizontal stiffener. These adjustments will provide a land for the specified fillet weld and minimize melt through and weld splatter at the corners of each plate. Backside stiffeners will be repositioned to match as required.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1614 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1303	Wall Rebar in conflict with raker base plate 13 (GL1.5,D.8)	Closed	04/03/2014	04/03/2014	04/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Due to a conflict between the rebar dowels and the raker base plate 13. WOJV is proposing to cut the existing rebar dowels flush with the mat slab and drill and epoxy in a new same sized bar beside the existing one once the re-bracing raker is removed. Please confirm if this would be acceptable			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed for this location.		
T-1304	SSS - Follow-up to CS3 Approval Comments	Closed	04/04/2014	04/14/2014	04/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please review and confirm the items below regarding the TG0701-075 SSS - Structural Steel Shop DWG (CS3) GL 12-13 approval comments: 1) Drawing 2669 ~ the noted beam is not sloping per S1-4004. Confirm the drawing is correct as submitted and no action is required. 2) Drawing 2707 ~ the noted beam is not sloping per S1-4015 (S1-4004 is not the correct drawing reference). Confirm the drawing is correct as submitted and no action is required. 3) Drawings 2706, 2710, 2713AB ~ the 3 1/16" dimensions are necessary as the beam webs vary in thickness. The 3" dimension on the angles has been used at the thickest beam web. Confirm the drawings are correct as submitted and no action is required. 4) Drawings 3792, 3793 & 3794, 4933, 4935, 4994, 4995, 4998 ~ The top cope on the right end is correct as shown. The Approver's reference to a 2" flange is incorrect as the TPG1 on Grid 13 has a 3 1/2" thick flange per S1-4200. We have limited the clearance at the top to 1/4" be able to fit the number of bolts per S1-5010. Confirm the drawings are correct as submitted and no action is required.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. Note that there is another comment on sheet 2706 for which the sheet needs to resubmitted for record. 4) Confirmed. 5) Confirmed.		

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	5) Drawings 4832 & 4924 ~ RFI T-0857 (SK 117, CD 089) asked for permission to cope the beam as shown on the submitted drawings on SK2 item 1 and the cope was approved in the response. Cutting one side of the flange is not sufficient to clear the brace. Confirm the drawings are correct as submitted and no action is required.						
T-1306	BGP - Geothermal Field 11 Mud Slab Rebar	Closed	04/07/2014	04/17/2014	04/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Please confirm it is acceptable to remove rebar in the mud slab of geothermal field 11 via contractors discretion. Please note rebar will be placed where micropiles are to be tested.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			ARUP Response: Arup does not require any rebar to be placed in the mudslab. We recommend that rebar is placed in the mudslab for locations where the micropiles will be tested on the mudslab.				
T-1307	SSS - Ground Level Connection GL 8	Closed	04/07/2014	04/17/2014	04/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 379 SK1 & SK2: Confirm it is acceptable to terminate the PL2x3/8 per 12/S1-5010 as shown to avoid fouling the connection angles. If not, supply a new detail.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			Confirmed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1616 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1308	BGP - Geothermal Field 11 Disturbed Unsuitable Material	Closed	04/08/2014	04/18/2014	04/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: During backfill activities in Geothermal Field 11 inclement weather occurred and as a result isolated areas of bay mud/clay are deemed unsuitable. Per field walk on 04-07-2014 with Arup these soft areas are found unacceptable to place mud lab. What are the procedures required to satisfy and meet an acceptable substrate for the mud slab.?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					ARUP Response: Remove disturbed material from the top of undisturbed soil in geofield 11. The geothermal trenches are okay as is. Arup will review the condition on Monday, 04-14-14 to confirm that the mudslab is ready to pour.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1309	SSS - Missing Stair ST202 information (GL 1.4-2)	Closed	04/08/2014	04/18/2014	04/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 387 SK1 to SK6 for items 1 to 15: 1) Supply all clouded dimensions on SK1 thru SK6. 2) [Issue has been resolved, no further action necessary] 3) Supply the top of concrete elevation for the (4) posts. 4) This detail shows horizontal HSS beam but the beam is not shown here or on S1-2202. Please clarify. 5) This detail does not allow for any horizontal adjustment for concrete +/- location variances. Please review and advise. 6) [This item is to be resolved by Skanska] 7) Confirm these posts are continuous from 1/S1-7400 (SK1) to here. 8) Clarify the noted landing steel and supply the member sizes, elevations & dimensions. 9) The minimum distance between the center of post and the W10x22 must be 1'-1 3/4 in order to connect per 3/S15012 and 1/S1-5010. Supply alternate connection details if the dimension is less. This is a typical occurrence on all stairs. 10) Confirm all stair landing beams are centered on the posts or supply offset dimensions. 11) Supply a connection detail. 12) The noted 2 braces per 1/S1-7600 will span across the slab opening. Confirm that is acceptable or give direction. 13) Do the posts starting above the Lower Concourse Level in detail 2/S1-7400 (SK2) extend to the underside of the HSS beams? Please clarify. 14) Clarify what supports the noted steel. 15) Supply a corner connection detail.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Refer to attached sketch SKS-0347 for missing dimensions. 3) Refer to 1/A1-7004 for top of concrete elevations. 4) Detail 4/S1-7600 does not apply and is incorrectly called out at the highlighted location. 5) The statement "this detail does not allow any adjustment for concrete +/- location variances" is not entirely clear. Up to a 1" gap is allowed between the end of steel beam and concrete wall therefore there should be enough tolerance for placing steel as long as concrete walls are constructed within tolerances. If the intent of the question was different, please clarify, or alternatively add this item to the next structural coordination meeting agenda for further discussion. 7) Confirmed. The guide rail posts are continuous in between floor levels. 8) Detail 3/S1-7004 was updated in IFC Main Package dated 3/31/2014. See attached sketch SKS-0347 that shows the updated framing. 9) Provide shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011 at the W10 stair beams typically for such instances. 10) Confirmed. Refer to latest architectural issued A1-7XXX series sheets for correct post locations. 11) Provide connection detail per 3/S1-7600 except, The W10 beam connects to the HSS post per 3/S1-5012. 12) Provide full depth stiffeners on both sides of the beam web in lieu of the braces per detail 1/S1-7600. 13) Yes. See attached sketch SKS-0347 that shows the HSS posts. 14) Detail 6/S1-7004 was updated in IFC Main Package dated 3/31/2014. See attached sketch SKS-0347 that shows the updated framing.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1618 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

15) See attached sketch SKS-0347 that shows connection detail callouts.

T-1310	SSS - CS3 Review Clarifications for Spandrel Beams	Closed	04/09/2014	04/19/2014	04/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached CD RFI # 374 SK1 & SK2 for items 2 to 4, as a follow up to the review comments provided in Submittal Package TG0701-075 SSS - Structural Steel Shop DWG (CS3) GL 12-13:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) [Item 1 has been responded to internally by Skanska. No further action is required]					2a) We confirm that the RFI response to T-0923.1 remains valid..		
2a) The approver's reference to T-0923 has been superseded by follow-up RFI T-0923.1. This RFI confirmed 2'-0 1/4 to match the W-1 Rhino model. Please confirm the RFI response to T-0923.1 remains valid.					2b) We confirm that the dimensions provided in the Rhino model are to be followed.		
2b) Not all CP6 connections are located 2'-0 1/4 below the top of steel on the Bus Deck Level. The dimensions shown on this drawing match the W-1 Rhino model. Please confirm that the dimensions provided in the Rhino model are to be followed and that no further action is required.					3) Confirmed no further action required.		
3) Refer to RFI T-0738, which confirmed modifications to the plate thicknesses. Confirm no further action is required.					4) The requested cope dimensions as shown cannot be confirmed by the Design Team. Please provide a 3D model of the entire connections, so that the Design Team can coordinate with the Rhino 3D model. Specifically, we would like to have the beam flange coping and cast node perimeter beam drag connection tabs with all other connection elements, so that we may confirm it fits with the W-18 and W-9 cladding Rhino model.		
4) The requested cope dimensions are shown. Confirm no further action is required.							

T-1311	SSS - Rolled Pipe Seam Location at Basket Columns	Closed	04/09/2014	04/19/2014	04/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Submittal Package TG0701-075 SSS -					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					The comments (blue text) in question on the shop		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1619 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1312	<p>Structural Steel Shop DWG (CS3) GL 12-13, sheet 1205 that indicates Skanska is to "confirm seam locations for rolled members." AESS specification section 05 12 14 only provides criteria to fully shape rolled members in shop to final curved shape (2.3.C.12) and to minimize distortion (3.7.C.1.a). No direction is provided in the specifications or contract drawings to orient the seam in any particular direction.</p> <p>Please advise if a specific orientation of rolled members is to be accommodated for upper basket column pipes (AESS Category 3) with wall thickness less than or equal to 1". Note that the seam location must not come in conflict with erection aids or other attachments. See drawing 1268 attached which indicates the orientation of erections aids.</p> <p>SSS - Hanger Above Connection Clarification</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 390 SK1 for items 1 & 2:</p> <p>1) Confirm a 2" gap is acceptable.</p> <p>2) The bolts cannot be located as shown in detail 4/S1-5026. Confirm the bolt locations as shown are acceptable with the bottom flange of the beams coped for bolt access. If not, supply an alternate solution.</p>	Closed	04/09/2014	04/19/2014	04/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>drawings are from W/O. Please note TT review stamp on the shop drawings sheet 1268 was marked as "Approved"</p> <p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1313	SSS - Deck Support Detail at Column	Closed	04/09/2014	04/19/2014	04/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Please reference detail 1/S1-5001. The L3x3x12ga deck support angle is shown coping into the web of the girder. At the majority of the conditions where this may occur the girders have thick and wide flanges. After the angle is coped as detailed we will have very little material to work with and it is unlikely to have much structural integrity. Please see attached alternative sketch. In this condition the angle is lapped on top of the girder and connected with fillet welds. The depth of the girder has no impact on the detail. This is a common detail in the metal decking industry. Please confirm the proposed column angle support sketch is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative deck support detail shown in the RFI can be used at the Contractor's option.				
T-1314	SSS - Basket Column Grout Hole Clarifications	Closed	04/09/2014	04/19/2014	04/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 370 SK1 to SK5 for items 1 to 10: 1) Confirm the fully grouted vertical column indicated shall have type 2 holes (per S1-4003, Note 2) with a pattern similar to that shown in detail B/S1-4018 for vertical columns filled with concrete. Reference SK1 & SK5. 2) Please confirm the grout port and vent hole locations for the noted vertical column are to be located similar to S1-4003 as indicated for diagonal pipe columns. 3) Please confirm the vent hole locations for the noted vertical column are to be located similar to S1-4003 as indicated for diagonal pipe columns. 4) Confirm the fully grouted vertical column indicated shall have type 2 holes (per S1-4003, Note 2) with a pattern similar to that shown in detail B/S1-4018 for vertical columns filled with concrete. Reference SK2 & SK5. 5) Confirm the fully grouted vertical column indicated shall have type 2 holes (per S1-4003, Note 2) with a pattern similar to that shown in detail B/S1-4018 for vertical columns filled with concrete. Reference SK3 & SK5. 6) The same column on the south elevation shown on S1-		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. See updated S1-4018 issued with the Main Package 2. Confirmed. 3. Confirmed. 4. See updated S1-4018 issued with the Main Package. 5. See updated S1-4018 issued with the Main Package. 6. See updated S1-4018 issued with the Main Package. 7, 8, 9 & 10. See updated S1-4018 issued with the Main Package.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>4007 (SK2) references B/S1-4018 (SK5) for the grout holes. Confirm that the typical grout holes per S1-4003 are to be applied at the noted column on the north elevation or clarify.</p> <p>7) The noted column is shown concrete filled per A-S1-4017 (SK4) and grout filled per A/S1-4018 (SK5). Please clarify.</p> <p>8) Confirm the vertical column indicated shall have type 2 holes (per S1-4003, Note 2) with a pattern similar to that shown in detail B/S1-4018 for vertical columns filled with concrete. Reference SK4 & SK5.</p> <p>9) The same column on the south elevation shown on S1-4002 (SK1) references B/S1-4018 (SK5) for the grout holes. Confirm that the typical grout holes per S1-4003 are to be applied at the noted column on the north elevation or clarify.</p> <p>10) Supply vertical dimensions to locate the grout holes in the upper columns.</p>						
T-1315	BGP - Concourse Transformer Vaults - Curb and Pad Dowels	Closed	04/09/2014	04/19/2014	04/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Transformer Vaults detail drawings A1-3001 & A1-9235 (for vaults on A1-2222); A1-3002 & A1-9236 (for vaults on A1-2223); A1-3003 & A1-9237 (for vaults on A1-2225), and pad details S-3002 of the IFC 3.31.2014 drawing set.			It is acceptable to provide mechanical couplers or drilled and bonded dowels for detail 4, 5 and 6 on S1-3002 at contractor's option. Contractor to ensure that the drilling does not expose or damage the existing rebars in the slab.				
The IFC set curb & pad details 4, 5 & 6/S1-3002 appear to require #4 rebar dowels to be cast into the Concourse slab. Please confirm if this is the designer's intent or if details similar to 2&3/S1-3002 can be applied at the Contractor's option for the concourse level transformer pads and curbs, i.e. couplers or drilled & bonded dowels.							
<hr/>							
T-1316	SSS - Missing Stair ST203 information (GL 5)	Closed	04/11/2014	04/21/2014	04/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1622 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 388 SK1 to SK6 for items 1 to 6: 1) Supply all clouded dimensions on SK1 thru SK6. 2) Confirm all landings have 1/4" checker plate. 3) Please clarify which stringers go up and which stringers go down and add stair to landing connection references as was done on S1-7004. 4) How are the (3) W10x22's supported/connected? 5) How are the noted (2) W10x22's supported/connected? 6) The noted 6" dimension does not work with detail 3/S1-7601 which shows the stringer attaching at the toe of the beam flange. Please clarify.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Refer to attached sketches SKS-346 and SKS-349 for missing dimensions. SKS-349 shows how the stair landing beams that are perpendicular to the stringers can be located based on architectural drawings. 2) Refer to Specification "Steel Stairs and Railings 05 51 00" under 2.2 Materials -B Checker Plate Treads and Landings. 3) See attached sketch SKS-0346 for clarification of stringer direction. Also refer to architectural drawings A1-7005 and A1-7104. 4) The W10 beams frame into CMU walls and are shown on S1-7005 that was updated in IFC Main Package dated 3/31/2013. See attached sketch SKS-0346. 5) See response to 4). 6) Move the W16 beam closer to the edge of slab for detail 3/S1-7601 to work at the location.				
T-1317	SSS - Second Level Connection clarifications GL 1.4 - 2	Closed	04/11/2014	04/21/2014	04/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 386 SK1: The gusset plate per 6 & 9/S1-4206 fouls the WT/pretensioned rod connection per 3/S1-5050 & S1-5052. Please advise.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no fouling. 24" dimension between the bottom of Steel Beam and the top of WT section per Detail 3/S1-5050 does not apply at BRB frame connections, see note 2 in detail 3/S1-5050. Where BRB gussets are present, the distance between the bottom of gusset plate and the WT section is 12" as indicated in Details 4 & 8/S1-4206.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1318	SSS - Second Level Protected Zone Connection Clarification GL 7	Closed	04/11/2014	04/21/2014	04/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 381 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) The noted brace connection occurs within the "Protected Zone" per 1/S1-4201. Confirm that is acceptable or supply an alternate solution. 2) The gusset plate per 8/S1-5015 will foul the top bolts in the double angle connection per 1/S1-5010. Confirm it is acceptable to use a shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011 at this location or supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			1) Provide the brace connection to the moment frame column using a bent plate as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0345. 2) It is acceptable to move the gusset plate and the brace per 8/S1-5015 slightly to clear the bolts.				
<hr/>							
T-1318.1	SSS - Second Level Bent Shear Plate Around Protected Zone	Closed	05/07/2014	05/17/2014	05/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 381.1 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) The bent plate shown on TT SK-0345 cannot be bent with a sharp 90 degree bend as shown. Confirm the cold bending radius shown is acceptable or supply the bending radius to be used. 2) Confirm the welding as shown is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.				
<hr/>							
T-1319	SSS - Missing beam sizes and connection clarification Ground Level GL 1.4	Closed	04/11/2014	04/21/2014	04/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 380 SK1 for items 1, 2 & 3: 1) Confirm the noted missing beam size is W12x14. 2) Confirm the noted missing beam size is W16x26. 3) Confirm the PL2x3/8 per 12/S1-5010 may terminate as shown to avoid fouling the connection for the W12x14 per 1/S1-5010. If not, supply a new detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Provide a shear plate connection at the W12x14 beam and extend the 2 x 3/8 stiffener plate per 12/S1-5010. The stiffener plate may be stopped short at the shear plate connection to avoid conflict.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1320	BGP - Dewatering Sleeve at Mat Slab Depression	Open	04/14/2014	04/24/2014	04/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Grace requires that there be a minimum 8" clear horizontal plane to allow for the waterproofing membrane transition. Dewatering sleeve #38 is located on the edge of a sloped mat slab depression. Please confirm it is acceptable to lower the flat the mud slab to provide a sufficient horizontal plane to accommodate waterproofing. Sides of depressions will be sloped at 45deg.					The TJPA Representative does not object to the Contractor's proposal to adjusting the mud slab as described at Dewatering sleeve #38 to suit the waterproofing manufacturer's requirements.		

T-1321	BGP - Geothermal Riser Location Field 14	Closed	04/14/2014	04/24/2014	04/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ryan Brekke							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm the riser for Geothermal Field 14 is to be located between Soldier Piles 349 and 350. In addition, please confirm the temperature probe in Geothermal Field 14 is to be located between Soldier Piles 350 and 351.					WSP take no exception to the proposed location of the Riser and Temperature probe.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1625 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1322	SSS - West Zone Bus Level and Roof Level Grade Clarifications	Closed	04/14/2014	04/24/2014	04/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 383 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 3: Drawings A1-2502 (SK1), A1-2892 (SK2), A1-2951 (SK4), and 1/A1-2951 (SK5) show a valley. A valley is not shown on S1-2502 and S1-2602 and it is not clear what the intent is for the structural framing: 1) In order to keep the diagonal brace framing along Grid H in one plane (shown in blue), it is necessary to introduce a valley as indicated by the red line. If not, twisting will be introduced into the framing and connection details 3/S15025 at Grid 1.4 and 1/S1-5018 at Grid 2. Per Note 6 on S1-2602 the beams are canted to match the slope of TPG1 on Grid 2 but the BU-40 on Grid 1 is horizontal. This will result in the beams having to twist. To avoid this a valley as shown on the architectural drawings is required. Please confirm a valley as indicated by the red line is required or clarify/supply the top of steel elevations between grids 1-2. 2) If a valley is introduced, all beams crossing the red valley line will need to be broken-back/bent beams. Please supply a detail showing the splice at the bend lines. 3) If the valley is to occur, please clarify the location of the valley as drawings A1-2502 (SK1) and A1-2892 (SK2) show conflicting information. The same condition shown here also occurs between Grids 1-2/B-D, 32.4-33.5/B-D & 32.433.5/F-H. The same condition except opposite shown here occurs between Grids 1-2/F-H on the roof park level. 4) It is not clear on S1-2606/S1-2607 where the east-west slopes start east of Grid 31.7. Please clarify the framing.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1.) A valley is not required. See specific comments for Bus Deck and Roof Park Levels below: At Bus Deck Level, an additional top of steel elevation is provided within the deck zone bounded by Gridlines 1&2 and E.6&H. Top of Steel at Gridline 2/G can be calculated as 55' 10 3/8" by linear interpolation using the top of steel information provided at Gridlines 2/E.6 (at column face) and 2/H. At GL 1.4/G top of steel can be assumed the same as 2/G therefore the diaphragm truss is in single plane. Metal deck will need to be slightly warped at other parts of this zone, where two way slopes are present. Ultimately, thickness of the structural topping slab can be adjusted locally to achieve the slab slopes per architectural drawings. At the Roof Level, following info is provided for the deck zone bounded by Gridlines 1&2 and E.6&H. East-west running beams are to be set perpendicular to TPG1. These beams will land on the Gridline 1 slightly rotated however rotation is small resulting in an approximately +/- 1/8" vertical deviation at the tips of the east west running beams' flanges with respect to the GL 1 beam. Metal deck will be slightly warped at this zone. Per our estimations, metal deck steel beam gap/clash is in +/- 1/16" range which can be addressed by small amount of warping in the metal deck. 2.) See response to (1). 3.) A valley is not required. Information provided in item 1 is applicable to the locations noted in this question at the Bus Deck and Roof Levels. 4.) In Sheet S1-2607, East-West slope starts at GL 32.4 as indicated Sheet S1-2607 (between gridlines 32.4/D4 & 32.4/E.6). As indicated in item 1, metal deck will be slightly warped in this area where two way slopes are present.				
T-1322.1	SSS - West Zone Bus Level and Roof Level Grade Clarifications	Closed	05/16/2014	05/26/2014	06/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1626 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 383.1 SK1 to SK6 for items 1 to 10: The noted (2) skewed W40x277 form part of the bracing system and must remain in the same as the other braces. This means that the noted W40x149 & W36x231 will not align with the top of the W40x297 on Grid 1. 1) Please advise how to make the moment weld for the for the W40x149 to the W40x297 with the flanges not aligned. 2) Please supply a detail showing how the deck will be supported at the (2) lowered beams. 3) Due to the beams not being aligned, confirm it is acceptable to connect these beams with shear plates per 1/S1-5011 4) Confirm it is typically acceptable to lower the beams to align the corner of the flange with the top of the supporting beams as some connections are moment connections. 5) Review all items on SK2 and confirm they meet the design intent. 6) The noted (2) skewed W40x277 form part of the bracing system and must remain in the same as the other braces. This means that the (4) noted beams will not align with the top of the W40x297 on Grid 33.5. Please supply a detail showing how the deck will be supported at the (4) lowered beams. 7) Confirm the T/Steel elevation at this location is EL. 55'-8 9/16 based on the north/south slope to keep the diagonal bracing in the same plane. 8) Confirm the noted (2) beams will be canted to match the other beams based on the slope on TPG1 on Grid 2. 9) Review all items on SK5 and confirm they meet the design intent. 10) This is to confirm the response in RFI SK515 item 4: All beams within the blue boundaries on SK6 will slope as needed the have the top of beams flush with the top of the supporting beams per the noted T/Steel elevations. The east/west beams between Grids 32.4-33.2 will be canted to match the canted beams west of Grid 32.4. The east/west beams between Grids 33.2-33.5 will be canted to match the slope of the beams on Grid 33.2. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). The W40x149 (0.83" thick flange) may be lowered so that the complete penetration weld can be made for the top flange because W40 x 297 has a 1.65" thick flange. For the bottom flange weld, a plate might need to be added in order to achieve the complete penetration weld. 2). The T/STL for W40 x 149 is not necessarily controlled by the diagonal brace, as the type G drag connection detail (1C/S1-5018) has called for shim plates as required. W 36 does not need to support the metal deck. 3). Yes, the E/W beams between Grids 1 & 2 may be changed to a single shear plate connection as shown on 1/S1-5011 with the following 2 conditions: a) Type X bolts should be used for W21 and W24 beams. b). One row of bottom flange bracing should be provided for the W21 and W24 beams between Grid 1.4 & 2 per detail 8/S1-5015. 4). Confirmed 5). Confirmed. 6). See responses #1 & 2 7). Confirmed 8). Confirmed 9). Confirmed, Also see response to items 1 & 2. 10). Confirmed.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1627 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1323	SSS - Bus Deck Level Slab Clarification	Closed	04/14/2014	04/24/2014	04/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Bus Deck Level drawings S1-2502 thru S1-2507 indicate an S8 type slab, as per metal deck schedule 2/S1-5000, S8 is a 10" structural slab with 4" second pour topping slab. Sheet note #6 on S1-2502 indicates "shear studs are to extend a minimum of 2" into the second pour UON. See detail 9/S1-9004 for perimeter EoS conditions" (S1-9004 has not been provided). Drawings A1-2892 thru 2987 show a 1" topping slab typically between 10' north of GL D and 10' south of GL F. The slab outside of that region is typically shown as structural slab only. Confirm that decking drawings will be modeled as per the information provided on the structural contract drawings unless otherwise directed.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Note that the 4" second pour topping slab is part of the structural slab and studs are to be extended 2" into this 4" topping slab as shown on 4/S1-5003. Studs do not extend into the architectural topping slab. Also, the correct detail reference for perimeter EOS condition is 9/S1-5004.			
T-1324	SSS - BRB Clevis Plate Detail	Closed	04/14/2014	04/24/2014	04/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Skanska is the process of incorporating the AAN BRB Shop Drawings from Star Seismic into the Tekla model. During the integration process we have identified a deviation from certain dimensions shown in the contract documents. Specifically, the 2" dimension shown from edge of clevis to top of concrete at the ground level connection and the 5" dimension shown from edge of clevis to the bottom flange of W section above. Below, is a table showing the "As Detailed" dimensions at each BRB. Please confirm that the 2" & 5" dimensions shown on S1-4206 are not controlling dimensions and the lengths of the BRB's from WP-WP as designed, detailed and approved, control.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided dimensional deviations from contract documents are acceptable at all locations except for BRBs at GL 4-5/F; 28-29/D.4, 29-30/D4 and 30-31/D.4. At GL 4-5/F, provide bottom clearance between 2" and 3" (2" ideal) and a top clearance between 5" and 6" (5" ideal). At East Building BRBs (28-29/D.4, 29-30/D4 and 30-31/D.4), it is not clear from the RFI that the contractor understood the design intent at the bottom clevis plates. At the bottom, 2" clearance to the clevis plate applies from the top of the finished floor (not the top of structural concrete slab) since these braces are exposed. See BRB elevations (S1-4150) and the corresponding detail (1/S1-4206) for this info. Note that the finished floor at this location slopes down to East and this information shall be coordinated per			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1628 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1324.1	SSS - BRB Clevis Plate Detail From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Skanska has incorporated the response to RFI T-1324 into the drawings and made the necessary adjustments, while maintaining the required stiffness factor, at gridlines 28-29/D.4, 29-30/D4 and 30-31/D.4. These adjustments have been submitted under submittal package TG0701-415.4. However, after discussions with Star Seismic, at GL 4-5/F the stiffness factor plays a limiting role into modifying the length of the brace. Please see the attached stiffness and over strength analysis, provided by Star Seismic, and confirm that the brace lengths may stay the same as previously approved in TG0701-415.2.	Closed To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	05/08/2014	05/18/2014	05/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			ANSWER: civil/landscape drawings as applicable. For these BRBs, top clearances indicated in the RFI are acceptable in current form. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			GL 4-5/F dimensions shall be as indicated in RFI T-1324. It is acceptable to have a stiffness ratio of 11% as shown in the calculation submitted by the Contractor. We also note that there may also be other ways to achieve the required pin-to-pin dimension and the required stiffness multiplier called out on the contract drawings. Also, it is not clear why the yield zone length is reduced by 16" whereas the pin-to-pin dimension is reduced by 6" in the calculation. With a longer yield zone length a lower stiffness multiplier can be achieved.				
T-1325	BGP - Partition Wall Details From ASI 110 From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto Co-Author:	Accepted To: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche	04/15/2014	04/25/2014	04/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			ANSWER: Please refer to Field Order 00027, 100% Main Package Drawings, "Issued for Construction" dated 3/31/14 Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			Please provide elevation and reinforcement details for partition walls on the Train Level added to TG0600's scope as part of ASI 110. Additionally the dimensions for the partition walls were deleted between ASI 107 and 110. Please confirm ASI 107 dimensions or provide new dimensions for ASI 110 drawings. The ASI 110 drawings in question are AI-2122-2127, AI-2222-2227, and AI-2230.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1326	BGP - Vehicle Ramp End Support Beams	Closed	04/16/2014	04/26/2014	04/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please reference AI-7401 rev 4 and SI-2251 rev 5. Please also reference RFI T-0835 1. S1-2251 shows additional beams added to vehicle ramp that intersect the South and West foundation walls. A 1-7401 does not appear to show the same quantity of beams intersecting the south perimeter wall. Please supply a revised architectural drawing or detail that shows any/all beams that are added from S1-2251, and that shows the angles at which those beams intersect walls. 2. Please confirm AI-7401 revises the beam intersecting angles that were provided in RFI T-0835.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. A1-7401 has been updated to show beams, including angles at which they intersect the foundation wall. Refer to SKA-3138 attached. 2. The intersecting angles for Beam B142 (previous beam mark B43), B125 and the 16" wall are confirmed. B132 has been removed.		

T-1327	BGP - Lower Concourse Beam Locations	Closed	04/16/2014	04/26/2014	04/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please confirm the bellow structural beam updates should be incorporated into the TG06 Scope of work. 1. CB24 is required between Grids 4 and 5. Beam centerline to be located 12'-3" south of Grid C.3. 2. B1 shown west of Grid 5 at approximately Grid B.6 is not required and can be deleted from scope. 3. The pair of B4's shown east of Grid 5 near Grid B are not required (opening has been removed). Beams can be deleted from scope. 4. B24 is required between Grids 6 and 7. B23 is required between Grids 7 and 8. South face of both beams shall be located approximately 27" north of Grid E.6 and align with the northern most face of trestle pile blockouts in order that they not be interrupted by the blockouts. The coordinated location of the beam with blockouts will be submitted on the comprehensive layout drawings. RFI T-1040 response is superseded as is RFI T-876. Section 2/S1-3501 does not apply. SKS-0343(attached) will detail the section across drop. 5. B25 is required between Grids 7 and 8 near Grid B.6. Beam will align with B29 to the west. 6. CB15 is required between Grids 10.1 and 11 near Grid			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Confirmed. 2. Confirmed. 3. Confirmed. 4. Confirmed. 5. Confirmed. 6. Confirmed. 7. Confirmed. 8. Confirmed. 9. Confirmed. 10. Confirmed. Stacy Wilson 4/21/2014 Pending TJPA approval, a CR will be issued seeking a credit for the deleted beams		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1630 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>C.7. Beam centerline to be located 10'-4 north of Grid D.</p> <p>7. Beam between Grids 13 and 14 near Grid B.5 will frame escalator opening and be marked B12. Beam will be located at edge of opening shown on A1-2844. To minimize potential congestion at overlapping beams, beam between Grids 12 and 13 near Grid B.6 marked B9 will be located such that the north face of beam aligns with the south face of adjacent beam B12.</p> <p>8. B15 is required between Grids 14 and 15, 5'-10" south of Grid B.</p> <p>9. B53 is required between Grids 20.1 and 21 near Grid C.4 at the north face of the escalator pit. A B53 is also required at the south face of escalator pit. B4A is required at the west face of escalator pit between B53's. Companion B54's between Grids 21 and 22 will align with B53's. Beams will be located per pit dimensions given on A1-2845.</p> <p>10. CB8 is required between Grids 33.2 and 34. Beam centerline will be located 6'-4" south of Grid G.</p> <p>Beam locations will be submitted for review with the comprehensive layouts.</p>						
T-1328	BGP - Vehicle Ramp End Support Embeds	Closed	04/16/2014	04/26/2014	04/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference SI-2251 rev 6, SI-3401 rev 7and S1-3411 rev 3.		1. End support for beam B132 (22" wide beam) to follow detail 1/S1-3411 as shown on plan 1/S1-2251; corbel width to be 2'-0". For end support of beam B142, see SKS-0344 attached.					
1. Clouded area of attached SI-2251 shows beam types: B125, B132, B141 and B142. B125 is a 24" wide beam, B132 is a 22" wide beam, B141 is a 48" wide beam and B142 is a 30" wide beam. SI-3411 DI & DI0 depict the beam support embed. These two (2) details are for a 24" wide beam and a 48" wide beam only. Please provide details for 22" and 30" wide beams.		2. Rods to be provided with matching nuts as required Specification 03 20 00, Section 2.3.F. Welding of plate washer to L8x8 is not required.					
2. See attached SI-3411 DI & DI0. Embed details call out 1-1/4" threaded rod FI554 GR55 w/ 2-1/2" x 2-1/2" x 1/2"							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1631 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1329	BGP - Lower Concourse Beam Locations, Added Beam	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please confirm the below structural beam update should be incorporated into the TG06 Scope of work. 1. CB15 is required between Grids 14 and 15 near Grid C.3. Beam centerline to be located 7'-1 ¼" south of Grid C.3. Beam locations will be submitted for review with the comprehensive layouts.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1330	BGP - Glass Guardrail Embeds at B1 Beams	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Please reference RFI #T-0440 and #T-0440.1 responses and the attached Contract Drawings S1-3410, SI -2203, and SI-2204.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The detail for the glass guardrail embed depicted in 7/SI-3410 calls for a 3/8"x7" embed with an 8" minimum coverage for the top embed and a 6 1/2" minimum coverage for the bottom embed. The guardrail embeds located at B1 beams on the east side of openings between GL 11/12 and D.8/E.2 (SI-2203) and GL 18/19 and B/C (SI-2204) will not have minimum sufficient coverage due to the 18" beam depth of BI beams (see attached photo).			Bottom embed plate at B1 members not required. Additional supporting member to be included as part of Phase 2 scope. Top embed plate at B1 to be placed with 8" min coverage and align with top embed at supporting concrete girders.				
Please provide a detail for glass gaurdrail embeds at the B1 beams. Please note, these specific embeds have been fabricated and are onsite							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1633 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1331	SSS - Missing Stair ST301 Information	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	05/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached CD RFI # 389 SK1 to SK7 for items 1 to 12:			1) Not acceptable. Provide a W16x26 beam centered on the two HSS posts as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0350. Provide shear plate connections per 1/S1-5011 at the ends of this beam. The W16x26 beam will be added on the structural drawings in the next ASI.				
1) The noted W16x26 beams are centered below the concrete wall on S1-2303. Confirm the lower beam may be moved below the stair post or supply an alternate solution.			2) See response to 1).				
2) The noted W16x26 beam is centered below the concrete wall on S1-2303. Confirm it may be moved below the stair post or supply an alternate solution.			3) Refer to architectural drawings A1-7006, A1-7501, A1-7502 and 3/A1-7506 for the stringer and landing beam locations.				
3) Supply all clouded dimensions on SK2 thru SK7.			4) Align the intermediate W10 beams to the stringers.				
4) Confirm equal spacing.			5) Correct detail reference at the 8 locations should be 6/S1-5012.				
5) It appears the noted stair stringer connects to the HSS post. Please supply the missing connection detail.			7) Detail at the highlighted location is similar to 3/S1-7601 except the stringer shall be welded to the bent plate at the edge of slab and not the WT.				
6) The plan shows a moment connection but detail 3/S1-5012 does not. Please clarify the intent for the beam to post connections at (8) locations.			8) Confirmed.				
7) 9/S1-7601 is not the correct detail because it shows an HSS beam and we have a W21x50 at this location. Please clarify and note that detail 3/S1-7601 will not work as the edge of slab is 7" from beam center.			9) Confirmed.				
8) This dimension is 7" per S1-2403. Confirm 7" is correct.			10) Provide shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011 at the W10 stair beams typically at such locations where double angle connection is not possible.				
9) Confirm the "CB" notation should be removed.			11) Refer to architectural drawing A1-7006 for correct post locations.				
10) The minimum distance between the center of post and the W10x22 must be 1'-1 3/4 in order to connect per 3/S1-5012 and 1/S1-5010. Supply alternate connection details if the dimension is less.			12) See response to 7).				
This is a typical occurrence on all stairs.							
11) The red dimensions match the dimensions shown in detail 3/S1-7006 (SK3). Please clarify the discrepancy in dimensions.							
12) 9/S1-7601 is not the correct detail because it shows an HSS beam and we have a W21x50 at this location. Please clarify and note that detail 3/S1-7601 will not work as the edge of slab is 6" from beam center.							
T-1331.1	SSS - Missing Stair ST301 information	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	05/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
This is a follow up to Skanska RFI 521 which was sent on April 14, 2014. Please answer question #6 below which			Moment connection symbol shown on the plan is correct. The referenced detail should be 6/S1-5012.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

was
not answered in the RFI response T-1331.

See attached CD RFI # 389 SK1 to SK7 for item 6:

6) The plan shows a moment connection but detail 3/S1-5012 does not. Please clarify the intent for the beam to post connections at (8) locations.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1635 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1332	SSS - Offset Connection Details at PE301-302	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 392 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 7: 1) Confirm connection at offset beams as was typically requested in RFI T-1299. 2) Confirm connection at offset beams as was typically requested in RFI T-1299. 3) Confirm connection at offset beams. 4) Confirm connection at offset beams as was typically requested in RFI T-1299. 5) Confirm the short W16x26 beam on the west side of Grid 8 may be relocated to align with the W30x108. 6) Connections will foul. Supply an alternate detail. 7) Connections will foul. Supply an alternate detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. We assume that the 9" offset shown from the W24x76 beam is to the C-channel adjacent to the circular opening. 4) Confirmed. 5) Confirmed. 6) Reduce the "Leh" distance to 3" and the distance between the beam end and the column flange to 1/2" at the W40x493 connection. Provide shear plate connections per 1/S1-5011 at the W30x90 and W33x118 beams framing into the W40x593 beam. 7) Reduce the "Leh" distance to 2", number of bolt columns "N" to 4 and the distance between the beam end and the column flange to 1/2" at the BU56 connection. Provide shear plate connections per 1/S1-5011 at the W30x90 and W16x36 beams framing into the BU56 beam. The W30x90 and W16x36 beams may be moved by a maximum of 2" to clear the connection.			
T-1333	SSS - Bolt Edge Distance at Weld Access Hole	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 395 SK1 & SK2: The weld access hole as shown on SK1 will create an inefficient edge distance for the 1 1/2" diameter bolt at this location. Please confirm this will be acceptable as modeled.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. RESPONSE 2 George Metzger 4/28/14 Bolt nearest to the weld access hole as shown on SK2 need not be provided.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1636 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1334	SSS - Curved Vertical E.O.S. Plate Connection at Light Column	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached detail titled, "Built-Up Plate Assembly" (Skanska RFI SK1) for radius plate assembly. Confirm this is acceptable.				Confirmed.			
T-1335	SSS - Roof Deck HSS Bracing	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached CD RFI # 319.1 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 4:				1) Confirmed.			
1) Confirm this general layout locating the shop splices is acceptable.				2) Confirmed.			
2) Confirm dimensions.				3) Not acceptable. The weld between the thru shear plate and the HSS column shown on 9/S1-7632 varies from 1/2" to 3/4" per schedule 8/S1-7632. The dimension should vary accordingly.			
3) Confirm dimension.				4) It is unclear what is referred to as "location points" and what needs confirmation. PJP welding shown on the sketch to connect the 1/2 inch thick stiffener plates to the column and the beam comply with what is called out on detail 4/S1-7632 and are acceptable.			
4) Confirm location points for 1/2x3 stiffeners.							
T-1336	SSS - API 5L X65 Pipe to A216 WCC Casting (Field Weld) PQR	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Skanska is currently procuring weld test plates for qualifying field welds to API-5L Grade X65 pipe. For this, we propose to use API 2W plate. Whereas API 5L is strictly a pipe specification, API 2W is a plate specification but is commonly rolled and welded to create API 5L pipe. Below is a direct comparison between API 5L Gr. X65 allowable chemical and mechanical properties with our proposed				Contractor's request is not acceptable in current form. Please provide additional information. Is this request for welding qualifications only? Which grade of API 2W is to be used? Provide API 2W corresponding specification with the RFI or mill report that shows that the material qualifies for API 5L X65 use. Verify if the material that is being proposed to be used for welding qualifications is subject to Buy America clause or not.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1637 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	API-2W plate material. Values for the plate are taken directly from the MTR for the plate we propose to use (attached and highlighted). All values for the API 2W plate we propose to use meet the requirements of the API 5L Grade X65 specification. Please confirm it is acceptable to use the API 2W plate for our PQRs.						If it is, please verify it complies with it.
T-1337	SSS - Train Box Column Cap Plate at GL18	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The Train Box Column cap plates at GL 18 as shown on 5 A/ S1-5050 have been ordered and modeled as 3-1/2" thick plate instead of the 3-1/4" shown. The column flange and web length have been adjusted accordingly. Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed with the 3-1/2" thick cap plate.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1338	SSS - Gridline 18 - Gravity Moment Connections	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory KemererTo: Adamson Associates, Inc. Paul MacPhail</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
At the Roof Park level drawing S1-2604 at near grids F/18 & D/18 detail 8/S1-5032 is called out at the noted locations				1-) Confirmed.			
shown on sketches CD RFI 394 SK1 to SK3. Due to the large tapered girder and the requirement of a moment connection at these locations the doubler plate size has been modified to allow for the 11/16" all around fillet weld called for in detail 8/S1-5032.				2-) Confirmed.			
1) Confirm that doubler plate modifications shown on CD RFI 394 SK2 are allowed.							
2) Confirm that doubler plate modifications shown on CD RFI 394 SK3 are allowed.							
T-1339	SSS - Deck Support Steel at Step in Slab GL 12-14	Closed	04/17/2014	04/27/2014	04/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory KemererTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Refer to SK-1 thru SK-3 for 3 locations at step in slab between GL 12 - 14:				1) Confirmed. Provide a 3/8"x3" full depth stiffener at the W24 beam (same side as the bent plate). Provide 1/4" double sided fillet welds for the stiffener (3 sides - web, flanges). The stiffener shall be located at the middle of the bent plate span.			
1) At section A-A on SK-2 an extended WT will expose the flange through the concrete. Confirm a bent plate as per SK-3 is acceptable.							
2) At section B-B on SK-2 support is required at the extended upper deck over the W12x14 (A4987). Confirm a WT can be added per section B-B.				2) WT is not required. Provide an 18 gauge Z-shaped closure plate to close between the upper and lower decks.			
T-1339.1	SSS - Deck Support Steel at Step in Slab	Closed	05/23/2014	06/02/2014	06/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie AzzolinoTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
RFI SK534 (T-1339) addressed steps in the ground floor slab which occurred between grid lines 12-14. This condition also occurs between the following grids:				Provide a WT per 4 or 5/S1-5002 at locations where the distance between supporting beams is greater than 3'. At other locations where the distance between beam is less than 3', a Z closure plate is sufficient,			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1639 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>2-3, 3-4, 8-9 & 9-9.9 (16 locations).</p> <p>Item #1 added a 3/8" bent plate to support the upper level deck and can be applied at two locations between grid 2-3 as indicated on SK1. At the other 14 locations the step is similar to item #2 of T-1339 which added an 18 gauge Z closure. At grid 12-14 the perpendicular support beam is located within 1'-9" of the step, at the 14 locations listed above the support beam varies from 2'-0" to 6'-0" and at two locations at grid 2-3 no support beam is provided. Refer to SK3 for clarification.</p> <p>Please confirm the 18 gauge Z is sufficient to carry the load of the deck at the 14 locations or provide an alternative detail.</p>						
T-1339.2	SSS - Deck Support Steel at Step in Slab	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	07/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The response to RFI T-1339.1 indicated the zee closure was incorrectly shown on SK-3 and shall be supported on the lower beam, not on top of the deck. We agree the closure would be best supported on the lower beam, however the closure was placed on top of the deck so that the lower deck could bear 3" on the beam as is required for a type 3 deck as per 2/S1-5000.				Option 1 is not acceptable.			
SSK-0355 revises the closure so that the bottom leg is underneath the lower deck and the top leg is above the upper deck. This creates several problems for installation. The most significant being that the closure now needs to be installed before the deck. Typically closures are installed after the deck so that the deck can be used as a working platform. SSK-0355 would require the installation of the closure on open iron, which while possible is not a safe working practice.				Option 2 is acceptable. The 3" minimum bearing requirement may be waived and a bearing of 1-3/4" is acceptable at locations where detail B on SK-1 is applicable.			
Option 1: As a proposed solution to the issues indicated							





Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1341	BGP - Plumbing Opening in Mechanical Room B2203	Closed	04/18/2014	04/28/2014	04/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please see attached drawing for clarification regarding dimension of the plumbing opening above the door in Room B2203. In AI-9215, the door opening and distance between piers is scaled to be 3' -5" and was submitted as a 3 '-5" opening per approved submittal TG0600-102. However in A1-9217 a plumbing opening with a dimensioned width of 3' -11" is shown to span the distance between the piers. If the 3 '-11 " opening dimension is correct as shown, the blockout would cut into the piers. Please confirm the dimension of the plumbing opening and whether or not it is intended to cut into the piers. Please note that the pier dowels have already been installed with the 3'-5" span per approved submittal TG0600-102.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 3'-5" width dimension for the door opening in between piers, described in this RFI, is correct. For updated plumbing opening above the door at Stair 203 (Room B2203), refer to the attached SKA-3142 and SKA-3143.	
<hr/>							
T-1342	BGP - Partition Wall Thickness Above Door Openings	Closed	04/21/2014	05/01/2014	05/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Both the Architectural and Structural Drawings of the partition walls show the plan view at the base of the wall and do not indicate the thickness of the wall above the door openings. Please clarify wall thickness above door openings in partition walls.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For door openings in Reinforced Concrete and CMU partition walls, the wall above the doorway is the same thickness as the adjacent run of wall. To clarify, for example, where the wall is 10" thick CMU and there are 1'-4" thick piers on both sides of the doorway, the wall above the doorway will be 10" thick CMU.	
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1642 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1343	BGP - Lower Concourse Slab Edge and Penetrations	Closed	04/22/2014	05/02/2014	04/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached sketches.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sketches 3132-3137 incorporate changes made to slab edge dimensions and penetrations through the lower concourse as a result of the TG0600-121 submittal review comment and 3.31.2014 IFC drawing set coordination meetings. Please confirm these sheets are to be incorporated into the TG06 scope.					Ethan Heinrich 4/22/2014		
			This RFI is rejected. Please see specification 01 10 40. RFIs shall not be used for questions relating to coordination between trades, or a division of work among Trade Subcontractors.				
<hr/>							
T-1343.1	BGP - Lower Concourse Slab Edge and Penetrations	Closed	04/23/2014	04/23/2014	04/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached sketches.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Architectural sketches SKA 3132-3137 incorporate updates made to slab edge dimensions and penetrations through the lower concourse as a result of the TG0600-121 submittal review comment and 3.31.2014 IFC drawing set coordination meetings held between AAI, WSP, TT, MDS, SCCI, WOJV and TCCO. Please confirm these sheets are to be incorporated into the Transit Center construction scope.					Architectural Sketches SKA 3132-3137 have received updates based on the workshops mentioned in the RFI.		
			For information to be incorporated into the Transit Center Scope, please refer to the attached updated SKAs listed below:				
			- SKA-3132_R2 - SKA-3133_R2 - SKA-3134_R2 - SKA-3135_R1 - SKA-3136_R1 - SKA-3137_R1				
			Modifications from the original documents have been identified with colored clouds as follows:				
			Magenta - items previously shown on the SKAs for the workshop sessions Blue - items updated subsequent to the workshop sessions.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1643 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1345	SSS - Dimension Confirmation for Locating Bolts at GL 16	Closed	04/22/2014	05/02/2014	04/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 336 SK1 & SK2: Confirm it is acceptable to increase the 2" dimension to 3" in order to locate the bolts at the locations provided in RFI SK 193C.* *RFI SK 193C was answered internally by Skanska. The relevant sketch is attached below.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1346	BGP - Column Jackets at Lower Concourse, Vehicle and Bike Ramp	Closed	04/23/2014	05/03/2014	05/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference AI-2842 rev 5, AI-2847 rev 4, AI-2850 rev 5, AI-2853 rev 6, AI-9213 rev 0 and SI-3503 rev 2. 1. See AI-2842, AI-2847 and AI-2850. Please confirm these are the locations of columns to receive column jackets on the concourse level. 2. See AI-9213 details 5 through 8 and AI-2853. These details show 1/2" thick ring with 8" long welded studs (to be used for the installation of column jackets) at the base of columns on the concourse, bike ramp and vehicle ramp levels. AI-2853 does not depict any column jackets at the bike or vehicle ramp levels. Please provide a detail that depicts which columns are to receive jackets at the bike and vehicle ramp levels.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: WOJV received revised response 5/8/2014 1. Confirmed. These columns receive column jackets. We do not show detail references for column jackets at Slab Edge Plans - Refer to the following Lower Concourse Level Zone Plans and Enlarged Plans issued with the MEP Add #3/ASI-116 showing detail references for column jacket details: A1-2202, A1-2207, A1-2210, A1-3005, A1-3006, A1-3007. 2. For columns that receive jackets at the ramp area, refer to SKA-3236 (Updated A1-2250 - Enlarged Ramp Plan). Refer also to A1-9208 (Column Detail Plans, Section References, and Notes) and SKA-3237 for updated A1-9213 (Column Section Details).		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1347	BGP - Column Jacket 1/2" thick x 4" wide Base Plate at Concourse	Closed	04/23/2014	05/03/2014	05/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference S 1-3503 rev 2, detail 6, AI-9208 rev 0 and AI-2842 rev 5. 1. Please see clouded areas of AI-2842. Please confirm			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: The 1/2" thk x 4" wide ring plate around columns are coped at walls. For updated A1-2842, refer to attached SKA-3140.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1644 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>1/2" thick x 4" wide ring base plate is to be continuous around the entire column per details on AI-9208. Please confirm the designer does not want 1/2" ring to be coped where it intersects walls.</p> <p>2. If coping is required, please provide details or direction on coping the 1/2" thick column jacket base plate.</p>						
T-1348	BGP - SFPUC Electric Room Copper Mesh	Closed	04/23/2014	05/03/2014	04/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto						
	REQUEST: <p>The response to RFI 1220.1 included E1-3212 which details the embedded grounding required for the SFPUC Electric Rooms. Note 5 indicates that a #6 copper mesh is to be installed.</p> <p>Please provide the following information:</p> <p>1) Type of mesh (Pure Copper or Copper Coated Steel)</p> <p>2) Required spacing for grid of mesh</p> <p>In addition, please provide a drawing with the dimensions to the location of the #2/0 copper pigtails which stub up into the future switchgear enclosures.</p>	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			REVISED RESPONSE				
			1) Mesh shall be copper. Copper coated steel is not acceptable. Erico or equal.				
			2) Required spacing shall be 8" x 8"				
			The copper pigtails may be stubbed up anywhere within the switchgear footprint/elevated pad area.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1645 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1348.1	BGP - SFPUC Electric Room Copper Mesh	Closed	05/29/2014	06/08/2014	06/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference plan sheet EI-3212.					1) The #6 mesh is to be interconnected to the grounding grid in several locations. Where the #4/0 grid crosses or contacts the mesh, it could be directly connected. Additional connections to the #4/0 grid are required from remote parts of the mesh. These interconnections shall be made with #1 bare CU connections.		
1) Note 4 on plan sheet EI-3212 states, "Cadweld main #4/0 grid to #6 mesh with #1 stranded Cu conductor (typical). Refer to Detail 1/EI-3212." Detail 1/EI-3212 does not show a #1 copper conductor connecting the grid to the mesh. Please confirm the 4/0 grounding grid is to be connected directly to the grounding mesh.					2) The Detail 5/ E1-3212 did not convey a numbered note for this connection. Similar to the response to question 1, this connection refers to additional bond points (using #1 bare CU conductors) between the #4/0 ground grid and the grounding mesh.		
2) Please see the attached Detail 5/EI-3212. Please identify which part of the grounding grid system the highlighted portion belongs to and provide the proper wire size.					3) Yes, the callout refers to using #2 AWG bare CU to the battery racks. The pigtail in Detail 4/E1-3212 is also required to be #2 AWG bare CU to the battery rack.		
3) Detail 5/EI/3212 designates the embedded conductors going to the battery rack as #2. Please confirm this means #2 AWG copper conductors. In addition, no designation is provided on Detail 4/EI-3212 at the pigtail which appears to be for the battery rack in B1289. Please confirm this is pigtail is to be #2 A WG conductor as well.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1348.2	BGP - SFPUC Electric Room Copper Mesh	Closed	06/09/2014	06/09/2014	06/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Judith Long			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: The response to RFI T-1348.1 stated the #6 mesh shown on E1-3212/Detail 1 is to be interconnected to the grounding grid at "several locations" and that the #4/0 grid could be "directly connected" where it crosses or contacts the mesh. This response also stated that all other connections are to be #1bare CU connections. 1) Please provide the exact quantity of connections which are required from the #4/0 grid to the #6 mesh. 2) Please provide the interval distance between required direct connections from the #4/0 grid to the #6 mesh. 3) Plan sheet shows six (6) total #1 "remote connections" in each room. Please confirm this is the proper quantity required.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger: 6/13/14 Per TJPA(Guy HOLLINS) direction, this RFI shall be redirected to the TJPA to forward to SFPUC for response. Matt Ho 6/17/14: 1) RESPONSE: Referring to Details 4 and 5 on Sheet E1-3212 for the West and East Switchgear Rooms, we count 16 locations in the West room and 17 locations in the East room that offer an opportunity to connect the #6 mesh to the #4/0 grid. These locations include all interconnections of the #4/0 grid to ground riser conductors, grid cross connections, grid to pigtails (for equipment grounds), and grid to ground test bar connections. 2) RESPONSE: As noted above, the recommended connections to the mesh do not need to be evenly spaced. The connections can be made by including the mesh in the various connections to the #4/0 grid. 3) RESPONSE: The quantity noted should be adequate. Response by: Matt Ho, SFPUC dated 6/17/14			

T-1349	BGP - Beam B52 Trestle Pile Conflict	Closed	04/23/2014	05/03/2014	04/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: See attached CD S 1-2202 and sketches. Trestle pile No. 88 at GL F5 encroaches into the B52 beam by approximateley 6". In liue of creating the blockout in this beam SCCI proposes to shift the beam 8" to the North. Whith the approval of the beam moving concept, following items will be taken into consideration: 1. Adjacent beam B51 , to the West, has long bars and short bars. these will be placed in to layers.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Ethan Heinrich 4/24/14 Response to RFI comes at no cost to TJPA.			

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1648 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1352	BGP - Manlift 2 Conflict with EJB and Cast in Strut	Closed	04/24/2014	05/04/2014	05/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached sketch The manlift 2 lower concourse blockout is in conflict with an electrical junction box and cast in strut. Please confirm it is acceptable to move the electrical junction box 6inches East to clear the blockout and the cast in strut 6inches North to clear the blockout.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Moving the embedded electrical junction box 6" to the East and cast in strut 6" to the North to clear the Manlift 2 Lower Concourse blockout is acceptable.		
T-1353	SSS - Specification Clarification - Rejectable Flaws	Void	04/30/2014	05/10/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Section 05 10 00 - Structural Steel - 1.8 Quality Assurance by TJPA's Testing Agency - Paragraph D. - Sub. Para. 5 Welding: contains the following provisions: c. Complete joint penetration welds: Test all complete joint penetration welds for soundness by means of either radiographic or ultrasonic testing in accordance with AWS D1.1 and ASTM E164 procedures. All flaws in plate or flange material revealed during such tests shall be repaired by the Contractor at the Contractor's expense. d. Partial penetration welds: Test all partial penetration welds for soundness by means of visual and magnetic particle inspection, unless other methods are specified in the Contract Documents. All flaws in plate or flange material revealed during such tests shall be repaired by the Contractor at the Contractor's expense. Please confirm the intent of the specification is to repair "All rejectable flaws in plate or flange material revealed during such tests" in accordance with D1.1 & D1.8 acceptance criteria.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1649 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1353.1	SSS - Specification Clarification - Rejectable Flaws	Closed	04/30/2014	05/10/2014	05/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Section 05 10 00 - Structural Steel - 1.8 Quality Assurance by TJPA's Testing Agency - Paragraph D. Sub. Para. 5 Welding: contains the following provisions: c. Complete joint penetration welds: Test all complete joint penetration welds for soundness by means of either radiographic or ultrasonic testing in accordance with AWS D1.1 and ASTM E164 procedures. All flaws in plate or flange material revealed during such tests shall be repaired by the Contractor at the Contractor's expense. d. Partial penetration welds: Test all partial penetration welds for soundness by means of visual and magnetic particle inspection, unless other methods are specified in the Contract Documents. All flaws in plate or flange material revealed during such tests shall be repaired by the Contractor at the Contractor's expense. Please confirm the intent of the specification is to repair "All rejectable flaws in plate or flange material revealed during such tests" in accordance with D1.1 & D1.8 acceptance criteria.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1650 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1354	SSS - Response to CS5 Connection Clarification at GL 14	Closed	04/30/2014	05/10/2014	05/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 406 SK1 & SK2: The revised end connection per CS5 Approval Submittal (Package Number: TG0701-77) drawing 5049 (SK1) will interfere with the connection for the W16x26 as shown. Confirm the double angle connection for the W16x26 may be replaced with a shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011 or supply an alternate solution.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Confirmed.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-1355	SSS - CS5 Built Up Frame Beam Dimension	Closed	04/30/2014	05/10/2014	05/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 405 SK1 & SK2: 1'-6 1/4 is correct per A1-2884 as shown on SK2. Confirm 1'-6 1/4 remains the current dimension or confirm that the dimension has been revised to 1'-4 1/4.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: AAI noted correction on shop drawing 2616 is current. Please see Architectural Drawing A1-2884 issued March 31,2014 in the IFC package.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-1356	SSS - Deck Support at Slab Opening GL 15	Closed	04/30/2014	05/10/2014	05/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 400 SK1 & SK2: Supply a detail showing how to support the slab on the west side of the slab opening.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: The slab at the transfer girder is to be supported per 8/S1-3705. Slab just west of the opening shall be reinforced by a C-channel per detail 12/S1-5003. The response (reference to 8/S1-3705) is called out on the plan and 12/S1-5003 is a typical detail in the Contract Documents. We disagree with the claim that this RFI is a "cost increase" since the data is in the Contract Documents.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please see attached RFI SK 525B for reference: For the rounded cover plate as shown in the CD RFI 393 SK 1, please confirm that it is acceptable to use a cut section of Round HSS that fits over the outside of the brace within 3/16". The grade of steel for the HSS cover plate would be the same as the HSS brace.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-1359	SSS - Double Angle Connection Interference GL 8G	Closed	04/30/2014	05/10/2014	05/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 403 SK1 & SK2: The double angle connection per 1/S1-5010 will not work at the noted location as it fouls the stiffener plate as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to use detail 2/S1-5011 with a one-sided 3/8" PJP weld due to the lack of welding access. If not, supply an alternate detail.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed. Provide 3 equally spaced bottom flange braces per 8/S1-5015 at the W40x183 beam from the south side.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-1360	SSS - Shear Plate Connection Interference at GL 9F	Closed	04/30/2014	05/10/2014	05/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: At grid location 9/F at the ground level (S1-2303) the kicker brace per detail 5/S1-5015 shares the full depth shear plate of the W40x211 above. Due to the position of the bolts at the bottom flange the shear plate cannot be increased to 1" thick, as required by 5/S1-5015, without clashing with the bolts. Reference attached sketch CD RFI # 402 SK1 & SK2. Please provide a connection for this location that meets all requirements.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: The shear plate thickness need not be increased from 1/2" to 1" at the highlighted location. Stitch plates with varying thicknesses may be used to accommodate differences in the thicknesses of the shear plate and the upper gusset plate	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1361	SSS - Bearing Pads foul beam flange	Closed	04/30/2014	05/10/2014	05/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
See attached CD RFI # 401 SK1 & SK2:				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The Scougal Rubber Bearing Pads (Package Number TG0701-95.1) foul the flange of the W40x327 as shown.				The 2 - 3/4" clearance between the W12x65 beam and the W24x68 beam shown on 1A/S1-5021 may be increased and the bearing assembly may be lowered so that the bearing pads clear the W40x327 flange. Adjust the hanger length accordingly. A minimum clear horizontal clearance of 3/4" shall be provided between the pads and adjacent structure.			
Please provide a solution.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1362	BGP - Lower Concourse Confirmation	Closed	05/02/2014	05/12/2014	05/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>See attached submittal sheet D2.28 and sheet E1-2204. Response comment to Submittal Package TG0600-121.1 on sheet D2.28 between gridlines 12-13 B-C, calls out "conduits are now embedded in the lower concourse slab". Per the TG0600-121.1 submittal review comment meeting held on 4/30/14, please confirm that embedded conduits FE045,FE051,FE052,FE058 incorporated on sheet E1-2204 dated 03/31/14 will continue to be surface mounted and blockout will be left in place for penetrating the slab.</p> <p>Please confirm attached sketch SKA-3148 showing the coupler setting out dimensions for the future corridor wall at B1 level, GL 10, B-C as reviewed with AAI in our slab edge workshop held April 30, 2014</p> <p>Please confirm rebar for Lower Concourse Floor drains marked "Future" are to be trimmed as detailed on 1/S1-3501 but not blocked out.</p> <p>For door openings not dimensioned on architectural slab, floor or wall plans, please confirm it is acceptable to size door rough openings in the lower concourse partition walls to be 4.5" larger than doors scheduled on sheets A1-9700, A1-9701, A1-9702. If not please provide a door jamb detail for these openings.</p> <p>Please confirm that Lower Concourse telecom penetrations shown on slab edge plans A1-2841 through A1-2851 to be 4" x 90 GRS elbows with a factory 30" radius as shown on 6/TE1-8014.</p>					<p>1. Embedded conduits:</p> <p>WSP Response: WSP does not object to the proposal of surface mounting conduits and retaining the slab blockout in these specific referenced zones. For other areas where embedded conduits are indicated, WSP recommends the embedment in this phase.</p> <p>2. SKA-3148 showing coupler setting out dimensions for future corridor walls at B1 Level, GL10/B-C:</p> <p>AAI Response: Confirmed.</p> <p>3. Future Floor Drains:</p> <p>WSP/MDS Response: It is confirmed that the lower concourse floor drains marked "Future" will be trimmed as detailed on 1/S1-3501 but not blocked out.</p> <p>TT Response: The reinforcement for the Lower Concourse slab at Floor Drains marked as "Future" are to follow detail 1/S1-3501. It is acceptable to trim bars.</p> <p>4. Door Rough Opening:</p> <p>AAI Response: As stated in workshop meeting April 30th, 2014, AAI cannot provide rough opening dimensions, as the rough openings may vary between manufacturers. It was agreed that WO will check on specified door manufacturers for the appropriate door rough opening requirements and provide this information to sub-contractor.</p> <p>5. B1 Level Telcom Conduit Penetrations on slab edge plans:</p> <p>SMW response: 4"x 90 GRS Elbow with factory 36" min - 42" desired radius cast into concrete beam as shown on 6/TE1-8014.</p>		
			RESPONSE WOJV 5/13/14				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1655 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1362.1	BGP - Telecom Cast-In Elbow Radius - Lower Concourse	Closed	4. Door Rough Opening				
			For door openings not dimensioned on architectural slab, floor, or wall plans, size door rough openings in the lower concourse partition walls to be 4.5" larger than doors scheduled on sheets A1-9700, A1-9701, A1-9702.				
T-1362.1	BGP - Telecom Cast-In Elbow Radius - Lower Concourse	Closed	05/14/2014	05/24/2014	05/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
T-1362.1	BGP - Telecom Cast-In Elbow Radius - Lower Concourse	Closed	Co-Author:				
			REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>
			See attached RFI T-1362 Response.				
T-1362.1	BGP - Telecom Cast-In Elbow Radius - Lower Concourse	Closed	The response to RFI T-1362 states that 4"x90 elbows with factory 36" min - 42" radius are to be cast into concrete beam as shown on 6/TE1-8014. This contradicts with the 30" radius called out on sheet 6/TE1-8014 and 30" radius confirmed in the comprehensive layout drawings, TG0600-121.1. Please confirm if the 30" radius elbows currently installed per TG0600-121.1 will need to be swapped out for 4"x90 GRS ELBOW with Factory 36" min - 42", as stated in the response to RFI T-1362.				
			SM&W Response: NO, 30" bend radius is not confirmed or approved, the minimum bend radius shall be 10 times conduit trade size (internal diameter), this means SM&W will accept commercially available factory bends of minimum 36", with 42" preferred.				
			See attached updated detail TSK-0040, which supersedes TE1-8014				
T-1363	BGP - Vehicle Ramp Beam Support Embeds - Threaded Rod, PL Washer and Nut	Closed	05/05/2014	05/15/2014	05/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
T-1363	BGP - Vehicle Ramp Beam Support Embeds - Threaded Rod, PL Washer and Nut	Closed	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Filip Filipic				
			REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Please reference detail 1 and detail 10 on S1-3411. Please also reference RFI T-1326 and attached sketch BES-001.				
T-1363	BGP - Vehicle Ramp Beam Support Embeds - Threaded Rod, PL Washer and Nut	Closed	RFI T-1326 provides angles at which vehicle support beams intersect the foundation walls. As shown on attached sketch BES-001 the built up 8x8 angle will be				
			Provide tapered washers or add tapered steel plates that develop full bearing between the nut and the built up angle.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1656 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1364	adjusted to match the angle at which the applicable beam intersects the wall. S1-3411 detail 1 and 10 call out for a 1-1/4" diameter threaded rod with plate washers and nuts running through slotted holes in the 8x8 angle. These rods, washers, and nuts will not be perpendicular to the 8x8 angle due to the angles at which the beams intersect the walls.	Closed	05/05/2014	05/15/2014	05/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Please confirm no wedge, spacer, or shim will be required between the 8x8 built up angle and the plate washers to evenly distribute the load.						
	BSE - Geothermal Field 12 Subgrade Acceptance						
	From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Kelly Phariss						
	REQUEST: Please confirm Geothermal Field 12 buttress area subgrade was accpeted based on the methods TCCO, ARUP, WOJV and BBII discussed in the field, as follows: 1. Aerate the area 2. Re-compact with compaction equipment 3. Inspect / Accept Please see attached email from ARUP (Stephen McLandrich) to TCCO (Jack Adams)	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: ARUP Response: Confirmed	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1365	SSS - Train Box Column Cap Plate Hole	Closed	05/06/2014	05/16/2014	05/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: With reference to the Train Box Column cap plate, our machine shop has drilled (1) non-standard hole in (1) p395 cap plate due to a broken tool. See attached inspection report and photos. The hole is dimensionally in the correct position but has an internal spiral cut. The minimum diameter is 1-9/16" (1.563) and the max diameter is 1-49/64" (1.770). Please confirm if one of the following is acceptable: Option 1 - Proceed with the as-built condition, no further action required. Option 2 - Reem out the hole to 1-13/16 and use a 1-1/2" bolt. AISC Table J3.3 page 16.1-121 allows oversize hole in slip critical connections, a hardened washer will be installed over the oversized hole. (see attached) Option 3 - Drill the hole to 1-13/16 and use a 1-3/4" diameter bolt.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Both option 2 and option 3 are acceptable. This approval does not set a precedent, evaluation will be made case by case for similar issues in future.		
T-1366	SSS - Slab Opening Clarifications	Closed	05/06/2014	05/16/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Adamson Associates, Inc. Paul MacPhail			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 410 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) The Architectural Slab Edge Drawings indicate round slab openings greater than 8". Confirm structural perimeter steel is not required at all round openings or supply a detail. 2) It is not clear what is meant by large openings. Does detail 12/S1-5003 apply to all rectangular/square slab openings shown on the Architectural Slab Edge Drawings? Please clarify.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) For openings greater than 8" and up to 2' provide rebar as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0354. 2) The large opening detail applies for openings that are greater than 2' but limited to the dimensions specified on 12/S1-5003.		
T-1366.1	SSS - Slab Opening Clarifications	Closed	06/02/2014	06/12/2014	06/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1658 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Refer to attached CD RFI 410.1 SK1: 1) The response in RFI T-1366 (SK 551, CD 410) does not address rectangular slab openings where one side is less than 2'-0 and the other side is over 2'-0. See the example slab openings and clarify the perimeter steel requirement for all rectangular slab openings where one side is over 2'-0 and the other side is less than 2'-0. 2) The noted slab openings along with other slab openings shown on the Architectural Slab Edge Plans are NOT shown on S1-2302 and other structural plans. Confirm the slab openings on the Architectural Slab Edge Plans supersede the structural plans with updated structural drawings to follow.				1) The 2' dimension limit stated in the response to RFI T-1366 is the larger of the dimensions of the rectangular openings. So for a rectangular opening where one side is over 2' and the other side is less than 2', detail 12/S1-5003 shall apply. 2) Confirmed.		
T-1366.2	SSS - Slab Opening Clarifications	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Following up on RFIs T-1366 and T-1366.1, please find attached table and exhibits of small slab openings with at least one side that is 2'-0" long. For each of the minor slab openings included in the following table, please confirm that the direction provided in the aforementioned RFI response is to install framing channels per 12/S1-5003. In some cases, the slab openings are only between 8"-12" wide. Otherwise, please indicate that it is acceptable to provide rebar as shown in SKS-0354 per RFI T1366 instead.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide perimeter steel per response to RFI 1366.1 around openings where the side of the opening that is perpendicular to the deck span is greater than 2'. For openings highlighted in green, the perimeter steel per detail 12/S1-5003 is not shown on floor plans because 12/S1-5003 is a typical detail. We disagree with the claim that the perimeter steel for these openings constitutes a change order. Some of the openings highlighted in red are shown on both architectural and structural drawings. These openings are noted in the schedule shown on attached sketch SKS-0369. Other openings that are missing from the structural drawings will be added in a future ASI.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1367	SSS - IFRM Prime Coat Requirement	Closed	05/06/2014	05/16/2014	05/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Stacy Wilson			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Specification section 07 81 23 (Intumescent Fire Resistive Materials), issued with Field Order 00027, lists three acceptable basis of design manufacturers for IFRM systems. Additionally, specification section 07 81 23, 1.7.C.2 states that the intumescent fire protection system is to be from a single source, indicating that the prime coat Skanska shop applies must be from the same manufacturer as the subsequent coats that are field applied. Per the monthly schedule delivered to TJPA, the IFRM contractor is not to be selected until 10/16/14. Skanska requires direction as to which of the three approved basis of design manufacturers will be used on subsequent coats in order to obtain a recommendation from that intumescent coating manufacturer as to the appropriate primer to be utilized. Alternatively, priming of IFRM steel can be removed from Skanska's scope and added to the scope of the IFRM contractor. This will result in a cost increase. Please provide direction.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TJPA has rejected this RFI per 01 10 40 1.6 C 2 c.			
<hr/>							
T-1368	BGP - Moment Frame Beam Perimeter Stirrup at Column Supports	Closed	05/06/2014	05/16/2014	05/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Due to the construction sequence, where the moment frame beams intersect a column support, the single-piece moment frame beam perimeter stirrups cannot be installed as shown in 2/S1-3600. Please confirm that it is acceptable to use an alternate 3-piece perimeter stirrup configuration where the moment frame beams intersect a column support. See the attached sketch for details		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1369	SSS - Weld Electrode Subcomponents	Closed	05/07/2014	05/17/2014	05/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams	

Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton

REQUEST:

During a Quality Control review, performed by Thompson Metal Fab for compliance with the "Buy America" clause of the Contract, a question was noted regarding the proposed use of ESAB Spoolarc F9A4-ENi4 Submerged Arc Welding (SAW) Electrode for the welding of the HPS70W steel in the Train Box Columns. The attached letter from ESAB, dated April 22, 2014, describes the process that ESAB employs in the manufacture of the referenced product. It notes the fact that the tensile and yield properties of the specific filler metal alloy required to meet the Contract specifications of 90XX are not offered or produced by any mills within the United States. The alloy is provided as a "Greenrod" and is acquired outside of the States. The cold drawing, proprietary processing and packaging of the product is done, by ESAB, wholly within the United States and uses, other than the alloy itself, domestically produced and acquired materials. The Certificate of Conformance from ESAB states that the product is manufactured in the United States (attached).

An inquiry was made, by Skanska, to Lincoln Electric regarding a similar product classification that met the Contract requirement (F9A4-ENi5). Lincoln Electric advised Skanska that they also receive "Greenrod" and strip from sources outside of the United States for this product.

A subsequent Quality Control review by The Herrick Corporation revealed a similar condition for the use of the Lincoln Electric product Outershield XLH-70, AWS classification E70T-1C-H8, FCAW process weld electrode. Once again, Lincoln has indicated that "Greenrod" for weld electrode products may not be domestically available and may be sourced from throughout the world. However, the manufacturing process, like ESAB, is done wholly within the United States. The Certificate of Conformance from Lincoln also states that the product is manufactured in the United States (see attached certificate and letter dated 04/28/2014).

The CFR Part 661.5 of the Clause gives the following definitions:

c) The steel and iron requirements apply to all construction materials made primarily of steel or iron and used in

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

The Contract Documents are clear, and Buy America requirements can reasonably be derived from a review of the Contract Documents. RFI are not an appropriate request to the TJPA for interpretation if products meet Buy America Certification.

The Contractor shall submit the Buy America Certification and the Prime Contractor is responsible for ensuring that lower tier subcontractors are in compliance.

REF: SECTION 00 08 13 - SPECIFIC PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

SECTION 00 08 13 - USDOT REQUIREMENTS FOR AGREEMENTS WITH THE TJPA



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1661 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>infrastructure projects such as transit or maintenance facilities, rail lines and bridges. These items include, but are not limited to, structural steel or iron beams and columns, running rail and contact rail. These requirements do not apply to steel or iron used as components or subcomponents of other manufactured products or rolling stock, or to bimetallic power rail incorporating steel or iron components.</p> <p>d) For a manufactured product to be considered produced in the United States:</p> <p>(1) All of the manufacturing process for the product must take place in the United States; and</p> <p>(2) All of the components of the product must be of U.S. origin. A component is considered of U.S. origin if it is manufactured in the United States, regardless of the origin of its subcomponents.</p> <p>Skanska has interpreted this clause to indicate that both ESAB and Lincoln supply welding electrodes for this Project that are wholly manufactured within the United States and that they satisfy the requirement of the "Buy America" clause.</p> <p>Please confirm that the use of manufactured weld electrodes on the Project for which the manufacturer is providing a Certificate of Conformance indicating that the entire manufacturing process is performed in the United States, but may contain alloy material produced elsewhere, meet the intent of the Contract "Buy America" clause.</p>						
T-1370	SSS - Roof Level Stiffener Plate GL 16	Closed	05/07/2014	05/17/2014	05/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 404 SK1 & SK2: The 3/4" thick stiffener plates per 1/S1-7604 will foul the beam connections above. Please provide a solution.				Stop the stiffener plates short of the WF beam bottom flanges.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1662 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1371	SSS - CP1 Connection Support Stiffeners	Closed	05/07/2014	05/17/2014	05/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Following our discussion on the CP01 support stiffener welds at Thursday 05/01/14 structural issues coordination meeting, Skanska proposes to remove the "all-around" designation on the 3/4" PJP weld shown in section C 1/S1-8001 and replace with 'four sides' written in the weld tail. The welds will terminate at the start of the clips at the internal corners. Please confirm this is acceptable. (See sketch below)			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. However we disagree with the "time increase" impact of this RFI. This modification was proposed by the Contractor in a Structural Coordination meeting and we did not take an exception to it. If there is an "impact" to be claimed for this modification, please provide all around welding per contract documents.		
T-1372	BGP - CDSM Soldier Pile Encroachment Area 16	Closed	05/08/2014	05/18/2014	05/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A - G This RFI addresses the impact of the encroaching CDSM soldier piles (SP) on the north & south wall in mat slab pour Area 16 as well as all levels of the encroachment into the foundation wall between CDSM piles 343 to 440 on the north east and south elevations Plan see exhibit - A. Exhibit - B & C depict the location and degree in which the SP are encroaching. WOJV proposal North elevation on gridline A (343 -369): (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM pile 351 to 353. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 352. Originally these were WR1 reinforcement areas #11 @8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11 @6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D). WOJV proposal East elevation on gridline 35 (369 -414): (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM pile 373 to 375,379 to 381, 387 to 399 & 404 to 406. WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 374,380,388,390,391,395,398 & 403. Originally these were WR1 reinforcement areas #11 @8"oc			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The contractor proposed revisions to foundation wall reinforcement due to encroaching CDSM Piles in Area 16 are acceptable. Update Area 16 shop drawings affected by the shoring encroachment info presented in this RFI and submit them for record.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>WOJV proposal on the South elevation on gridline A (415 - 440): (See Exhibit - B) Between CDSM piles 415 to 417 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 419, This foundation wall area was originally a embedment column (C -023) with reinforcement in this area was a double layer of #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to double layer of #11@5"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail B/Sk.4 option 2 (Exhibit -F).</p> <p>Between CDSM piles 417 to 420 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 34" to clear the encroaching SP 416 Originally these were WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>Between CDSM piles 423 to 425-426, 428 to 434 & 438 to 441-442 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33" to clear the encroaching SP 424,428 to 432 & 441 Originally these were WR1 reinforcement areas #11@8"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@6"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.1 (Exhibit - D).</p> <p>Between CDSM piles 425-426 to 428 WOJV is proposing to decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33" to clear the encroaching SP 426 & 427 This foundation wall area was originally a embedment column with reinforcement in this area was a double layer of #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to double layer of #11@5"OC this reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.4 option 1 (Exhibit -F).</p> <p>Between CDSM piles 434 to 438 WOJV is proposing to</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1664 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>decrease the specified 36" wall thickness to 33" to clear the encroaching SP 436 & 437 Originally this was a WR2 reinforcement areas #11@6"oc EF vertically and would change to #11@5"OC, the reduction in foundation wall thickness would be compensated by reducing the rebar spacing predicated on Detail A/Sk.3 option 2 (Exhibit -E)</p> <p>In all other areas without CDSM pile encroachment issues the reinforcement will remain unchanged as per the Contract drawings.</p> <p>See Exhibit - G shows a typical detail of transition between modified reinforcement to contract reinforcement.</p> <p>These solutions if approved would be incorporated into the TG06 shop drawings. Please confirm if these solutions would be acceptable.</p>						
T-1372.1	BGP - W140- C23 Embedded Columns Rebar	Closed	12/30/2014	01/09/2015	01/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: S1-3300, S1-3306 Locatoion: Zone 4, Train Box Gridline: J/34.8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Gerdau's RFI#147, RFI T-1372			Provided that (48) embedded column reinforcing bars are present within the 72" embedded column width, the condition is acceptable for the first wall lift.				
The Area 16 East End Seismic Joint on the South Wall (W140) does not allow for the placement of all 56ea #11 vertical bars @5" OC as called out in RFI T-1372.			RFI T-1372 indicates that the CDSM wall encroachment is near the base of the wall. Additional reinforcing (reduced spacing) within the embedded column per RFI T-1372 will not be required in subsequent lifts provided that the wall vertical reinforcing is spread back to that of the non-encroached 36" wall by the top of the wall second lift. Contractor shall plan for transitioning wall tie lengths accordingly.				
Instead, only 48ea #11 vertical bars can be installed at 5" OC before the vertical bars interfere with the seismic joint.							
Note that C-23 embedded column only requires 48ea #11 vertical bars.							
Please confirm that it is acceptable to eliminate 2ea vertical bars on each face (4 faces for a total of 8 vertical bars) out at the eastern most end of Wall W140 at East			In the event that contract embedded column width cannot be restored to the non-encroaching condition within the second lift or that additional encroachments are found going up, contractor shall propose method of providing additional reinforcing similar to that				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1665 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Seismic Joint.					proposed in RFI T-1372. Starter bars for such additional reinforcing may be placed in the second lift and need not be present within the first.	
T-1373	BGP - Modifying Slump Limits for Mix 1557205	Closed	05/07/2014	05/17/2014	05/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference attached letter dated 5/2/2014, authored by Robert Foley, CEMEX QC Manager. On March 20, 2014 the column mix was modified to increase average compressive strength due to low test results for laboratory cured cylinders. The changes that were made to mix #1557205 to increase strength are having an effect on the slump variability. SCCI and CEMEX propose the design slump range be increased to 6 to 9 inches. Is this proposed change acceptable?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable for Mix 1557205.			
T-1374	SSS - Stair Post Connection Clarifications	Closed	05/08/2014	05/18/2014	05/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 413 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the connection is acceptable as shown or supply an alternate detail. 2) Confirm the connection is acceptable as shown or supply an alternate detail.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Acceptable, except align the W24x55 beam to the centerline of the posts. Provide offset double angle connection similar to RFI T-1201. 2) Align the W24x55 beam to the centerline of the posts. Provide offset double angle connection similar to RFI T-1201. Similarly, on the north side of the stair, the W14x43 beam north of GL D.8 shall be moved to aligned with the centerline of the stair posts.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1666 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1375	SSS - Connection Clarifications	Closed	05/08/2014	05/18/2014	05/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 416 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the missing beam size is a W12x14. 2) The connections will foul each other. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the WF beam with a shear plate per 1/S15011.				1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.		Note that the connection detail at the HSS 10x10x5/8 is called out as 5/S1-5013 on SK1. However, the connection detail at the HSS is per 8/S1-7630 and is called out on C/S1-7130. Slotted holes are not required at the connection.	
T-1376	SSS - Welding Connection Clarification	Closed	05/08/2014	05/18/2014	05/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 417 SK1 & SK2: Supply welding information for thick flange/plate into thin flange @ moment connection.				For the locations covered by this RFI only, bevel the W40 beam flange to a depth that matches with the thickness of W30x99.			
T-1378	BGP - SFPUC Electrical Room Grounding	Closed	05/09/2014	05/19/2014	05/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</div><div></div></div><div>To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles</div><div>Answered By: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Spencer Sayles</div></div> <div>Co-Author:</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please reference RFI T-1227.1 - SFPUC Plate Grounding. Please confirm the SFPUC Transformer mounting plate is to be installed by a future contractor and SCCI is only to stub the grounding conductor into each corner of the Electrical Room(see Note 1 on Plate Sheet EI-2203). If SCCI is to install this SFPUC Transformer mounting plate, provide the specifications, including but not limited to material type, size and thickness.				It is confirmed that SFPUC Transformer mounting plate in transformer vault room elevated slabs will be supplied and installed by future contractors. However, SCCI BGP base bid scope needs to be increased from the corner of the three electrical rooms originally bid in BGP. This increase shall be priced and coordinated as described in RFI 1227.1 sketch in order for grounding conductors to be embedded in the structural Concourse slab. Grounding conductors must be extended from the corner of each Electrical Room to each future pad location and stubbed up so that transformer mounting plates can be connected by future electrical contractor. Please provide a sketch and product detail of how BGP electrical intends to implement this grounding extension so that SFPUC			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1667 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>review can proceed as described on new sheets E1-3208, E1-3209 and E1-3210</div> <div>IFC drawings (dated 3.31.2014) issued in Field Order 27 contain updated electrical drawings. BGP contractor should review these drawings for any modifications to Electrical scope bid during TG06. This is to include Grounding and embedded conduit for F-15 EJB conduit. New electrical scope other than that described above is not currently requested at this time.</div>							
T-1378.1	BGP - SFPUC Electrical Room Grounding	Closed	05/30/2014	06/09/2014	06/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please provide a drawing which shows the dimensioned locations of the SFPUC Transformer plates so the grounding tails can be stubbed out of the slab at the correct locations.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached SKA-3477 which shows updated dimensions of SFPUC transformer plate locations at vault rooms# B1323 and B1324.				

T-1379	BGP - Pit and Pile Discrepancy at GL 27/E	Closed	05/12/2014	05/22/2014	05/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference attached contract drawings sheet S1-2026. The mat slab pit located at Gridline 27 and E has a width of 2'-6". The pile located within this specific pit (see marked up S1-2026 is a 36" pile as detailed. Please provide new dimensions for the pit incorporating the 36" pile.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Accommodation of temporary conditions such as trestle piles and bridge piers is the responsibility of the contractor. For the trestle pile at Grid 26.7, the contractor is free to propose to the Design Team that the pit be temporarily widened to minimize the complexity of a blackout. Contractor shall include means and detailing of restoring the pit to its planned dimension.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1379.1	BGP - Pit and Pile Discrepancy at GL 27-E	Void	05/21/2014	05/31/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: SCCI is in receipt of RFI T-1379. SCCI disagrees with the response provided in the aforementioned RFI. S1-2026 illustrates a 30" wide pile in a 30" wide pit at gridline 27/E. However, Submittal #TG0300- 284.4, which was reviewed and approved by the design team, shows the previously mentioned trestle pile as a 36" wide pile. It has also been confirmed in the field this pile is 36" wide pile. Please provide applicable details (similar to D4 on SI-3009 & D2 on SI-3007) for permanent elements in the mat slab construction, including but not limited to galvanized sleeves and structural steel reinforcing, for the pit at GL 27/E which contains a 36" wide pile, not 30" as shown on the design drawing S 1-2026.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1379.2	BGP - Pit and Pile Discrepancy at GL 27/E	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference attached SI-2026, SI-3007, SI-3009, SCCI Mat Slab Comprehensive Drawing S113.0, Gerdau Mat Slab Rebar Shop Drawing, and Sketch 113-001. For constructability reasons, SCCI proposes to enlarge the pit at GL 27/E in order to facilitate the installation of the trestle pile sleeve and cap. Please see sketch 113-001 for details and dimensions. Rebar would be altered to accommodate enlarged pit dimensions. See sketch 113-001 for rebar details for pour-back portion of pit once pile is removed. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed for dimensions assumed. Notify design team field representative(s) of any changes resulting from as-built pile survey.		
T-1380	SSS - Field Weld Access at Deck Support Angles	Closed	05/12/2014	05/22/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Refer to 1/S1-3701 for deck support angle welded to Transfer Girder web detail.</p> <p>Due to restricted access the decker cannot make the required field welds when the top of deck to underside of Transfer Girder flange is less than 12". See attached SK1 for clarification.</p> <p>1) Confirm a 3/8" bent plate can be welded to the toe of the top flange.</p> <p>2) Confirm the weld indicated on SK1 is acceptable.</p> <p>3) Confirm the deformed anchor rods can be welded to the bent plate.</p> <p>Where deck to underside of girder exceeds 12" the deck support angle will be detailed as per 1/S1-3701.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1). Welding of the deck to the support angle may be performed from the underside, using 1/8" fillet weld, 3" long at 12" on center</p> <p>2) See response #1</p> <p>3) See response #1.</p>		
T-1380.1	<p>SSS - Field Weld Access at Deck Support Angles</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p>	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>	
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>After reviewing the response to T-1380 there are several items of concern:</p> <p>A. Access from the underside will not always be possible. At certain locations the perimeter wall bracing and rebracing that will remain in place during the deck installation on operation at Ground Level is in close proximity to the transfer girder and will restrict the mobility of a scissor or lift required for a welder to reach the work point from the lower concourse slab, approximately 30' below.</p> <p>B. To provide an effective weld from the underside, the deck lower flange is required to overhang the toe of the angle. In order to achieve this, shifting the deck may result in the loss of bearing at other locations. If the deck can't be shifted a 12ga minimum flashing plate will be required, see details 3 & 4 on SK1.</p> <p>C.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1. Confirmed.</p> <p>2. Confirmed.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Effective concrete placement will be an issue if adequate clearance from the top of deck flute to bottom of girder flange is not established.</p> <p>To move forward we propose the following:</p> <p>1. Where d<7" we will use stock angle sizes up to 8x4x1/2" (LLV) welded to the toe of the flange, see detail 1.</p> <p>2. Where d>7" but <15" we will use an overhead 1/8" fillet from the underside as per the response to T-1380 (where accessible), see detail 2. This will allow a minimum of 4" clearance from top of deck flute to underside of flange for placement of concrete.</p> <p>Where the bottom flute does not overhang the toe of the angle and shifting the deck creates a loss of bearing at another location, a 12ga min flashing will be welded to the angle and deck bottom flute, see detail 3 & 4.</p> <p>Please confirm items 1 & 2 are acceptable.</p>						
T-1381	SSS - CVN Testing For Secondary Material	Closed	05/12/2014	05/22/2014	05/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The response to RFI T-1034 indicates that secondary steel components (stiffeners, connection plates, continuity plates, etc.) are to be CVN tested in accordance with their respective ASTM specification. In the CS05 (TG0701-077) and CS07 (TG0701-079) submittal packages, Skanska's detailer inadvertently tagged the spandrel shear plates and web reinforcement plates at the Bus Deck level to receive CVN, Frequency P testing. These same components were not tagged for CVN testing in the CS1, CS2, CS3, CS4, and CS6 packages and the drawings were approved with no comment on the CVN requirements.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
For the subject material, the governing ASTM 572 specification indicates that supplementary CVN, Frequency P testing is not required unless specifically indicated in the contract documents. In accordance with							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1671 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the response to RFI T-1034, Skanska has proceeded without CVN-P testing for the following secondary components: (Note that the material listed has been ordered without Frequency P testing.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Bus Deck Spandrel PlatesBus Deck Web Reinforcement PlatesBus Deck Drag Connection PlatesRoof Level Fabricated Nodes (as per submittal package TG0701-097.1)Other secondary materials (stiffeners, connection plates, continuity plates, etc.) <p>In preparation for the resubmittal of CS05 and CS07 drawing packages, Skanska will remove the CVN remarks for these components to conform to the RFI T-1034 response, the ASTM specifications, and the previously approved packages.</p> <p>Please confirm concurrence.</p>						
T-1382	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 12	Closed	05/14/2014	05/24/2014	05/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A - B Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 12 for location plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north and south elevations due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall due to encroachment of the CDSM beams as well as typical cross sections of the revised spandrel beams. RFI T - 0784.1 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of Area 12.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Modifications for the spandrel beam at locations outlined are acceptable.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1672 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please confirm that these modifications as outlined at these locations are acceptable.</p>							
T-1383	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 13	Closed	05/14/2014	05/24/2014	05/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titche	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - B				Modifications for the spandrel beam at locations outlined are acceptable.			
Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 13 for location plan see exhibit - A							
Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north and south elevations due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall due to encroachment of the CDSM beams as well as typical cross sections of the revised spandrel beams.							
RFI T - 1216.1 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of Area 13.							
Please confirm that these modifications as outlined at these locations are acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1673 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1384	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 14	Closed	05/14/2014	05/24/2014	05/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - B					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 14 for location plan see exhibit - A					Modifications for the spandrel beam at locations outlined are acceptable. We assume that the RFI incorrectly refers to RFI T-1384 for the extent of modifications to foundation wall in Area 14. We assume intended reference was RFI T-1287.		
Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north and south elevations due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall due to encroachment of the CDSM beams as well as typical cross sections of the revised spandrel beams.					WOJV Response: RFI T-1287 is confirmed.		
RFI T - 1384 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of Area 14.							
Please confirm that these modifications as outlined at these locations are acceptable.							
T-1385	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 15	Closed	05/14/2014	05/24/2014	05/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Documents: Exhibits A - B					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 15 for location plan see exhibit - A					Modifications for the spandrel beam at locations outlined are acceptable.		
Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north and south elevations due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall due to encroachment of the CDSM beams as well as typical cross sections of the revised spandrel beams.							
RFI T - 1218.1 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of Area 15.							



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1675 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1387	SSS - Erection Plan Temporary Lugs	Closed	05/12/2014	05/22/2014	05/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
During a recent structural issues coordination meeting, Skanska raised a concern regarding a submittal response received with package TG0701-29. Specifically, Skanska flagged a comment that indicated our temporary erection aids at the exterior moment frame columns needed to be located 36" below the moment frame beam to column connection at the bus deck level and also 36" away from the weld joint between the column and cast node/transfer girder at ground level. See attached drawings for ease of reference.				Confirmed.			
As discussed during the meeting, please confirm that this is not mandatory; and, if Skanska opts to leave the lugs as shown on the attached documents, it is acceptable.							
T-1388	SSS - Framing Connection Interference at GL7G	Closed	05/13/2014	05/23/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 414 SK1 & SK2: The connections for the W16x26 beams foul the connection for the W40x149 per 1/S1-5019. Confirm it is acceptable to reduce the 1'-11 dimension to 1'-6 and supply shear plate connections for the W16x26 beams per 1/S1-5011 as shown. If not, supply a new detail.				Confirmed.			
T-1389	SSS - Stud Comment Clarification on Decking Drawings	Closed	05/13/2014	05/23/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
With reference to the Linden Steel decking drawings the reviewer's comment references general note DK-5 - Distribute steel studs uniformly over beam span unless otherwise noted on drawings. Maximum spacing of ¾ inch headed studs shall not exceed 24" on center (one stud				While the maximum stud spacing requirement of 24" noted in General Note DK-5 is the design intent, we understand that the Note 1 on 1/S1-5000 is somewhat conflicting. We agree to handle the 24' spacing requirement on a case by case basis, by marking on			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>every 2 feet) unless otherwise noted.</p> <p>As per note 1 on 1/S1-5000 - "See general notes for headed stud size and maximum spacing. Number of studs is indicated on the framing plan." Linden has modeled their drawings as per note 1, referring to the general notes for size and spacing requirements and the framing plans for stud quantities indicated on each member as per the Steel Beam Legend on S1-2302.</p> <p>If a stud quantity is not indicated on a beam member, no studs are provided. Please confirm this interpretation is correct. If additional studs are required on members that are not currently identified please provide revised drawings identifying beams and quantities required.</p>						
T-1389.1	<p>SSS - Stud Comment Clarification on Decking Drawings</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>According to Note 1 on 1/S1-5000, the number of headed studs is indicated on the framing plans. As per the steel beam legend on the framing plans, the number of studs is indicated in (*) following the beam designation (see SK1). It has come to our attention that the design team requires studs on certain members that currently do not show a stud quantity.</p> <p>Please provide a document that shows which members, not identified as requiring studs on the framing plans, shall have studs installed so that we may incorporate into our decking shop drawing submittal packages.</p>	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
						Refer to attached sketches SKS-0361 through SKS-0367 that show updated plans with additional shear studs (clouded) on beams.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1677 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1390	SSS - Stiffener Details at Roof Spandrel GL 1.4-B	Closed	05/13/2014	05/23/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Detail 4 on S1-8002 indicates the stiffener requirements at grid line 1.4/B at the perimeter roof girder. Please confirm the following (reference CD RFI 407 SK1 through SK3): 1. Confirm the stiffener plates and welding are per detail 2/S1-4205. 2. Detail 4E/S1-4205 graphically indicates a beam framing into the perimeter roof girder, however there is no beam on Grid 1.4 at Grid B per S1-2602. Please confirm it is acceptable to provide a stiffener per 2/S1-4205 on each side.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.	
T-1391	SSS - Approval Comment Clarifications, Beams at Stiffener Locations (GL 15-16)	Closed	05/13/2014	05/23/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 418 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) Please confirm the welding as shown is correct. 2) The added stiffeners per 11/S1-7630 at (8) locations will result in the (4) beams connecting at these locations not being erectable. Confirm the connection may be changed to a shear plate per 1/S1-5011 except with the bolts pulled outside the profile of the beams to allow access to the bolts. If not, supply an alternate solution.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		1) Confirmed. 2) The 5/8" stiffeners are not required. Provide full depth shear plate connections per 1/S1-5013 at beams that are perpendicular to the beams supporting the posts.	
T-1392	SSS - Missing Brace Locations (GL 3)	Closed	05/13/2014	05/23/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 419 SK1: It is not clear what is meant by the information inside the box, please clarify. If the information is meant to locate the braces per 1/S1-7661, it seems they will not work as		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		Braces per 1/S1-7661 are not required at the highlighted location.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1678 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
they will foul the beams. Please provide the locations on plan for the braces per 1/S1-7661.							
T-1393	SSS - Missing Beam Location (GL 15)	Closed	05/13/2014	05/23/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 420 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3: 1) Supply the missing dimensions to locate the beam. 2) Confirm the short W16x26 is located 1'-1 1/4 south of Grid D as shown. 3) If the response to item 2 above is yes, confirm the east end of the short W16x26 may be connected with a shear plate to avoid fouling the double angle connection for the supporting W16x26.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Refer to attached sketch SKA-3346 for missing dimensions. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed.			
T-1394	BGP - Stem-Walls With Elevated Slab - Mat Slab Level	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	05/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached Contract Documents. Sheets A1-2124 through A1-2127 show 20 stem-wall cells with elevated slabs @ -32'-1" and -30'-0" TOC added in ASI 107 (clouded). Note 1 on mentioned sheets calls out "reinforced concrete wall refer to structural drawings", the S1-9000 series does not provide rebar schedules or details for stem-walls in question. Please confirm if typical wall rebar should be used where wall thickness is covered by the typical details. Or provide rebar schedules for vertical/horizontal rebar in stem-walls and the elevated slab. Also provide corner, intersection, and stem-wall to elevated slab connection details.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TT Response: Please see attached SSK-0353 for clarification of the Train Platform Room walls at the Mat Level. For corner and intersection detailing, please refer to typical detail 3/S1-3001. AAI Response: SKA-3362 and SKA-3363 reflect updated elevated slabs datum at MEPT rooms. Refer to SKA-3364 for updated stem wall geometry of MEPT rooms.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1679 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1395	BGP - Lower Concourse Beams Intersecting Columns	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	05/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please confirm for east-west single-span beams and end-span beams of the Lower Concourse East of Grid 5 it is acceptable to provide a full tension embedment length within the MF beam exterior hoops for beam bottom long bars in lieu of end hooks where beams intersect concrete columns within the MF beams.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1396	SSS - Connection/Erection Clarifications at W-13 System	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	06/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 422 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 8: 1) Supply missing dimensions. 2) Supply hole size for the W-13 bolts. 3) The beam will not be erectable with a shear plate on each side of the web and the bottom flange CJP welded. Please supply an alternate detail. 4) Supply missing dimensions. 5) Supply the dimensions to locate the holes for the W-13 bolts. 6) Confirm the 2" vertical stiffeners may be located radially to avoid bevel cutting the edges.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: 1) Refer to attached sketch sbp-SKS-200 for distance between the bolts. 2) Bolt holes shall be 1 9/16" in diameter. 3) Provide a single 2" thick shear plate on one side of the beam web for the beam to be erectable. Provide double sided 1/2" fillet welds similar to the other 2" stiffener plates. 4) Refer to attached sketch sbp-SKS-200 for missing dimensions. Note that the frame is symmetric about the center leg meaning the two highlighted dimensions are equal. 5) Bolts shall have a horizontal spacing of 4" and shall be placed symmetrically about the beam web . 6) Confirmed. 7) Confirmed. 8) Confirmed.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1396.1	SSS - ConnectionErection Clarifications at W-13 System	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1680 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><p>See attached CD RFI # 422.2 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3: 1) Detail 3/S1-5028 shows 8 pairs of bolts and RFI T-1396 shows 6 pairs. Confirm 6 pairs is correct. 2) RFI T-1396 gave the 4" horizontal spacing without being specific on the bolt locations. As shown, the 4" spacing will not work because the 2" shear plate with 1/2" fillet welds will foul the 1 1/2" bolts. Please clarify the bolt spacing. 3) The connections foul each other with the revised beam spacing as shown on SK1. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the beams parallel to Grid E.2 with a single shear plate per 1/S1-5011 or supply an alternate solution.</p></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><p>1) & 2) Details 1 and 2 on S1-6020 as issued on 7/11/2014 do describe the intended design of the bolted connection of the W-13 system to the building framing.</p><p>3) Not acceptable. See response to RFI T-1671.</p><p>We disagree with the reasons for RFI request associated with it. We categorize this as no cost clarification.</p></div></div>							
T-1397	SSS - Missing information at PE301 & PE302 System	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	05/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
<div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><p>See attached CD RFI # 423 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 8: 1) Confirm the HSS6x6x5/8 posts are aligned with the HSS12x6x5/8 posts in the north-south direction as supplied in RFI T-1090. 2) Supply the dimension to the center of the (2) HSS6x6x5/8 posts. 3) Confirm the correct reference is 1/S1-7600. 4) Supply a connection detail for the bottom of these posts at the corner of the slab opening. 5) It appears here and in detail B/S1-7132 (SK3) that the east-west HSS12x6 beam connects to the concrete wall but the north-south HSS12x6 beams are continuous. Please clarify the steel framing. 6) Supply missing dimensions. 7) Supply missing elevations. 8) Supply a connection detail for HSS beams to concrete wall.</p></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><p>1) The two HSS 6x6x5/8 posts are not required and may be removed. 2) See response to 1). 3) Confirmed. 4) See response to 1). 5) The HSS 12x6 beams are not required and shall be removed. 6) See response to 1). 7) The HSS 6x6 beams shall be equally spaced between elevation 103' - 5" and centerline of the HSS12x6 beam that is just below the roof park level. 8) Provide connection per 4/S1-7602 at ends of the HSS 6x6x5/8 beams.</p></div></div>							
T-1398	SSS - W40X264 Connection clarifications (GL 32)	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	05/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1681 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 424 SK1 & SK2: Confirm it is acceptable to cope the top flange of the W40x264 as shown to clear the TPG1		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
T-1399	SSS - W40X249 Schedule (GL 20-21)	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	06/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 425 SK1: The W40x249 is not listed in the schedule. Confirm it is acceptable to insert it in the 2nd row from the top.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<hr/>							
T-1400	SSS - W40X149 Connection Clarification (GL 24)	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	05/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 426 SK1 & SK2: As shown on attached SK2 & SK2, it is not possible to connect the skewed W40x149 using 'W' when 'b' = 2". Confirm the connection as shown on SK2 is acceptable or supply an alternate solution.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1401	SSS - Access Hole at CJP Termination on TG	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	05/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please confirm it is acceptable to incorporate two weld access holes (as per AWS D1.1, section 5.17.1) as indicated on the attached SK2 to allow TMF to properly terminate the CJP welds after the slotted intermediate flange (p774) is welded to the web. See attached SK1 & SK2 for clarification.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		
<hr/>							
T-1402	SSS - Bolt Accessibility GL 14 and 15	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	05/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 415 SK1 to SK3 for item 2. 2) The noted bolts for the W27x84 beams are not accessible from the back side as shown in SK3. Please supply an alternate detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) If the bolts are not accessible from the back side, it is acceptable for this location to use a shear plate connections per 1/S1-5011 that does not require access of the bolt in the 4' gap. 2) It is Skanska's responsibility to figure out the erection means and methods. For this condition, the flange of the beam in question might be coped to allow the beam to drop down between the double angles that are shop bolted to the column web plate. The bolts to the beam web will then be accessible because the coped flange.		
<hr/>							
T-1403	BGP - Partition Wall Construction Joints	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	05/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please confirm the following items are acceptable regarding partition wall construction joints. 1. To provide the 3/8" gap for the vertical CJ's, SCCI intends to place felt board in the joint with a 3/4" chamfer (see attached drawing). Once the walls on either side of the CJ have been poured, the felt board will be trimmed down to the end of the chamfer and the edges of the joint			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI Response: 1. 3/4" chamfer for min 3/8" partition wall vertical CJ is confirmed. For joint filler and caulking of fire rated walls: refer to Spec Sec 07 84 13. TT Response:		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<div>will be caulked. Please confirm this is acceptable.</div> <div>2. With the exception of the tank walls, SCCI intends to pour the Train Level Partition Walls that go all the way to the Lower Concourse (~28'-11" tall) in two lifts with one horizontal CJ. SCCI proposes prepping the joint by roughening it with 1/4" amplitude. Please confirm this is acceptable.</div>						<div>2. Confirmed. Additionally contractor to confirm construction joint is clean of foreign materials.</div>
T-1404	SCS - Transfer Girder Clarification	Closed	05/15/2014	05/25/2014	05/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher</div> <div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Please clarify the designer's intent:</div> <div>Sheet SI-2303 indicates that the south end of Transfer Girder TR9 extends beyond the B87 and B88 beams southern edge and partially into the intersecting MFBI beam which is angular to the B87 beam. Section 8/S1-3701 indicates that there are welded rebar couplers at the top flange of the TR9 girder to match the B78 beam reinforcing, but the B78 beam ends at the B87/B88 intersection prior to the southern end of the TR9 girder.</div>		<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>The note" BARS TO MATCH BM78 BARS WITH LENTON COUPLER" has a typo. It should read as "BARS TO MATCH MB1 BARS WITH LENTON COUPLER". The bottom bars for BM78 shall go through the holes in the web of TR9 as shown in Detail 8/S1-3701.</div> <div>WOJV Received: 6/2/14</div>				
T-1405	SCS - TR7 Transfer Girder	Closed	05/16/2014	05/16/2014	05/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher</div> <div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</div>			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Please clarify the designer's intent.</div> <div>Sheet S1-2303 indicated that the south end of Transfer Girder TR7 extends into the B106 beam (60"w X 72"h). Section 8/S1-3702 and 11/S1-3703 indicate a substantially shallower beam section.</div>		<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>The beam depth shown on 8/S1-3702 and 11/S1-3703 was not shown to scale. Since there is no dimension given on these 2 details, the beam depth (72") specified in the beam schedule govern. There is no changes needed for these 2 details. The 2 1/2" x 14" x 2'-6" steel plates are to be center to the B106 bottom bars.</div> <div>WOJV Received: 6/2/14</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1685 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	referenced Section 9/S1-3702 at the south ends of TR19.9 and TR20.1 doesn't correlate with the slab elevation in relation to the top of structural steel.						
	Please clarify the detail for the welded couplers at the south end of TR19.9 and TR20.1.						
T-1409	TR1.4 Transfer Girder 72" X 40" CBM Welded Couplers/Bars	Closed	05/19/2014	05/29/2014	05/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please clarify the designer's intent:				As noted on the plan, the slab west of Grid 1.4 has a step at Grid E.			
Sheet S1-2302 indicates that the 2 northerm 72"x40" CBM beams east of Grid 1.4 are sloping and references Section 1/S1-3700 which indicates that the CBM beams are level. The 2 southern 72 "x40" CBM beams east of Grid 1.4 are not indicated as sloping and reference Section 1 /S1- 5023 that indicates that the beams are sloping. Please clarify the details for the welded couplers and #11 bars for the 72"x40" CBM beams at east side of TR1 .4. Section 2/S1-7605 indicates 17-#11 bars top and bottom, one added set of 17-#11 bars 3" below the top bars, and 4-#11 side bars.The details shown in Sections 1/SI-5023 and 9/SI-3700 indicate that the top and bottom 17-# 11 bars are connected to the transfer girder by welded couplers or bars. Please verify that only the top and bottom #11 bars connect to the transfer girder by welded couplers or bars.				As noted on the plan, along Grid 1.4 , top of slab is at 20.23 north of Grid E and at 21.21 south of Grid E. As noted on the plan, along Grid 1 (top of concrete wall), top of slab is at 20.03 north of Grid E and 21.00 south of Grid E. The 72x40 concrete beams are to have a slope per elevation noted on plan.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1410	BGP - Updated Concrete Wall Elevation and Lower Concourse SKA's	Closed	05/22/2014	06/01/2014	06/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
On May 20, 2014 WOJV received an email from Adamson-Associates containing 28 SKA's with the request that WOJV incorporate the SKA's into the TCB construction documents via the RFI Process.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference attached sketches: - SKA-3322 TO SKA-3325 (CONC WALL ELEVATIONS) - SKA-3326 TO SKA-3329 (CONC WALL ELEVATIONS) - ZONE 2- SKA-3330, SKA-3334, SKA-3338, SKA-3357 - ZONE 3 - SKA-3331, SKA-3335, SKA-3339 - ZONE 4 - SKA-3359, SKA-3360, SKA-3361 - ZONE 5 - SKA-3322, SKA-3336, SKA-3340 - ZONE 10 - SKA-3333, SKA-3337, SKA-3341					The following SKAs, included with this RFI response, are current and shall be incorporated in the construction documents. B2 and B1 Level Concrete Wall Elevations: SKA-3322 TO SKA-3329 Zone 2: SKA-3330, SKA-3334, SKA-3338, SKA-3357_R1 Zone 3: SKA-3331_R1, SKA-3335_R1, SKA-3339_R1 Zone 4: SKA-3359_R1, SKA-3360_R1, SKA-3361_R1 Zone 5: SKA-3332, SKA-3336, SKA-3340 Zone 10: SKA-3333, SKA-3337, SKA-3341		
Please confirm the attached architectural SKA's shall be incorporated in the TCB construction documents. Please note these unissued SKA's have been referred to in submittal package "TG0600-341 - REBAR - Shop Drawings - Partition Walls" returned to WOJV 5/21/2014.					For updated enlarged plans and details as discussed during the June 4, 2014 coordination workshop - Refer to the following SKAs SKA-3416 (A1-3007) SKA-3417 (A1-7426)		
Also, in the attached, there are two versions of the SKA's. Please clarify which shall be deemed "current" for use in the project.					For Future Washroom plumbing layouts, refer to the following sketches: PSK2-3001, PSK2-3002 Note that the Design Team did not receive RFI T-1410 until yesterday, June 4, 2014, even though Shimmick indicated it had been submitted at least a week ago. The RFI was issued with a large volume of attachments and consequently did not reach the design team from Constructware. In future, please limit Constructware email attachments to less than 5 megabytes.		
					WOJV: WOJV submitted RFI 5/23/14		
T-1411	SSS - Missing dimensions PE403 and PE404	Closed	05/23/2014	06/02/2014	05/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Please confirm that wall thickness tolerance noted in spec 05 15 22 is intended to apply to the ends only, and that the wall thickness throughout the remainder of the pipe may be greater by as much as is allowed by API5L, but shall be no less than the nominal wall thickness.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1689 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please see OIW shop drawing 2771-RN151. The termination of backing plate d151 and the finished ends of the CJP welds produces an inconsistent looking finish.</p> <p>It is OIW's intent to provide a continuous 5/16 seal weld at the end of the backing plate and the node web plates(see attached photo). We believe this closure weld is within the allowances of AWS D1.1, and will improve the overall finish of this AESS area.</p> <p>Please confirm that the noted seal weld is acceptable for all welded roof nodes on OIW detail drawings RN151 through RN164.</p>				Confirmed.		
T-1417	<p>SSS - Missing OCS Switch Information</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>This is a follow-up RFI to RFI SK 399 (CD 296) See attached CD RFI # 296.1 SK1 to SK7 for items 1 to 18:</p> <p>1) 2/S1-9101 shows the framing at 14'-2 C/C UON but no start location for the steel is supplied. Please supply location dimensions for the vertical HSS4x4 hangers per 2/S1-9101.</p> <p>2) Supply missing clouded dimensions (10) locations.</p> <p>3) Supply elevation to top of 3/8" galvanized.</p> <p>4) Supply missing clouded dimensions (12) locations.</p> <p>5) Supply elevation to top of 3/8" galvanized plate.</p> <p>6) Clarify how detail 2/S1-9101 applies at the noted location. Should the reference be to detail 3/S1-9101?</p> <p>7) Supply (5) clouded dimensions.</p> <p>8) Supply a connection detail.</p> <p>9) Confirm the brace connection is as shown in detail 3/S1-9101 (SK5).</p> <p>10) Supply a detail for the bottom of the HSS4x4 posts.</p> <p>11) Supply a connection detail for the HSS4x4 posts to horizontal HSS4x4.</p> <p>12) Supply elevation to underside of posts.</p> <p>13) Supply the weld for PL3/8" to HSS4x4.</p>	Closed	05/23/2014	06/02/2014	06/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>				<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1). See the response noted on the attached sketch RFI 296.1 SK1</p> <p>2). See the response noted on the attached sketch RFI 296.1 SK2</p> <p>3). See the response noted on the attached sketch RFI 296.1 SK2</p> <p>4). See the response noted on the attached sketch RFI 296.1 SK3</p> <p>5). See the response noted on the attached sketch RFI 296.1 SK3</p> <p>6). Yes, the reference shall be to Detail 3/S1-9101. (TT)</p> <p>7). See the response noted on the attached sketch RFI 296.1 SK4</p> <p>8). See A/SKS-356 attached (TT)</p>	<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed	
	14) Supply this dimension for each HSS4x4 post. 15) This detail will not work as it is not known at the detailing stage where the deck flutes will be. The detail also does not work when the deck spans parallel with the brace. Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed per the information in RFI T-1067.2 (SK 230.2, CD 181.2). 16) Supply the thickness and welding for the stiffeners. 17) Supply elevation to establish stiffener locations. 18) Supply a connection for the HSS4x4 to the PL3/8".			9). Confirmed, also see the comment on RFI 296.1 SK5 10). See detail 3 on A1-8551 (AAI) 11). See B/SKS-356 attached (TT) 12). See the response noted on the attached RFI296.1 SK4 13). 1/4" fillet weld both sides (TT) 14). See the response noted on the attached sketch RFI 296.1 SK5 15). The detail works as shown. It is a means and methods issue, it just means that the connection cannot be shop fabricated as the work requires contractor's coordinate during construction. If the deck span parallel to the brace angle, field weld the brace angle to the L4x4. (TT) 16). Stiffener plates are to be 3/8" thick with 1/4" double fillet weld to column. (TT) 17). See the response noted on the attached sketch RFI 296.1 SK6 18). See the response noted on the attached RFI 296.1 SK7 (TT)				
T-1417.1	SSS - Missing OCS Switch Information	Closed	06/27/2014	07/07/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The responses to the following items were not sufficient for Candraft to proceed. 7) The response notes one of the requested dimensions as "VARIES". Please provide criteria for this varying dimension. 12) Detail 3/A1-8551 does not provide the bottom of the				Please see OCS configuration in 1/A1-8550. Notice the OCS path relative to the beam (16'-4 1/2" from GL C.3 in CD RFI 296.1 SK4) is not a constant offset in plan and changes locations traveling east to west. From this, the HSS structure supporting the OCS assembly from above will also have an offset				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1691 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	HSS post elevations. Please supply the elevation at each post. 13) Per the structural details only the 1/2" plate is to be galvanized. Confirm this is correct and supply weld required for PL3/8" to HSS4x4. 14) Supply the requested missing dimension as shown at each post. 17) Please supply the elevations for the stiffeners in the columns. 18b) Please provide the size, radius, hole location and dimension on the 1/2" x 8" plate. Note: See response sketches SK1 through SK7			dimension from the beam that is not constant and will vary. 12) The bottom of HSS post elevation will vary because the bottom elevation is dependent upon the elevation of the OCS Universal Spacer Bar which is dependent upon the ultimate constructed sloping grade below (concrete). The OCS Universal Spacer Bar shall be 18'-0" above the built finish grade and the dimension between the bottom elevation of the supporting post and the Universal Spacer Bar is given on detail 3/A1-8151. 13) All should be hot dip galvanized as noted in the CDs. The weld shall be 1/4" double sided fillet weld. Please note that the connection plate shall be centered to the work point of the diagonal angles. 14) Same response as in item #12. 17) CL of plate is determined by SFMTA OVS. See response to item #14 on attached CD RFI 296.1 SK5. 18b) Plate size, thickness and hole location are provided in 6/S1-9101. SFMTA must provide size of plate hole, as the cable tensioner components are provided by SFMTA. TJPA shall assist with the SFMTA contact if required. The Design Team suggests that the OCS connectors be field installed to accommodate the final coordination with the SFMTA			
T-1417.2	SSS - Missing OCS Switch Information	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	07/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 296.4 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 4: Skanska plans the following erection aids for the OCS. Please review and confirm there are no adverse structural implications.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed, but use all around weld.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	1) Confirm the concept of the erection aid detail as shown is acceptable to accommodate the field welding required. 2) Confirm welding for cap plate as shown is acceptable. 3) Confirm the concept of the erection aid detail as shown is acceptable to accommodate the field welding required. 4) Confirm it is acceptable to supply (4) 15/16 diameter holes per plate for erection lifting holes as shown.						
	3) Confirmed, but finger tighten A325 through bolt. 4) Holes are acceptable. However, contractor is to plug holes completely with full grommet of the shield plastic fiber insulating material specified in Section 05 50 00 .						
T-1417.3	SSS - Missing OCS Switch Information	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	07/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
This is a follow-up to RFI T-1417.1 (SK 399.3A, CD 296.3)		Item 7 - information has been provided. Skanska should review with WOJV and TJPA.					
Skanska: The responses to items 7, 12, 14 & 17 require further clarification. Please review the items below. Item 7 ~ the response and reference to A1-8550 does not provide the requested dimensions. Please provide the dimensions to locate the posts. Item 12 ~ the response tells us that the Universal Spacer Bar is to be 18'-0 above the ultimate constructed sloping grade with the bottom of the post being +/- 4" above that per 3/A1-8151. Several unknowns remain: a) What does "ultimate constructed sloping grade" mean? b) The top of slab information on drawings S1-2306, A1-2306 & A1-2866 is not clear c) What does the +/- 4" in detail 3/A1-8151 mean? Item 14 ~ same as item 12 Item 17 ~ same as item 12		Item 12 - a) It means field dimension must be determined from the constructed grading by the CM/GC and coordinated between trade subcontractors and the SFMTA (the transportation agency). The design team cannot provide the as-built field dimensions that are required for this item. b) The reviewer should be using civil (grading) information - not structural information. Refer to sheets L1-3306, L1-3307, C1-4007 and C1-4009. c) This dimension is incorrect - It is 1'-0" +/-4". This will be corrected in VE Round #4 submission.					
		Item 14 - This question is the same as in Item 12, so the response is the same.					
		Item 17 - This question is the same as in Item 12, so the response is the same.					
		AAI recommends that WOJV schedule a coordination meeting with SKANSKA, TJPA, SFMTA the Design Team to review This RFI and the previous sub-number.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1693 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1417.4	SSS - Missing OCS Switch Information	Closed	09/02/2014	09/12/2014	09/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Following the OCS RFI coordination meeting held 8/28/2014, please provide the following information as discussed:			Item #7. For dimensions of vertical OCS supports see attached sketches SKA-4084 and SKA-4085.				
Item 7 - the response and reference to A1-8550 does not provide the requested dimensions. Please see SK1 and provide the dimensions to locate each post.			Item #12. For elevations (heights) of vertical supports see attached sketches SKA-4082 and SKA-4083.				
Item 12 - the response tells us that the Universal Spacer Bar is to be 18'-0 above the ultimate constructed sloping grade with the bottom of the post being +/- 4" above that per 3/A1-8151. Please provide the elevations for the bottom of each support post.			Item #17. The elevation of the center line of the lower plate is 31'-4", the elevation of top of the upper stiffener plate is 36'-7".				
Item 17 - please supply the elevations for the stiffeners in the columns.			Item #18b. Per Chris David's (SFMTA) sketch SK7, the hole size is 0.69".				
Item 18b - please provide the size, radius, hole diameter and hole location on the ½" x8" plate.							
T-1417.5	SSS - Missing OCS Switch Information	Closed	10/23/2014	10/23/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Gregory Kemerer</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached CD RFI # 296.8 SK1 to SK2 for items 1 to 8:			1. Not Required, as location of switch is unknown. Plate may be required/installed in future work after phase I.				
1) Confirm if 1/2" thick Galv plate is required and provide dimensions & elevation.			2. Confirmed, typical to details 2 and 3/S1-9101.				
2) Confirm items 65 & 66 are typical 2/S1-9101 hangers.			3. Not Required, as location of switch is unknown. may be required/installed in future work after phase I.				
3) Confirm if 1/2" thick Galv plate is required and provide dimensions & elevation.			4. Not exactly typical to 2/S1-9101, but similar to the upper plate connection on 2/A1-8550. Refer to the attached sketch SKA-4293.				
4) Confirm items 67 & 68 are typical 2/S1-9101 hangers.			5. Required location is on 1/A1-8550 and SKA-4085 which was a part of the response to RFI T-1417.4 SSS. Hanger elevations over OCS Shield have been revised to 34'-5" as shown on attached sketch SKA-4082 R1.				
5) S1-2407 shows a reference to 6/S1-9101 between grids 31.7-			6. Confirmed. However, these supports are at the				
32. Please supply the location & elevation of the plate/hangers if required.							
6) Confirm items 71 & 72 are typical 2/S1-9101 hangers.							
7) Confirm if 1/2" thick Galv plate is required and provide dimensions & elevation.							
8) Confirm if reference to 6/S1-9101 between grids 31.7-32 is required. Please supply the location & elevation of the plate/hangers.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1694 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1417.6	SSS - Missing OCS Switch Information	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
REQUEST: See attached SK1 - The noted bottom of HSS support elevations per RFI T-1417.4 (SK 399.6, CD 296.6) conflict with the top of plate elevations per RFI T-1417 (SK 399.1, CD 296.1). Please clarify the discrepancies. See attached SK2 - With the elevations provided in RFI T-1417.4 (SK 399.6, CD 296.6) the upper stiffener plates will be above the top of the cruciform and will no longer conform to the Plan view in 4/S1-9101. Review and advise.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response to question on SK1 sketch - Support elevation height conflicts at steel plate were revised in sketch SKA-4082 which was attached as the response to RFI T-1417.5. Response to question on SK2 sketch - Please refer to the enclosed RFI T-1417.6 Sketch of the OCS compression strut that changes the connection to column of the westmost upper plate. Enclosed is also for reference a markup of sheet OV-11 noting information to be provided by SFMTA. TJPA shall work with SFMTA to obtain the additional information required.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1695 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1417.7A	SSS - Missing OCS Information at East End Column	Closed	02/01/2015	02/11/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: N/A Location: Zone 4 Gridline: C.3/32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 296.15 SK1 & SK2, RFI T-1417.6 1. Refer to the attached CD RFI 296.15 SK2 section A-A. Confirm the plate along C.3/32.4 shown in CD RFI 296.15 SK1 will not foul the continuity plate at EL. 35'-5.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Confirmed. Connection plate does not foul continuity plate, as it is located at a higher elevation. Please refer to attached SKA-4439 for revised connection detail.			
T-1417.7B	SSS - Missing OCS Information at East End Column	Closed	02/01/2015	02/11/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: N/A Location: Zone 4 Gridline: C.3/32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 296.15 SK1 & SK2, RFI T-1417.6 2. The beam connection near C.3/32.4 shown in CD RFI 296.15 SK1 does not reflect the actual condition. Refer to the attached CD RFI 296.15 SK2 section B-B and confirm the connection as shown is correct.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Agreed. Skanska's detail of beam connection submitted is correct.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1696 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1417.7C	SSS - Missing OCS Information at East End Column	Closed	02/01/2015	02/11/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div> <div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: N/A Location: Zone 4 Gridline: C.3/32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 296.15 SK1, RFI T-1417.6 Refer to the attached CD RFI 296.15 SK1 for the following: 3. Supply dimension at CL PL 1 1/2" @ CL column. 4. Supply dimension. 5. Supply dimension. 6. Supply angle. 8. Supply elevation at CL PL 1 1/2" @ CL column. 9. Supply angle.</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>3. Refer to response to RFI 1417.7A which locates the western upper connection plate. 4. Refer to response to RFI 1417.7A which shows dimension of end of plate extended from cladding. 5. Refer to response to RFI 1417.7C (item #4 above). 6. Refer to response to RFI 1417.7A which provided angle of the western upper connection plate relative to column gridline. 8. Refer to response to RFI 1417.7A which provides the angle and elevation of centerline of the western upper connection plate. 9. Refer to response to RFI 1417.7A which provides the angle and elevation of centerline of the western upper connection plate.</div></div>							
T-1417.7D	SSS - Missing OCS Information at East End Column	Closed	02/01/2015	02/11/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div> <div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: N/A Location: Zone 4 Gridline: C.3/32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 296.15 SK1 & SK2, RFI T-1417.6 7. The note on CD RFI 296.15 SK1 states "Column WT stiffener to be terminated at EL. 35'-0". This note is not clear. Refer to CD RFI 296.15 SK2 section A-A and clarify.</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>7. Skanska's SK2 section A-A shows the WT stiffener termination elevation correctly.</div></div>							
T-1417.7E	SSS - Missing OCS Information at East End Column	Closed	02/01/2015	02/11/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1697 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: N/A Location: Zone 4 Gridline: C.3/32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 296.15 SK1, RFI T-1417.6 10. The note on CD RFI 296.15 SK1 states "T/O plate ELEV. 36'-7 " and "CL of plate ELEV. 35'-9". It is not clear what these elevations are referring to. Please clarify.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 10. For revised western upper connection plate elevations, refer to response to RFI 1417.7A (SKA-4439). Note: All OCS information provided is a result of coordination with documentation provided by SFMTA and it should be field verified.				
T-1418	SSS - PE403 & PE404 Missing Connection Detail	Closed	05/23/2014	06/02/2014	06/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 428 SK1: Supply a connection detail for the flat MC10 to HSS posts.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide welds at the MC10x8.4 to HSS column connection as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0355.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1418.1	SSS - PE403 & PE404 Erection Aid Seat Angle	Closed	05/21/2015	05/31/2015	06/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 3/S1-7107 Location: Zone 2, PE403/404 Add'l Doc Ref's: SSK-0355 This is a follow up RFI to T-1418. RFI T-1418 provided direction to install and remove a temporary seat angle onto the HSS columns PE403 & PE404 within the roof level headhouse. Although the RFI specifies that the 4x4 angles are to be removed after welding the MC flanges, Skanska inadvertently, in the course of connecting the members, welded continuously around both the MC channel and the 4x4 angle. Removing the angle at this point would disturb the permanent weld on the MC. Therefore, please confirm leaving the 4x4 angles in place and not removing them after erection is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with the reason for request, alternate proposal. We categorize this RFI as request for substitution. Answered by design team: 5/29/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/1/15				
T-1419	SSS - Bus Deck Cast Node Dimension Confirmation	Closed	05/23/2014	06/02/2014	06/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Galoyan							
REQUEST: The structural issues meeting on 5/15/2014 reviewed potential changes to the cast node machine shop drawings. Due to the sand inclusions in the 35A and 35B cast nodes, further machining of the pad surfaces is required. This will result in a dimension of 16" from the W0 work point in lieu of the initial dimension of 17" (see attached sketch). Cast Connex has proceeded to make the 16" revision to the cast node machine shop drawings. Please confirm this is acceptable, and update the structural drawings to match.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable to TT. Machining of these cast node pads was not indicated on the design drawings (nor Skanska or Bradken shop drawings). Design Team has no issues with the resulting dimension of 16" from the W0 work point in lieu of the initial dimension of 17" . The machining of these pads < 1 1/2 deep to remove sand inclusions found in as cast surface is a Contractor means and methods. Webcor to communicate/coordinate with Shimmick as the TG18.1 Bus Ramp Contractor to coordinate if shop machining versus field grinding is preferred for weld prep. This weld prep work is at no cost to the TJPA.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1699 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1420	SSS - Missing Connection Detail BU-60 GL 4-5	Closed	05/27/2014	06/06/2014	06/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 430 SK1 : Please supply a connection detail for the BU-60 to the BU-60's.				Provide a double angle connection per 9/S1-5032 at the ends of the BU-60 beam.			
T-1421	SSS - ST401 Slab Opening Dimension Discrepancies	Closed	05/27/2014	06/06/2014	05/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 431 SK1 & SK2 : The black dimensions hi-lited in purple on SK2 are per 1/S1-7009 and the red dimensions are per A1-2864. The current model and drawings match 1/S1-7009. Please advise which dimensions are correct.				Red dimensions noted on attached SK2 submitted with RFI per A1-2864 are the correct dimensions.			
T-1422	SSS - Bolt to Edge Dimension Clarification GL 16	Closed	05/27/2014	06/06/2014	06/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 432 SK1: Confirm the 1 7/16" edge distance for the 1 1/2" dia. bolts per 1/S1-8000 is acceptable or supply a solution.				It appears from the sketch SK1 provided in the RFI that the detailer spaced the middle two bolts at (tw + 3 3/4") per detail 1/S1-8000. At this location with tight edge clearance, revise the spacing between the middle two bolts to 4". The resulting bolt edge distance is acceptable.			
T-1423	SSS - Girder Flashing Max Gap Dimension	Closed	05/27/2014	06/06/2014	06/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
With reference to details 6, 7 & 9/S1-5000, a 9" max dimension is shown from the edge of the girder flashing to the edge of the deck with a 1-1/2" minimum bearing onto the girder, indicating the flashing gauge is to match the				Confirmed that the gap may be increased from 7 1/2" to 9" where 16 gauge closure sheet is used.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1700 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>gauge of the deck. Based on the preceding, most locations would require 18 gauge flashing with the max gap between beam and deck being 7-1/2".</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable to increase the max gap to 9" as the deck flutes are at 12" centers and at some locations this gap will exceed 7-1/2". To accommodate the increased gap, the decker is proposing to use 16 gauge flashing at all locations, connecting the flashing to the beam with ¾" diameter puddle welds at 12" OC and connecting the side lap with button punches at 12" OC or top seam welds at 24" OC.</p> <p>See attached SK1 for clarifications.</p>						
T-1425	SSS - Edge of Slab Angle at Seismic Joint GL10 & 20	Closed	05/29/2014	06/08/2014	06/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Section 3/S1-3282 details the typical concrete wall at expansion joint on the Roof Deck Level. Please confirm an edge of slab bent plate and deck support as per 9/S1-5000 is not required. See SK1 & SK2 for reference.		The Typical Detail 9/S1-5000 is applicable at the expansion joint, as the slab edge overhung is within the range (2' - 4') noted for this detail.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1701 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1425.1	SSS - Edge of Slab Angle at Seismic Joint GL10 & 20	Closed	06/30/2014	07/10/2014	07/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 433.1 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the outline of top of slab/edge plate at grids B & H at the expansion joints. 2) Confirm the edge plate support detail at the 1/1/4" connection plate is acceptable as shown or supply an alternate detail. 3) The 10" on SK2 indicates top of roof floor slab. Confirm the bent plate will stop at top of slab OR is an additional 8" required to the concrete key location. 4) For detail 9/S1-5000 now required at the Seismic joints, verify the 8'-0 Max spacing for the angles can be increased to 8'-6 in order to line up with the back span beam spacing per design.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Confirmed. However, the requirement for the closure plate and other misc. steel per Detail 9/S1-5000 noted in TT's previous responses to RFI 1425.0 may be waived to negate SKANSKA's claim of added scope. If the closure plate is not provided by SKANSKA, the concrete contractor shall provide proper forming/shoring for supporting wet weight of the concrete while pouring slab concrete. How to support the wet weight of the concrete when placing the slab is the contractor's means and methods. 2). Confirmed, also see the response to comment #1. 3). It is W/O's option to stop the vertical leg of the closure plate at the top of slab (additional forming is required to retain the concrete while placing the slab), or stop the vertical leg of the closure plate at the concrete key location (additional forming not required). 4). Confirmed that the outrigger spacing may be increased to 8'-6" to be in line with the back span beam spacing.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1702 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1425.2	SSS - Edge of Slab Angle at Seismic Joint GL10 & 20	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Galoyan							
REQUEST: The response to RFI T-1425 indicates that detail 9/S1-5000 is to be used at the roof deck level expansion joint. The rebar in that detail is incompatible with the rebar layout shown in detail 3/S1-3282. Please clarify the rebar requirements and layout.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). As noted in the response to RFI 1425.1, the requirement for the closure plate and other misc. steel per Detail 9/S1-5000 noted in TT's previous responses to RFI 1425.0 may be waived to negate SKANSKA's claim of added scope. If the closure plate is not provided by SKANSKA, the concrete contractor shall provide proper forming/shoring for supporting wet weight of the concrete while pouring slab concrete. How to support the wet weight of the concrete when placing the slab is the contractor's means and methods. 2). The rebars per 3/S1-3282 shall be used.		
<hr/>							
T-1426	SSS - TR5 End Details at GL5G	Closed	05/29/2014	05/29/2014	06/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 446 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 4: 1) Confirm the locations for 3/4" dia. headed studs per 3/S1-5023. 2) Confirm the locations for 2" diameter holes per 3/S1-5023. 3) Confirm the locations for 3" diameter holes per 3/S1-5023 to clear girder splice. 4) Supply missing dimension.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Confirmed 2). 2" holes are to be 2" above bottom of the concrete beam. 3). Holes for B57 bottom rebars are to be located 2 3/4" above the bottom of the beam. Adjust bottom bars slightly to avoid TG slice as shown is acceptable. 4). The beams are to be equally spaced between the first beam south of Grid G (5'-6" south of G) and Grid K. The spacing should be 9'-7 11/16".		
<hr/>							
T-1427	SSS - Slab Support at 2nd Level GL1.4-D.4	Closed	05/29/2014	06/08/2014	06/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 443 SK1 for items 1 & 2:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Yes, for the N/S direction beams, add BU-WT per		
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1703 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1428	SSS - High Slab Support at Ground Level GL4F From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 442 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the BU-WT's at these locations should be extended as shown. 2) Confirm BU-WT's are required at the noted locations to support the high slab. SUGGESTION:	Closed	05/29/2014	06/08/2014	06/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.				
			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
T-1429	SSS - Framing Interference at GL 5D Ground Level From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 441 SK1: 1) The double angle connection is not possible as it will foul the stiffener plate. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W16 beam with a full depth shear plate with bolts, plate thickness and welding per 1/S1-5011. 2) Confirm the connection above may be applied at other similar locations. SUGGESTION:	Closed	05/29/2014	06/08/2014	06/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: 1) Confirmed. 2) Changes to shear plate connections at similar locations will be considered on a case by case basis. Submit an RFI highlighting all similar locations or mark such instances on the shop drawings for approval.				
			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1704 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1430	BGP - Lower Concourse E/W Bottom Deck Bar at GL 9 MFB	Closed	05/30/2014	06/09/2014	06/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please confirm per field conversation between structural EOR and Gerdau that it is acceptable to install the concourse slab bottom East-West reinforcing at GL 9 per the attached sketch.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal is acceptable provided: 1. Tail of slab bottom bar is fully developed within the confined joint 2. Tail of slab bottom bar runs over the top of the lowest MFB longitudinal bar and is no longer located below it 3. Field bends conform to ACI minimum radii limitations 4. Within the joint, bottom MFB bars are brought to their lowest possible position above (and in contact with) the MFB exterior hoop bottom legs 5. All hooks of MFB vertical ties shall be made to fully engage the MFB longitudinal reinforcing outside the joint and at the sides of the joint 6. Proposal is implemented at all Grid 9 columns where the overpour results in slab bottom reinforcing being out of tolerance (3/4 clear plus 1/2" tolerance) It is also acceptable to cut the bottom slab bars at the face of the MFB-column joint and splice in an equivalent z-bar.				
T-1431	SSS - PE403 & PE404 Missing Connection Detail at Posts	Closed	05/30/2014	06/09/2014	06/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 434 SK1 & SK2: The connection per RFI T-1105 shown above will not work at the noted locations as the base plate for the HSS10x10 is in the way. Please supply an alternate connection for the HSS12x6.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The T/steel of the horizontal HSS12x6 shall be raised by a few inches so that the HSS 12x6 clears the bolts at the base plate and frames into the vertical HSS 10x10. Provide an all-around fillet weld similar to 3/S1-7600 at the HSS to HSS connection.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1705 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1432	SSS - PE403 & PE404 Fouling Connection Detail	Closed	05/30/2014	06/09/2014	06/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 435 SK1 & SK2: The upper angle per 5/S1-7600 will foul the gusset plate for the brace. Please supply an alternate detail.				Move the upper angle to the side of the horizontal HSS 12x6. Provide vertical fillet welds to connect the angle to the post and the horizontal HSS . Angle and weld sizes shall remain the same as specified in detail 5/S1-7600.			
T-1433	SSS - Conflicting ST401 Dimensions	Closed	05/30/2014	06/09/2014	06/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 437 SK1 to SK3: The approval instructions on drawing 3265 in the CS6 approval submittal (Package Number TG0701-78) require a clarification. S1-7011 and A1-7011 show conflicting dimensions to locate the posts as shown on SK2 & SK3. Currently the model reflects S1-7011. Please confirm that S1-7011 is correct or supply clarifying direction on which ST403 post locations are correct.				Refer to attached sketch SKA-3379 for Stair HSS locations. Structural drawings will be updated in a future ASI.			
T-1433.1	SSS - Conflicting ST401 Dimensions	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 437.1 SK1 & SK2: The result of the varying dimensions on S1-7011 and SKA-3379 (A1-7011) is that we do not know where to locate the posts on the north side of stair ST403. Please clarify the discrepancies.				HSS posts shall be located per SKA-3379-R1 issued with RFI T-1433.1. Structural drawings (S1-7011) will be updated in a future ASI			
T-1434	SSS - Conflicting ST401 Dimensions at Post Connections	Closed	05/30/2014	06/09/2014	06/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1706 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>See attached CD RFI # 438 SK1 & SK2: This approval instruction on drawing 3264AB in the CS6 approval submittal (Package Number TG0701-78) requires a clarification. As shown on SK2, 4/A1-7011 shows conflicting dimensions to locate the posts for Stair ST401. Currently the model reflects S1-7009 & RFI T-1189 (SK 419, CD 413). Please confirm that S1-7009 and RFI T-1189 are correct or supply clarifying direction on which ST401 post locations are correct.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1707 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The reviewer's comment on Linden Shop drawing D3 detail 49, requests the contractor to coordinate the change of steel deck height with RFI T-0803.1 and with W2 roof assembly components (see SK1). After further review of the available information, detail 1/A1-8171 provides conflicting information to what is indicated on 1/S1-5032, the W-2 retail façade roofing assembly build-up indicates a 1-1/2" metal deck (see SK1). Please confirm the steel framing and 1-1/2" metal deck as currently detailed is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This item was already confirmed by RFI T-1413.			
T-1437	BGP - Shear Wall Column Vertical Splice at 3rd Lift	Open	06/03/2014	06/13/2014	06/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Reference: RFI T-0620 For constructability purposes, the shearwalls require horizontal construction joints at the same elevations as the foundation wall construction joints. All vertical reinforcing has been detailed with HRC mechanical couplers with the exception of the 3rd lift of the shear wall column located adjacent to the knockout wall. Please confirm that it is acceptable to splice the verticals in the shear wall column with a Dayton Superior Barlock D250SCA coupler		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable provided that the coupler is a Type II coupler, such as Dayton Superior Barlock L-Series. The coupler proposed in the RFI does not qualify. The contractor shall plan for the installation of the coupler by taking into account the length of the coupler, the length of the reinforcing stub to be spliced, and the available clearance. The coupler may need to be preinstalled with the stub or a blockout created depending on the proximity of the obstruction to the planned construction joint. The detailer shall account for the increase in effective bar diameter at the mechanical coupler with respect to ties and clear cover.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1708 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1438	SSS - Kicker Brace at Slab Opening	Closed	06/04/2014	06/14/2014	06/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 449 SK1 & SK2: Please confirm the location of the slab opening on SK1 as it is currently located over a kicker brace and not indicated on the structural drawings. Please provide revised structural drawings indicating all slab openings required.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Slab opening locations per A1-2862 govern. Move the kicker brace so that it is in between the two openings. Structural drawings will be updated in a future ASI to show the two openings. Note: Small openings in slabs are to be coordinated between sub-contractors by GC and included in the contract as defined in Contract Documents.			
T-1439	SSS - Oversized Holes in Cruciform Column Base Plate	Closed	06/04/2014	06/14/2014	06/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Due to the thickness of the cruciform column base plate and the transfer girder top flange connection (7-1/2" to 9-1/2" thick). Please confirm it is acceptable to provide oversized holes in the base plate only at the slip critical connection as per AISC (see SK1). This will allow additional tolerance for threading the 2-1/2" diameter post tensioned rods varying from 14' to 38' long through the 7-1/2" to 9-1/2" thick steel. Note: The transfer girder top flange will remain a standard size hole (d+1/16").		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Using oversized holes in the SFRS bolted connection indicated in the RFI is not acceptable. It is acceptable to achieve additional tolerance for the post-tensioned rods by using oversized holes for these rods within the base plate.			
T-1440	SSS - Moment Frame Column Protected Zone	Closed	06/04/2014	06/14/2014	06/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: After reviewing the contract documents for the moment frame protected zones, please reference attached SK1/SK2 and note the following: For the built-up moment frame beams, details 1, 3/S1-4201 have a note that directs Skanska to detail 10/S1-4202, which depicts the yellow striping and warning signage to be installed. However, the protected zone detail for the moment frame columns, 2/S1-4201, does not have		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 10/S1-4202 is a typical detail that applies for all moment frame protected zones (beams & columns).			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1441	SSS - Discrepancy for Slab Opening Location at ST301	Closed	06/04/2014	06/14/2014	06/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 447 SK1: Based on the beam locations from grid D on S1-2403 and the slab opening location on A1-2883 the noted dimension should read 9 1/8". Please confirm or clarify the discrepancy.					Confirmed.		
T-1442	SSS - Discrepancies for Elevator Slab Opening Location PE202	Closed	06/05/2014	06/15/2014	06/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 448 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) The location dimensions for the elevator pit shown in 2/S1-7101 and A1-2862 do not match as indicated by dimensions hi-lited in red. Please clarify which dimensions are correct. 2) The location dimensions for the elevator opening shown in 4/S1-7101 and A1-2882 do not match as indicated by dimensions hi-lited in red. Please clarify which dimensions are correct.					Dimensions noted on Architectural edge of slab drawing A1-2862 govern. Structural drawings will be updated in a future ASI. Dimensions noted on Architectural edge of slab drawing A1-2882 govern. Structural drawings will be updated in a future ASI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1710 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1443	Re-Install Dewatering Well Pump #34 per Field Coordination	Closed	06/06/2014	06/16/2014	06/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>On Thursday, May 22, 2014, there was slurry intrusion through dewatering well #34, from the Transbay Tower Project. After the Transbay Tower Project placed a lean mix to plug the slurry intrusion, only water has come out of the well at a pressurized rate, not yet experienced on this project prior to the event.</p> <p>The water in this well has been confirmed acceptable by the SFPUC to discharge into the City's combined sewer system, on 6/5/14. A plug has been placed in this well in order to keep the jobsite from flooding due to the volume of water pushing through the well. We want to replace the dewatering pump in this well, but are concerned that we may end up dewatering the Transbay Tower Project and possibly draw the water table on their project outside of the requirements of our specification.</p> <p>1) Please confirm that it is acceptable to re-install the dewatering pump in well #34.</p> <p>2) Please let us know if there are certain steps or durations that you want us to pump in an effort for ARUP to monitor the water table on Transbay Tower's Project and/or other adjacent properties.</p> <p>3) Please confirm that in performing this activity, we are not held to the requirement of Spec Section 31 56 13-13.F.1. in regards to "The performance of the shoring wall shall be such that the groundwater levels around the excavation are maintained within 3 feet from the pre-excavation levels" since there is the potential of us drawing their groundwater through our well.</p>					<p>1. It is acceptable to reinstall the dewatering pump in well #34.</p> <p>2. Access has been provided to the global analyzer. Please watch carefully the affects from dewatering in wells P-03DS and P-6MS. These have currently not shown any change in the piezometric elevation since May 22.</p> <p>3. The specification will not be relaxed at this time.</p>		
<hr/>							
T-1444	SSS - Location of Grout & Vent Holes	Closed	06/09/2014	06/19/2014	06/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>As a follow-up to the review comment on drawing 1202 within Submittal Package TG0701-73.1, the elevation of the grout/vent holes on the pipe basket columns is called out to be 6'-0" above finished floor per S1-4003 (SK1). Skanska's modeler has taken the finished floor to be the</p>					<p>We confirm the grout/vent hole elevation of 63'-6" at the Bus Deck Level is acceptable for shop drawing packages CS1 through CS7.</p> <p>The elevation of the finish floor at Bus Deck Level is</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1711 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>top of steel dimension provided in the structural drawings (EL 56'-4") plus the slab thickness provided on S1-5000 (SK2). Based on this, the model currently reflects the grout/vent holes at EL 63'-6", 6'-0" above the structural slab high point. (TOS EL 56'-4" + 1'-2" [S8 slab] + 6'-0" = EL 63'-6") (SK3).</p> <p>Please confirm a grout/vent hole elevation of 63'-6" at the Bust Deck Level is acceptable. Note that shop drawings packages CS1 through CS7 have been released for fabrication based on the current model.</p>						
T-1445	BGP - Foundation Wall Mix Placed in Partition Walls	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	REQUEST: Please reference RFI T-1093 and cast-in-place mix designs TG0600-203.1 (#1557216 Foundation Walls) and TG0600-204.2 (#1558218 Slabs, Beams, and Shear Walls). The Foundation Wall cast-in-place mix design satisfies all requirements prescribed in Table 2-1 "Concrete Properties" (03 30 20.2.1) for the "Slabs, Beams, and Shear Walls" cast-in-place mix design. Please confirm both concrete mix designs (#1557216 and #1558218) can be used for Partition Walls.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed.	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1712 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1446	SSS - PE 202 Dimension Discrepancies	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 454 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) The dimensions locating the edge of slab shown in 4/S1-7101 & A1-2892 do not match as noted by the highlighted dimensions. The model currently matches the dimensions in detail 4/S1-7101. Please confirm that 4/S1-7101 shows the correct dimensions. 2) The noted dimensions do not match the dimensions in detail 2/S1-7101. It appears the dimensions should match with elevator posts extending from the Ground Level to the Bus Deck Level. Please work with CD RFI 448 and clarify.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Dimensions per A1-2892 shall govern. Dimensions to locate the edge of slab will be removed from 4/S1-7101 in a future ASI. 2) The elevator shaft size at the bus deck is larger than that at the ground level. Dimensions per A1-2892 shall govern. The RFI refers to CD RFI 448. Note: In future RFIs, provide reference to general contractor RFI number and not subcontractor RFI number. Turner shall return RFIs using subcontractor RFI numbers and have WOJV revise the RFI prior to submitting the RFI to the PCPA team.			
T-1447	SSS - Column Connection by Bi-Fold Door Support	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Please refer to the response to T-1402 (SK RFI 558B) and see attached SK 1: The W27x84 beams have a depth of 26.7 inches. In order to access the bolts as suggested in the response, both the top and bottom flanges will need to be coped. The bottom flange supports the Bi-Fold Door Supports at these locations. Please provide the minimum distance between the ¾" cap plate and the cope for the bottom flange of the W27x84 beams.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide a minimum distance of 1" between the cap plate and cope of the bottom flange of the W27x84 beams.			
T-1448	SSS - Shear Stud Layout at Column Base Plate	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Reference drawing S1-2304 at grid line 16G, section detail 9/S1-3702 indicates 7 rows of 6 studs on the top flange of the transfer girder. At this location and at 5 other typical locations along grid line G the transfer girder top flange is		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 42 (3/4" headed) studs shown on the top of beam flange may be deleted.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1713 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	covered by the column base plate. See SK1 for clarification.						
	Please provide a layout detail for the 42 shear studs if they are to be welded to the column base plate.						
T-1449	SSS - North Exit Mezzanine Hanger Detail	Closed	06/10/2014	06/20/2014	06/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	See attached sketches CD RFI # 456 SK1 to SK3 which reference the hanger and brace location that clashes with the lower concourse column at grid C/21. The hanger and brace per 1/S1-2252 are directly in line with the cap plate bolts at grid C/21. Please provide an alternative connection detail.		The hanger shall be connected to the cap plate similar to the detail at the bottom of the hanger as shown in detail 9/S1-5028. The 2" distance between the ends of the gusset plate and angle may be increased to clear the bolts at the cap plate. The V-shaped angle braces at the location highlighted in the RFI may be deleted.				
T-1449.1	SSS - North Exit Mezzanine Hanger Detail	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	See attached CD RFI # 456.1 SK1: The response to T-1449 does not work. The hanger connection per 9/S1-5028 fouls the column cap plate connection. Please supply a solution.		Change the orientation of the hangers and the gusset plates at the top and bottom so that the gusset plates are parallel to the transfer girder. Provide 3/8" thick full depth stiffeners at the W12x40 beam on each side of the beam web and aligned to the bottom gusset plate. Stiffeners shall have double-sided 1/4" fillet welds on 3 sides.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1450	SSS - HSS Brace Gusset Plate Connection	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 455 SK1: Details 4, 5 & 7/S1-7632 (7/S1-7632 shown) show the 1/2" x 3" stiffener PL above the beam to be parallel with the offset line opposed to the brace connections below the beam where the stiffener PL is not parallel to the offset line. Please confirm it is acceptable to locate the 1/2" x 3" stiffener PL based on the horizontal and vertical weld length for the gusset plate to the beam/column as shown in the example from the model.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable. As shown for the bottom connections, the details do not require the offset lines and the stiffeners to be parallel.		
T-1451	SSS - SE401 Missing Post Locations	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	06/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 459 SK1: The elevator post locations are not shown on the structural drawings. They are currently located in the model per the dimensions shown. Confirm the dimensions are acceptable or supply alternate dimensions.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Final elevator guiderail support post location shall be provided by the elevator manufacturer/contractor.		
T-1452	SSS - Beam Location Verification at Roof Level GL 12	Closed	06/11/2014	06/21/2014	09/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: On attached sketch CD RFI # 458 SK1 on S1-2603 near grids 12/F verify the W12x14 beam is located 12'-0 5/16 from grid line 12 taken from the Revit model. Note per the architectural drawings there is no wall or curb etc to locate this beam.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1715 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1453	SSS - ASI 108 - Limits of Light Column Grout Port	Closed	06/12/2014	06/22/2014	06/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: ASI 108 S1-6005 / Detail A specifies grout port holes drilled at one of four light column pipes at train platform level and grout port holes drilled at one of eight light column pipes above lower concourse level. Please confirm design intent is to drill holes in light column pipes at all four pipes at train box (2Ea x 4 pipes) and all eight pipes above concourse level (2Ea x 8 pipes).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We confirm that the grout port holes need to be drilled at all four pipes at train box and all eight pipes at concourse level.		
<hr/>							
T-1454	BGP - Lower Concourse Temporary Manlift	Closed	06/13/2014	06/23/2014	06/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: In order to provide access to the first area of steel which is going to be erected on GL 10.1. it is necessary to install a temporary manlift on the concourse moment frame beam at GL-9.9 & D for approximately 2 months, please find attached a layout plan, section and some typical manlift manufactures information. If it is acceptable to have the manlift footprint on the moment frame beam at GI 9.9 -10.1, Webcor will prepare a formal submittal for the design team to review. Please confirm if this location would be acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The location is acceptable provided the proposed submittal, and methods contained therein, comply with the General Conditions and Structural Notes GR-4,5,and 18.		
<hr/>							
T-1455	BGP - Top of Shear Wall Lift 2, Beam Block-Out Pour Back	Closed	06/16/2014	06/26/2014	06/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference attached comprehensive lift drawing for walls Area 1 to 7 2nd lift (Drawings: W290A.1, W290A.2, W290B.1, W290B.2 W290C.1, W290C.2, W290D.1, W290D.2, W290E.1, W290E.2), and Gerdau wall rebar shop drawings SW-1, SW-2, and SW-3. Please reference clouded section on all drawings above. Due to constructability of formwork to build this portion of			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to extend the blockout from the bottom face of MFB horizontally east to the edge of the shear wall as proposed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1716 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the block-out clouded on the attached comprehensive drawings, SCCI propose to pour this section back with the concourse. The difficulty arises due to forming through the embedded column steel at these locations in the shear walls.</p> <p>Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>						
T-1456	BSE - Concourse Deck Loading	Closed	06/16/2014	06/26/2014	06/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Kelly Phariss							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached axle loadings for Hyundai forklift model 70DS-7E. The forklift is intended to be used on the concourse deck for removal of bracing and installation of rebracing.				Verifying the adequacy of the structure for construction loads as well as the design of any required shoring is the responsibility of the contractor. See also General Requirement note GR-18 on S-0005.			
Please confirm if it is acceptable to use the noted forklift on top of the concourse slab.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1462	SSS - TR5 Vertical Shear Studs at GL5C	Closed	06/17/2014	06/27/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please reference S1-2302, grid 5/C. At this location and similar conditions, section 2/S1-3707 is shown. Through this detail section 6/S1-3702 is cut. This detail calls for 6 rows of 6 studs @ 6" placed on the top flange of the transfer girder. At conditions where the end of the transfer girder is 4'-8" from the grid line there is not enough room to install the studs as indicated. See attached SK-1. Note: This condition also occurred at GL9/C and detail 5/S1-3707 was provided with field order 027 to show 4 rows of 4 studs. Confirm this detail is also acceptable at 2/S1-3707.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
T-1463	SSS - Shear Studs and Rebar Holes at TR4 GL4G	Closed	06/17/2014	06/27/2014	06/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 460 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) It is not clear how many studs are required. See SK2 and confirm the location and number of studs. 2) It is not clear how many 2" diameter holes are required. See SK2 and confirm the location and number of holes.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: 1). Confirmed the studs shown on SK2 are acceptable. 2). Confirmed the holes shown on SK2 are acceptable		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
T-1464	BRP - Copper Drain Pipe Details	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	07/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference the attached drawings, A1-2817 and A1-8881. Please provide further details regarding the added 2" diameter copper overflow drain pipe clouded in the attached drawings. . 1. Please specify the type of valve needed for the copper drain pipe. 2. Is the copper pipe insulated? If so, please provide specific details on insulation. 3. What type of install method should be used such as, is		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: 1. Valve needed for the Copper Drain Pipe: Soldered Ball Valve 2. Insulation for Copper Pipe: No Insulation, however pipe wrap required, refer to Spec 22 11 11 for underground pipe wrap. 3. Type of installation method: Soldered Joints 4. Details on how the copper drain pipes terminate at		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1465	<div>the connection brazed, soldered, butt welded, mechanical, etc? 4. Please provide further details on how the pipe terminates at the SJ joint. 5. Please clarify how the 2" diameter hose adapters connect to the 2" diameter copper drain pipes and how they are sealed to flex flashing and SJ assembly.</div> <div>SSS - Seal Weld at Edge of Backing Bar</div> <div>REQUEST: Reference attached RFI OIW 033. The same configuration of weld joint and backing bar used on the fabricated roof nodes is also used on the bus-deck nodes for each pair of shear plates. It is our intent to provide a continuous seal weld at the end of the backing plate and the shear plates. Please confirm that the noted seal weld is acceptable for all shear plate connections to bus-deck nodes.</div>	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	06/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer</div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>		<div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>		<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>			
<div>SUGGESTION:</div>		<div>ANSWER:</div>		<div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>The RFI question and information are not complete.</div> <div>- It refers to RFI OIW 033. We can't find RFIs through sub-contractor numbers. W/O should refer to W/O RFI numbers.</div> <div>- On page 7, the question in RFI OIW 033 was included. However, it is referring to a shop drawing which is not included in the RFI. It is also referring to a photograph that was not attached.</div> <div>- There are drawings attached with no markups (pages 4 and 5), so it is not entirely clear what they are for.</div>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1721 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1465.1	SSS - Seal Weld at Edge of Backing Bar	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Reference attached RFI OIW 033. The same configuration of weld joint and backing bar used on the fabricated roof nodes is also used on the bus-deck nodes for each pair of shear plates. It is our intent to provide a continuous seal weld at the end of the backing plate and the shear plates. Please confirm that the noted seal weld is acceptable for all shear plate connections to bus-deck nodes.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the noted seal weld as shown on the attached shop drawing RN151 is acceptable for the shear plate connections to Bus Deck nodes		
T-1466	SSS - Exposed Flange at Step in Slab	Closed	06/18/2014	06/28/2014	06/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: 1) Please reference sheet S1-2302, grid E.2. 5-6. At this location detail 10/S1-5002 is cut. The W33x118 beam is located 1' 1-7/8" from line E.2 as per S1-2303. Per A1-2862 the face of the slab is 1' 6-3/4" from line E.2. The face of the step to the center of the beam is 4-7/8" and the width of the flange is 11-1/2" resulting in the beam flange projecting 7/8" beyond the face of the step. Please advise if the structural steel or decking is to be modified to avoid this occurrence. 2) Please reference sheet S1-2303, grid E.2, 6-7. If item #1 requires changes, confirm if changes are required at this location also. Note: the face of the step does not meet the minimum 2" from the beam flange required as per detail 10/S1-5002. See attached sketch 20 for clarification.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) See response to RFI T-1415. 2) No changes are required at the location noted in item 2. The 2" min requirement per 10/S1-5002 can be waived at the location posed in the question 2 of this RFI		
T-1467	SCS - Foundation Wall Lift #4 Construction Joint	Closed	06/23/2014	07/03/2014	06/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Based on the construction joints shown on Sheet SI-3201,			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is construction means and methods issue. We do		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1722 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the fourth lift and the ground level slab is to be poured monolithically. Pouring the fourth lift monolithically with the ground slab causes problems with access, staging space and formwork. SCCI proposes to add a construction joint on the fourth lift as shown in the attached marked up reference drawings to remediate these issues.</p> <p>Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>						<p>not take an exception to the new construction joint proposed by the contractor at the location indicated in the RFI.</p>
T-1468	<p>SCS - WPS Qualification - Lenton Weldable Couplers</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>The Lenton welding information provides guidance for qualification of processes; however there are inconsistencies when trying to fulfill AWS D1.1 (2010) requirements. The materials used for manufacturing weldable couplers size #9-11 are Grade 1030/1035. These grades of material are not listed in AWS D1.1 (2010) Table 3. 1, although Grade 1030 is listed in AWS B 2.1 Table D.1 as a Group 2 material (table attached). In order to move forward with welding the Lenton weldable couplers to the Transfer Girders, TMF proposes that FCA W Grade 70 filler material to be used manufacturer ESAB 7100 Ultra, Classification E71 T-9, AWS Specification AWS 5.20"D". One mockup of the actual coupler welded to a Group 2 plate and macro etched would be provided as a supplement.</p> <p>Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>	Closed	06/23/2014	07/03/2014	07/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
			<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Acceptable.</p>		<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1724 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>Detail 4 on S1-3010 includes a scaled dimension of 5'-0" from face of CDSM wall to the inside face of the west half of the seismic embed (See S1-3010 attached). Therefore, the bottom embed plate will need to extend 2'-6" beyond the 5' dimension per Detail 7 of AI -8881 (attached).</p> <p>Since the as-built dimensions of the edge of pits range from 5'-0" to 5'-11" from face of CDSM wall, the bottom embed plate will overhang the pit depression 2'-6" to 1'-7". The plate could be reduced up to 1'-11" (2'-6" minus the 8" for clamping detail) to accommodate the edge of pits and allow for waterproofing clamping detail. Is this acceptable?</p> <p>Please provide further details at locations where encroaching pits do not allow for sufficient room for bottom embed plate and clamping assembly.</p>						
T-1471.1	BGP - Seismic Joint Bottom Embed Plate at Pits	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Further to the response to 1471 please find attached embed plate layout with cross-sections at the pit locations. It will be necessary at the pit locations to also infill and adjust the mud slab vertical/sloped face in order to accommodate the embed plate and clamping detail of the SJ embed.			AAI Response: The dimensions provided in SK-1, SK-2, and SK-3 for the SJ bottom embed plate are confirmed. The high strength grout or concrete infill should be compatible with the WPM and should be approved by the WPM manufacturer.				
Please confirm if this is acceptable.			TT Response: The proposed dowels are sufficient to keep in place the 2" minimum high strength grout or concrete infill during construction.				
Note: all infill material used is to be approved by the WPM manufacturer			WOJV 8/1/14: Confirmed, proceed with work.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1725 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1472	BGP - Pier and Opening Sizes on Deck D207-D209	Closed	06/24/2014	07/04/2014	07/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Because the specific sizes are not noted on the Contract Drawings provided, and wall heights are not shown on the Contract Drawing (Refer to RFI T-1472), please confirm Pier and Opening Sizes for Deck D207 to D209 are per the attached drawings.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pier and opening sizes without mark ups for Deck D207 to D209 are confirmed. Refer to attached PDF (AAI Response) for AAI notes and mark ups.		
T-1473	BGP - Lower Concourse Service Corridor Dimensions on West Wall	Closed	06/25/2014	07/05/2014	07/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference RFI T-0576 regarding the offset of the West Foundation Walls to account for the CDSM Encroachment. The west wall (GL 1) was offset 3 1/8" to the east while the southwest wall (GL XI-1) was offset 1 7/8" to the northeast. Currently there are no dimensions explicitly shown in the contract drawings for the width of the service corridor that runs along the very western edge of the Lower Concourse in Area 1 and 3. However there is a dimension shown on A1-3006 & A1-7004 that shows the eastern face of the service corridor at 5' to the west of GL 1.4 which translates into a service corridor width of 9' -8 7/8". Is it the designers intent to offset the service corridor walls similar to the foundation walls to maintain the 10' corridor width, or is it the designers intent to shrink the width of the service corridor and keep the interior walls in place? Please provide dimensions for the service corridor width.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The location of interior walls of rooms along the west and southwest service corridors shall be maintained. The service corridor widths shall be reduced by 3 1/8" on the west and 1 7/8" on the southwest.		
T-1473.1	BGP - Lower Concourse Service Corridor Dimensions on West Wall	Closed	07/07/2014	07/17/2014	07/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: With the response from RFI T-1473 and the contract drawings, SCCI has enough dimensions to model the service corridor running north-south in Area 3. However			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the alignment of the service corridor that runs along the west side of the Lower Concourse, as requested in this RFI, please refer to the work points		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1474	BGP - Seismic Joint Fire and Smoke Barrier	Closed	06/26/2014	07/06/2014	06/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Spencer Sayles				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference the attached drawing, AI-8881. Per ASI-107, a fire and smoke barrier is added at the top of Gridline 35 on 3/AI-8881. Please confirm: - 1. The fire and smoke barrier is not to be incorporated in TG06 Contract. 2. There will be no embeds associated with the fire and smoke barrier that will need to be installed in TG06 Contract. 3. Please verify who will be supplying the flexible drain to be installed in the top wall poured in TG06 Contract.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Fire smoke barrier and seismic cover to be supplied and installed by others. 2. No specification exists for the referenced seismic joint. Currently there are no known embeds. TG06 scope delineation on this sheet remains. SCCI to incorporate any ASI modifications to its originally contracted work. 3. The drain pipe design through the wall appears to be not fully developed at this point in time. WOJV is requesting structural sleeving details via RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1729 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	drawings do not supply consistent information for the location of the AESS enclosures. Please clarify where the AESS enclosures are required. 2) The AESS enclosure plate on A1-8692 is weldable only on one vertical side where it contacts the node. Confirm that is the intent. 3) The AESS enclosure plate on A1-8693 is weldable only on one vertical sides and the bottom side where it contacts the node. Confirm that is the intent. 4) Confirm all AESS enclosure plates are A572 GR50 material.			information required for AESS elements is consistent between Architectural & Structural drawings. 2) It is correct that only one side of AESS cylindrical plate is welded to cast node and it is to extend below the concrete topping slab. All exposed edges of the plate shall be finished per AESS requirements, as documented on drawings and Spec Section 05 12 13 2.3; welding shall meet QA in Spec Section 05 10 00, 1.8 D.5.d. Contractor is to submit detailed shop drawings of this AESS work describing the AESS closure fabrication, prep and welding procedures, so that basket column nodes may be reviewed as complete elements to confirm all conditions documented in Sheet A1-8690. 3) It is correct that AESS cylindrical plate is welded to one side and the bottom side onto the cast node. Additionally, plate is to extend below the concrete topping slab. All exposed edges of the plate shall be finished per AESS requirements, as documented on drawings and Spec Section 05 12 13 2.3; welding shall meet QA in Spec Section 05 10 00, 1.8 D.5.d. Contractor is to submit detailed shop drawings of this AESS work describing the AESS closure fabrication, prep and welding procedures, so that basket column nodes may be reviewed as complete elements to confirm all conditions documented in Sheet A1-8690. 4) Confirmed.			
T-1480	SSS - ST301 Shear Plate to HSS Connection	Closed	06/30/2014	07/10/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 471 SK1: The shear plate for the W10x54 only partially attaches to the HSS12x6. Confirm that is acceptable or supply an alternate detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable, except provide 5/16" fillet welds in lieu of the 1/4" fillet welds per schedule at the shear plate connection.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1730 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1481	Pier and Opening Sizes on Deck D214-D215	Closed	06/30/2014	07/10/2014	07/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Because the specific sizes are not noted on the Contract Drawings provided, and wall heights are not shown on the Contract Drawing (Refer to RFI T-1461), please confirm Pier and Opening Sizes for Deck D214 to D215 are per the attached drawings.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Pier sizes are confirmed. Size provided for CMU pier between GL 14 and 15 (refer to attached PDF-AAI Response). Door openings are confirmed based on RFI T-1362.				
<hr/>							
T-1482	SSS - Slab Opening Location at Roof Park GL5D	Closed	06/30/2014	07/10/2014	07/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 472 SK1: Please supply the size and location for the noted slab opening.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			The opening noted in this RFI is no longer there. Refer to the A-2902 issued as part of Roof Park Restaurant IFC.				
<hr/>							
T-1483	BGP - Dimension to Door on North Vehicle Ramp Wall	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: The door in question is at the east end of the north Vehicle Ramp Wall. There is a dimension on AI-2853, dimensioned at 7'-5 7/4" from GL 6 to the end of the wall and it is shown without a door attached. On all other drawings a door is shown at the east end of the wall, but there are no other dimensions indicating the east-west location of the door. Please confirm if it is the designer's intent to have the door placed on the end of the wall shown in AI-2853 so the east face of the door is 6'-5 1/4" off of GL 6 or if the door is to be placed per scale at 6'-3" off of GL 6.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			For door location with updated dimension at the east end of the north and south Vehicle Ramp walls, refer to SKA-3747 & SKA 3748.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1731 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1484	SSS - Missing Slab Opening Locations GL16D	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 478 SK1: Please supply the missing slab opening locations.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For missing slab opening dimensions refer to SKA-3674 attached. Drawing A1-2864 will be issued as part of an upcoming ASI.		
T-1485	SSS - East and West End Hole Dimension Clarification	Closed	07/01/2014	07/11/2014	07/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please confirm that grout hole "5" as shown on the attached sketch, SK1, is required on the west side only on grid 1 and on the east side only on grid 33.5. If not please clarify locations.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Hole "5" (3 in dia port in steel pipe) is used not only at East and West ends of the buildings as indicated in Sheet S1-4018 and at other locations as indicated in Sheet S1-4003. At East and West ends of the Buildings: In detail B/S1-4018 at GL H, a 3" hole (indicated as hole 5 in the RFI) is to be provided above the Bus Deck Level. On detail B/S1-4018 at GLs F.7 and E.6, a 3" grout hole above the Bus Deck Level is not needed since Bus Deck castings (casting 37 per S1-5120) include 3" holes to allow concrete flow through. Per symmetry and as called out, all pipe columns at D4., C.3 and B require the same hole configuration as those of H, F.7 and E.6. Hole requirements for pipe columns between the ground level and the roof level in detail A/S1-4018 are identical to those of Detail B/S1-4018.		
T-1485.1	SSS - East and West End Hole Dimension Clarification	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 463.1 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) Confirm Hole 5 is on the west side of the columns on Grid 33.5 and on the east side of the columns on Grid 1. 2) Supply elevation for Hole 1.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1-) Confirmed for columns on Gridlines 1 and 33.5, except corner columns. At column 1-B, locate hole 5 at plan-45 degrees facing South-West; At column 1-H, locate hole 5 at plan-45 degrees facing North-West; At		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1486.2	SSS - Missing Hole Locations for CP3, CP4 & CP8 Connections	Closed	08/15/2014	08/25/2014	09/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please supply the size and location for the bolt holes at the CP3, CP4, and CP8 connections as indicated on the attached SK1, SK2, SK3, and SK4 drawings.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			SK1 - response has been issued by TT as RFI T-1486.1 SK2 - please see attached SK3 - please see attached SK4 - please see attached				
T-1486.3	SSS - Missing Hole Locations for CP3, CP4 & CP8 Connections	Void	09/15/2014	09/25/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 476.2 SK1 to SK3 for items 1, 2 & 3: 1) The green lines are not extended thru the holes and it is not conclusive where they are located. Confirm the bolts are centered on the red lines as shown. 2) The sum of these dimensions = 35" but the d-2tf of the BU-40x22x1x2 on Grids 1 & 33.5 = 36". Please update the dimensions to suit the BU-40. 3) The sum of the green dimensions = 2'-7 1/2" but the PL 1/2" is 2'-6" long. Please clarify which dimensions are correct.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
T-1486.4	SSS - Missing Hole Locations for CP3, CP4 & CP8 Connections	Closed	09/16/2014	09/26/2014	09/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 476.2 SK1 to SK3 for items 1, 2 & 3: 1) The green lines are not extended thru the holes and it is not conclusive where they are located. Confirm the bolts are centered on the red lines as shown. 2) The sum of these dimensions = 35" but the d-2tf of the BU-40x22x1x2 on Grids 1 & 33.5 = 36". Please update the dimensions to suit the BU-40. 3) The sum of the green dimensions = 4'-7 1/2 but the PL 1/2" is 4'-6 long. Please clarify which dimensions are correct.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			1. Confirmed 2. See attached sketch for revised dimensions. 3. 4'-7 1/2" is the correct dimension as per detail 8 / S1-6094, issued with the Superstructure IFC set on 07/17/2013.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1734 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1487	SSS - Shear Plate Weld Connection Clarification	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: For roof level shear plate connection details at GL11D & GL11F, S1-2603 refers to 3/S1-5013. This detail calls for a 3sided PJP weld at the shear plates, with a t-1/8 bevel (t=shear plate thickness). The shear plate located at the center of the web has a thickness of 2 ½", which results in a 2 3/8" bevel. The column web at this location has a thickness of 1 ¼"; the stiffener plates top and bottom have a thickness of ½". A 2 3/8" PJP weld will greatly distort the ½" stiffener plates. The weld size should not exceed the thickness of the thinnest member. Also, Detail 3/S1-5013 refers to Connection Detail 4/S1-5013 which in turn refers to Shear Connection Detail 3/S1-5013. Since both sides of the shear plate are accessible (note 1), is a ½" fillet both sides as shown in 3/S1-5011 acceptable for this location?			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Double sided 1/2" fillet welds are acceptable at the top and bottom stiffener plates as indicated in the RFI. Also, reduce the weld size at the column web from 2-3/8" PJP welding to double sided 1/2" fillet welds.	
T-1488	SSS - NDT of Centrifugally Cast Pipes	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Specification 05 15 22, section 2.1.A.3 indicates magnetic particle testing (MT) shall be performed according to the criteria of ASTM A903, which in turn indicates that liquid dye penetrant testing (PT) may be performed, not in lieu of but in addition to MT, to give further information in cases where the MT results may be unclear. Please confirm if PT is an acceptable NDT method per ASTM A903, in addition to the MT already prescribed. For clarification, no reduction in the amount of MT is requested.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable at Contractor's option. When available, include dye penetrant test (PT) data as part of NDT submittals.	
T-1489	SSS - Pin Coating Clarification	Closed	07/02/2014	07/12/2014	07/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Structural Steel Specification - 05 10 00, states that the			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor's interpretation of the corrosion	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1735 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>pins for the basket columns, a Type 2(M) drag connection, are to be galvanized to class A or Class B-1 per ASTM A153. After reading this note, and looking through all of the applicable details, Skanska interpreted all of the remaining drag connection pins to be provided as bare steel. In the response to the submittal package TG0701-60.1 SSS - PIN Drawings (Central Zone), drawing A9312, a Type 2 (N2) drag connection at GL 11, was marked to receive a galvanized coating. Similar pin connections occur at GL 21 & GL 22 (Type 2-P) and GL 28 (Type 2-N2). Does the design team want these pins galvanized too? If so, please provide the standard required.</p>						
	<p>protection/finish of remaining pins (other than the Basket column pins) is not correct. AESS elements documented to receive IFRM should receive IFRM in all instances (pins are included), both as fire protection method and as a corrosion prevention measure.</p> <p>The Design Team as the TJPA Representative will offer this as Contractor's Option; to hot dip galvanize ALL the remaining pins (other than the Basket column pins), or apply the intumescent coating system over non-galvanized steel, in either option, the tolerances required for installation of pins is a means and methods solution the responsibility of the contractor</p>						
T-1490	BGP - IDF Room B1545 on Concourse Level	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: On concourse wall and floor plans (SKA-3332 and SKA-3336) the southern wall of IDF room B1545 is shown as RCW. However, on detail 3 of sheet A1-3009 it is shown as 0.10CMU. Please clarify the type of wall.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			The southern wall of IDF room B1545 is RCW; refer to A1-3009 issued with ASI 119.				
<hr/>							
T-1491	BGP - Extent of Ramp Wall Reinforcement Embedded in Lower Concourse	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please confirm the western extent of the north vehicle ramp wall that is to embed into the Lower Concourse. The five main contract drawings pertaining to this issue show five different layouts for the end of the wall embedded into the Lower Concourse. Please provide details or confirm which drawing shows the correct layout for the extent of the north Vehicle Ramp Wall that is to have reinforcement embedded into the Lower Concourse.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			Please refer to the attached SKA-3751, SKA-3771, SKA-3772, SKA-3773 and SKA-3774 for updated plans and section showing updated extent of concrete wall and CMU wall infill below the ramp.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1492	BGP - Gridline W Ramp Wall Pier Dimensions	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please provide dimensions for 3 of the piers located along the wall south of Gridline L and west of Gridline W. A1-2230 refers to A1-2850 for wall dimensions, but none are shown for the piers.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the attached SKA-3878, for location of piers at ramp wall, requested in this RFI.		
<hr/>							
T-1493	BGP - Two Future Plumbing Penetrations West of GL15	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: On Plan Sheet SKA-3361_R1, two(2) future plumbing penetrations are shown 2'-5 1/2" West of Gridline 15. The Moment Frame Beam at this location is 6' wide. This places both plumbing penetrations in the MFB. Please provide details on how SCCI is to provide plumbing penetrations through MFB on GL 15 or provide new offsets for these plumbing penetrations which are outside the MFB.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the updated locations of 2 future plumbing penetration west of GL 15 referred to in the RFI, please see the attached SKA-3740 and SKA-3741.		
<hr/>							
T-1494	BGP - Minna St. West Transformer Vault Pier Dimensions	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please provide dimensions to the center piers in the Minna St. West Transformer Vault. Refer to the attached drawings.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI Response: For Transformer Vault Door B1223A dimensions refer to door schedule A1-9701. Please refer to attached SKA-3863 and SKA-3864 for clarification. TT Response: Confirmed. See schedule on 9/S1-9050 for pier sizes.		
<hr/>							
T-1495	BGP - CMU Wall and B9/B11 Beam Dimensions D204 at GL4-J	Closed	07/03/2014	07/13/2014	07/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1737 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</div></div>			<div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Please provide dimension or confirmation for the CMU wall as well as the B9 and B 11 beam just north of GL Jin between GL X and 5. AI-2202 gives a dimension to the east-west alignment of the wall, but no north-south dimension. The wall is not in any of the AI-3000 detail drawings and no dimension is shown on AI-2222. In SI-2202 the wall appears to be centered on a B9 beam, which appears to be aligned with the BI 1 beam to the east. There is a 1' -5 3/8" dimension that appears to be for the location of the C37 beam, but the beam is also adjacent to the circular opening. Please confirm whether the B11 (and therefore the B9 beam) are to be dimensioned off of the circular opening, the dimension near the C37 column, or another dimension not provided. Also please confirm whether the CMU wall above the B9 column is to be dimensioned off of the location of the B9 beam, or another dimension not provided.</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>AAI Response: The location of the CMU wall is centered on B9 beam.</div><div>TT Response: Centerline of B9 and B11 is 1'-5 4/8" north from GL J as shown on S1-2202. This is also the centerline of the column C37.</div></div>				
T-1496	SSS - Exposed Flange at Second Level Slab GL 15	Closed	07/07/2014	07/17/2014	07/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>			<div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>See attached CD RFI # 477 SK1: The noted dimension is shown as 15'-5 1/2 on A1-2864 but the flange of the W16x26 will extend 1/2" inside the slab opening. Confirm the slab opening may be located 15'-6 east of grid 15 as shown. If not, supply an alternate solution.</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>The slab opening shall be located 15'-8" east of GL 15 as shown on the attached sketch SKA-3862. The opening will clear the steel flange by min 2". Drawing A1-2864 will be issued as part of an upcoming ASI.</div></div>				
T-1497	SSS - Brace Connection Clarification at W1 - Facade System	Closed	07/07/2014	07/17/2014	07/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>			<div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>See attached CD RFI #464. Please confirm the connection as submitted and shown on the attached sketch, SK3 as approved in RFI T-0923.2 is typically acceptable.</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Confirmed.</div></div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1738 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1498	SSS - Continuity Plate Thickness at Moment Beam Flange GL 20.1	Closed	07/07/2014	07/17/2014	07/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 480 SK1 & SK2: At the Bus deck level at grids 20.1/C & 20.1/G (Sim.) shown on SK1 & SK2 the bottom continuity plate is currently shown as 4 3/8" thick to accommodate the moment beam flange thickness and elevations. Please confirm it is acceptable to use 4" thick plates by tapering the bottom flanges, similar to the response to Webcor RFI # T-1234 (SK RFI # 427).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. We assume that the SFRS moment frame beam bottom flange continuity plate is not shown on sketch SK2 of the RFI for clarity.		
T-1499	SSS - W-1 Brace Details at Bus Level	Pending	07/07/2014	07/17/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 470 SK1 to SK3: CD RFI # 257 was issued to confirm that detail 8/S1-5015 would be referenced for all information not shown in detail 4/S1-8003 and the response in RFI SK 330 referred us to revised ASI 109 drawing S1-8003. The revised detail added (1) bolt at the bottom end of the brace connection but did not give any additional information for the connection at the top end of the brace to the beam. The connections for the braces per detail 4/S1-8003 were therefore applied per the information in detail 8/S1-5015 and RFI's T-0919, T-0919.1 & T-0919.2 (SK 173, 173.1 & 173.2, CD 127, 127.1 & 127.2). Please confirm the connection as submitted and shown on SK3 is typically acceptable. Note: no approval comment was made for the same connection on drawings 4207 & 4208 in sequence CS8.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1500	BGP - CMU Wall Dimension D206 at GL5.5-K	Closed	07/07/2014	07/17/2014	07/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1739 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	A group of Future CMU Walls are shown on the Zone Wall Plans (AI-2222, AI-2230) with lateral dimensions given to Gridline X, but no dimensions are given to the walls running east-west. The group of walls also do not show up on any other architectural or structural drawings. Please provide dimensions to the east-west future CMU walls coming off the south radius wall on D206 near Gridline 5.5-K as marked in the drawings attached.						
T-1501	SSS - Edge of Slab Plate Termination Clarification at GL 7	Closed	07/08/2014	07/18/2014	07/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 466 SK1 & SK2: With the sloping slab per A/A1-7106 (SK2), it is not clear where to terminate the edge plates per 8/S1-5000. Please clarify and supply the missing dimension.	SUGGESTION:				ANSWER: Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>
						See attached 'CD_RFI_466_SK1_SK2' submitted with the original question for requested dimension.	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1502	SSS - Decking Around Bus Deck Level Crash Rails	Void	07/09/2014	07/19/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
With reference to the Bus Deck Level crash rail post detail 1/S1-8000, the post base plate is 18"x30" and spans or overhangs the width of the supporting beam allowing no bearing for the deck. As a result along grid lines B & H where the deck runs parallel to the support beam, our decker is required to provide a gauge support angle and flashing where required around the base plate, see details 1 & 2 on SK1. At grid lines 1.1 & 33.5 where the deck runs perpendicular to the support beam, a beam flange extension is required to achieve the 3" end bearing requirements for the S8 slab, see detail 3 on SK1.							
Please confirm these details are acceptable or provide an alternative detail for the deck support around the crash rail base plate.							
<hr/>							
T-1503	BGP - Lower Concourse Grounding Grid Alternate Detail - Room B1441 GL15/G.5	Closed	07/09/2014	07/19/2014	07/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per the breakout meeting held after the TTC progress meeting on 7/9 @10:30, and email correspondence between Adib Sassine and Walter Melville (Attached). Please confirm the following items regarding the grounding mesh in electrical room B1441 at Grid Lines 15/G.5.					1) WSP has no exceptions to this proposal, subject to SFPUC acceptance.		
- Due to constructability issues please confirm that the attached PUC approved alternate detail is acceptable and will be incorporated into lower concourse electrical room B1441 at GL15/G.5					2) WSP has no exceptions to this proposal, subject to SFPUC acceptance.		
- The attached alternate detail incorporates a 4/0 field fabricated grid in lieu of the original #6 mesh and 4/0 ground ring. Please confirm that the alternate detail 4/0 grid will suffice to also act as the ground ring, and all pigtails can be attached to the grid.					3) WSP has no exceptions to this proposal, subject to SFPUC acceptance.		
- Please confirm the grounding grid spacing is 4' on center with connections to mat rebar at 8' on center.					4) WSP has no exceptions to this proposal, subject to SFPUC acceptance.		
					5) WSP has no exceptions to this proposal, subject to SFPUC acceptance.		
					6) Refer to SFPUC response.		
					7) WSP has no exceptions to this proposal, subject to SFPUC acceptance.		
					8) WSP has no exceptions to this proposal, subject to		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1741 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div><div><div><div>- Please confirm that cadweld or use listed irreversible compression connections to cross-grid and ground mat at 8' on center minimum is acceptable.</div><div>- Please confirm ground potential rise study at each switch gear room is not required.</div><div>- Please confirm which specification governs, IEEE142 per Transbay Transit Center contract documents or per PUC referenced specification IEEE80, which will require "Ground Grid Test". (See attached email).</div><div>- Please confirm the layout of grid does not extend past the walls in South Electrical room B1441.</div><div>- Please confirm that exothermic or irreversible compression connections listed for concrete encasement are required for all pigtails main grid connections, (outside edge to cross members, corners, and main cross connectors), and connections to building ground wires (shown with "G" on plan).</div><div>- Please confirm that SFPUC and DBI will be the only entities inspecting the grounding grid.</div></div></div><div></div></div></div>						
T-1504	BGP - Lower Concourse Future Wall FS Conflicts	Closed	07/09/2014	07/19/2014	07/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Per attached correspondence, WOJV has directed SCCI to install future wall formsavers according to the details attached that clarify the Contract Drawings. However, due to congestion created by the increased amount of reinforcing within the beam components, ample space to install the future wall formsaver bars at the design spacing does not always exist. See attached pictures.				Confirmed.			
Because the CMU contract has not been solicited or awarded, please confirm that it is acceptable to offset the bars out of alignment+/- 4" in attempts to maintain proper							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1742 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	spacing, and/or increase or decrease the specified spacing +/- 6" such that the future wall formsaver bars can be installed and the correct number of dowels is maintained. The same flexibility is also requested for the "ends, intersection and corner" detail per the attached document.						
T-1505	SSS - Stiffener Plate Location at TR13	Closed	07/09/2014	07/09/2014	07/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 473 SK1: The 2 1/2" plate has been located 1 1/8" above the 2" diameter rebar holes to allow room for the 1" fillet welds. If the plate is located per the response to RFI T-0889 (SK 145, CD 107) item 1, it will cover the 2" diameter rebar holes. Confirm the plate location as shown is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1506	BGP - Room B1441 Grounding Grid Approval and Inspection Jurisdiction	Closed	07/11/2014	07/21/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Judith Long				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per breakout meeting held after the TTC progress meeting on 7/9 @10:30am, please confirm that PG&E will have no jurisdiction over approval and inspection of the grounding grid in electrical room B1441 GL 15/G.5.					As SFPUC is the utility, SFPUC shall have jurisdiction over the approval and inspection of the grounding grid in electrical room B1441 GL 15/G.5. PG&E, as the WDT provider, may have jurisdiction only over the metering section of the WDT switchgear. For reference, please find attached an email from SFPUC on 7/25/2014 and PG&E on 7/14/2014 confirming PG&E does not have jurisdiction over the grounding grid in the electrical room. Please note, SFPUC, through Walter Melville, had inspected and approved the ground grid for the North electrical room on 7/16/2014		
					Answered By: Sam Larano, Manager SFPUC Answered On: 7/29/2014		
T-1507	BGP - Seismic Joint Removable Corbel Connection Variance	Closed	07/11/2014	07/21/2014	07/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per contract drawing S1-3205, the removable W14x61 steel corbel and WT8X28.5 angles it connects with are to be fabricated with a 2" vertical slotted hole.					1.) Not acceptable.		
In order to eliminate the lead time of field measured fabrication of the corbels after concrete formwork removal from the SJ assembly, the contractor is proposing either or preferably both of the following modifications:					2.) The beam portion of the corbel may be coated for corrosion protection rather than galvanized. Refer to specification section 09 97 13, part 3.6, item E for acceptable coating types.		
1. Change the slotted hole from vertical to horizontal (east to west) direction on the angles and or the steel corbels							
2. Change the finish of the removable W14X61 steel corbel only from galvanized to primed steel (all other embedded metals would remain galvanized per the contract drawing).							
Please confirm if either of these proposals would be acceptable?							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1508	SSS - Additional Stud Requirements on ASI 112	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: ASI 112 added "UON, see general note DK-5 for added studs on beams" on partial stair plan drawings S1-7002 & S1-7003. It is unclear what beams require studs on these plans. Please provide stud quantities for each beam as per the steel beam legend on S1-2302 so Skanska can provide accurate pricing for this ASI.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches SKS-0371 through SKS-0373 that show updated plans with additional shear studs (clouded) on beams.		
T-1509	SCS - Lower Concourse Partition Walls Drawing Conflicts	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	07/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: 1. There is a conflicting detail on Sheet No A1-2202 and S1-2202. A1-2202 shows the wall on grid line B.8-1.4 as a concrete wall but on S1-2202, the same wall is shown as a concrete masonry wall. Please verify 2. There is a conflicting detail on Sheet No A1-2202 and S1-2202 and corresponding details on A1-3008 and B/A1-9241. The dimensions of the concrete walls on grid line F-3 are different. Doors have different locations. Please verify 3. There is a conflicting detail on Sheet No A1-2202 (and corresponding details on A1-3001 and B/A1-9235) and S1-2202. The architectural drawings show a concrete wall along grid line 3, there is no wall in S1-2202. Please verify 4. There is a conflicting detail on Sheet No A1-2203 (and corresponding detail on A1-2250) and S1-2203. The scaled dimensions of the concrete wall on grid line K.1-7.5 are different. Please verify. Please also provide Sheet A1-7405 with actual dimensions. 5. There is a conflicting detail on Sheet No A1-2203 (and corresponding details on A1-3002 and E/A1-9236) and S1-2203. In S1-2203, grid line B.6-11 there are two gaps in the concrete wall, there is only one gap in the same wall in A1-2203. Please verify 6. There is a conflicting detail on Sheet No A1-2204 (and corresponding details 2/A1-3008 and A1-9240) and S1-			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The wall along GL B.8 was updated with the Addendum #3 drawings (issued 04/24/2014) as a concrete partition wall. 2. Follow architectural drawings for layout and dimensioning of concrete partition wall door openings along GL F.3. 3. Follow architectural drawings for layout of concrete partition wall along GL 3 between GL A-B. 4. Follow architectural drawings for layout and dimensioning of concrete partition wall along GL K.1 near GL 7.5. 5. Follow architectural drawings for layout of concrete partition wall and openings along GL 11 near GL B.6. 6. Follow architectural drawings for layout and dimensioning of concrete partition wall and door opening near GL C.3/15 and GL B.1/15. 7. Follow architectural drawings for layout and dimensioning of concrete partition wall door opening along GL 21 near GL G.5.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1745 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>2204. The door locations for the EAST FSR on grid line C.3-15 and B.1-15 are in different positions. Please verify</div> <div>7. There is a conflicting detail on Sheet No A1-2205 (and corresponding details 1/A1-3003 and E/A1-9237) and S1-2205. The door locations on the concrete wall on grid line G.5-21 is in a different position. Please verify</div>							
T-1510	SSS - W-1 Brace Details at Bus Level	Closed	07/14/2014	07/24/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 470 SK1 to SK3: Revised detail 4/S1-8003 from ASI 109 added (1) bolt at each end of the brace. The connections for the braces per detail 4/S1-8003 were therefore applied per the information in detail 8/S1-5015 and RFI's T-0919, T-0919.1 & T-0919.2 (SK 173, 173.1 & 173.2, CD 127, 127.1 & 127.2). Please confirm the connection as submitted and shown on SK3 is typically acceptable. Note: no comment was made for the same connection on drawings 4207 & 4208 in sequence CS8.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
<hr/>							
T-1511	BGP - Unistrut at Lower Concourse E-W Spandrel Beams	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	07/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please confirm it is acceptable to install unistrut at the E-W and Spandrel Beam Bottom and Sides at the Lower Concourse construction joints (Reference attached sketch). This unistrut would serve as the bottom edge form, be left in place and cast in the Lower Concourse with the subsequent deck pour.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: The proposal is not acceptable. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1512	BGP - Mechanical Pump Room B2761 Electrical Sump Feeds	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	07/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Plan Sheet EI-2027 shows two(2) sump controllers in Mechanical Pump Room B2761, one for SE-B2- D-1,2 and the other for SPG-B2-D-1,2. There will be 2" conduits from these controllers to two of the three sump pits in the mechanical room for the pump leads. Plan Sheet EI-2027 indicates the two(2) eastern-most pits get the pump lead conduits(see attached), however Detail 4 on Plan Sheet PI-3006 identifies the western-most pit as "SPG" and the middle pit as "SE"(see attached). Please confirm: 1) Detail 4 on plan sheet P1-3006 is correct. 2) The pump lead conduits from SE-B2-D-1,2 will lead to the pit identified as "SE" on plan sheet P1-3006. 3) The pump lead conduits from SPG-B2-D-1,2 will lead to the pit identified as "SPG" on plan sheet P1-3006.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Detail 4 on plan sheet P1-3006 is correct. 2. This is correct. 3. This is correct.				
T-1513	SSS - Corner Drag Beam Framing at Bus Deck Level	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	07/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 383.2 SK1 & SK2: The revised framing shown on attached SK1 & SK2 is per discussions in a conference call following the response to RFI T-1322.1. Please review and confirm all boxed notes on SK1 & SK2.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed details noted in the boxes are acceptable.				
T-1514	SSS - Bus Deck Level Stiffener Conflict at CP8 Near GL 1.4	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	07/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 484 SK1. The 1 1/2" stiffener on the far side will cover the hole in the bottom flange for CP8. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 1-1/2" stiffener requirement per 4/S1-8003 may be waived at the location highlighted in the RFI. Provide two 2L3x3x3/8 braces per 4/S1-8003, one each at the 1"x 9" stiffener plates adjacent to the CP6 connection work point. Note that stiffener plates per				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1747 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1514.1	SSS - Bus Deck Level Stiffener Conflict at CP8 Near GL 1.4	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 484.1 SK1: Providing two 2-L3x3x3/8 braces per T-1514 does not work as the brace close to the W36x231 will foul the beam. Confirm it is acceptable to supply one 2-L3x3x3/8 as shown.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable. The brace in conflict with the W36x231 beam may be moved to the adjacent 1"x9" stiffener.				
T-1515	SSS - Connection Clarifications for Stiffeners and Plate at BU Beam at GL 1.4-2 & I Closed		07/15/2014	07/25/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 485 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3: 1) The 1/2" x 9" stiffeners foul the built-up beam as shown. Please provide a solution. 2) The 1/2" x 9" stiffeners foul the connection per detail 2/S1804 as shown. Please provide a solution. 3) The hole locations in detail 6E/S1-8003 are not known and have been requested in RFI CD 476 but it appears the PL 2" will obstruct the flange holes. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Provide stiffeners as shown in attached sketch SKS-0374 at the location highlighted in the RFI. Note that stiffeners per 6/S1-8003 are 1" thick, not 1/2" as noted in the RFI. 2) See response to 1). 3) Bolt holes may be shifted towards the edge of the flange edge to avoid interference with the 2" plate. Refer to response for RFI CD 476 for additional information on bolt hole locations.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1748 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1516	SSS - Bolt Requirement for BU Beam at Roof Perimeter Corner	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 488 SK1 & SK2: 11 bolts are required per 1/S1-5010 for W40 beams. However, due to the weld access holes in the BU-40x22, we can only fit in 9 bolts in the one row as shown. The other row will have 11 bolts. Confirm that this detail is acceptable or please supply an alternate detail.				Confirmed, this is acceptable.			
T-1517	SSS - Weld Detail for Architectural Plate	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please confirm the attached weld detail is acceptable for fi eld welding the 3/8" architectural cylindrical plate.				Confirmed.			
T-1518	BGP - Partition Wall Pilaster Ties	Closed	07/15/2014	07/25/2014	07/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPClaude Titche</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
As discussed onsite with the SEOR, please confirm the following for partition walls:				Confirmed, noting disagreement that ties are added scope.			
1. All isolated pilasters have ties over their entire height							
2. All pilasters thicker than the adjacent integral wall have ties over their entire height- Please note that this is added scope to TG06 Contract							
3. Pilaster that are the same thickness as the adjacent integral wall require ties only for the lengths defined in Note 3 of Detail 9/SI-9050							
4. Where ties are present at a pilaster base, the ties are not required to penetrate the supporting slab or foundation.							
5. Ties may be built up from stirrups and hairpins containing 135 hooks.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1749 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please reference the attached drawings, S1-9050.</p>							
T-1519	BGP - Formsavers for Ramp Walls Embedded in Lower Concourse	Closed	07/17/2014	07/27/2014	07/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please confirm that it is acceptable to use formsavers for the Ramp Walls that are to be embedded in the Lower Concourse in lieu of dowels shown in A/S1-3203 or 3/S1-3502. This is done to improve construction access. Locations for the proposed formsavers are per attached documents- highlighted in red.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Use of formsavers is acceptable, provided the following: - please adjust placement of dowel to accommodate formsaver cap and provide vertical wall clear cover per drawings. - formsaver dowels to be straight bars where dowel full embedment length into beam at lower concourse is provided. Otherwise formasvers to be provided with standard hook at end. - please provide proposed formsaver for use of dowels with terminator. Formsaver must have equal or greater capacity of dowel with terminator to be acceptable.				
<hr/>							
T-1520	SSS - Moment Weld at Bottom Flange of W30X90	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please supply a detail showing how to make the moment weld for the bottom flange of the W30x90.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide moment connection detail at bottom of the W30x90 beams at CP4 connections along GL 1 per attached sketch SKS-0376.				
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1751 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	3) Supply the edge of slab location on the north, west and south sides at T/SLAB 85'-0" as A1-2902 seems to show different information than 2/S1-7003. (The east side is shown in detail 6/S1-7602).						
T-1524.1	SSS - ST201 Missing Dimensions and Slab Location	Closed	08/07/2014	08/17/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 501.1 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) The response RFI T-1524 (SK 691, CD 501) did not supply a response to item 1. 2/S1-7003 clearly shows the steel framing as shown on SK1 but does not supply this dimension to locate the beam. Please supply this missing dimension. 2) Edge plate per 8/S1-5000. Confirm. 3) Supply a detail for the edge of slab plate if required.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The W16 beam shall be aligned to the HSS8x8 column as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0397. 2) Confirmed. 3) Distance between GL E.6 and the slab edge noted as 11 1/2" on SK1 in the RFI is incorrect. Refer to SKA-3906 submitted with RFI T-1524 and detail F/A1-2952 for the edge of slab condition at the north edge of the elevator landing. Provide slab edge plate per typical detail 8/S1-5000 at this slab edge.				
T-1525	SSS - Plate Extending Past End of Girder at Roof Level	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 513 SK1 & SK2: The 3" plate per Type 61 on S1-5132 extends 3" past the end of the Girder. Please confirm that is the intent or supply a solution.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide 25" long cap plate (in lieu of 28") to prevent the 3" extension past the end of the Girder.				
T-1526	SSS - Dimensional Adjustment to Avoid Fouling BU-Box Beam at Bus Ramp Supp	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 515 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) The web reinforcing plate will foul the BU-Box Beam 'B' if extended past the flange cope 1'-0 per S1-5017. Confirm the 1'-0 dimension may be reduced to 9 3/4" as shown or supply an alternate solution. 2) The web reinforcing plate will foul the end plate for the WF beam if extended past the flange cope 1'-0 per S1-5017. Confirm the 1'-0 dimension may be reduced to 6 1/4" on both sides or supply an alternate solution.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-1527	SSS - PE201 & ST201A Welding Clarifications at WF	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	07/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 494 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) Confirm weld prep. 2) The noted fillet weld cannot be made with the 3/8" gap per item 1. Confirm this weld will also be a CJP weld to match the T & B weld. 3) This weld cannot be made with the 3/8" gap. Supply an alternate weld.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: 1) Provide a root opening of 1/4" and a groove angle of 45 degrees for the CJP weld. 2) Confirmed. 3) The 5/16 fillet weld can be made by providing a backing bar as shown in attached sketch SKS-0377.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1528	SSS - ST201A Missing Moment Connection Details at HSS Posts	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	07/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 498 SK1: Clarify how the top and bottom flange of the W12x19 are to be moment welded as they do not align with the top and bottom plates for the HSS10x8 per 6/S1-7604 as shown.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketch SKS-0379 for moment connections details at W12 beam to HSS post connections. The top 3/4" thick plate per 10/S1-7604 shall be extended and welded to the top flange of the W12 beam as shown in the sketch. Increase the thickness of the bottom plate from 3/4" to 2 1/4" and provide a CJP weld to the W12 bottom flange. Note that the W12x19 beams connect to the W14x311 columns near GL 1/D.4 and GL 1/E.2, not to HSS columns as indicated on SK1 in the RFI. The W14x311 columns extend up to the bottom of the S7 slab (T/slab EL = 86'-9").		
<hr/>							
T-1529	SSS - ST201 W16 to HSS Post Connection Clarification	Closed	07/18/2014	07/28/2014	07/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 503 SK1: Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W16's to the HSS posts per 1/S1-5011.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide connections at W16 beams as noted in attached sketch SKS-0378. Note that the W14x311 columns at ST201 extend up to the bottom of the S7 slab (T/slab EL. = 86' - 9").		
<hr/>							
T-1529.1	SSS - ST201 W16 to HSS Post Connection Clarification	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 503.1 SK1: The connection for the HSS10x8 per 10/S1-7605 no longer works with the W14x311 terminating at the underside of slab at T/Slab 86'-9 per RFI T-1529 (SK 693, CD 503). Please supply a new detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please see the red marks added to the CD RFI 503.1 SK1 (page 2).		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1529.2	SSS - ST201 W16 to HSS Post Connection Clarification	Closed	10/31/2014	11/09/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 503.2 SK1: 1). The connection detail is not possible as the beam will not be erectable with the HSS beam extending to the web of the W14 column as shown by the (2) end views of the HSS10x8x1/2. Please supply a new detail that permits the erection of the (2) noted beams. 2). For the added prep. weld to the top of the HSS per the response T-1529.1 verify this is a PJP weld with zero clearance and if so review with question # 1 for erection of these members in question.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Provide HSS beam to WF column moment connection per attached sketch SKS-0428. 2) See response to 1). TT: We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with verification. We categorize this as no cost clarification.			
T-1530	SSS - ST201 Edge of Slab Locations at Landings	Closed	07/19/2014	07/29/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The edge of slab locations for the ST201A landings are missing. Please refer to the list below and supply the edge of slab locations for items 1, 3, 5, 6 & 8: 1) 2/S1-7001 ~ supply edge of slab information 2) 3/S1-7001 ~ edge of slab information is shown on A1-2882 3) 1/S1-7002 ~ supply edge of slab information 4) 2/S1-7002 ~ edge of slab information is shown on A1-2892 5) 3/S1-7002 ~ supply edge of slab information 6) 1/S1-7003 ~ supply edge of slab information 7) 2/S1-7003 ~ edge of slab information is shown on A1-2902 8) 3/S1-7003 ~ supply edge of slab information		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As requested, only responses to items 1, 3, 5, 6 & 8 are being provided. Item 1 & 3: Intermediate Landing levels at 32'-1", 41'-9" and 50'-9" are all identical, for edge of slab locations refer to A1-2882. Item 5 & 6: Intermediate Landing levels at 59'-9", 68'-9" and 77'-9" are all identical, for edge of slab locations refer to A1-2892. Item 8: Refer to 1/A1-2964 for corresponding slab edge plan.			
T-1531	SSS - ST201 Bolt and Cap Plate Connection Clarification	Closed	07/19/2014	07/29/2014	07/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 504 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) The bolts will not be erectable if left inside the profile of		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) The W14 column extends up to the bottom of the			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1755 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1532	SSS - Deck Support Angle at Column Base Plate	Closed	07/19/2014	07/29/2014	07/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Per detail 1/S1-5052 when the column base plate and the transfer girder flange is the same width, there is no deck support for the length of the column base plate when the deck sits at the same level as the girder. Please confirm it is acceptable to provide a gage angle to support the deck around the column base plate. The gauge angle will be welded after the column to girder connection is made to avoid the angle and weld interfering with the connection. See attached SK1 & 2 for clarification.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Using gage angle for connection to the metal deck around the base plate is acceptable, however, the gage angle is to be welded to the transfer girder flange, not the base plate. Extend the vertical leg of the gage angle down as needed.	



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1532.1	SSS - Deck Support Angle at Column Base Plate	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
This is a follow-up to the response of RFI T-1532.				Welding the deck support angle to the base plate is acceptable if the welding is made only in the zones marked on attached sketch SKS-0396. The gage angle welded to the base plate will provide adequate deck support. Using Hilti pins to attach the angle to the base plate is not acceptable. We disagree with the claim that overhead welding at the deck support angle constitutes a "cost increase". Detail 8/S1-3705 which shows deck support angle detail at the transfer girder flanges was part of bid documents. The only exception to this detail at the column base plates is that the angle is being welded to the base plate and not the transfer girder flange. Also, refer to details on A1-9317 for slab edge detail at the column base plates.			
As per the response, restricting welding to only the girder flange creates several issues: 1. See detail 17 on SK1 - an additional 4" would be required on the vertical leg of the angle to allow welding to the girder flange. This creates a 12" vertical leg, welded at the bottom toe to the girder and supporting a 13" concrete slab. Our decker does not believe this is adequate support. This occurs at 9 locations. 2. See detail 5 & 17 on SK1 - overhead welding will be required from the underside to weld to the girder flange. Detail 5 occurs at 67 locations and 17 occurs at 9 locations. Our decker will incur additional labor and equipment costs for this work. If welding to the base plate is prohibited, an alternative solution which will have lower additional cost impact is to use Hilti pins to attach the gauge angle to base plate or girder flange. See attached product data and application details. See attached SK2 for clarification. Please confirm if welding to the column base plate is prohibited, Skanska can use Hilti pins as per SK2.							

T-1532.2	SSS - Deck Support Angle at Column Base Plate	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
This is a follow-up to the response of RFI T-1532.1				1.) We believe that deck support during construction is a means and methods issue, however in our opinion, the simplest solution is running angles parallel to the transfer girder, from one perpendicular beam to another, around the column base plates. This will also help to provide the 1" separation needed from the column base plate in detail A1-9317. 2.) As indicated in the design drawings there are no elements around the base plate that require welding to the base plate. Any accidental welding in the field to			
As per the response to the above RFI, direction to drawing A1-9317 (which was provided as part of FO 27) indicates a deck closure/support angle separated 1" from the column base plate, with no structural information provided. As a detail for deck support around the column base plate is not provided in the structural drawings and Skanska's proposals have been rejected in previous RFI responses, this remains an open issue. We require a detail in order to proceed							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1757 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>with the detailing of shop drawings. Please note this condition occurs at CS1 and throughout the central zone and is currently holding up the resubmittal of the metal deck shop drawings for the central zone.</p> <p>Additionally, the RFI response identified a "no weld zone" that was not shown on the design documents. As this was not called out on the contract drawings, this zone is not being identified with paint strips as per the protected zone requirements. This may lead to trade workers accidentally welding in the field. Please provide direction for the identification requirements for the base plate "no weld zone".</p>						
T-1532.3	SSS - Deck Support Angle at Column Base Plate	Closed	10/07/2014	10/17/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Please provide a structural detail indicating the designer's requirements for the deck support/closure angle around the column base plate to top of transfer girder connection on all sides of the base plate.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				Our response to RFI 1532.2 stands. This RFI is written in a misleading manner. In the 10/02/2014 meeting, we have reiterated that temporary shoring of slab is a means and methods issue. This RFI does not include any new information over the .2 version therefore refer to .2 version which already provided a direction as part of question 1. What was stated in the 10/02/2014 meeting was SER agrees to look at the proposal of the contractor to help resolve the issue however the RFI question is identical to the first question in RFI 1532.2 therefore no further action taken.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1758 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1532.4	SSS - Deck Support Angle at Column Base Plate	Open	06/17/2015	06/17/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-2303 to A1-2863, 5/A1-9317, S1-2302 to S1-2307, S1-3705 Location: Ground Level Gridline: 11, 12, 13, 15, 16 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached Docs Please Refer to the RFI Text on the Sheet attached.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-1533	BGP - Additional Reinforcing at MS 113	Closed	07/21/2014	07/31/2014	07/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Due to sagging of the top mat reinforcing at Mat Slab MS 113, there would be excessive concrete cover. Per field conversation with SEOR, please confirm it is acceptable to install #5 reinforcing at 8" OC(either on dobies or other reinforcing) at locations where this sagging occurs to decrease the upper cover to within the allowable limits.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable at MS 113 for the pit below the trestle.		
<hr/>							
T-1534	SCS - Transfer Girder Elevation & Detail - G Line - TR19.9, 20.1, 22, 24	Closed	07/22/2014	08/01/2014	08/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Find attached Harris RFI dated July 17, 2014 and SK2 and SK3 from response to RFI #T-1408 with added blue markups/comments. SK3 with the response to RFI #T-1408 shows the elevation of the top of steel to be above the elevation of the top of concrete. 1. Please confirm the top of steel is intended to come out			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The top of steel shown is correct. 2. Please see the attached sketch SSK-0384 For TR19.9 and 201.1 2. See response to item 2 above.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1759 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>of the top of concrete and provide a revised 9/SI-3702 detail.</p> <p>a. Please clarify the detail for the welded couplers at the top flange.</p> <p>For TR19.9 and 20.1, a plate for the bottom welded couplers are not shown on SI-4304.</p> <p>2. Please clarify the location of the lower set of couplers. Does the lower set of couplers weld to the bottom flange?</p>						
T-1535	<p>SSS - PE201 Connection Clarifications at Roof Level</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>See attached CD RFI # 505 SK1 for items 1 to 6:</p> <p>1) Supply the elevation of the (4) HSS12x6x1/4.</p> <p>2a) Supply a connection detail.</p> <p>3) Supply a connection detail.</p> <p>4) Supply missing dimension.</p> <p>6) The noted slab edge detail is referenced but no slab information is shown. Please clarify.</p>	Closed	07/24/2014	08/03/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			1) T/steel of the four HSS12x6 beams is 101'-5".				
			2a) HSS8x6x1/4 beams noted in SK1 in the RFI are not required and shall be removed. See attached sketch SKS-0387 for updated framing layout. Note that HSS outriggers have been moved from detail 3/S1-7003 to 4/S1-7003 as shown in the attached sketch. A HSS 8x6x1/4 beam has also been added at the west edge of PE201 in detail 4/S1-7003.				
			3) See response to 2a).				
			4) Refer to details 4/A1-7861, 2/7862 and 4/A1-7864 to determine the extents of the HSS8x6 outrigger beam.				
			6) The slab edge detail is incorrectly called out. Detail 9/S1-5000 does not apply at the highlighted location.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1536	SCS - Concrete Cover & Tolerance on Foundation Wall Terminator Rebar	Closed	07/24/2014	08/03/2014	08/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: Drawing SI-3201 and other similar foundation wall sections call out a 2" concrete cover on the terminators of the foundation wall vertical rebar. These vertical bars have no adjustability because one end is a terminator and the other end is a male coupler end. The elevation of the top of terminator will be dependent on the coupler elevation above the Lift 3 Foundation Wall. The ground floor slab is 10" thick and sloped along the top of foundation wall. To allow for maximum deviation to accommodate for the slope of the slab, tolerances in rebar fabrication and location from the previous wall lifts and the final wall lift: 1. Shimmick proposes to change the concrete cover from 2" to 5" and increase the tolerance to 2.5". Please confirm this is acceptable. 2. If the proposal is not acceptable, please provide a concrete cover and tolerance that is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Standard ACI tolerance shall apply on concrete cover, increasing the cover and deviation of the tolerance is not acceptable. These proposed modifications to the cover and tolerances would be acceptable only if contractor provides additional U bars over the moment frame beam top rebar with size and spacing matching the size and spacing of stirrups in Zone 1 of Detail 6/S1-3600 at no cost to the owner. The U bars would span between the top corner bars of the moment frame beam have vertical legs that are equal to embedment length per 1/S1-3001. No additional U bars is required between the beams.			
T-1537	SSS - ST202 Connection Clarification at HSS Posts	Closed	07/24/2014	08/03/2014	08/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 508 SK1: Confirm the connection as shown is acceptable or supply a new detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Extend the WF beam stiffener at the far side (shown in gray color in SK1 of the RFI) full depth. Provide the same fillet weld per 10/S1-7600, except 3 sides instead of 2.			
T-1538	SSS - ST202 & PE203 Connection Clarification and Missing Connection	Closed	07/24/2014	08/03/2014	08/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 509 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3: 1) Please confirm the noted dimension. 2) Please supply a connection detail for the HSS post to the underside of slab beside B71.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The noted dimension shall be 1'- 6". 2) The HSS post connection to underside of concrete slab shall be similar to 9/S1-7600 to an embedded plate.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1762 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1541	SSS - ST202 & PE203 Framing Clarifications at Lower Level Concourse	Closed	07/24/2014	08/03/2014	09/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 511 SK1 & SK2: 2/S1-7004 or any other details on S1-7004 do not appear to show the framing at the Lower Concourse Level as shown on A/A1-7004 (SK1). Please clarify.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached sketch SKS-0390 for stair support framing at lower concourse level.			
T-1542	SSS - Steel Plate Availability	Closed	07/24/2014	08/03/2014	08/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: After reviewing the specifications and standards for ASTM A572 Gr. 50 steel, along with speaking with our steel suppliers, Herrick has found that the aforementioned grade of material is not manufactured below 3/16". Please confirm that A606 Type 4 Mod is acceptable where A572 Gr 50 is specified at 1/8" (Please see attached SK1).		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFI VOIDED - See T-1542.1			
T-1542.1	SSS - Steel Plate Availability	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	08/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: After reviewing the specifications and standards for ASTM A572 Gr. 50 steel, along with speaking with our steel suppliers, Herrick has found that the aforementioned grade of material is not manufactured below 3/16". Please advise.		SUGGESTION: A606 Type 4 Mod may be acceptable where A572 Gr 50 is specified at 1/8" (Please see attached SK1).		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No specific drawing, location, or specification is referred to. Question is too vague to respond to.			
T-1542.2	SSS - Steel Plate Availability	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	09/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The Type 3 drag connection detail, 1/S1-5018, calls for shim plates as required at connections between beams of		SUGGESTION: Please confirm that A606 Type 4 Mod is acceptable where A572 Gr 50 is specified at 1/8" (Please see		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Suggestion acceptable			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1763 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>different depth. The contract documents specify, "Shims/Fillers: Match Material Strength of Connecting Members", which in this case would be ASTM A572 Gr. 50.</p> <p>After reviewing the specifications and standards for ASTM A572 Gr. 50 steel, along with speaking with our steel suppliers, we have found that the aforementioned grade of material is not manufactured below 3/16".</p> <p>Please advise.</p>	attached SK1).					
T-1543	SSS - ST201A Missing Information	Closed	07/24/2014	08/03/2014	08/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached CD RFI # 500 SK1 for items 1 to 4:			1) Confirmed.				
1) Confirm the missing beam size should read W12x26.			2) Missing dimension is 3' - 11 1/2".				
2) Supply missing dimension.			3) Slab type is S7.				
3) Supply the slab type.			4) Dimensions to locate the two noted davits in the north/south direction are noted on A1-7003.				
4) The noted (2) davits are shown located on Grid 'D' but A1-7003 shows the davits located north of Grid 'D' with providing the location. Please provide the north/south location of the davits.							
T-1544	SSS - SE201 & SE202 Connection Clarification at W16X36 Beams	Closed	07/24/2014	08/03/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached CD RFI # 522 SK1 & SK2:			Confirmed. Note that the framing plan shown on SK1 in the RFI is not current. S1-2602 was revised and submitted as part of Roof Park Restaurant IFC package on 5/30/2014. Refer to attached sketch SKS-0383 for current framing layout.				
Confirm it is acceptable to connect the noted W16 beams per 1/S1-5011 as 1/S1-5010 will not work with the connection on the opposite side.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1764 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1545	SSS - SE201 & SE202 Beam Connection and Location Clarifications	Closed	07/24/2014	08/03/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 523 SK1 for items 1 & 2:				1) Confirmed.			
1) Confirm it is acceptable to locate the beam 6" from the edge of slab.				2) Confirmed.			
2) Confirm it is acceptable to connect the beam per 1/S1-5011 at both ends to avoid fouling the HSS beam connection.							
T-1546	SSS - Brace Connection Clarificationat GL 3 W40X149 Beam	Closed	07/24/2014	08/03/2014	08/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 526 SK1:				Provide a WT 10.5x66 welded to the bottom flange of the W40x149 and to the transfer girder flange, in lieu of the kicker brace per 5/S1-5015. Connection of the WT to the W40 beam and the transfer girder including weld size, type and length, shall be similar to that shown in sketch SKS-0290 submitted with response to RFI T-0824.			
Confirm it is acceptable to omit the brace per 5/S1-5015 as there is insufficient room below the noted W40x149.							
T-1547	BGP - Seismic Joint Deformed Bar Anchor Variance	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	07/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPClaude Titcher</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please reference Detail 2, Sheet S 1-3205.				1). See response to #3			
Please clarify the following deformed bar questions:				2). The detail was drawn graphically incorrect, see response to #3			
1. 1" diameter deformed bar is a non-standard diameter for deformed bar. This will require the bar to be specially manufactured which could take up to 4 weeks to procure. 3/4" diameter deformed bar is the largest standard size readily available. Is it acceptable to use 3/4" diameter in lieu of 1" diameter deformed bar?				3). Using 1" (#8) welded rebars is acceptable as long as ASTM A706 bars are used. Submit weld detail with the seismic joint shop drawings for review.			
2. The detail depicts a head on the end of the deformed							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1765 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>			
T-1548	<p>bar. Headed deformed bar is also non-standard (see attached Nelson Stud Deformed Bar Product Data) and currently found to be unattainable. Is it the intent of the engineer to include a headed deformed bar anchor? Is it acceptable to use a standard A 108 bar per ASTM A496 as detailed in the attached product data?</p> <p>3. If the 3/4" diameter deformed bar is unacceptable, is it acceptable to use 1" (#8) welded rebar in lieu of the 1" deformed bar? Furthermore, will the rebar require headed reinforcement?</p> <p>BGP - Protection Slab at Seismic Joint</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please reference Detail 3 of A1-8881, S1-2027, and the attached Drawings.</p> <p>Please confirm the protection slab is to stop 5" east of GL 35 as scaled on attached Detail 3 of Sheet AI - 8881.</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable to eliminate the 12" section of protection slab against the east CDSM wall.</p> <p>Please reference attached drawing S1-2027. If the protection slab is required to end 5" east of GL 35, the slab will be poured halfway up the slope on the center and north pits as depicted in S1-2027. Is it the engineer's intent to end the slab halfway up the pit? If not, please provide details of protection slab location at the seismic joint at the center and north pits.</p>	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>			
								Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
								ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
								<p>1. Confirmed, the protection slab may stop 5" east of GL 35. Protection of the membrane is a means and methods issue and is the contractor's responsibility and does not require our comment.</p> <p>2. It is acceptable to eliminate the 11" protection slab against the east CDSM wall. Protection of the membrane is a means and methods issue and is the contractor's responsibility and does not require our comment.</p> <p>3. For the North and Center pits along GL 35, where the embed plates are shortened in accordance with RFI-1471, the protection slab will terminate at the vertical face of mud slab.</p>		
T-1549	<p>BGP - 3rd Wall Lift Vertical Unistrut Spacing Tolerance</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</p>	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>			
								Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1766 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
<div><div><div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Vertical Unistrut embedded in the 3rd wall lift is spaced at 10' O.C. per plan drawing AI -6231. Due to locations of wall bulkheads, form work panel ribs, and other embedded items, the contractor requests a tolerance of plus/minus 4" off the 10' O.C. spacing. Please confirm if this is acceptable and if not, please provide an acceptable lateral tolerance.</div></div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Confirmed. It is acceptable to have +/- 4" off the 10'-0" spacing of the vertical Unistrut at the Lower Concourse foundation walls.</div></div></div></div>							
T-1550	SSS - PE203 Connection Clarifications	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
<div><div><div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>See attached CD RFI # 512 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Please confirm the noted connection (similar to RFI T-1105, SK 240.1, CD 183.1) is acceptable or supply a new detail. 2) The connection per 1/S1-7630 (shown in item 1) and the connection per 1/S1-7600 foul each other at this location. Please supply a solution.</div></div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>1) Connection as shown on SK1 in the RFI is acceptable. Provide a 1/2" stiffener plate perpendicular to the 5/8" plate and centered on the HSS beam similar to that shown in attached sketch SKS-0386. Provide 1/4" double sided fillet welds for the stiffener plate at the beam flange and the 5/8" plate. 2) Provide connection per attached sketch SKS-0386 at the highlighted location</div></div></div></div>							
T-1551	SSS - SE201 & SE202 Connection Clarification at HSS Posts	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
<div><div><div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>See attached CD RFI # 516 SK1 to SK3: The L8x4x1/2 is insufficient for the HSS10x10 posts in SE201 & SE202. Please supply an alternate detail.</div></div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>The detail is applicable as is. The base plate to match the size of the post as indicated in the detail, and the L8 embed angle is large enough to weld the pipe section onto (pipe to embed angle weld).</div></div></div></div>							
T-1552	BGP - Pit Rebar in South Pit at GL 35	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	07/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1768 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1553.1	SSS - SE201 & SE202 Stud Length Requirement and Dimension Clarification	Closed					
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			attached sketch SKS-0389 HSS beam to WF column connection detail.				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Note that all the sketches attached with this RFI were already issued by the design team as part of the Roof Restaurant IFC package (5/31/2014). W/O to coordinate issuance of drawings to the sub-contractors				
REQUEST:			08/25/2014 09/04/2014 09/08/2014 Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached CD RFI # 524.1 SK1 for items 1 & 2:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
1) Please update the stud length requirements to suit the revised wall thicknesses/beam locations.			ANSWER:				
2) This 5" dimension is shown as 1'-9 3/4 on SKS-0383 in RFI T-1544 (SK 712, CD 522). Please clarify which dimension is correct.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
SUGGESTION:			1) Sheets S1-7102 and S1-7631 have been updated and issued with Roof Park Restaurant IFC package on 5/31/2014. Refer to attached sketches SKS-0410 and SKS-0411 that show updated wall thicknesses and stud lengths.				
			2) See response to 1).				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1553.2	SSS - SE201 & SE202 Roof Level Framing Clarifications	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 524.2 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) This dimension is 11" per 10/A1-2969. Please confirm that is correct or supply the dimensions at the (2) hi-lited clouds to locate the slab opening. 2) It is not clear where the noted beam is located. This dimension is not shown anywhere except RFI T-1544 (SK 712, CD 522) SKS-0411, which shows the beam off-set 1'-5 3/4 from the edge of the opening but this detail appears to place the beam below the wall whose thickness is not known. Please supply the location for the beam. 3) The wall is shown as 1'-6 thick in detail 10/A1-2969. If that is the case the 6" long studs will extend outside the concrete. Please clarify.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Refer to revised A1-2969 issued in ASI No.0127 dated 09/12/14 for revised information. 2) The beam shall be located 1' - 9 3/4" from the edge of slab as shown on S1-2602 submitted with Roof Park Restaurant IFC package on 5/31/2014. CMU knee wall thickness is 8" and is called on S1-2701 submitted with Roof Park Restaurant IFC package on 5/31/2014. Detail 10/S1-7631 does not apply at this CMU wall. Refer to typical detail 11/S1-5003 that shows detail for beam supporting CMU wall. 3) Refer to revised A1-2969 issued in ASI No.0127 dated 09/12/14 for revised information. We agree with the reason for RFI request "Verification", disagree with others. We categorize this as called out on contract documents.		
T-1553.3	SSS - SE201 & SE202 Roof Level Framing Clarifications	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 524.3 SK1: The W16x26 beam has been moved to 1'-9 3/4 south of the slab edge in ASI-127. The result is that the beam will be very close to the beam on Grid F with only 3/4" clear between the flanges and the connection per 1/S1-5010 is not possible. Please supply a solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide a shear plate connection at the W16 beam framing into the BU60 beam as shown in attached sketch SKS-0421. Note that the reference to 6/S1-5010 for BU60 beam connection on SK1 in the RFI is incorrect.		
T-1554	SSS - PE201 Missing Dimensions	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 491 SK1 for items 1 to 7: 1) Supply the missing clouded dimension and confirm the outriggers are spaced in 4 equal spaces.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Refer to detail 4/A1-7861 for outrigger locations and spacing.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1770 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	2) Supply the missing clouded dimension and confirm the outriggers are spaced in 3 equal spaces. 3) Supply the missing clouded dimension and confirm the outriggers are spaced in 3 equal spaces. 4) Supply missing clouded dimension. 5) Supply missing clouded dimension. 6) Supply missing clouded dimension. 7) Confirm items 1 to 6 may be applied at details 2,3/S1/S1-7001; 1,2,3/S1-7002 & 1,2,3/S1-7003 unless the framing is clearly shown otherwise.			2) See response to 1). 3) See response to 1). 4) Refer to drawing A1-7861, A1-7862, A1-7863 and A1-7864 to determine the extents of the outrigger beams. 5) See response to 4). 6) See response to 4). 7) We confirm that responses to items 1 through 6 apply to 2,3/S1-7001; 1,2,3/S1-7002 & 1,2,4/S1-7003 . Note that outriggers in detail 3/S1-7003 have been moved to detail 4/S1-7003. See also response to RFI T-1535.			
T-1555	SSS - PE201 HSS Connection Clarifications	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 492 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) Detail 2/S1-7602 as shown does not apply at this location. Confirm the modified detail as shown is acceptable. 2) Confirm it is acceptable to cut the vertical leg of the angle as shown to fit below the cantilevered horizontal HSS10x8.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.			



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1773 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1559	SSS - TPG1 Stiffener Connection Clarification at GL 3	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 529 SK1 & SK2 for items 1a & 1b: 1a) The typical connection for the TPG1 to the perimeter BU Beam is per 6/S1-5010 as shown on SK2 but at this location a pull-out shear plate is shown. Supply thickness, bolt and weld information for the shear plate connection if that is the connection to be used at the noted location. 1b) The stiffener will foul the bolts for the top plate per 7/S1-5032 if the connection per 6/S1-5010 is used. Please provide a solution.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1.) Detail 6/S1-5010 is to be applied at this location. 2.) For the 8 bolts on the same side as the stiffener: Move 4 bolts 1.5 inches to east and move the other 4 bolts 1.5 inches to west. This modification will increase the spacing between the central bolts from 4.5 inches to 7.5 inches and reduce edge distance from 4.5 inches to 3 inches (each side).				
T-1559.1	SSS - TPG1 Stiffener Connection Clarification at GL 3	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The response to T-1559 will not work on north end beam A1135 (grids B/2) as the stiffener is not centered. Please confirm dimensions proposed on SK1.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed				
T-1560	SSS - Stiffener Connection Discrepancies at Roof Perimeter Beams	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 529 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) The noted details on S1-8002 show different stiffener configurations than 2/S1-4205 without indicating the size/welding information for the stiffeners and a reference to detail 2/S1-4205 is also not shown on S1-8002. Please clarify which details show the correct information for the stiffeners. 2) The noted detail on S1-8002 shows a different stiffener configuration than 1/S1-4205 without indicating the size/welding information for the stiffeners and a reference to detail 1/S1-4205 is also not shown on S1-8002. Please clarify which detail shows the correct information for the stiffeners.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> At the locations identified in the RFI: 1) Apply stiffener size and welding info per 2/S1-4205 and configuration per S1-8002. 2) Apply stiffener size and welding info per 1/S1-4205 and configuration per S1-8002.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1774 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1561	SSS - Weld Connection Clarification at Roof Perimeter Beam GL 2	Closed	07/25/2014	08/04/2014	08/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: The 1 1/2" stiffener with 1" fillet welds per 5/S1-4205 will not fit between the bolts. Please provide a solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to RFI response T-1559.		
T-1562	SSS - Protected Zone Signage	Closed	07/28/2014	08/07/2014	07/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Detail 10/S1-4202 shows the protected zone signage attached directly to both sides of the beam. The response to submittal package TG0701-37A includes a note directing the contractor to remove the signage before SFRM application, and then reattaching it after the SFRM is applied (See SK1). Please confirm this note is to be ignored.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contract documents indicate paint and signage for protected zone. It has been previously established that the paint may be applied directly to the beam before the application of SFRM. This should serve to designate the protected zone during erection and over the life of the building. The signage is intended to be an exterior alert, over the life of the building, and must be visible from the exterior. Therefore, the signage must be outside of the SFRM. The contract documents do not specifically indicate that the signage be present before the application of SFRM as the contract documents generally show the final condition. It would, however, behoove the contractor to have the signage present at all stages of construction, before and after application of SFRM, in order to mitigate the risk of accidental damage to the part, which would be very expensive to replace.		
T-1562.1	INT - Details for Warning Signs over SFRM	Closed	03/09/2015	03/09/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 10/S1-4202 clearly describes the purpose and intent of the sign in the steel protected zone conditions. The timing and sequence of the installation of this sign is a construction means and methods solution. As an aid to the construction team, we offer the		

Page: 1775 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1776 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1563	SSS - Erection Access Confirmation at TPG1	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: There is a 3 7/16" gap between the flanges of the TPG1 and W40x264. The north end of the W40x264 is connected to the W40x297 per 1/S1-5010 and the south end is connected to the BU-40x28 per 1/S1-8001 including a field moment weld at the top and bottom flange of the W40x264. Please review and supply any changes that are required for erection access. Alternatively, please confirm that it is acceptable to move CP1D (shown on S1-4002) 6-inches away from TPG01.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		It is not acceptable to move W-1 awning connection CP1D from its current location. However, it is acceptable to move the W40x264 beam 6" away from TPG1 to allow access for field erection.	
				horizontal leg of a zinc-coated or hot dip galvanized clip angle. The clip angle horizontal leg shall be sufficiently long to protrude from the applied fireproofing. b. Hang sign from zinc-coated or hot dip galvanized Z clips, the vertical leg of the Z clip angle shall be epoxied flush to the structural steel web. c. Acceptable pre-manufactured clips include z-clips, l-strap ties, and bent straps commonly supplied as timber connectors. 16ga material of at least 1 1/2" width will be sufficient.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1564	SSS - Bus Ramp Support Connection Clarifications	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 489 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Please provide the hole diameter and hole size as noted. 2) Please provide the weld size for the 2" web plate to the 2" end plate.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1.) The drop-in span at the Bus Ramps is being revised by the Contractor as part of a post-bid value engineering proposal. This may impact the bearing details currently shown on the bus ramp drawings. WOJV to coordinate. 2.) Provide 1 inch thick fillet welds on each side of the web.		
T-1565	SSS - ST403 Embedded Angle Elevation & Orientation and Curb Dimensions	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 481 SK1 & SK2: 1). At Stair # 403 at the train platform level verify the embedded angles for the elevator posts per detail 11/S1-7600 are at elevation 29'-0 and confirm the angles orientation onto the concrete curb. 2). Confirm the 5'-4 dimension is to inside face of curb shown on SK1. 3). Confirm the 5'-10 & 6'-1 dimensions are to inside face of curb shown on SK2.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. It is confirmed that the embedded angles are at elevation 29'-0" and the embedded angles align with inside face of the curb. 2. Dimension is confirmed. 3. The dimension from GL E to the inside of the curb located at south is 5'-9" instead of 5'-10" . The dimension from GL E to the inside of the curb located at north is 6'-2" instead of 6'-1" .		
T-1566	SSS - Pretension Rod Connection Clarification at Second Level GL 3	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 525 SK1: The columns on Grid 3 indicate that the WT's/Pretensioned Rods in the web of the columns are to extend up to the Bus Deck Level. If this is the intent, supply a detail showing how the continuity plates per 4/S1-5012 interface with the WT/Pretensioned Rods at the Second Level.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> At this location, provide holes within the second floor moment frame beam continuity plates to run the pretension rods through.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1778 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1566.1	SSS - Pretension Rod Connection Clarification at Second Level GL 3	Closed	09/03/2014	09/13/2014	09/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 525.1 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) The WT22x167.5 fouls the continuity plates. Please provide a detail showing the solution. 2) Supply hole size for 2 1/2" dia. pretensioned rod thru the continuity plates 3) The WT22x167.5 fouls the continuity plates. Please provide a detail showing the solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Provide continuity plates on each side of the WT22x167.5 and on each side of the MF column web (total 4 plates) at the locations highlighted in the RFI. 2) For the pretension rods at this location, provide oversize holes per AISC 360-10 Table J3.3 at the continuity plates. 3) Apply response to item 1.		
T-1566.2	SSS - Pretension Rod Connection Clarification at Second Level GL 3	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1566.1 (SK 715.1, CD 525.1) 1) As an alternative to response #1 and #3, is it acceptable to provide a one-piece continuity plate (one each side of MF column web), and slot the WT22x167.5 to clear the one-piece continuity plate? 2) If yes to #1 above, is a weld required at the slotted WT/one-piece continuity plate joint? 3) If yes to #2 above, is a minimum sized fillet acceptable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Not acceptable. Alternatively, continuity plates between the WT and the column flange on the no beam side can be omitted. Also, do not weld the remaining continuity plates to the WT section therefore welding would be required on two sides, namely, to the column flange on the beam side and column web between the beam flange and the WT. Extend the continuity plates as close to the WT as possible. 2) See response to question 1 3) See response to question 1.		
T-1567	BGP - Substitute Fly-Ash Product - Salt River	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference attached product data sheet for the Salt River brand Fly-ash, product data sheet for Headwaters brand Fly-ash and product comparison spreadsheet. If needed, due to a shortage in supply of the Headwaters			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1779 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>brand fly-ash, please confirm it is acceptable to substitute Salt River brand fly-ash for use in all TG06.0 cast-in-place mix designs.</p> <p>If Salt River Fly-ash is acceptable, will the design team require trial batches?</p>						
T-1567.1	<p>BGP - Substitutue Fly-Ash Product - Salt River - Attached Cemex Letter</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please reference attached CEMEX Letter and product data sheet for the Salt River brand Fly-ash, product data sheet for Headwaters brand Fly-ash and product comparison spreadsheet.</p> <p>If needed, due to a shortage in supply of the Headwaters brand fly-ash, please confirm it is acceptable to substitute Salt River brand fly-ash for use in all TG06.0 cast-in-place mix designs.</p> <p>If Salt River Fly-ash is acceptable, will the design team require trial batches?</p>	Closed	08/11/2014	08/21/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
			<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Based on the assertion contained within the Cemex letter, that the proposed substitution will result in equivalent performance to the previously approved mix designs, the design team does not object to the proposed substitution or require additional trial batches. Should the proposed substitution be placed in elements whose strength is evaluated on predictive methods, the performance of the mix shall be tracked separately.</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1568	BGP - Pile Location Discrepancy at GL E/34.5 - Zone 4	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
SCCI is in receipt of RFI response T-0741. RFI response T-0741 references RFI response T-0264.3, which states: "... Note that a pile in this location will require the pile to be cut off at a lower elevation than the typical detail, which will involve a larger block-out..."			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
1. Please provide an elevation, referenced in the above mentioned RFI response, which the pile will be cut.			1) Per the RFI attachments, the bridge pier appears to be completely contained between the shallow eastern sump and the deeper sump immediately west. As such, the cutoff elevation for the bridge pier may be the same as for blockouts at the typical top of mat slab elevation. Detail 4/S1-3009 will apply to the blockout in the north-south direction except that diagonal trim bars are not required. For the east-west direction, Detail 4 would not apply but may be modified such that the #5 at 8" infill cap bars lap with the pit wall reinforcing on the west side and lap with embedded dowels of same size and spacing on the east side. The resultant depth of blockout will be approximately 30". The (6) additional #11 bars shown on 1/S1-2065 may be relocated adjacent to the pier below the shallow east sump. Additional reinforcing beyond the (6) #11's mentioned is not required above the bottom of the mat. Additional reinforcing per Detail 7/S1-3009 is required at the bottom of the pit.				
RFI response T-0264.3 also states: "... the mat shall be re-braced at the block-out by TG03 ..."			Temporary blockouts are the responsibility of the contractor and the suggestion above is but one acceptable way to accommodate the change in pier location. The contractor is requested to provide a sketch of the final proposed configuration and reinforcing for confirmation through the RFI process.				
2. Please provide a detailed description of this required re-brace and how it will effect TG06 formwork, rebar, etc.			2) The comment regarding re-bracing may be ignored.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1781 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1568.1	BGP - Pile Location Discrepancy at GL E/34.5 in Zone 4	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	09/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference RPI response T-1568, attached photo of bridge pier/sleeve at Grid Lines 34.5/E and attached sketch. SCCI is in receipt of RFI response T-1568. The bridge pier in question is not fully contained within the sumps pits referenced in RPI response T-1568 (see photo attached). The galvanized pile sleeve encroaches into the Eastern most sump pit approximately 5/8". In order to facilitate the installation of this sump pit the provided contract details will need to be modified. The pile will need to be cut off at a lower elevation than the typical detail, which will require a larger block-out. The typical contract rebar details will need to be altered, as well as the typical waterproofing details. 1. Please confirm the attached sketch showing revised rebar and formwork details is acceptable. 2. In order to install a deeper blockout, the galvanized sleeve will be cut down to 4" above bottom Of blockout. This cut will remove the sleeve flange. Please confirm this is acceptable. All waterproofing detail revisions will be performed per Grace's recommendation and referenced mat slab "Ready-to-Pour" sign-off document for Mat Slab 16			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Item 1 is confirmed. Item 2 is not acceptable. Submit a proposal for providing a flange on the sleeve, field repair of galvanizing, and any waterproofing details that are proposed to be modified.	
T-1568.2	BGP - Pile Location Discrepancy at GL E/34.5 in Zone 4	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	09/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: SCCI is in receipt of RFI response T-1568.1. Please see attached sketch for reference. SCCI offers this response for Item #2. 1. Galvanizing will be removed from surface of the installed sleeve in order to weld a new identical flange centered 19" down from the top of sleeve. Weld will be a			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1782 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1569	<p>1/4" fillet weld, both top and bottom of flange all the way around the sleeve. The sleeve will then be repaired with approved cold galv spray.</p> <p>2. All waterproofing details will remain typical.</p> <p>Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>	Closed	07/29/2014	08/08/2014	08/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</p>			<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please reference attached sketch that illustrates a proposed CJ layout for the 3rd wall lift foundation walls located in Zone 1, above the knock-out wall locations.</p> <p>Please confirm this layout is acceptable?</p> <p>Please note: This layout, if deemed acceptable, will be submitted in the comprehensive layout drawings for 3rd wall lift area 1 through 5.</p>			<p>SUGGESTION:</p> <p>ANSWER: Confirmed.</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1783 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1570	SSS - PE201 Missing Information at Roof Level	Closed	07/30/2014	08/09/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 506 SK1 for items 1 to 4: 1) Supply location and size for slab opening. 2) Supply missing dimensions. 3) Confirm the C8x11.5's per 12/S1-5003 connect to the HSS beams per 6/S1-5011. 4) The davit base plate per 12/S1-7600 will foul the top plate in detail 6/S1-7604. 5) Detail 9/S1-5000 shows the slab support connecting to WF beams. Please supply a detail showing how to connect the braces at the HSS beams.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to 1/A1-2964 for location and size of opening. Missing dimensions are supplied per attached RFI T-1570_Sketch. Provide shear plate connections per 1/S1-5011 with two bolts at the C8x11.5 channels. See attached sketch SKS-0392 for connection at base of the davit pedestal. Provide a cap plate in lieu of the top flange plate per 6/S1-7604 as shown in the sketch. Braces per 9/5000 may be waived at the HSS beams on this level.		
T-1571	SSS - PE302 Angle Brace Connection Clarification	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 532 SK1 & SK2: Per RFI T-0973 (SK 061A, CD 070A) the angle braces per 5/S1-5015 are not possible in the space. Confirm the alternate connection at this location is acceptable or supply a new detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide a WT 16.5x59 welded to the bottom flange of the W33x130 and to the transfer girder flange, in lieu of the kicker brace per 5/S1-5015. Connection of the WT to the W33 beam and the transfer girder including weld size, type and length, shall be similar to that shown in sketch SKS-0290 submitted with response to RFI T-0824.		
T-1572	SSS - Post Location Clarifications GL 19.1-19.9	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 534 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) 3 spaces at 11'-8 3/4 equals 35'-2 1/4. Please clarify which dimensions are correct. 2) The HSS 10x10 post will be located east of Grid 19.1. The result is that the east wall of the HSS 10x10 cannot be fillet welded to the beam below as it extends beyond the beam flange as shown. Confirm that is acceptable or supply a solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The dimensions on A/S1-6030 should be taken as 3 equal divisions of 35'-2 3/8". 2) Per structural drawings, there are two HSS10x10 columns at the highlighted location; one for the W-8 system per 1/S1-8006 and the other for W-12 system per 1/S1-8016. HSS 10x10 per 1/S1-8006 shall be centered on workpoint WP1 (W-8 system) as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0391 and welded to the MF flange at the bottom per 1/S1-8006. The HSS10x10		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1784 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1573	SSS - Dimension Clarifications for W-3 Support Beams on Ground Level	Closed	post per 1/S1-8016 at WP1 (W-12 system) may be waived.				
			07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 537 SK1: Confirm the dimensions on B/S1-6050 are the dimensions to be used to locate the beams on S1-2305 noted thus * (beams indicated by bold red line on SK1).				
T-1573.1	SSS - Dimension Clarifications for W-3 Support Beams on Ground Level	Closed	SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			We confirm that the dimension provided on B/S1-6050 and 2/S1-6051 are to be used to locate the beams noted thus * on S1-2305. These sheets were part of the Design-Build Glazing IFB Addendum 10.				
			REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 537.1 SK1: It is not clear where the row of beams west of Grid 19.1 & east of Grid 24.9 are located. Per B/S1-050 they are located 3'-8" off the noted Grids. S1-305 appears to show the beams centered under the 1'-3" wide thick portion of the slab and detail 9/S1-5022 does not provide a dimension. Confirm the beams are located 3'-8" off the noted Grids.				
T-1573.1	SSS - Dimension Clarifications for W-3 Support Beams on Ground Level	Closed	SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			The W12x14 beams east of GL 19.1 and west of GL24.9 shall be centered on the 1'-3" slab step shown on 9/S1-5022. The W14x68 beams with * symbols that are graphically shown in the same row as the W12 beams shall be centered on the W-3 system supports located on S1-6050. Note that the 3'-8 1/2" dimension on S1-6050 locates the W-3 outside cable centerline at the corner condition, not the centerline of the W-3 supports. Refer to base plate detail PL3 on S1-8005 for centerlines of the W-3 system supports at the corner condition. Refer to the Architectural Slab Edge Plan A1-2865 for the location of the slab step and concrete curb.				
			REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 537.1 SK1: It is not clear where the row of beams west of Grid 19.1 & east of Grid 24.9 are located. Per B/S1-050 they are located 3'-8" off the noted Grids. S1-305 appears to show the beams centered under the 1'-3" wide thick portion of the slab and detail 9/S1-5022 does not provide a dimension. Confirm the beams are located 3'-8" off the noted Grids.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1573.2	SSS - Dimension Clarifications for W-3	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 537.2 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) The reference to S1-8005 in RFI T-1573.1 (SK 732.1, CD 537.1) is not helpful in locating the W14x68* as dimensions are not provided. Supply the locations for the W14x68* beams from Grids 19.1 & 24.9. 2) S1-2305 locates the W12x14 beams 4'-3" from Grid 19.1 & 24.9. Confirm we are to proceed to revise the beam locations to center them under the 1'-3" slab step per RFI T-1573.1 (SK 732.1, CD 537.1). 3) Depending on the amount of off-set between the W12x14's and the W14x68, confirm it is acceptable to connect the W12x14 per 1/S1-5011 at one end.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The Architectural Slab Edge Plan A1-2865 locates the exterior face of the curb 3'-3" from Gridlines 19.1 and 24.9, respectively. Per 4/S1-8005, the dimension to the centerline of the plate is 11'-7/8". The resulting dimension for locating the W14x68 beams parallel to Gridlines 19.1 and 24.9 is 4'-2 7/8". 2) Confirmed. The 4'-3" dimension will be removed from S1-2305 in the next ASI. 3) Confirmed. We agree with the reason for RFI request "Verification", disagree with "Insufficient Information". We categorize this as no cost clarification and change to be issued in future bulletin.			
T-1574	SSS - Dimension Discrepancies at W-3 Support Beams on Bus Deck Level	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 539 SK1: The dimensions on S1-2607 (SK2) do not match the dimension on A/S1-6058 (SK1). Please clarify.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The beams indicated in the RFI are at the Roof Level, whereas W-3 system spans from Ground to Bus Deck Level. Refer to Bus Deck Level plans for W-3 support beams.			
T-1575	SSS - Locations for W-3 Support Beams on Ground Level	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 538 SK1: D/S1-6058 appears to be the plan of the W-3 system at the Ground Level but dimensions to locate the beams noted thus * on S1-2307 (SK2) are not provided. Please provide locations for the beams hi-lited on SK2.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> All necessary dimensions have been provided to locate the base plates, therefore the supporting beams are located accordingly. See details B/S1-6058 and C/S1-6059 for dimensioning.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1786 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1576	SSS - Comment on W16 Elevation at GL19.9	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached CD RFI # 536 SK1: The noted W16 beam has been lowered in order for the decking for the low slab to continue from Grid G thru to the W44x230 as shown in 9/S1-3703. The (2) W16 beams on the east side of Grid 19.9 are flush with the top of TR19.9. Confirm that is acceptable at Grid G & C or clarify the framing in this area.				Confirmed			
T-1577	SSS - E510-E512 Missing Connection & Support	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached CD RFI # 542 SK1: 1) Supply a connection detail for the low W30 to the W40 on both ends. 2) The noted W12x14 beams have no support at the noted locations as the W30x99 is below at -2'-10 1/2. Supply a support/connection detail.				1) Provide connection per 1/S1-7604 at the low W30 beam that frames into the W40 beams at its two ends. 2) See attached sketch SKS-0393 showing the support for W12 beams at the knock-out slab.			
T-1578	SSS - Pipe Grade Requirement	Closed	07/31/2014	08/10/2014	08/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
At Gridline 21 & 22 between D & F, S1-2505 shows two pipes 16 X 1.031, that are to be supplied as API 5L GR X52. Herrick has been unable to locate this grade of material that stays within the Buy America requirement. Please advise.		Herrick has found two pipes that are certified to API 5L GR X42 but meet the mechanical properties for API 5L X52 (Please see attached Mill Certification). Please confirm this material is acceptable.		Suggestion acceptable for the two pipes indicated in the RFI.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1579	BGP - Seismic Joint Stepped Embed Clarifications	Closed	08/01/2014	08/11/2014	08/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please reference Contract Drawing S1-3010 and Submittal TG0600-051 .1. Please clarify the following: 1. Sheet 8.01 of Submittal TG0600-05 l.1 calls for a M30x4-1/2" stud welded to the embed. Due to the unavailability of M30x4-1/2" studs, please confirm it is acceptable to fillet welding M30x4-1/2" long cut pieces of fully threaded rod. 2. Submittal TG0600-051.1 requested design to determine bar lengths for the hooked #6 welded rebar. Please provide missing lengths for the hooked welded #6 rebar. 3. Please clarify the (. 11 7) at the double flare bevel weld on the hooked #6 rebar and the deformed #6 bar. It is SCCI's understanding the 3/8" is the weld size and the 5 is the weld length. What is the (.117) referring to? 4. See attached SI-3010. The east embed top vertical leg appears to be welded to the horizontal leg with a square bevel and convex weld with a fillet on the other side. Typically, a square bevel has a given dimension that depicts the gap between plates. As no dimension is given and the other side is a fillet weld, it appears to be a flat fillet laid down on the joint, with no gap. Please confirm this is the design intent.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). The headed studs, their weld attachment forming a part of clamping assembly are a part of assembly designed by seismic joint supplier. Changing of the clamping assembly shall be approved by the supplier. 2). The hook #6 shall be 36" long (length without hook) same length as the 3/4" deformed bar anchors. 3). The double flare weld is 3/8" with 0.117" effective throat. 4). Gap of the square groove weld shall be per AWS prequalified weld joint detail. The gap size depending on the weld process used.				
T-1580	SSS - Stiffener Fouling 2" Plate at GL21G	Closed	08/04/2014	08/14/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 541 SK1: With the actual location of MFB11 relative to TR21 as shown, the PL2 1/2" x 14 x 2'-6 will foul the vertical stiffeners. Confirm it is acceptable to locate the PL 2 1/2" as shown and terminate the vertical stiffener plates 1" below MFB11 as shown. If not, please clarify detail 8/S1-3702 at Grid G/21.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The 2 1/2" x 14" plate should locate as close to the 2" holes as possible, say changing the 1 1/4" clearance to 1/2" clearance. 2) The vertical stiffeners does not need to keep 1' clear from the bottom of MFB. They can be extended into MFB 11, just short of 2 1/2" plate.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1788 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1581	SSS - Inaccessible Welds at Corner GL Cast Nodes	Closed	08/04/2014	08/14/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 474 SK1 to SK6 for item 1 to 10:				1). The CP weld noted may be achieved by weld a backup bar/angle prior to setting the column.			
1-							
8) Several of the shop and field welds required at the ground level corner cast nodes are inaccessible once the cast node is set in position. Please see items 1 through 8 on SK1 through SK8 for clarification and provide direction.				2). The CP weld noted may be achieved by weld a backup bar/angle prior to setting the column. The back-gouge and 5/16" reinforcing fillet may be deleted.			
9) Supply the welding for the north flange plates of the BU column to the node.				3). The double bevel weld may be changed to single bevel weld from the east side.			
10) The welds required at this external corner create an unweldable condition, See SK5 & SK6 for clarification. Please provide direction.				4). The CP weld noted may be achieved by weld a backup bar prior to setting the column. The back-gouge and 5/16" reinforcing fillet may be deleted.			
				5). See response #4			
				6). See response #4			
				7). Backup bar may be installed prior to fitting the transfer girder to the cast node. The back-gouge and 5/16" reinforcing fillet may be deleted.			
				8). Cannot see when the weld cannot be made. The vertical stiffener may be installed after the 2" PP weld is completed.			
				9). The weld info is called out as CP weld with back gouge and 5/16 reinforcement weld, which is questioned in item 4 above.			
				10). Weld access hole per AWS D1.1.			

Confirmed.



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1584	SCS - Wall Construction Joint - Moment Frame Beam Conflict	Closed	08/04/2014	08/14/2014	08/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST: See attached diagram of a wall lift construction joint overlay on the ground floor plan. Per Specification Section 03 30 02 - 3.2, Foundation wall and ground floor construction joints shall align with the location of joint below in TG06 and will not impair the strength of the structure. A conflict occurs at the noted areas of the attached diagram, where the wall joint placed according to specification, will intersect at a moment frame beam. SCCI proposes to move wall construction joints in order to avoid conflicting with the moment frame beams. Please confirm shifting construction joints to not align with the construction joints below is acceptable and provide permissible parameters to assign new construction joints for SCCI to reflect upon and modify the construction joint layout. A conceptual sketch is attached reflecting the proposed shift in vertical construction joint.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The foundation wall construction joints cannot run through Ground Level MFB's. The best option to avoid this situation is to jog Foundation Wall construction joints around the MFB's as proposed. The recommended location for the offset is the horizontal Foundation Wall construction joint immediately below the MFB's. The Design Team will evaluate contractor proposed construction joints during submittal review of the Ground Level construction joint layout that shall include any modifications to the previously reviewed and approved Foundation Wall construction joint layouts.			
T-1586	SSS - Telecom Vault - ToS Elevation	Closed	08/04/2014	08/14/2014	08/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 545 SK1: Please supply the top of slab elevation.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the top of slab elevations of the Telcom Vaults (North and South) at GL 33.5, refer to A1-9250 issued with the Main Package IFC dated March 31, 2014.			
T-1587	SSS - ST501 & ST502 Missing Dimensions	Closed	08/04/2014	08/14/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 543 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) Confirm the set-back from edge of slab to center of beam is 6" on (3) sides noted or supply the missing dimensions.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The offset between the edge of slab and centerline of beam shall be 5" for the noted W16 beams. 2) The offset between the edge of slab and centerline of beam shall be 5" for the noted W16 beams.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1792 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	2) Confirm the set-back from edge of slab to center of beam is 6" on (3) sides noted or supply the missing dimensions.			3) Confirmed.			
	3) Confirm the 8" dimension offset to match the opening at Grid C or supply the missing dimension.						
T-1588	SSS - E510-E512 Framing Clarification at GL 22	Closed	08/04/2014	08/14/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 544 SK1: It appears a beam is missing on the east side of the dropped slab to support the low steel. If yes, supply the size and location of the beam. If no, supply a connection for the east end of the (3) low W24x68 beams.				There shall be a W24 x 55 at the east end of the depressed slab supporting W24x68s. Locate this beam similar to the W24x55 on the west side. Connections are detailed on 1/S1-7604 per plan.			
T-1589	SSS - Missing Beam Locations at OCS Posts	Closed	08/04/2014	08/14/2014	08/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 546 SK1: Supply the missing dimensions to locate the beams. A1-2307 does not supply the dimensions.				Per the structural note, the information requested can be found on drawing A1-2867, not A1-2307.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1793 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1590	SCS - Concrete Form Support Kicked To Temp Bridge	Closed	08/04/2014	08/14/2014	08/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: A unique support system is necessary for the foundation wall under the temporary bridges (First, Fremont, Beale). Shimmick proposes that in these areas, the form work will kick to support brackets mounted to the underside of the bridges to provide better support. Without this, the form system will be a cantilever system supported by 1 row of anchors which will exert a significant force on the wall lift below. Please confirm it is acceptable for the fourth lift form system to be supported by the bridge underside.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The bridge is designed by a WOJV subcontractor. WOJV shall respond to this RFI.				
T-1591	SCS - Pendulum Bearing Test Results	Closed	08/05/2014	08/15/2014	08/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Per Specification Section 03 20 02-1.4-A-7, "test results for [pendulum] bearings with similar size" are to be submitted for approval. Per Mageba, they have test data on pendulum bearings (isolators) with similar sizes which they believe have been tested under more severe conditions than the ones required for this project. See attached email correspondence with Mageba for further explanation and more specific details in regards to their test and how the results apply to satisfy the requirements in the specifications. The referenced Annex documents in the email are also attached. Only a sample of the data has been included for preliminary approval; full test data will be submitted once this data is confirmed acceptable. Please confirm that the mentioned test reports could serve as evidence of the proper functioning of mageba pendulum bearings, as well as the fulfillment for the requirements in the specifications.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reports from past test data can serve as a basis to waive the testing requirement. However, the information provided with this RFI is not sufficient to waive the testing requirement. The test data provided in the RFI seems to belong to a bearing of similar size but it does not seem to meet vertical load carrying requirements outlined in the specifications. It is also not clear whether it meets the horizontal force requirements (friction coefficient) outlined in the specifications or not. To waive the testing requirement: - Provide specifications for the product that is intended to be used in this project that meets the design requirements outlined in the contract documents. - Provide test data for a bearing that is comparable in size and performance to those intended to be used in this project tested with conditions that are comparable to the design requirements.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1794 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1591.1	SCS - Pendulum Bearing Test Results	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: RFI T-1591 response noted two requirements to waive the testing requirements. 1. Provide specifications for the product that is intended to be used in the project that meets the design requirements outlined in the contract documents. See attached preliminary Pendulum Bearing product information and drawing. 2. Provide test data for a bearing that is comparable in size and performance to those intended to be used in this project tested with conditions that are comparable to the design requirements. Please see attached additional performance test results from other bearings of comparable size and performance. Also reference T-1591 for previously submitted test results. Please confirm that the mentioned test reports could serve as evidence of the proper functioning of mageba pendulum bearings, as well as the fulfillment for the testing requirements in the specifications.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the information provided can be considered sufficient to fulfill testing requirement. Note that per Section 3.2.D of specification 03 20 02: "Pendulum bearing dimensions shall fit within the columns they are installed at. Anchors for the bearings shall not interfere with the column reinforcement." In current design, PM8.89 does not seem to satisfy this requirement for the 34 in diameter columns at Gridline 34.8. Verify this requirement is satisfied for all pendulum bearings.				
T-1592	SSS - PE201 Splice Location Clarifications for Weld Access	Closed	08/06/2014	08/16/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI 490.2 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm it is acceptable to relocate the splice in order to have access to weld the interior plate diaphragms as shown. 2) Confirm the splice per item 1 will also be required at the noted location in order to have sufficient access to weld the interior diaphragm plates.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.				
T-1593	BGP - Seismic Joint Corbel Spacing	Closed	08/08/2014	08/18/2014	08/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1597	SSS - Transfer Girder Top Flange Stiffeners at GL3	Closed	08/11/2014	08/21/2014	09/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPGregory KemererTo: Turner Construction Company Phil MilitelloAnswered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
At either side of transfer girder TR3, the lower slab elevati on requires the deck to be cut around each of the girder sti ffeners compromising the rigidity of the deck, see attached SK1 for clarification.				Confirmed			
Please confirm it is acceptable to shorten the short stiffene rs under both of the center columns to 1" above the top flu te of the deck.							
T-1598	SSS - Supplemental Pin Testing	Void	08/11/2014	08/21/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPGregory KemererTo: Turner Construction Company Phil MilitelloAnswered By:							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Based on review of structural and referenced specification section it appears that Supplemental destructive testing of galvanized pins is not required after pins are galvanized per para 2.3.J. As per our previous QAQC meeting of June 17, 2014, it was requested by the TJPA representative that additional galvanized steel pin samples (ASTM A668 Class M) with associated nuts for each pin size be provided for destructive testing by TJPA representative testing lab and as follow: 1. 7" dia. X 2'-1" (A1551 as shown on 1551 of Pin shop drawings) 2. 7" dia. X 1'-2 3/16" (A1553 as shown on 1553 of Pin shop drawings). 3. 7" dia. X 1'-6 7/8" (A1554 as shown on 1554 of Pin shop drawings). 4. 8" dia. X 2'-7" (A1555 as shown on 1555 of Pin shop drawings). 5. 6" dia. X 1'- 8 13/16" (A13001 as shown on 13001 of Pin shop drawings).							
Please provide the following: 1. Provide testing criteria to the testing lab agency after pins have been galvanized and in addition to the specified forged steel pins ASTM 668 Class M testing requirements. 2. Provide WOJV with a CR to supply and ship these additional pins and nuts to the testing lab. 3. If additional samples of other pins on the project are							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1598.1	SSS - Supplemental Pin Testing	Closed	08/12/2014	08/22/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Based on review of structural and referenced specification section it appears that Supplemental destructive testing of galvanized pins is not required after pins are galvanized per 05 10 00 para 2.3.J. As per our previous QAQC meeting of June 17, 2014, it was requested by the TJPA representative that additional galvanized steel pin samples (ASTM A668 Class M) with associated nuts for each pin size be provided for destructive testing by TJPA representative testing lab and as follow: 1. 7" dia. X 2'-1" (A1551 as shown on 1551 of Pin shop drawings) 2. 7" dia. X 1'-2 3/16" (A1553 as shown on 1553 of Pin shop drawings). 3. 7" dia. X 1'-6 7/8" (A1554 as shown on 1554 of Pin shop drawings). 4. 8" dia. X 2'-7" (A1555 as shown on 1555 of Pin shop drawings). 5. 6" dia. X 1'- 8 13/16" (A13001 as shown on 13001 of Pin shop drawings). Please provide the following: 1. Provide testing criteria to the testing lab agency after pins have been galvanized and in addition to the specified forged steel pins ASTM 668 Class M testing requirements. 2. Provide WOJV with a CR to supply and ship these additional pins and nuts to the testing lab. 3. If additional samples of other pins on the project are required, please specify. 4. BRB pins are not included in this RFI to be tested. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 8/12/2014 RESPONSE: Per Turner on 08/12/2014, this RFI has been voided. Ethan Heinrich 8/19/2014 RESPONSE: The TJPA has not requested and has no plans for supplemental testing of galvanized pins. This RFI can be closed as not required/not requested. If in the future, if the TJPA determines supplemental testing is requested, they will issue a CR only for additional pin sample material.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1798 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1599	SSS - Top of Slab at Roof Park Level GL F	Closed	08/11/2014	08/21/2014	08/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 549 SK1: Confirm the note should read 80'-7 1/2 to match S1-2605.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached SKA-4000, the correct elevation is 80'-7 1/2".		
T-1600	SCS - Concrete Form Support Kicked to Temp Bridge	Closed	08/11/2014	08/21/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, I Danny Walsh			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: A unique support system is necessary for the foundation wall under the temporary bridges (First, Fremont, Beale). Shimmick proposes that in these areas, the form work will kick to support brackets mounted to the underside of the bridges to provide better support. Without this, the form system will be a cantilever system supported by 1 row of anchors which will exert a significant force on the wall lift below. Please confirm it is acceptable for the fourth lift form system to be supported by the bridge underside.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1601	SCS - Concrete Slabs Between Lower Concourse and Ground Level	Closed	08/11/2014	08/21/2014	08/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See Detail 2/S1-2252 from ASI 117. On grid Line H - 23 there is a concrete slab between the Lower Concourse and Ground Level (elevation 1 '7"). The Slab is connected to a concrete partition wall on the south. On the north of the slab there is a concrete wall starting at the slab and connecting at the Ground Level Slab. Detail 2/S1-2252 was revised to add detail 2/S1-3504 in ASI 117. 1 . Is TG07.2 to add this scope of work and provide a price? See Detail 1/S1-2252. On grid Line B - 23 there is a concrete slab between the Lower Concourse and Ground Level (elevation 1'7"). The Slab is connected to a CMU wall on the north side. On the south of the slab there is a			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes, Include scope shown in Detail 2/S1-3504 added in ASI 117 and provide pricing. 2. The elevated slab shown in Detail 1/S1-2252 at gridline B-23 is part of the 7.2 scope. This work is to be sequenced and coordinated with the masonry contractor.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1602	SCS - Gas Line Lateral Pipe Size at GL 7.3/A	Closed	08/12/2014	08/22/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference attached excerpt drawings: U1-2002 (IFC - 3/31/14), 1/U1-3007 (IFC - 3/31/14), P1-2203 (ADD #4).				The natural gas service sleeve size is 4" and it is shown in detail D/P1-4001.			
The utility drawing U1-2002 shows a Gas Utility Lateral east of GL 7/A at station 4+93.82. The size of the utility line is not provided on drawing P1-2203 or indicated on the utility plans.							
Please provide the pipe size for the utility lateral located at station 4+93.82 with an invert elevation of 13.5'.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1800 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1602.1	SCS - Gas Line Lateral Pipe Size at GL 7.3/A	Closed	09/02/2014	09/12/2014	09/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached RFI T-1602. Per response to RFI T-1602 please confirm the following. 1.) Please confirm PG&E has approved both the gas meter room and the use of a 4" sleeve and routing/elbow to pull plastic tubing as reflected in this project design. 2.) Confirm the sleeve through the perimeter structural and shoring wall is an 8" (or larger) sleeve. 3.) What are the required structural and architectural details for suspending a concrete encased gas main from the structural lid/deck for the entire run between perimeter wall and gas meter room?			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. PG&E has reviewed three options proposed by the design team for routing the incoming gas service into the gas meter room. There are two options that locate the gas piping above the trainbox lid and under the sidewalk that are being coordinated to determine the final design solution which will then be submitted to PG&E for approval. The third option to penetrate the foundation wall and steel beam will not be pursued further. 2. Based on the options reviewed with PG&E no sleeve will be required through the foundation wall. The gas piping will be installed above the trainbox lid under the sidewalk. Coordinated details will be provided in a future drawing issue. 3. A suspended concrete encased gas main will not be required for the two preferred options described above.				
T-1603	SSS - Transfer Girder Flange Shop Splices	Closed	08/12/2014	08/22/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: It has been understood that, due to the availability of mill run plate size and length, it would be necessary to splice some of the top and bottom flange components of several of the Transfer Girders in order to achieve the overall length required. The Contract provisions and AWS D1.1 Structural Code require that all splices made by welding are to be shown on the shop drawings. However, the location of the shop splice(s) was not shown on the shop drawings that were issued for fabrication to Thompson Metal Fab. TMF has fabricated flanges that have been spliced by full penetration welds. The welds have been inspected and have been accepted in accordance with the provisions of the AWS D1.1 Structural Code for static load criteria. The locations of the splices in the transfer girder components and the affected flanges are shown in the attached documentation. Girder A626 - top and bottom flange			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the as-built shop splices shown in Appendix B and proposed splice locations in Appendix C are acceptable.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1801 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Girder A627 - bottom flange only Girder A630 - top and bottom flange Girder A631 - bottom flange only Girder A643 - top and bottom flange Girder A645 - top and bottom flange</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed as fabricated. A ll shop drawings will be revised to indicate all shop weld lo cations. In addition TMF propose to shop weld flanges not currently indicated on shop drawings, please review appendix C an d confirm the splice locations are acceptable. See Appendix A for shop drawing girder segments referen ced on Contract Drawings. See Appendix B for as- built splice locations including UT & MT reports. See Appendix C for proposed splice locations.</p>						
T-1604	<p>SSS - Light Tower Cast Node Detail LC-702 Clarifications</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 559 SK1 for items 1 to 3:</p> <p>1) Provide welding detail for the contact plate to lug plates.</p> <p>2) Verify dimensions. 3) Confirm the dimensions in item 2 can be used at similar conditions e.g. 3&5/S1-6005, 4&6/S1-6006.</p>	Closed	08/12/2014	08/22/2014	08/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>						
	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1) 1/8 inch fillet weld all around the contact plate. 2) Dimensions confirmed. 3) Confirmed.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1802 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1605	SSS - Light Tower Cast Node LC-302W Detail Clarifications	Closed	08/12/2014	08/22/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 560 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) The CJP weld cannot be applied at the sharp edges of the 2 3/4" thick (2) plates and the 3" thick connection plate. Verify it is acceptable to shape the edges of plates as shown. 2) Confirm the solution in item 1 can be applied to similar conditions e.g. 4/S1-6006 and 3&5/S1-6005.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. It is acceptable to shape the edges of the plates at shown. 2. Confirmed.			
T-1606	SSS - Type Drag Connection Geometry at Bus Level Cast Node 29A-01 and 29B-01	Closed	08/12/2014	08/22/2014	08/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached SK RFI 744 SK01. The shear plates at drag connection type 1-A at cast node 29B-01 and 29A-01 land on the edge of the welding pad. This condition does not make allowance for as-cast tolerances on the welding pad edge and may impact our ability to achieve effective weld size. Please advise. Skanska acknowledges the response to SK RFI 004.1 (T-0738) and 004.2 (T-0738.1). Following these RFIs, Skanska increased shear plate spacing to give a 1/8" gap on the inside of each shear plate for erection clearance. Even had this gap not been added, Skanska would still flag this issue for designers review as 1/8" still does not allow for as-cast tolerances at these locations.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The information provided in the RFI is not sufficient to provide a single solution at this time. Consider following solutions, which depend on the actual size of the pad: 1-) If the as cast dimensions of the pad allow the shear plate to land on the pad, no action needed. Since the contractor has opted to machine the pads, the rounded edges of the pads will likely be removed to create a wider weldable pad surface. 2-) Once the as cast dimensions of the pad are determined and if the plates do not fit in the pad, the ends of the plates can be tapered 0.25" with 1:2.5 ratio (e.g., 0.25"x 0.625" taper) at the outside faces of the plates. Lastly, the contractor plans to use 1/8" gap on each side of the shear plate per the RFI. Considering that these are slip critical connections, a smaller gap might be considered by the contractor which can decrease the out to out connection width. To achieve slip critical, shim plates are needed if there is a 1/8" gap between the connection plate and beam web.			





Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1611	SSS - Mis-Drilled Holes in Transfer Girder A628	Closed	08/14/2014	08/24/2014	08/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPGregory KemererTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Skanska's transfer girder fabricator, TMF, has drilled girder A628's top flange hole pattern 5/16" north of the designed location. Please confirm it is acceptable to offset the hole pattern and machined grooves on the column base plate to account for the offset on the girder. This will allow the column to be positioned at the required location while accommodating the offset holes. The girder short stiffeners will also need to be shifted 5/16" to allow bolt clearance. See attached 628AC & 628AB for as-built hole locations, also see attached p4284 for proposed offset on column base plate.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1612	SSS - Transfer Girder Stud Clarifications at GL6G	Closed	08/15/2014	08/25/2014	08/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPGregory KemererTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 568 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) Please clarify what is meant by "SIM". 2) Please supply the missing stud information.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: 1). The text "SIM" shall be deleted. 2). Use 2- 3/4"dia x 6" studs at 6" on center (total 6 rows @ 6" on center).		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1613	SSS - Deck Support at TR3 Grid C & G	Closed	08/15/2014	08/25/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPGregory KemererTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: At grid C3 the BU perimeter beam butts into the transfer girder TR3. The deck support angle in the web of the BU beam stops back 4' 9-5/16" from the center of the girder. This results in a region of about 4'-4" without deck support at an end bearing. Design drawings do not provide a specific detail for this condition. Deck support at column detail 1/S1-5001 should not be used as this detail typically only supports one or two flutes of deck. The condition described above has 4 ½ unsupported flutes in an end bearing condition with 10" of			SUGGESTION: A 4x4x3/8" steel angle can be field welded from the perimeter beam deck angle to the transfer girder deck angle to span the unsupported deck or provide an alternative detail. See SK1 for clarification. This condition also applies at line G.		ANSWER: Deck support is a "means and methods issue" and we disagree with the cost increase claim. Deck support angles proposed in the RFI and as shown on SK1 in the RFI are acceptable at the two locations on GL 3.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1807 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1616	SSS - Drag Beam Web Stiffener Plate Connection Clarification	Closed	08/18/2014	08/28/2014	09/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 572 SK1: Confirm it is acceptable to end the web stiffener plate as shown to avoid fouling the shear plate for the beam connection.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1617	SSS - Drag Beam Connection Symbol Clarifications GL 20	Closed	08/18/2014	08/28/2014	09/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 570 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) Confirm the kicker brace symbol is not required as the beams are the same size. 2) Confirm it is the intent to show the symbol indicating shear plate connections. 3) Confirm the kicker brace symbol is not required as the beams are the same size			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1618	SSS - E610 & E611 Dimension Discrepancies at Ground Level	Closed	08/18/2014	08/28/2014	09/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 569 SK1: Please clarify the discrepancy in dimensions for the escalator pit. Supply/confirm the clouded dimensions if A1-2866 is correct.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: The location of the escalator pit is to follow Architectural Drawing A1-2866 issued as part of ASI NO.0123 dated 08/06/14. Structural drawing to revised to match in future ASI.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1619	SSS - E510 & E511 Edge Plate Support Clarification	Closed	08/18/2014	08/28/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 564 SK1: There is no support for the edge plate per 7/S1-5004 for the permanent slab at this location. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: The slab edge plate shall be welded (1/4" fillet weld) to the HSS cap plates shown on 6/S1-7661 at its two ends. Welds at the cap plates shall be minimum 3"		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>		
T-1620	SSS - Drag Beam Welding Conflict at North Elevation GL 21-22	Closed	08/18/2014	08/28/2014	09/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>		
From: Webcor Construction LP			Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			ANSWERED By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger						
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>
See attached CD RFI # 565 SK1: A portion of the W36x231 top flange cannot be CJP welded due to the top flange cut on the W40x362. Please confirm that is acceptable or supply a solution.						Confirmed			
T-1621	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Missing Slab Information	Closed	08/18/2014	08/28/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>		
From: Webcor Construction LP			Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			ANSWERED By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger						
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>
See attached CD RFI # 548 SK1 for items 1 to 4: 1) Dimension is not shown on structural drawings. Confirm the dimension per 5/A1-7204 is correct. 2) Confirm top of slab elevation is 106'-7 3/4. 3) Supply location and size for slab openings. 4) Supply edge of slab locations.						1) Confirmed, The dimension noted on 5/A1-7204 to locate the HSS columns are correct. 2) Refer to Architectural Drawing A1-2966 issued with IFC package dated 03/31/14 for dimension. 3) Refer to Architectural Drawing A1-2966 issued with IFC package dated 03/31/14 for dimension. 4) Refer to Architectural Drawing A1-2966 issued with IFC package dated 03/31/14 for dimension.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1809 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1622	BGP - Top of Vertical Wall Interface with Ground Level MFB	Closed	08/18/2014	08/28/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The current design indicates the top of the # 11 vertical wall reinforcing terminating with a terminator maintaining 2" concrete clear cover above the bar as seen in Section 1 on S-3201 .				Confirmed, provided that the resulting clear cover to the Foundation Wall Vertical Reinforcing Terminator is within the parameters of the RFI T-1622 response including the supplemental U-bars. We disagree that a potential clash is anything other than insufficient means and methods.			
A # 11 555 t-head is 11/ 16" thick and a #11 Lenton Terminator is 11/16" thick. The Ground Moment Frame Beams appear in Section 5 of S1-3600. The concrete clear cover indicated over the stirrup is 2 3/4".							
Due to the designed concrete clear cover called for, the thicknesses of the different terminator products and the allowable tolerance in fabrication and placement per ACI a conflict with the two interfacing componets is expected to occur at the top bars of the MFB.							
Please confirm if the tenninator on the vertical bar can terminate below the ground level MFB top bars to avoid the expected conflict similiar to that allowed between the column and concourse MFB as indicated within RFI T-0917.							
Should this proposed solution not be acceptable please provide direction how to proceed.							
T-1623	SSS - ST601B Missing Beam Location	Closed	08/18/2014	08/28/2014	08/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 547 SK1: Supply the missing dimension (not shown on Arch. drawings).				See attached SKA-4040 that provides the requested dimension.			
T-1624	BGP - CMU Wall Dimensions Deck 220 GL20-H	Closed	08/18/2014	08/28/2014	08/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1810 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
						</	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1626	BGP - Column 101E and 101F Concrete Elevation	Closed	08/20/2014	08/30/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Adib Sassine				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Column 101E and 101F was poured 1 ft below shoring elevation.				Proposed using concourse slab mix to pour back both columns is unacceptable.			
Is it acceptable to use concourse slab concrete mix 1558218 to pour back the remaining top foot concurrently with concourse deck D201?				Pour the remaining 1 ft of concrete at both columns 101E and 101F the same mix as the concrete columns with the following options as discussed with Sean McNeil:			
				Option 1: Pour both columns separately under separate IR.			
				Option 2: Or pour both columns at the same time as the concrete deck D201 provided you allow 2 hours for the concrete to set and then you pour the deck with the scheduled concrete mix. This will require a separate IR to track this condition at both columns. Include special instruction in the IR to ensure consolidation of both columns are inspected separately as well as paying close attention not to disturb the concrete of poured column sections when consolidating. Prep the top of concrete column surface to achieve the required amplitude as required per previous column pour cold joint condition.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1627	SCS - Bridge Blockout CIDH Piles	Closed	08/21/2014	08/31/2014	09/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please provide details for blockout(s) at the concrete roadway section as shown in the attached sketch. A Blockout will be necessary to allow the CIDH pier(s) to be removed from the ground level, pulled up through the deck, after the concrete bridge(s) section has reached design strength. Once the CIDH piers have been removed the circular section will need to have rebar installed, concrete poured back, and waterproofing repaired prior to receiving infill pursuant to contract documents; 10 sets of CIDH piers, per temporary structure, will require Blockouts at First, Fremont, and Beal street.				1. Reference RFI T-0470 and RFI T-0807. Temporary blockouts are the contractor's responsibility. Refer to General Notes GR-4, GR-5, and GR-9. 2. Refer to attached conceptual detail representing an acceptable method of restoring a temporary opening to contract final condition at the roadway slabs. It does not relieve the contractor from the obligation of verifying the suitability of the detail to actual field conditions and construction loading. 3. Should the contractor elect not to shore the temporary condition, the contractor shall submit a statement or supporting calculations justifying the unshored condition under construction loads signed by a licensed professional engineer. Should the contractor elect to use conceptually different detailing, the detailing and any required supporting calculations shall be submitted for review. 4. The final choice of detailing shall be explicitly indicated on the deck reinforcing submittals for each unique blockout case for coordination with surrounding reinforcing.			
T-1628	SSS - Weld Columns to TG-33.2	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See SK-1 attached 1) Ref.; 3/S1-4357 Confirm no weld at 1-inch plate to web as shown 2) Ref.; 3/S1-4357 Confirm no weld at 2-inch plate to TG-33.2 inside of pipe column as shown 3) Ref.; 3/S1-4357 Cannot back gouge weld as shown - access is not provided please resolve 4) Ref.; 4/S1-4357 Clarify 5/16 fillet weld shown - provide complete extents for all-around weld. No weld show for WF flange to TG-33.2 shown please confirm 5) Ref. S1-4357 Suggest use of base plate to resolve				Refer to attached sketch SKS-0415, which provides a simplified connection at the locations indicated the RFI. We disagree with the reason for RFI request "Engineering Conflict". We categorize this as "clarification for issues on means and methods" and "change to be issued in a future bulletin".			

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	weld issues						
T-1628.1	SSS - Pipe Column Base Connections at GL 33.2	Open	06/08/2015	06/18/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Contract Doc Ref: 6/S1-4357 Location: Ground Level, Zones 4 Gridlines: 33.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK001, SKS-0415</p> <p>Please refer to RFI T-1628 and attached sketch SK 001 for the 2' plate connection at the base of the east elevation lower pipe columns at gridline 33.2.</p> <p>1) Design drawing 6/S1-4357; shows weld bevels in the pipe wall. We propose putting the weld bevels on the 2" plate instead. This option has the added advantage of providing a weld termination hole in the plate to allow correct termination of the CJP weld (with the previous option, such holes would have to have been cut into the pipe). Please confirm this is acceptable.</p> <p>2) Please note that ASI 109 through 130 does not contain the missing 6/S1-4357. Please confirm DT will issue in next ASI or if detail does not apply.</p>							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1629	SSS - Shop Prime Coat Thickness for Carbozinc 859	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Specification 05 10 00 3.2.P.1.b.1 requires a primer of DFT 2.5 to 3.4 mils. The product data sheet for the approved Carbozinc 859 specifies a DFT of 3-5 mils. OIW coating instruction CI-2770-14-04 notes the 3-5 mils as recommended by the coating manufacturer. Please confirm that a prime coat of 3-5 mils of Carbozinc 859 is acceptable.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Prime coat of 3-5 mils of Carbozinc 859 is acceptable. Specification Section 05 10 00 3.2.P.1.b.1 is changed to: Apply primer to a DFT between 3 and 5 mils.				
T-1630	SSS - ST201 Weld Details for Access at W14x311	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: For erectability and weld access, the following is proposed: stiffener plates will be shop welded while the HSS will be field welded (as far back as allowable with only a 2-5/16" gap). Please confirm sketch is acceptable; otherwise, provide alternative.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide connection detail per attached sketch SKS-0409 where detail 10/S1-7605 is called out on plans except at two locations on 2/S1-7003. At these two locations, provide detail as shown on SK1 in the RFI.				
T-1631	SCS - Elevation at Transformer Vaults Room	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang REQUEST: On Sheet AI-2203, on the slab around the transformer vaults room, grid lines 12-C, the elevation is indicated as TOFF -7'-9". On Plan 1/A1-3002, there is an elevation point corresponding to the same slab at grid lines 12.1-B.5 that indicates an elevation of TOC -7'-9". On the detail A/AI-9236 same point has an TOC elevation of -8'-2". Please confirm that elevation -7'-9" on Detail 1/A1-3002 corresponds to TOFF instead of TOC.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The elevation -7'-9" on Detail 1/A1-3002 corresponds to TOFF instead of TOC. Refer to SKA-4049 which reflects updated elevation tag.				
T-1632	SSS - Ground Level Kicker Brace Detail Clarification at GL 20	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1816 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1635	SSS - Exit Mezzanine Framing and Connection Clarifications at South Exit	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 554 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 14: 1) Supply missing dimensions. 2) Confirm dimensions. 3) Supply location for the MC4. 4) Confirm the vertical hanger is interrupted at the upper beam. Please clarify. 5) Clarify where the MC4x13.8 is located and supply a connection to the W12 & CMU wall. 6) Supply missing dimension. 7) Connection per 9/S1-5028 will not work at the noted location. Supply an alternate detail. 8) Confirm off-center connection per 9/S1-5028 is acceptable or supply an alternate detail. 9) Supply the elevation for the W12x40 at the landing and depending on the elevation, supply a connection detail at each end. 10) Supply missing dimension. 11) Supply length of weld. 12) Supply a connection detail for brace to hanger/beam. 13) Confirm dimension for plate orientation. 14) Confirm detail 9/S1-5028 also applies to the top of the hangers. 15) Confirm a 2-sided fillet is acceptable as the welding access of the end of the brace is not sufficient.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. For updated slab edge drawing confirming and showing missing dimensions, refer to SKA-4081. 2. See updates on SKS-0403. Braces to be placed at equal spacing. 3. The MC4x13.8 channel may be waived at the highlighted location. In lieu of the MC4x13.8, provide a W12x40 beam as shown in sketch SKS-403 and SKS-0405. 4. See SKS-0403 and SKS-0405 for hanger locations. 5. See response to question 3. Connection of W12 to CMU wall per 12/S1-9001. Connection of W12 to W12 per 1/S1-5011. 6. For wall dimension to GL F.7, refer to A1-7009 issued with ASI-123. 7. See SKS- 0403. 8. Align W12x40 with centerline of W40x230 above, as specified on 2/S1-2252. See SKS-0403. 9. See SKS-0405. 10. S1 slab to attach to top of W12x40 bottom flange, as shown on 4/S1-5032. Requested dimension approx. 3-7/8". 11. Provide 6" min weld length at double angle brace to gusset plate. 12. Connection of brace and hanger to beam above per 6/S1-5028 sim. 13. Confirmed. 14. Confirmed. 15. Confirmed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1817 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1635.1	SSS - Exit Mezzanine Framing and Connection Clarifications at South Exit	Closed	09/26/2014	10/06/2014	10/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyPhil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
See attached CD RFI # 554.1 SK1: The W12x40 is currently not supported on the right end. Supply a connection for the hanger at the Ground Level or supply a connection detail to the 2-L6x6x1/2 hanger.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For both North and Sound Exit Mezzanine, adjust the location of north-south spanning W24x62 at ground level (S1-2305) to support 2L-6x6x1/2 hanger at upper landings. These W24X62s were shown in SKS-404 submitted in response to RFI T-1635 (also included in ASI 127). East face/toe of 2L-6x6x1/2 hanger at upper landing to be placed 10" from face of step (Ref: Detail 1/S1-5034). Connection of 2L-6x6x1/2 to W24x62 per 9/S1-5028.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1818 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1636	SSS - Exit Mezzanine Framing and Connection Clarifications at North Exit	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 555 SK1 for items 1 to 9: 1) Supply/confirm all clouded dimensions (9 clouds total). 2) Verify dimension. 3) Connection per 9/S1-5028 will not work at the noted location. Supply an alternate detail. 4) Confirm off-center connection per 9/S1-5028 is acceptable or supply an alternate detail. 5) Confirm the noted dimensions may vary to match the W-3 supporting beam locations above. 6) Confirm the orientation for the MC4. 7) Confirm the vertical hanger is interrupted at the upper beam. Please clarify. 8) Clarify where the MC4x13.8 is located and supply a connection to the W12 & CMU wall. 9) Supply the elevation for the W12x40 at the landing and depending on the elevation, supply a connection detail at each end.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. See attached sketch SKS-0406 for requested dimensions and for updated slab edge drawing, refer to SKA-4081 and 6/A1-7011 issued with ASI-118. 2. Confirmed. 3. Move the W12x40 beam northwards so that the 2L6x6 clears the W33x118 flange by 1". The EOS of the mezzanine floor will also move with W12x40. 4. Move the W12x40 beam so that it aligns with the W44x230 beam above. The EOS of the mezzanine floor will also move with W12x40. 5. Confirmed. 6. Confirmed. 7. Provide 1 hanger on each side of the slab step on both sides of the slab as shown in attached sketches SKS-0404 and SKS-0405. 8. The MC4x13.8 channel may be waived at the highlighted location. In lieu of the MC4x13.8, provide a W12x40 beam as shown in sketch SKS-0405 9. Provide a W6x25 beam in lieu of the W12x40 beam at the upper slab as shown in sketch SKS-0405.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1637	SSS - North Exit Mezzanine Clarifications	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 561 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 20: 1) Confirm all dimensions shown in a green rectangle box. 2) The noted W12x40 appears to be shown as one continuous beam from west of Grid 22 to east of grid 24. Supply splice locations and a splice detail. 3) Confirm the CMU wall aligns with the west edge of the slab opening or supply more information. 4) Confirm it is acceptable to locate the MC4's 1" from edge of slab openings. 5) It is not clear where the MC4 is located. Is it backed against the CMU wall? Please provide more information and connection details. 6) The location of the hangers are not correct at the locations noted as a red rectangle box based on the concrete beam locations per RFI T-1010 (SK 287, CD 230). Confirm the updated dimensions are correct. 7) Confirm connection is per 9/S1-5028. 8) Supply a connection detail. 9) Supply a connection detail for MC4 to MC4. 10) Confirm all W12x40's and all MC4x13.8's are located vertically per 4/S1-5032 (SK3). If not, supply more information. 11) The location of the hangers are not correct at the locations noted as a red rectangle box based on the concrete beam locations per RFI T-1010 (SK 287, CD 230). Confirm the updated dimensions are correct. 12) Confirm the CMU wall aligns with the east edge of the slab opening or supply more information. 13) Confirm dimension to edge of slab. 14) Confirm MC4 is located 1" west from the edge of slab or supply more information. 15) Confirm the underside of the slab is typically at the top of the bottom flange of the W12x40's or supply more information. 16) Supply a connection detail for the MC4 to the W12x40. 17) Supply a connection detail for the MC4 to the CMU wall. 18) Please supply dimensions for hooked deformed bars. 19) Confirm stud spacing to avoid the bending radius. 20) Confirm 1 1/4" I/S cold bending radius.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			1. For confirmation of dimensions highlighted in green on CD RFI 561 SK1, A1-2854 should be read in conjunction with A1-3020, A1-7010 and structural details. a. 12'-0" is confirmed b. 2'-8 5/8" - should be 2'-0 5/8", refer to A1-2854 issued with ASI-118. c. 11'-6" - should be 11'-2", refer to A1-2854 issued with ASI 118. d. 11 5/8" is confirmed. e. 19'5 3/4" - is acceptable 2. Refer to response to RFI T-1073 for clarification on W12 beam splice locations and detail. 3. Wall below is 3" offset from EOS. Refer to Detail 5/A-0024. 4. MC4s shall be 2" (clear) away from the slab openings. 5. The MC4 channel may be waived at the highlighted locations. 6. Confirmed. 7. Confirmed. 8. Move the W12x40 and 2L6x6 hanger northwards so that the W12x40 beam is 1" offset from the W40 beam at the ground level. 9. Refer to response to RFI T-1073 for MC4 to MC4 connection detail clarification. 10. Confirmed. 11. See attached sketch SKS-0414 for correct hanger locations.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1820 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
				12. Wall below is 3" offset from EOS. Refer to Detail 5/A-0024.			
				13. Dimension of EOS to GL 24.9 is 6'-2 1/8" as shown on A1-2854 issued with ASI-118.			
				14. The edge of the MC4 shall be aligned to the edge of slab. The MC4 shall span between the W12x40 beam on the south to the first perpendicular CMU wall and not the entire width of the slab.			
				15. Confirmed.			
				16. Refer to response to RFI T-1073 for MC4 to W12x40 connection detail clarification.			
				17. Refer to detail 12/S1-9001 for MC4 to W12x40 connection detail. Detail 12/S1-9001 is called out on 4/S1-5032.			
				18. Develop the deformed bar anchors 24" into the MFB beam. Refer to detail 4/S1-3001 for hook lengths.			
				19. Confirmed.			
				20. Confirmed.			
T-1638	SSS - Framing Beam Location at GL20.1G & C	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 577 SK1 for items 1 & 2:				1) The W14x68 beam is 2' - 1 3/4" away from GL 20.1 and is centered on the W-3 system door HSS post shown on Sheet 1/A1-8215D issued with ASI 120 on 7/11/2014.			
1) Supply location for W14x68.							
2) Supply welding information for L4x4x3/8 deck support a ngle flush with the top of the plate on the Transfer Girder.				2) Provide horizontal fillet welds per detail 10/S1-5002 at the bottom of the transfer girder flange and 5/16" vertical fillet welds at each end of the angle.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1821 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1638.1	SSS - Framing Beam Location at GL20.1G & C	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 577.1 SK1: Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W14x68 with a shear plate per 1/S1-5011 as a double angle connection per 1/S1-5010 will foul the shear plate connection for the W33x118. NOTE: The same condition occurs at Grid C			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. TT: We agree with the reason for RFI request "Alternate Proposal", disagree with "Engineering Conflict". We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
T-1639	SSS - Light Column LC-301 Detail Clarifications	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 581 SK1 for items 1 to 8: 1) Verify dimension. 2) Verify dimension. 3) Provide elevation. 4) Provide dimension. 5) Confirm the noted dimension should be 8 3/4" to match the dimension shown on 7/S1-6005. 6) Verify dimension. 7) Verify dimensions. 8) Verify dimension.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Dimension confirmed 2) Dimension confirmed 3) The slope of the tapered girders at GL23 (hence elevations at any intermediate point) can be calculated using elevations at GL B (H) and D (F). Top of steel elevations at GL B and D are 80'-11" and 79'-9 1/2", respectively, as indicated on plans. 4) Dimension as per SBPs detail 5/S1-6005 = 10-1/2". To be confirmed with calculated elevations as per TTs response to item 3. 5) Dimension confirmed 6) Dimension confirmed 7) Dimension confirmed 8) Dimension confirmed		
T-1639.1	SSS - Light Column LC-301 Detail Clarifications	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 581.1 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) Verify elevation. 2) Verify dimensions. 3) Please verify the noted dimension which is different than RFI T-1639 (SK 783, CD 581) item 4.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1-) Confirmed. 2-) Confirmed. 3-) Dimension confirmed. TT: We agree with the reason for RFI request.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1822 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1640	SSS - Light Column LC-302E Detail clarifications	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 582 SK1 for items 1 to 4: 1) Verify dimension. 2) Verify elevation. 3) Verify dimension. 4) Verify dimensions.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Dimension confirmed. 2) Top of steel is confirmed. However, the beam is W30x173 as shown on the plans, not W40x397 as indicated in the RFI. 3) Dimension confirmed. 4) Dimension confirmed.		
T-1640.1	SSS - Light Column Connection Detail at LC301	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/29/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 3/S1-6005, 5/S1-6005 Location: Light Column Cast Node LC301, Roof Park Gridline: D.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1640 The center of pin elevation relative to the top of steel elevation of the W30x173 is shown in 3/S1-6005. The response to RFI T-1640 confirmed and determined that the 2" thick lug plates are more similar in shape to the plates detailed in 5/S1-6005. 1. As the assembly detailed in 5/S1-6005 does not require a 1" thick stiffener at the top, please confirm if the requirement for top stiffener in 3/S1-6005 can be waived. 2. If the stiffener is required, please confirm weld required between 2" thick plate and horz stiffener 3. If a CJP is required, confirm weld termination hole can be provided as shown in SK 1 attached with a min 1/2" radius.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The stiffener at the top is required. 2. Double-sided 15/16 inch fillet weld with length equal to or greater than 4 inches may be used instead of a CJP. 3. Notch is not acceptable. Fillet weld alternative given in answer to point 2. SBP agrees with the reason for request (alternate proposal) and categorize it as a no-cost clarification. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
T-1641	BGP - Embedded Column Base Plates	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please reference detail 6, section B of S1-3503 and attached sketch.</p> <p>Please confirm concrete column collar plate can be fabricated out of continuous plate at the concourse and bike/vehicle ramp level.</p>				Confirmed.		
T-1642	BGP - Electrical Junction Box at GL 2.8/V.3 Beam	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto						
	REQUEST: Plan sheet AI-2850 shows an electrical junction box located at GL 2.8/V.3 which is directly in the B18 Beam. Please confirm this location is correct or provide revised locating dimensions for this EJB.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
					For the updated location of the embedded junction box at GL 2.8/V.3, refer to attached SKA-4053.		
T-1643	SSS - W40 Moment Connection Clarification GL 21-22	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 583 SK1: The required 11 bolts per 1/S1-5010 for the W40x149 does not leave room for the weld access hole at the bottom flange for the moment connection. Confirm it is acceptable to supply 10 bolts or supply an alternate solution.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Confirmed		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1824 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1644	SSS - Steel Fouling at Telecom Vault GL 33	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached CD RFI # 585 SK1: The W12x53 is flush with the underside of the sloping WT40x53 on the left end of the W12x53 and fouls the WT40x503 by 1" at the right end of the WT. Please provide a solution. Note: The same condition occurs on Grid C.3.			The W12x53 shall be flush with the bottom of the WT40x503 and shall follow the same slope as the WT40x503. Shim plates tack welded to the bottom flange of the W12x53 may be provided as required between the S4 slab and the W12 beam bottom flange.				
T-1645	SSS - SE201 & SE202 W16 Connection Clarification	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached CD RFI # 587 SK1: Please supply a connection for the W16x36 to avoid fouling the connection per 9/S1-5032 on the opposite side.			Provide a shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011 at the W16 beam at the location highlighted in the RFI. Note that S1-2602 has been updated and issued with Roof Park Restaurant IFC package on 5/31/2014. Refer to sketch SKS-0383 submitted with response to RFI T-1544 that shows updated framing in the area highlighted on SK1. As shown in the sketch, the W16 beam aligns with the W40x503 beam.				
T-1646	SSS - TPG1 Moment Connection Detail Clarification GL 21	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	09/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached CD RFI # 588 SK1: The bottom flange moment weld per 8/S1-5013 is not possible as the flange of the W44x230 only partially contacts the sloping flange of the TPG1. Please supply a detail.			Provide moment connection at bottom flange of W44x230 as shown in attached sketch SKS-0412.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1647	SCS - 12" Thick Partition Walls over 24' height	Closed	08/25/2014	09/04/2014	08/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Partition walls taller than 24'-0", as indicated in Section 3/S1-9050, have vertical reinforcing of #7 bars @12" centers. Section 4/S -9051 indicates that the vertical bars will have a 90 degree tail at the top end of the bar. The standard tail length for #7 bars is 14" and will not fit within the 12" thick walls. Rotating the #7 bar tails to clear the concrete face by 1 1/2" clash with one another. Harris Rebar requests permission to utilize #7 straight vertical bars with a #5 'U' shaped cap with 30" lap@ 6" centers at the top of walls. Is this acceptable? In order to minimize multiple varying lengths of the #7 vertical wall bars, the #7 threaded vertical dowel bar length will be increased from 49" to 56". The #7 wall vertical bar will be held up to the top of wall elevation, less clear cover, and maintain a minimum 49" lap splice at the Concourse Level. Is this acceptable?			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, it is acceptable to use #5 "u" bars with splice length of 30" at 6" OC in lieu of standard hooks for #7 vertical partition wall reinforcement. At contractor's option it is also acceptable to provide a reduced-dimension hook length at wall ends for the #7 vertical partition wall reinforcement. A hook length of 9" is acceptable. Confirmed, 49" lap splice for #7 vertical wall reinforcement is acceptable.				
T-1648	SSS - Deck Support Angle at Drum Café Roof	Closed	08/26/2014	09/05/2014	08/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 584 SK1: Supply the size, length and spacing for the expansion anchors shown on SK1.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Expansion anchors shall be 3/4" dia Hilti Kwik Bolt TZ anchors with 4 3/4" embedment spaced at 18" on center and at 4" from each end. Provide a L6x4x3/8" (LLV) angle in lieu of the L3x3x1/4 shown on 1/S1-3281A.				
T-1649	SSS - Review Comments on Embed Angles	Closed	08/26/2014	09/05/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 589 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) 5" long studs are correct per detail 1/S1-7600. Confirm no further action is required. (The same applies to drawing			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Detail 1/S1-7600 applies to HSS posts landing on composite decks. For HSS posts landing on concrete slabs details 11/S1-7600 and 12/S1-7602 are				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1826 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
9519 & 9526).	2) 3 3/4" is correct to place the pipe collar on the centerline of the HSS8x8 post per 1/S1-7600 above as shown. Confirm no further action is required.						
				applicable. Details 11/S1-7600 and 12/S1-7602 call out 8" long studs.			
				2) Embed Angle A9516 is noted in two locations, 3 on Train Platform (drawing EM46) & 2 on Bus Deck Levels (drawing EM47). The Corrected dimension applies to embeds at the Train Platform level (see drawing EM46). Skanska to confirm if Embed A9516 is designed for both levels.			
T-1650	SCS - Requesting Approval for Precast Panels in Lieu of Cast-In-Place	Closed	08/27/2014	09/06/2014	09/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:	Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	See attached Exhibits A through D as a possible means of precast installation method. Using a precast yard facility in lieu of concrete cast in place will reduce the construction duration for the scallop, perimeter, and sky light elliptical wall operations since production can start prior to the construction start date. Precasting concrete elements also results in a better final product. Quality advantages of using a precast yard facility over cast in place methods are improved formwork design, curing procedures, temperature control, and form striping methods since work space, formwork weight, formwork relocation and reassembly, and hoisting equipment restrictions are greatly reduced if not eliminated.		In concept, the proposed P/C scheme will work structurally. However, we would point out that the support of the panel on the steel beam shall be detailed to allow for in/out and up/down adjustments. The detail shall also accommodate the nature camber in the steel beam. Structural calculations and shop drawings shall be submitted for review. The calculations and shop drawings shall be stamped and sealed by a California Structural Engineer.				
	shimmick requests approval from the engineer to allow precast manufactured panels in lieu of the cast in place walls shown on S1-2752 & S1-3282 scallop walls, S1-2602 stair well, S1-2603 elliptical skylight, S1-2604 light column opening, S1-2606 stair shaft, and S1-2607 elevator shaft.		In concept, the proposed P/C scheme will work visually for the architectural team. However, without an existing precast concrete specification and drawings that outline visual and quality control issues there may be some details that require a joint agreement on what is to be provided between the Contractor, TJPA, and the TJPA Representatives. Submit a draft design package including specification, confirmation on waterproofing details, and more developed design drawings to the TJPA Representative for review prior to final agreement on this substitution.				
	Please confirm that the concept drawing is acceptable as well.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1828 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Level slab constant along the wall? This would mean that the top of wall would slope with the ground level. Please confirm.</p> <p>2. Please clarify how to obtain the elevation of the top of the partition walls. Note: The elevations obtained through those two methods below conflict.</p> <p>a.Should be obtained using the ground slab elevation points on plan S1-2303 and a constant slope between two consecutive elevation points? -OR-</p> <p>b.Scale the elevation from the section detail in AI AI-9236?</p> <p>3. Please confirm if the above answers are applicable to all similar partition walls.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1829 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1655	SCS - Additional Information Needed to Cut CDSM Soldier Pile Beam.	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	08/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>Direction provided is limited to: EXHIBIT A - TRADE SUBCONTRACTOR BID PACKAGE MANUAL AND FORMS, IV. SCOPE OF PACKAGE, D - 13. pg-13 - "Cut Interior Flange and Web of the CDSM Shoring Wall Steel Soldier Pile. Assume that the cutting of the pile will occur between 2' and 8' below the finish grade surface. The precise elevations for the cutting of the pile beams will be determined by a future design requirement."</p> <p>In order to perform this work the elevation of the cut is needed.</p> <p>Shimmick was informally provided a copy of the attached drawing from Webcor Obayashi Joint Venture which only identifies a vertical distance in elevation from finished grade elevations. Shimmick was then informed by WOJV that Thornton Tomassetti is currently making corrections to the site grading civil drawings C1-1000's to C1-8000's Rev 0 Dated 03/31/14 which show top of curb elevations. The civil drawings do not provide complete curb elevations to determine the elevation of the cut at all piles.</p> <p>1. Confirm that the attached drawing which identifies a vertical distance in elevation from finished grade elevation is to be used.</p> <p>2. Are the top of curb elevations in the civil drawings to be used as finish grade elevations for the depth of cut on the CDSM piles?</p> <p>a. Provide finished grade elevations for cutting the interior flange and web of the CDSM piles or provide a height from top of concrete elevations shown on the ground level deck on plans sheet A1- 2862 to A1-2781. Also, please provide a drawing identifying the type of cut required ie., horizontal, angling up, or angling down.</p>					<p>1. See attached sketch for notching depths.</p> <p>2. ASI 123 roadway at curb (low point) elevations will be used to calculate notching elevation.</p> <p>Note. Refer to submittal package "TG0702-145 SCS - CQC Plan for CDSM Notching" for "Means and Methods" procedures.</p>		
<hr/>							
T-1656	SSS - Beam Spacing Clarification at W-4 System GL20.1-22	Closed	08/28/2014	09/07/2014	09/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>The beam spacing does not meet the 6'-0 max. spacing requirement in 10/S1-5004. Please clarify the beam</p>					<p>The 6'-0" max spacing requirement per 10/S1-5004 can be waived at the deck support locations</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1830 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	locations to match 10/S1-5004.						highlighted in the RFI.
							TT: We disagree with reason for RFI Request "Engineering Conflict". We categorize this as no cost clarification.
T-1657	SCS - Lower Concourse MEP Room Construction Joints	Closed	09/03/2014	09/13/2014	09/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
ASI 121 issued new wall CJ locations. Reference sheet AI-2203, Detail I/AI-3008 and B/AI-9240.				A. Omit wall CJ running through Mech opening.			
A. On the south wall of the room at GL 13-B.2 there is a construction joint (see plan attached indicated as location "A") running through one of the MEP blocks outs. That creates a cantilever section below the beams cutout and above the MEP block out. Is that acceptable? If not, where should the CJ be relocated?				B. Wall CJ to be moved 1'-0" west of Electrical opening.			
B. On the same wall there is a construction joint (see plan attached indicated as location "B"), the distance between the MEP block and the construction joint is 5' 5/8", which is not enough to place diagonal trim bars on the comers of the MEP block out that are closer to the construction joint. Please provide detail for this location.				C. Wall CJs are continuous behind steel plates and are shown as hidden lines.			
C. In the same wall, the construction joints are not shown in the area cover by the spall plate, do the CJ's start at the top of the wall plates? Please confirm intent and provide further direction.				For updated A1-9240, refer to SKA-4094.			

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1833 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1662	SCS - CDSM Shoring Wall Pre-Cut	Closed	09/04/2014	09/14/2014	09/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please see attached documents. Pursuant to the response given in T-0774 WOJV is proposing the following means and method for precutting the interior flange of the CDSM beams in order to prevent damage to the waterproofing. Attached is a narrative along with a map of the locations, and depth wherein beams will be notched prior to installation of the waterproofing. Please confirm that the proposed notching of the CDSM beam will not compromise the design intent of the system.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Arup Response This is structurally acceptable with the following exceptions: No notching of the soldier piles supporting abutments shall occur while the piles are supporting abutments A different detail / construction sequence may be needed in the vicinity of the vehicle and bicycle ramps.				
T-1663	BGP - Construction Joint Between Walls W318 - W319 and W357-W358	Closed	09/05/2014	09/15/2014	09/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: In an effort to mitigate delays, WOJV is proposing moving the construction joint between walls W318 - W319 and W357-W358 2' to the west, See markup sketch attached, this move if approved would result in the contractor forming and pouring walls W318 and W358 prior to Deck pour D219. As part of this change WOJV is also requesting using Lenton A2 couplers in lieu of the #7 horizontal reinforcement lap splices between these walls Please confirm if this is acceptable at this one-off location.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed				
T-1664	BGP - Pier and Opening Sizes on Decks D220-D236	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1665	<p>Please confirm the Pier and Opening Sizes for Lower Concourse Decks D220 to D236 are per the attached drawings as the specific sizes and wall heights are not shown in the Contract drawings. (Reference RFI T-1461)</p> <p>BGP - B20 Spandrel Beam at Knock-Out Walls</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</p> <p>REQUEST: Please see attached S1-2210 and S1-3204 D4.</p> <p>SCCI inadvertently poured the Shear Wall against the Knock-out Wall without any blockout for West Spandrel Beam B20, as shown in S1-2210 and S1-3204.</p> <p>Please confirm the following remedy is acceptable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The affected #7 bars are drilled and bonded to supports (Shear Walls) with standard embedment per approved epoxy manufacturers recommendation.2. Tie spacing, which is presently at 12". Will be reduced to 8"; Tie size will remain #4 rebar.3. Contact surface not to receive ¼" X 8" continuous neoprene pad, will be roughened to 1/4" amplitude.	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Pier and opening sizes without mark ups for Deck D220 to D236 are confirmed. Refer to attached PDF (AAI Response) for AAI notes and mark ups.</p> <p>Reason for RFI Request appears appropriate.</p> <p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Confirmed.</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1835 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1666	SCS - Wall Opening Detail Conflicts	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please reference drawing S1-3001. See attached marked up drawing 4/S1-3207 details typical wall opening reinforcement, noting to use additional bars for 10" to 30" wall openings with lengths LTS + W. The typical vertical bars used for the foundation walls are #11 rebar and the added bar length is 19'-6" (LTS + W + W + LTS + W = 102" + 1 0" + 10 + 102" + 10"). Depending on the location of the penetration, the added bar would have to extend LTS + W beyond the opening, which in the 10" opening case is 9'-4" (102" + 10"). This is not possible considering the foundation walls under TG07.2 scope of work are between 8' to 12'. Additionally these additional vertical bars will potentially conflict with moment frame beam rebar at ground level by adding to the rebar congestion. See attached marked up drawings for example conflict. 1. Please provide an alternative to the current wall opening detail for the foundation wall. 2. Please provide an alternative detail for cases where additional vertical bars conflicting with moment frame beam rebar.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Coordination between trade packages in the responsibility of the contractor. Details shown on S1-3207 stand. Calculation of development length in the RFI is incorrect, vertical bars are not considered Top Bars. Where the opening occurs high in a wall and the calculated length of additional reinforcing exceeds the wall height, additional reinforcing may be terminated with a hook or a head. In order to avoid congestion and potential conflict with intersecting elements, the additional vertical reinforcing may be placed in an interior layer and aligned with the uninterrupted vertical bars.				
T-1667	SCS - Foundation Wall Conduit Penetration Locations	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher				
REQUEST: Reference drawings: A1-2862 to A1-2871, E1-2862 to E1-2871 and E1-3208 to E1-3210. Please see attached marked up drawings noting atypical set of conduit penetrations. A1-2862 provides a lateral distance relative to a grid line to set of conduits; however 3/E1-3208 details the set of conduits as not aligned. On top of this, the referenced drawings do not provide an elevation for the conduit penetrations. SCCO requires the locations of these penetrations to proceed with foundation wall rebar detailing.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached drawings for electrical conduit penetration locations.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>Please provide information on the location of the electrical conduit foundation wall penetrations.</div>							
T-1668	SSS - Weld Access Hole at Transfer Girder	Closed	09/08/2014	09/18/2014	09/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div> <div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>			<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Please confirm it is acceptable to provide weld access holes as indicated on 628BC per AWS D1.1 to adequately terminate the CJP weld to cast node. For plates not fabricated, confirm it is acceptable to omit the hole closest to the proposed access hole to maintain AISC min edge distance. This typically occurs at all cast node to girder connections.</div>			<div>SUGGESTION:</div> <div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>1). Confirmed that weld access holes shown on P77 attached is acceptable. The hole above the transfer girder flange should have rounded corner similar to the one below the flange. The bolt nearest to the hole shall still be installed.</div> <div>2). Confirmed that for the plates that still yet to be fabricated, the hole nearest to the access hole may be omitted to maintain minimum edge distance.</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1837 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1669	SSS - Insufficient Cope for Erection Clearance	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please refer to beams highlighted in S1-2503 (attached) and work with this RFI. The 7" cope shown in 2/S1-5017 is not sufficient for erection clearance. The connections on the other end of these beams dictate that the beams cannot be dropped vertically into position during erection (Please refer to attached SK RFI 813 SK1 and SK RFI 813 SK2). Beams have either a gravity moment connection (per 1/S1-8003) at odd gridlines or a shear plate connection (per 1/S1-8000) at even gridlines. These beams connect into the bus deck perimeter beams which must be installed first in our erection sequence due to the constraints of knife/pin connections at either end at the bus deck level cast nodes. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: We propose increasing the 7" bottom flange cope to 9.5" for both scenarios. We have modelled both cases and can erect the beams with a cope of this size.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Suggestion acceptable.		
T-1670	SSS - Reviewer Comments - Decking Dwgs GL 1-4	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Reference metal decking shop drawings submittal package TG0701-92D & SK1 1) On sheet 24, reviewer's comment requires studs on transfer girder. Note at TR3 the concrete cover on top of girder flange is 3". T/slab=21.344, T/steel=21.19) The shortest available stud is 3" after welding, resulting in insufficient concrete coverage. Please confirm shear studs are not required at TR3. 2) On sheet D16, detail 4, reviewer's comment requires 3" of bearing at S3 slabs per 2/S1-5000. Note, detail 4 depicts a deck flute parallel condition, note 2 on 2/S1-5000 indicates 2" bearing (3" bearing where noted) at supporting members perpendicular to deck span and 1-1/2" at members parallel. As this is a parallel condition the minimum bearing required is 1-1/2". Confirm detail is acceptable as is.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. TT: RFI Reason for Request is appropriate.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1838 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1671	SSS - Kicker Interference at Ground Level GL 22-24	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 578 SK1 for items 1 & 2: The kicker brace connections to the girder will foul the 2-1/2" stiffeners at two locations on each grid line. Confirm if option 1 or 2 is acceptable. 1) Option 1: Confirm it is acceptable to remove the fouling 2-1/2" thick stiffener plate and model the full height 1" shear plate as shown. 2) Option 2: Confirm it is acceptable to move the W30x90 as shown and connect to a 2 1/2" thick full height stiffener plate extended to the top as shown. Note option 2 has additional cost implications.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Options 1 and 2 are not needed. Move the W30 beams by few inches towards GL E so that the kicker braces clear the 2 1/2" stiffener plates. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request. We categorize this as no cost clarification.		
T-1672	SSS - Stiffener Interference at Ground Level GL 24	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 595 SK1: Confirm the beam location dimensions per S1-6050 & RFI T-1573 shown in red may be adjusted as shown in blue in order to connect the noted W44x230's to the 2" stiffener plate below the column flange. If not, supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Moving the beams as shown on SK1 in the RFI to utilize transfer girder stiffeners by omitting the shear plates is acceptable with the following condition: Provide (5)- 1 1/2" diameter A490-X bolts (single vertical row) at the connection on the west ends of the two W44x230 beams. Minimum bolt edge distances Leh and Lev shall be 3" and 4" respectively and bolt spacing shall be 4 1/2". Note that only the WF beams are allowed to be moved. Steel above the WF beam supporting the W-3 system shall be located per locations on S1-6050 and details on S1-8004. TT: We agree with the reason for RFI request "Alternate Proposal", disagree with "Engineering Conflict". We categorize this RFI as request for substitution and no cost clarification considering the omitted shear plates.		
T-1673	SSS - Structural Steel Additional Seismic Requirements	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Per Project Specification 'Structural Steel-Additional Seismic Requirements' 05-12-10-7, Section 2.3 - Source Quality Assurance, Part C - Non-Destructive Testing of Welded Joints, #1 states 'Non-destructive testing shall be conducted at locations required by AWS D1.8 and AISC 341 Appendix Q5.2. Frequency of testing shall be as required by AISC 341 Appendix Q5.2 and Table 2-1 (please see attached).</div><div>AISC 341 Appendix Q5.2, Part g - 'Reduction of Percentage of Ultrasonic Testing and Part h - 'Reduction of Percentage of Magnetic Particle Testing specifies a formula for reduction of percentage of weld testing UT and MT (please see attached).</div><div>XKT has welded each type of weld joint we will see for the 130 Moment Columns. XKT's repair percentages have been well below the required limit of 5%, to demonstrate the quality of our welders.</div><div>Per this section of specifications, the amount of UT and MT testing is permitted to be reduced if approved by the engineer of record.</div><div>To facilitate production and project schedule, XKT is requesting the engineer of record to implement this reduction to be performed by ISI QA Inspection Services.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>ANSWER:</div>	<div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>TT's recommendations are listed below. The final decision rests with TJPA/Turner.</div> <div><div>No reduction in Ultrasonic Testing is permitted for DCW (AISC 341, Section J6.2g)</div><div>No reduction is permitted for Magnetic Particle Testing or Liquid Penetrant Testing of Extra Smooth surface or weld access holes.</div><div>No reduction in CJP weld splice of steel plates</div><div>No reduction in Ultrasonic Testing of the plate material in the designated region of the link beam</div><div>For non-DCW, the reduction of rate of Ultrasonic Testing may follow AISC 360, N5.5e, based on Risk Categories IV.</div><div>For non-DCW, the reduction of rate of Magnetic Particle Testing may follow AISC 341, Section J6.2h.</div></div> <div>The reason for the RFI should be revised to Request for substitution (TT category vii).</div> <div>Jack Adams 9/19/2014</div> <div>RESPONSE: XKT welding (by Trade Subcontractor fab shop XKT) of Moment Columns and weld repair percentages may be below the required limit of 5%, to demonstrate the quality of our welders. However; the amount of NDE (UT and MT testing) will not be permitted to be reduced at this time as this is a contractual decision of the Owner, not EOR.</div>			
T-1673.1	SSS - Structural Steel Additional Seismic Requirements	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kernerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
	<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Per the response to SK RFI 812 (T-1673), the EOR made</div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>ANSWER:</div>	<div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>As discussed TJPA/Turner would revisit the NDT</div>			

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>recommendations that allowed for certain reductions in NDT. The final decision rested with TJPA/Turner and at that time they decided to not permit the reduction of any NDT testing.</p> <p>However, as per the meeting held at XKT Engineering on 11/14/14, it was discussed that TJPA/Turner would revisit the NDT reduction request from XKT Engineering. XKT has continued to demonstrate the quality of their welders, keeping repair percentages at 2%, well below the required limit of 5% as per AISC. At this time, XKT has completed 16 moment frame columns with another 20 columns currently in fabrication (see attached status report). This experience has allowed them to substantiate their repair percentages and the overall quality of their work.</p> <p>Please confirm that the EOR's recommendation to SK RFI 812 (T-1673) is acceptable and the NDT reduction may occur at the XKT Engineering facility.</p>						
						<p>reduction request from XKT Engineering. Skanska Subcontractor XKT welding of Moment Columns and weld repair percentages may now be below the required limit of 5 percent.</p> <p>The moment frame column NDT requirements on all weld configurations is per specification section 05-12-10 Structural Steel Additional Seismic Requirements, Table 2-1. As specified in AISC 341-05 (and 341-10), any reduction of UT or MT requires the approval of the EOR and the AHJ.</p> <p>Any decision to reduce the level of NDT must consider the criticality, redundancy, loading types, peak loads and other information in the domain of the EOR, in addition to weld reject rates, etc. AISC states that any allowable reduction in NDT requires the approval of the EOR and the AHJ. This means that it is EOR prerogative, and not a mandatory requirement. The EOR may allow such reductions per Note 2 below Table 2-1 which references AISC 341. However; AISC 341 (-05 & -10) stipulates that any reduction in NDT is for individual welders based on their reject rate. There is nothing in the AISC provisions (or in the project specifications) that suggest that any reduction in NDT be approved for a facility, only for individual welders whose reject rates do not exceed 5%. The RFI does not propose a reduction in NDT for specific individual welders, but requests it for the facility. This is not in keeping with the AISC provisions and a blanket reduction for the facility is not approved.</p> <p>However, the EOR will allow for QA Special Inspectors to reduce the NDT of those welds on the moment frame columns (Non-demand critical welds and Non-butt joints in the column splices) to MT on 25% of the joints and UT on 100% of the joints based on the AISC provisions. This will require Skanska and QA Special Inspectors to verify statistically the acceptance/rejection rates of each welder or welding operator proposed for reduction. The statistics should include the number of 'welds' made, the number of 'welds' examined by MT and UT, and the number of 'welds' rejected by MT and UT to comply with the AISC provisions. QA Special Inspectors would review</p>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1841 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
			the statistics prior to accepting any specific welder reduction request. The QA Special Inspectors are only authorized to reduce the NDT of those specific welders and the QA Special Inspectors only are authorized to rescind this.				
			NOTE: Regarding any proposed "Reduction of Rate of Ultrasonic Testing" specified in AISC 341-10 (J6.2g) compared to 341-05 (Q5.2 g). This exempts Demand Critical Welds from any reduction in UT testing. Any reduction of NDT is at the discretion of the EOR and AHJ.				
			Regarding these moment frame column Complete Joint Penetration (CJP) welds and specification section 05-12-10 Structural Steel Additional Seismic Requirements, Table 2-1, and AISC as noted above, any reduction of NDT is at the discretion of the EOR and AHJ. The EOR and the AHJ must be assured of the confidence QA Special Inspectors and the welding integrity. Four of Four (4 out of 4) welds will receive QA Special Inspectors AWS Code visual welding inspection with some reduction in MT inspection only at the discretion of the QA Special Inspectors who are only authorized to reduce the NDT to 25% for those individual welders whose reject rates do not exceed 5%. The QA Special Inspectors only are also authorized to rescind this.				
T-1674	SSS - PE502 & PE503 Ground Level Connection Clarifications	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached CD RFI # 597 SK1 for items 1 & 2:			1) Confirmed.				
1) The W12x19 & W24x55 cannot both be connected with double angle connections per 1 /S1-5010 because of insufficient space. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W12x19 per 1/S1-5011.			2) Confirmed.				
2) The W12x19 & W16x26 cannot both be connected with double angle connections per 1 /S1-5010 because of insufficient space. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the			TT: We disagree with reason for the RFI Request. We categorize this as no cost clarification.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1842 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
W12x19 per 1/S1-5011.							
T-1675	SSS - Roof Level Moment Connection Clarifications GL 22	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached CD RFI # 598 SK1 for items 1 TO 3:							
1) Confirm the prep. shown on the 2 1/2" thick flange is acceptable for the moment connection or supply an alternate detail.		1) Confirmed.					
2) The flange of the BU-beam does not align with the flange of the W44x230 for the moment connection. Please advise.		2) Provide fillet welds at the bottom flange moment connection as shown on SKS-0324 submitted with response to RFI T-0922.1. The 1 3/4" shear plate per 8/S1-5032 may be notched a maximum of 1 1/2" from the edge of the bottom flange to allow access for welding. Alternatively, short W40x392 beam can be changed to W40x264 and bottom flanges can be welded similar to 4D/S1-5010.					
3) Confirm the prep. shown on the 1 3/4" thick flange is acceptable for the moment connection or supply an alternate detail.		3) Confirmed.					
		TT: We disagree with reason for the RFI Request. We categorize this as no cost clarification.					



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1676	SSS - Missing Weld Access Hole Information at Roof Level GL 28	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 600 SK1: Confirm the weld access hole as shown is acceptable or supply the missing information.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed geometry is acceptable as long as welds are terminated in compliance with AWS requirements. Weld access holes at weld transitions and/or terminations is a means and methods issue and should be per applicable standards. Such weld access are dimensioned in the drawings only if SER is requesting a detail that is different than that required by AWS / AISC standards. Note that GR-2 provides the specific codes/standards for material, workmanship and quality control. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request noted. We categorize this as called out in contract documents.		
T-1677	SSS - TPG1 Connection Clarification GL 32	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 601 SK1: Please confirm the skewed TPG1 is to be connected to the BU-40x28x1x2.25 per 8/S1-5032 (skewed). If not, supply the missing detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request. We categorize this as a no cost clarification.		
T-1678	SSS - TR23 Missing Moment Connection Detail	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 602 SK1: The W30x90 connects to the BU-60x24 per 1/S1-5010 with the flanges moment welded but no detail is provided for the moment connection of the Transfer Girder to the BU-60x24 connect. Please provide a detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The moment connection of the transfer girder to the BU60 shall be similar to detail 4E/S1-5010 with double angle connection per 1/S1-5010. Bolts and angle sizes shall be those corresponding to W44 in the schedule on S1-5010. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request. We categorize this as a no cost clarification.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1679	SSS - TR29 Bolted Connection Clarifications	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 604 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) Condition at Transfer Girders with 4" thick flange: It is not possible to fit in the number of bolts as requested in 1/S1-5010 with the 4" thick Transfer Girder flange even with minimizing the end distance on the angles to 1 1/4" as shown. This condition occurs at W40x183, W36x135, W33x118, W30x108, W30x90 & W21x44 on S1-2606 & S1-2607. Confirm it is acceptable to reduce the number of bolts by one or supply an alternate connection. 2) Condition at Transfer Girders with 3" thick flange: It is not possible to fit in the number of bolts as requested in 1/S1-5010 with the 3" thick Transfer Girder flange unless we minimize the end distance on the angles to 1 1/4" as shown. This condition occurs at W40x183, W36x135, W33x118, W30x108, W30x90 & W21x44 on S1-2606 & S1-2607. Confirm this is acceptable or supply an alternate connection.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Double angle connection detail at gravity beams framing into transfer girders is per 12/S1-5010 which calls out N-1 bolts, where N is the number of bolts per schedule on 1/S1-5010. Connection detail as shown on SK2 in the RFI is incorrect. Also note that the reference to S1-2606 and S1-2607 in item 1 is incorrect as transfer girders are at ground level. 2) See response to 1). We disagree with the reasons for RFI request "Engineering Conflict", "Alternate Proposal" and "Verification". We categorize this as "Called out in contract documents".				
T-1680	SSS - ST301 Post Location Discrepancy	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 591 SK1 & SK2: The dimensions locating the HSS posts shown in detail 2/S1-7007 and detail 3/A1/7006 do not match as shown. Please clarify the discrepancy.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The dimension locating the HSS post are correct in detail 2/S1-7007. Architectural drawing revised, refer to SKA-4002.				
T-1681	SCS Clarification of Amount of Camber in BU-40x28x1x2.25 Beam	Closed	09/09/2014	09/19/2014	09/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Shimmick is requesting the engineer to provide the amount of camber that the roof top perimeter beams BU-40-28x1x2.25 will have before the perimeter walls are installed and after the roof is fully loaded. Refer to S1-2602 for location of BU-40-28x1x2.25.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1.) As indicated in the construction drawings, no camber is specified for perimeter BU40 beams at Roof Park Level. Coordinate with Skanska to see if the BU40 beams have any natural camber if that's the question. The deflection in the BU40 beam portion between the pipe column supports is expected be less				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1845 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Shimmick is requesting the engineer to provide the amount of vertical tolerance that should be anticipated in the perimeter beams BU-40-28x1x2.25 at the connection points.</p> <p>Shimmick is requesting the engineer to provide the amount of vertical tolerance that will be acceptable for the roof top perimeter walls.</p> <p>See attached Exhibit A for visual aid.</p>			<p>than 1/4" under full load.</p> <p>2.) For concrete construction tolerances refer to ACI 117, as indicated in specifications 03 30 02 and 03 20 02.</p> <p>3.) The question on the amount of vertical tolerance that should be anticipated in the roof perimeter beams is unclear. This is a continuous beam as indicated in construction drawings. Also refer to our response to first item for additional information.</p>			
T-1683	SSS - Stair Opening Framing Clarification GL 16-16.9	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p>			<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>See attached CD RFI # 593 SK1: The new slab opening shown on A1-2884 in ASI 121 is not shown on the current version of S1-2404 and will foul the steel as shown. Please clarify.</p>			<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Refer to attached sketch SKS-0416 that shows the stair opening and updated framing on structural plan.</p> <p>TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request "Engineering Conflict", agree with "Insufficient Information". We categorize this as change to be issued in future bulletin.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1846 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1684	BGP - Ramp Dimensions to RPC-308V and RPC-309V	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please provide missing dimensions for RPC-308V and RPC-309V. On AI-2870 there are N-S dimensions between RPC-308V, RPC-309V, RPC-310V, and RPC 3111V, but no reference dimension to anything else. Please provide N-S dimension to a reference point (i.e. Gridline L). The E-W dimension for RPC-309V is given to the slab centerline. Please provide E-W dimension for RPC-309V to a valid reference point (i.e. Gridline 3).			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to Sketch SKA-4158 for requested dimensions.				
T-1685	SSS - PE301 & PE302 Brace to BU-WT Connection	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 467 SK1 & SK2: Please clarify how the braces per 1/S1-7600 are to be applied at the noted locations with the close proximity of the beams and the BU-WT's on top of the beams.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Braces per 1/S1-7600 shall frame into the underside of the BU-WT top flange with the gusset plate welded to the BU-WT web and top flange, similar to Detail 2E/S1-7600. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request. We categorize this as called out in contract documents.				
T-1686	SSS - Stiffener Interference at Ground Level GL 24	Void	09/10/2014	09/20/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 595 SK1: Confirm the beam location dimensions per S1-6050 & RFI T-1573 shown in red may be adjusted as shown in blue in order to connect the noted W44x230's to the 2" stiffener plate below the column flange. If not, supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1847 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1687	SSS - Light Column Pipe Ring Bending Radius at EL 12ft	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The light column ring at EL. 12'-0" is specified as 6'-11 3/4" diameter (measured from center of pipe), from 14" diameter pipe with a wall thickness of 1.97". Refer to section C on S1-6006. The minimum achievable bending radius for a pipe this size and wall thickness is 42". This exceeds the actual designed radius by 1/8". We are requesting permission to change the diameter of this ring to 7' which will allow the minimum bending radius to be achieved. The difference in ring member size will be accommodated in the connection plates which join the ring to the cast nodes. Please confirm acceptance for this proposal			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We confirm that changing the ring diameter from 6'-11 3/4" to 7' in order to accommodate the minimum achievable bending radius is acceptable. When accommodating the difference in the connection plates, ensure minimum distances (ie edge of bolt hole to edge of plate) are adhered to. We agree with the reason for the request, stating that it is a substitution request.	
T-1688	SSS - Connection Clarification at GL 21.5	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 610 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) The top flange of the W40x503 is cut 1/2" past the PL 2 1/2". The shear plate for the W30x231 is only 3/8" past the end of the PL 2 1/2" and can therefore only be welded to the top flange on one side. Confirm if acceptable or supply an alternate solution. 2) The shear plate is 3/8" past the end of the PL 2 1/2" and the 5/16" fillet weld for the shear plate will clear the PL 2 1/2" by 1/16". Confirm that is acceptable or supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. TT: We agree with the reason for RFI request. We categorize this as no cost clarification.	
T-1688.1	SSS - Connection Clarification at GL 21.5	Closed	09/26/2014	10/06/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 610.1 SK1: The short W36x231 cannot be erected with the shear plate			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1848 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	on the east side of the web as shown in RFI T-1688 (SK 819, CD 610). To place the shear plate on the west side as shown will require the beam to be moved as shown. Confirm that is acceptable.						TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request "Engineering Conflict". We categorize this RFI as clarification for issues on means and methods.
T-1689	SSS - Nut Grade Clarification	Closed	09/12/2014	09/22/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Please see attached SK1 and note the following:		Confirmed.				
	After reviewing structural design drawing S-0007, structural note SS-2 calls for nuts to be provided as A563 DH. It is industry standard, as well as permissible by both AISC and RCSC, for nuts to be supplied also as A194 2H. Please confirm this is acceptable.		TT: We agree with the reason for RFI request "Verification". We categorize this RFI as request for substitution.				
T-1690	SSS - W30 Connection Clarifications at W40 GL 33.2	Closed	09/12/2014	09/22/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	See attached CD RFI # 609 SK1: The W40x503's are web vertical and the W30x90's are canted to match the slope. This makes it difficult to supply double angle connections per 1/S1-6010 for both beams. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W30x90 per 1/S1-5011at the noted locations.		Confirmed.				
			TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request "Engineering Conflict". We categorize this as no cost clarification.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1691	SSS - PE201 Connection Clarifications at Moment Symbols	Closed	09/12/2014	09/22/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 495 SK1: The moment symbol is shown at the noted locations while detail 12/S1-7604 is being referenced. Note that the moment symbols are not shown on plans 2,3/S1-7001 & 1,2,3/S1-7002 with detail 12/S1-7604 also being referenced. Confirm the moment symbols may be ignored and detail 12/S1-7604 applies at all locations where it is referenced.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. TT: We agree with the reason for RFI request "Verification". We categorize this as no cost clarification.		
<hr/>							
T-1692	SSS - PE201 Missing Connection Details	Closed	09/12/2014	09/22/2014	09/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 493 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) Detail 12/S1-7604 cannot be applied at this corner because the column size is HSS6x6x1/4. See attached SK2 and supply a detail showing how to connect the members at this intersection. The same condition occurs in details 1,2,3/S1-7002 & 1,2,3/S1-7003. 2) Supply a slab edge detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Detail 12/S1-7604 shall not apply at the location highlighted in the RFI. The HSS 6x6x1/4 column shall be continuous and typical detail 8/S1-7604 shall apply at the HSS beams framing into the column. The only exception to this is in details 2 & 3/S1-7003, where the HSS10x8x1/2 beam parallel to the GL E.6 shall be moment connected to the HSS 6x6 column per detail 6/S1-7604. 2) Slab edge detail shall be similar to 8/S1-5000, except, provide a closure plate tack welded to the HSS 10x8 beam in lieu of the edge bent plate. The deformed bar anchor per 8/S1-5000 shall be waived for the slab edge condition highlighted in the RFI. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request "Engineering Conflict", agree with "Insufficient Information". We categorize this as no cost clarification.		
<hr/>							
T-1692.1	SSS - PE201 Missing Connection Details	Closed	10/17/2014	10/17/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1850 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>See attached CD RFI # 493.1 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3:</p> <p>1) The response in RFI T-1692 (SK 681, CD 493) is a revision to the contract documents as it is clearly stated in the details on S1-7001, S1-7002 & S1-7003 that detail 12/S1-7604 is to be applied at 4 corners of PE201. The response will require revisions to the model and the material order.</p> <p>Please supply a splice location and a splice detail for the HSS6x6x1/4 column that is now to be continuous.</p> <p>2) Detail 8/S1-7604 cannot be applied as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to clip the corners as shown or supply a new detail.</p> <p>3) Details 6 & 8/S1-7604 cannot be applied as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to cope the corners as shown or supply a new detail.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1852 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1694	SSS - PE 301-302 Anchorage Detail Clarification	Closed	09/12/2014	09/22/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 553 SK1 for items 2 and 3: 2) Confirm the noted weld is intended to be a one-sided fillet weld as there is insufficient access for a 2-sided fillet weld. 3) 1 1/2" is insufficient space for the expansion anchors considering the inside radius of the angles. Confirm the 5 1/2" dimension may be reduced to 4 1/2" to increase the 1 1/2" to 2 1/2".			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request ""Engineering Conflict". We categorize this as no cost clarification.				
T-1695	SCS - Foundation Wall Conduit Penetration Location	Closed	09/12/2014	09/22/2014	09/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: See attached exhibits. See Exhibit A mark-ups. A minimum depth criteria is provided but the actual elevations or a finite depth for the 2" PVC conduits are not given. The dimensions for the typical support bracket are not given either. 1. Please provide either an elevation or a finite depth for the conduits. 2. Please provide the spacing between the 2" RG conduits and 6" RG conduits. The section detail A/ES-2107 provides elevations and dimensions between the 6" PVC to 2" PVC but the numbers do not add up nor does the dimension convert correctly. 3. Please clarify which value to use in detail A/ES-2107 and correct the remaining values. See Exhibit B. There is a spacing discrepancy between A1-2862, E1-3208 and ES-2108 for the 2" PVC sleeves. The architectural slab edge plan A1-2862 shows a typical dimension 1'-9" centers between pairs of electrical sleeves. Detail 3/E1-3208 shows a 3' clear spacing between conduits. ED-2108 showing the vertical centerline matching the below 6" sleeve.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI, WSP, and SFPUC Consolidated Response: 1. For invert elevations of the 2" and 6" RG conduits, refer to ES-2017 REV C EDIT attached. Invert elevations for 2" RG conduits is 1.79' TYP at the foundation wall from invert elevation of the 6" RG conduits. SFPUC Note: In general, the depth of the 2" conduits is not critical at the trenches and was not identified in order to allow flexible choice by the Contractor of conduit supports spacers between the 2" and 6" conduits. Maintain minimum of 3" separation between the 2" and 6" conduits at the trenches. 2. For spacing between 2" and 6" RG conduits, refer to architectural slab edge plans for horizontal dimensions, SFPUC drawings for vertical dimensions or invert elevations. Typical vertical spacing between 2" and 6" RG conduits is 1.79', refer to ES-2017 REV C EDIT attached. 3. For the updated and coordinated sheets between architectural, electrical, and SFPUC drawings, refer to architectural slab edge plans issued with ASI-127, for updated electrical plans, refer SKE-RFI-T-1695-1 to 4 and for updated SFPUC ES-2107, refer to ES-2107				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1854 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Per specification section 03 10 01 Part 2 - Products 7. H. Snap-Off Ties: Use for concrete walls below grade and walls which will not remain exposed to view and are not scheduled for architectural finishes. Drawing A 1-8608 shows the scallop and perimeter walls and A 1-8402 shows the skylight walls not being visible from the sides because of the fascia details and the earth backfill. These walls are not called out as architectural walls on the architectural drawings. Please confirm that typical snap ties are acceptable at perimeter wall, scallop wall, and sky light wall locations.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Design Team does not object to the use of Snap-Off ties only at skylight wall locations. At Roof Park level perimeter parapet wall including Scallop walls, removable form ties may be used, provided they comply with 03 10 01 2.2 B.7.g - "Removable Ties". Perimeter wall and scallop concrete walls shall be prepared TO receive elastomeric coating finish.				
T-1698	SCS - Wall Opening Detail Conflicts for Horizontal and Diagonal Bars	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	09/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Please reference detail 4/S1-3207 and RFI T-1666 about foundation wall opening conflicts. Since submitting RFI T-1666, more concerns regarding 4/SI-3207 have been brought to our attention. One of the concerns mentioned in RFI T-1666 was the case of additional vertical bars potentially conflicting with moment frame beam rebar. This issue can also occur with the diagonal cross bars and additional horizontal rebar. 1. Please provide an alternative detail for cases where either additional horizontal bars and diagonal cross bars conflict with moment frame beam rebar. Due to the length of additional horizontal bars, wall openings near foundation wall CJs will cause the constructability issue of requiring rebar to be built out further to proceed with concrete pours.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per General Note GR-11, the contractor shall apply contract details to similar conditions. It is acceptable for review of contractor's adaption of details to similar conditions to occur in submittal review or through the RFI process. Note that this RFI does not make reference to any specific condition where the typical detail cannot be similarly applied. Neither, does it contain suggestions for application of the detail to the conditions the contractor may have in mind. Responding to the RFI in a general sense, the first issue raised is the potential for diagonal trim bars to conflict with MFB reinforcing. As with openings near the tops of walls, typically trim reinforcing is bent parallel with the top of the wall or trim reinforcing on either side of the top of the opening is combined in one piece of reinforcing. Either approach is acceptable when necessary to avoid the MFB's or tops of walls. The second issue raised is the potential for horizontal				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1855 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	2. Please confirm that the alternate wall opening detail (requested in RFI T-1666) for additional vertical bar lengths can also be applied to additional horizontal bars.			additional reinforcing to interfere with the MFB's. The horizontal reinforcing is a smaller diameter than the MFB longitudinal reinforcing and the conflict is not obvious to us. If the contractor encounters a conflict, the spacing requirements of Detail 4/S1-3207 may waived in favor of providing the number of required bars over the specified spacing. It is also permissible for added horizontal bars to be placed in interior layers where the previous method is not achievable.			
				The third issue raised is that additional horizontal bars may extend past Foundation Wall CJ's. This is no different than typical wall horizontal reinforcing. The contractor shall either build their forms around the required added reinforcing, as with typical horizontal wall bars or they may request the use the Type 2 couplers. Where additional horizontal reinforcing bars would extend past a corner, the bar may be terminated with a standard hook at the far face of the corner.			
				Lastly, the RFI requests that RFI T-1666 response be applied. RFI T-1666 and T-1698 are to be applied separately to the respective bars they address.			
				Reason for request is "Other" - agreed.			
T-1699	SSS - Drag Beam Web Stiffener Plate Connection Clarification	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	09/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			ANSWER: Confirmed.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 572 SK1: Confirm it is acceptable to end the web stiffener plate as shown to avoid fouling the shear plate for the beam connection.	SUGGESTION:		TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request "Engineering Conflict", agree with others. We categorize this as no cost clarification.			
T-1700	SSS - Shaw Alley Bent Plate Clarification	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	09/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 533 SK1 for item 2: 2) Confirm the 3/8" bent plate (50 ksi) terminates on top of the "S1" slab on the Second Level and it does not extend to the top of the side plates in detail 5/S1-5004.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, terminate the S2 slab 3/8" bent plate in detail 5/S1-5013 at the top of the adjacent S1 slab. Note: there was no item #1 submitted with this RFI. TT: RFI Reason for Request appears appropriate.				
T-1701	SSS - Insufficient Cope for Erection Clearance	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	09/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please refer to beams highlighted in S1-2503 (SK1) and work with this RFI. The 1' 11 ½" cope is not sufficient for erection clearance as shown on A4644, A4645 (SK2, SK3). The Type 4 (V) drag connection on the other end of the beam limits the position in which the beam can be erected (See SK4, SK5). The beam needs to be erected from below and positioned through the shear plate on the moment frame column. As you slowly lift the back side that is currently coped, a ¼" clash transpires between the top flange of W40x327 and the shear plates on the bus deck casting. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: We propose increasing the 1' 11 ½" top flange cope to 2' 0 ½", please confirm this is acceptable. ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Increased cope dimension proposed in the RFI is acceptable. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request, erection is a means and methods issue. We categorize this RFI as clarification for Issues on means and methods.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1857 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1702	SSS - Weld Terminations on Moment Frame Column Shafts	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	09/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please see Section 5.17.1- Figure 5.2 from the AWS D1.1 Structural Welding Code (See SK1). In the sketch, proper terminations are shown for both a CJP weld and fillet weld as they approach an access hole. The moment frame column shafts have been designed with a varying thickness of web. These web splice locations require an access hole to account for the different weld details between the web and flange, with generally a CJP weld being performed on one side and a fillet on the other (See SK2). The shaft drawings that have been detailed show an access hole that conforms to 5.17.1 - Figure 5.2. Note, however the shaft drawings do not show the weld termination detail. It is industry standard for the modeler to exclude these details as it is up to the fabricator/inspector to understand that welds should always be terminated as per the section of the AWS code they fall under, unless the design engineer specifies otherwise. Currently, the TJPA shop inspection staff has directed our fabricator to terminate both the CJP & fillet welds similarly - as shown for a fillet weld (See SK3). Please confirm that this is acceptable as currently shown. Please also confirm that the weld terminations should be completed as per AWS D1.1 - Section 5.17.1- Figure 5.2 for all columns fabricated in the future. Terminating CJP welds, as currently directed by the inspection staff to be flush with the end of the access hole will result in additional costs to our fabricator.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1.) First question is not entirely clear since CJP and fillet welds are not terminated similarly per AWS D1.1. Per Figure 5.17 of AWS D1.1, fillet welds are not returned whereas CJP welds are terminated smoothly within the weld access hole envelope and shall not create any stress risers. 2.) For weld access holes in the SFRS, refer to specification 05 12 10, section 2.2.C.c, which requires compliance with ANSI/AISC 360 as a minimum, which is compatible with AWS D1.1, Section 5.17. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request "Engineering Conflict". We categorize this RFI as called out in contract documents. Jack Adams 9/26/2014 RESPONSE: Contrary to the RFI question, the TJPA shop inspection staff does not direct fabricators. These NDE Inspectors either accept or reject welds based on AWS Code. In this case the EOR has provided the answer that weld terminations should be completed as per AWS D1.1 - for all columns fabricated. Terminating CJP welds, as per AWS Code to be flush with the end of the access hole if there are any additional costs are solely the responsibility of the Contractor, not TJPA.				
T-1702.1	SSS - Weld Terminations on Moment Frame Column Shafts	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: As a follow-up to SK RFI 821 (T-1702.1), please note the following: It is unclear on how to exactly fix the weld terminations			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No further action needed at the locations indicated where the holes are used for weld transitions. The holes as dimensioned in the shaft drawings are acceptable. However, AWS D1.1 Section 5.17.1-				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1858 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>that currently do not conform with Section 5.17.1- Figure 5.2 from the AWS D1.1 Structural Welding Code.</p> <p>Skanska proposes two options that would allow the transitions to be permissible as per AWS code. Option 1: Remove material from the web/CJP that would allow for a proper transition down to the flange. See SK1. Option 2: Add additional weld metal to the CJP that would allow for a proper transition down to the flange. See SK2.</p> <p>Please confirm that both options are acceptable & it is at the fabricators discretion to choose which method.</p>						
T-1703	SSS - Fouling Issues for CP8	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 611 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 4: 1) This hole at the bottom flange for CP8 fouls the full depth gusset plate for the CP6 brace per 4/S1-8003. Please provide a solution. 2) The noted hole at the bottom flange for CP8 fouls the full depth gusset plate for the W40x277 beam on Grid 1.4. Please provide a solution. 3) The noted 4 holes will not be accessible as they are within the plate closure for CP5 per 1/S1-8003. Please provide a solution. 4) The noted holes are too close to the 2" thick stiffeners for the CP5 connection per 1/S1-8003. Please provide a solution.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) See response to RFIs T-1514 and T-1514.1. 2) Move the shear plate for the W40 beam connection towards the other side of the beam web. Move the two bolt holes along GL 1.4 to the east of GL 1.4 by few inches so that the bolts clear the shear plate. 3) For bolt installation at the 4 holes, tack weld the bolt heads to the top of bottom flange and tighten the nuts from below. Alternatively, 5" diameter access holes may be provided in the 1" stiffener plates similar to detail 11/S1-8001. 4) Move the two bolt holes by few inches so that the bolts clear the 2" stiffener plates. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request. We categorize this RFI as clarification for issues on means and methods and previously answered RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1704	SSS - Roof Connection Discrepancy	Closed	09/15/2014	09/25/2014	09/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 614 SK1: The connection per 9/S1-5032 is not possible at the noted locations because a CP4 connection per 1/S1-8002 occurs on Grids D.4 & E.6. Please supply an alternate connection			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Connections per Detail 9/S1-5032 are waived at this location. Provide connections per 1/S1-8002 (CP4 connection) at the two locations highlighted in the RFI with the following modification: Provide (7)-1 1/2" A490-X bolts with bolt spacing of 4 1/2" and bolt edge distances of 3" in lieu of the bolts shown on 1A/S1-8002. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request "Engineering Conflict". We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
<hr/>							
T-1705	BGP - Pilaster Rebar Detail	Closed	09/16/2014	09/26/2014	09/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference attached pilaster rebar detail. Please confirm the attached sketch detailing pilaster rebar is to be incorporated for installation of wall dowel formsavers in Lower Concourse Decks D201-D204, D218-D236.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TT has no objection to layout of pilaster vertical reinforcement as shown on attachment of RFI.		
<hr/>							
T-1706	BGP - Construction Joint in Vehicle and Bike Ramp Walls	Closed	09/16/2014	09/26/2014	09/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Spec section 03 30 20-16-3.2 states that the maximum spacing for interior walls and ramp slab is 60 feet. In the response to the Area 1-4 and Area 5 Comprehensive Drawings, TT indicated that no movement joints were required in the Vehicle and Bicycle Ramps below the ramp. To facilitate construction, please confirm:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. TT takes no exception to use of lost formwork at underside of ramp. 2. Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1860 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1707	BGP - Conflict Between Mezzanine and Vehicle Ramp Slab From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto REQUEST: See attached drawing showing the Mezzanine Slab conflicting with the Vehicle Ramp Slab. There is nothing in the contract drawings showing a detail of this intersection, or acknowledging this intersection occurs. Please confirm this intersection of the Mezzanine and Vehicle Ramp Slab is the designer's intent. If this is the designer's intent, please provide further drawing details on the interface of the two components.	Closed	09/17/2014	09/27/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Mezzanine Slab and Vehicle/Bike Ramp Slab are not connected. See SKS-0417 for clarification. Refer to attached SKA-4141, SKA-4142, SKA-4259 and SKA-4260 for slab edge, wall and joint configuration.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1861 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1708	BGP - Structural Detail for Mezzanine to Foundation Wall Connection	Closed	09/17/2014	09/27/2014	09/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: See attached marked up drawing SI-2250 showing Shimmick's assumption of which drawing details apply to the various edges on the Mezzanine Slab. There does not appear to be a structural detail for the connection between the Foundation Wall and Mezzanine Slab. Please provide a structural detail showing the connection between the Mezzanine Slab and Foundation Wall.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RCS6 detailing at foundation wall to follow typical detail 1/S1-3500 with foundation wall serving as end support beam as shown in detail. As indicated in this detail top rebar is hooked into the support and bottom rebar is extended a minimum of 6 inch into the support. The 2" clear on the top rebar hook can be slightly increased to avoid foundation wall rebar.		
<hr/>							
T-1709	BGP - Area 16 Placement Issues-West Side of Seismic Joint	Closed	09/18/2014	09/28/2014	09/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Detail 4/S1-3010 indicates the threading of the (3) #8 Horizontal Rebar through various closed loops of reinforcing created by the mat reinforcing intersecting welded joint reinforcing directly below the top clamp assembly on the west side of the seismic joint. Please confirm the following that has been discussed with the Design Team's Structural Field Representative and included in the attached sketch: 1) The topmost #8's below the top clamp assembly may be a continuous #5 in lieu. 2) The middle and bottom #8's below the top clamp assembly contained within the U-bar need not be continuous but may be placed end to end with a 0" splice. Each segment of #8 shall be positioned as indicated in detail 4/S 1-3010 and shall continuously engage no fewer than (4) #8 U-bars. 0" splices shall be located midway between adjacent U-Bars.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1862 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1710	SCS - Roof Scallop Wall Construction Joint Relocation	Closed	09/19/2014	09/29/2014	09/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Per drawing SI-3282 detail 4 and 5 the base of the scallop wall requires a chamfered starter wall that transitions from a 1 to 1 angle, 3 to 2 angle, and a 4 to 1 angle throughout the geometry of the scallops. Shimmick requests approval to relocate the construction joint from the wall to the deck and pour the full height of the wall including the deck beneath. See attachment "A" for clarification. This change would only occur at the scallops and detail 2 "Typical walls at the roof north & south edges" would not change. Please confirm the joint location is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor's proposal is acceptable in concept however moving the construction joint to the slab will result in long rebar dowels which will likely require splicing via laps or form saver couplers. The contractor should consider those detailing issues and submit the modified rebar detailing via shop drawings for review.		
T-1711	SCS - Roof Shear Key and Pylon Rebar Epoxy Connection	Closed	09/19/2014	09/29/2014	09/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Per S1-3282 detail 9 "SHEAR KEY AT ROOF" calls for vertical #4 rebar dowels to be cast with the structural deck. Per S1-3281 detail 7 "SIGNAGE PYLON FOOTING DETAIL" calls for vertical #5 rebar dowels to be cast with structural deck. For constructability reasons it is essential that Shimmick's operations maintain open access for roof top small cranes and man lifts for all trades. Per specification section 03 20 02 Part 2.3 F. 3. Adhesive for dowels in existing concrete b. HIT-RE 500_SD injectable adhesive by HIL TI, Inc., is an approved method. The minimum embedment depth requirement for #4 rebar is 2.75 inches and the concrete thickness requirement is 4 inches at the shear keys. The minimum embedment depth requirement for #5 rebar is 3.125 inches and the concrete thickness requirement is 4.375 inches for the signage pylon. The roof deck is 7" with 3" tall flutes leaving a clear space of 4 inches. Shimmick's solution for the 4.375 inch concrete thickness requirement is to pour an additional .5 inches of concrete at the concrete deck where the pylons will be installed. See drawing attachment "A" and product data attachment "B" on page 4 for rebar drill and epoxy requirements. Shimmick requests approval for the shear keys and the			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Request not acceptable, follow the details provided in the construction drawings. Alternatively, contractor may consider using form saver couplers at no cost to the owner.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1863 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1712	BGP - Bike Ramp Blockout for Steel Column at GL 5-G.7 From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto	Closed To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					
	REQUEST: The structural details for the blackout in the Bike Ramp for the steel column at GL 5-G.7 is called out in S1-2202. The drawing calls out for the ramp walls to be blocked out 2'-0" to the east and west of Gridline 5. The architectural details for the blackout in the Bike Ramp for the steel column at GL 5-G.7 is called out in A 1-2202 and A 1-9209. The drawings on A 1-9209 show a plan view detail at 3 different levels with no supplementary elevation views. Detail 4-A 1-9209 appears to call out for the ramp walls to be blocked out 2'-1" to the east and west of Gridline 5 at the base of the column. Detail 5-A 1-9209 appears to call out for the ramp walls and slab at the ramp slab level to be blocked out 1'-1 1/2" to the east and west and 1'-2" to the south of the center of the column and perpendicular to the ramp wall. Please provide an elevation detail for the column-ramp interface at GL 5-G.7 that clarifies the discrepancy between S 1-2202 and A1-9209 as well as clarifies the elevation at which the wall blackout changes from Detail 4-A1-9209 to Detail 5-A1-9209 (if A1-9209 is correct).	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Refer to attached Structural Sketch SKS-0420 and Architectural Sketches SKA-4171 and SKA-4172 for clarification of column and ramp interface as requested in RFI. WOJV received 10/6	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1713	SSS - Location of BU-40 Splice Locations	Closed	09/19/2014	09/29/2014	09/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 615 SK1 & SK2: Current splice locations for BU-40 members foul beam connections. Please confirm it is acceptable to relocate the splices as shown.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request. We categorize this as no cost clarification.		
T-1713.1	SSS - Location of BU-40 Splice Locations	Closed	10/07/2014	10/17/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 615 SK1 & SK2: Following confirmation from design team on moving splice locations, we have learned that the affected girder blanks have already been fabricated and cut to length. Confirm it is acceptable to relocate the W40 x 264 8" south and the W16 x 26 7 11/16" north.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed		
T-1714	SCS - Roof Seismic Joint Gap 22" or 24"	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	09/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: The roof top seismic joint shown on sheets AI-2603, AI-8897 detail 2 and AI-8898 detail 1 section elevation shows the gap between the cast in place walls at line 10 and at line 20 to be 24 inches. A1- 8613 detail 1 is a section view of the seismic joint for the exterior wall for line 10 & 20 shows the gap between the cast in place wall at line 10 and at line 20 to be 22 inches. Please clarify if the gap between the cast in place walls at the seismic joints needs to be 24 inches or 22 inches.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached SKA-3963 and SKA-3818, to be issued in forthcoming ASI-124.		
T-1715	SCS - Foundation Wall Mix Design	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1865 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
REQUEST: The answer to QBD 18 for the TG07.2 Trade Package, which asked if the "slab and beam mix can be used for the fourth wall lift", was "Confirmed. The slab and beam mix can be used for the fourth wall lift." Submittal TG0702-118 submitted the slab and beam mix and included the foundation wall as one of the usage locations. The review comment stated "Mix design for Foundations Walls shall be as approved in Submittal TG0600-203.1. Omission of SRA is not acceptable" which is the Foundation Wall mix. Please confirm if the Submittal Response to use the Foundation Wall Mix is superseding the answer to QBD 18 which confirmed the use of the Slab and Beam Mix design on the fourth lift foundation wall.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The number of Foundation Wall lifts changes with the contractor's means and methods. See RFI T-1467, issued after QBD 18, which increases the number of Foundation Wall lifts by one. In as far as QBD 18 confirms that it is acceptable to pour the Ground Floor slab and beams with the topmost Foundation Wall lift using the approved slab and beam mix, the QBD 18 response remains accurate. Similarly, it remains unchanged that the approved Foundation Wall mix design shall continue to be used below the topmost wall construction joint. Regarding reviewer comments on Submittal TG0600-203.1: Submittal makes no reference to lift numbers and simply states "Foundation Wall", for which an approved submittal already exists and for which the present submittal could not replace and meet Specification.		
T-1716	SSS - Field Weld Shear Plate Detail	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
REQUEST: Detail 3/S1-7632 requires a field fillet weld for the shear plate to beam connection. Positioning an electrode or gooseneck to achieve the 7/16" weld on the back side will not be possible in the field due to the limited gap between the weld and vertical HSS member. Please confirm it is acceptable to weld the shear plate to beam web on three sides on the near side and omit the far side weld. See attached SK1 for clarification.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear to us why this weld cannot be made. We understand the access is relatively limited but the same detail was used successfully in many other projects. If the concern is formation of unequal weld legs, that is acceptable as long as minimum weld size is satisfied and approved by the inspector. TT: The reason for RFI is listed as "Alternate proposal". We categorize this RFI as request for substitution.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1866 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1716.1	SSS - Field Weld Shear Plate Detail	Closed	10/03/2014	10/13/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Following further review of this detail it was found the varying web thickness of the framing beams are significantly less than the 7/16" fillet required as per 3/S1-7632: Typical framing beams are as follows: - W12x44 - tw 3/16" (max 3/16" fillet as per D1.1 Fig 2.1) - W16x26 - tw 1/4" (max 3/16" fillet as per D1.1 Fig 2.1) - W18x65 - tw 7/16" (max 3/8" fillet as per D1.1 Fig 2.1) - W21x44 - tw 3/8" (max 5/16" fillet as per D1.1 Fig 2.1) Confirm these weld sizes are acceptable or alternatively if welding the shear tab on 3 sides (7/16" fillet) as originally requested is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Maximum fillet weld sizes per AWS D1.1 Figure 2.1 are acceptable.			
T-1717	SSS - Missing Weld Details at GL Cast Node	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 619 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3: 1) All welds shown in red are from details on drawing S1-4351. Confirm they are acceptable where shown or supply the missing welds. 2) Provide weld for W14 to cast node. 3) All welds shown in red are from details on drawing S1-4351. Confirm they are acceptable where shown or supply the missing welds.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Confirmed. 2). Use CJP weld. 3). Confirmed. Reason for RFI is "shown in Contract Documents".			
T-1717.1	SSS - W14x730 to Cast Node Weld Clarifications	Closed	05/12/2015	05/22/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Ref Docs: S1-4351, S1-4355 Location: Ground Level Gridlines: C.3/F.7 typical cast node connection TR Add'l Doc Ref's: SK RFI 1092 SK1, SK2 Weld details for this component were confirmed in T-1717. Weld details for W14x730 to cast node and 4" thick cap		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). There is no 2" partial weld at the top of the W14x730 as shown. W14x730, an is to welded to the cast node along the tip of the flange as shown on Detail 5A/ S1-4351, and welded to the cap plate as noted in the response to RFI 1717.0. 2). Yes, provide continuous backing for CJP weld. Please explain why this cannot be achieved.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1867 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	plate present conditions that are not permitted by AWS D1.1. 1. 1. The 2" PJP that welds the W14x730 to the cast node is currently acting as backing for the CJP weld between the 4" cap plate and the cast node. Is this acceptable? 2. Per 5.10.2, backing for CJP welds shall be continuous for the full length of the weld. This requirement cannot be met with the current layout. Please provide a solution 3. Weld access holes are required at the location noted in SK RFI 1092 SK2. Please confirm these are acceptable.				3). Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): Not provided by Skanska. TT categorize this as " call out in contract documents" Answered by design team: 5/26/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/27/15		
T-1718	SSS - LC Beam Flange Location Verification at EOS From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: See attached sketches CD RFI 607 SK1 & SK2 and confirm acceptable the beam flange will protrude past the curved edge of slab by 5/16".	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	The 4' -6" dimension locating the W44x230 beam ends at GL 23 shall be reduced to 4' so that the beam flanges will be entirely inside the EOS. This applies to a total of (4) W44x230 beams around the opening. TT: We agree with the reason for RFI request "Verification". We categorize this as no cost clarification and change to be issued in future bulletin.		
T-1719	SSS - LC Connection Verifications at Skewed Beams From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: See attached sketches CD RFI 608 SK1 & SK2 and verify / confirm proposed connections for skewed beams.	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Confirmed. TT: We agree with the reason for RFI request "Verification". We categorize this as no cost clarification.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1720	SSS - W12 Connection Clarifications at Roof Level GL 31.7-33.2	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 613 SK1: Confirm the locations for the W12x305's may be modified as shown as hi-lited in order to connect the beams to the stiffeners in detail 1/S1-4205 with bolts per 1/S1-5011.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> W12x305 beams highlighted in the RFI may be waived. Please provide the proper credit for the deletion of this work. TT: We agree with the reason for RFI request "Verification". We categorize this as change to be issued in future bulletin.			
T-1721	SSS - MF Beam Connection Clarification GL 24	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 617 SK1 & SK2: The radius is to be 1'-1 per 7/S1-5027 but due to the flange thickness of the MF beam on Grid 24, the maximum radius on the plate is 1'-0 1/2. Confirm the connection is acceptable as shown or supply an alternate solution.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. TT: We agree with the reason for RFI request "Verification". We categorize this as no cost clarification.			
T-1722	SSS - PE403 & PE404 Conflicting Approval Information From CS7 Package	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 620 SK1: The dimension between the edge of slab and center of beam on drawing 3490 Section A-A & B-B and drawing 4151 Section A-A in Package Number: TG0701-079.1 has been changed from 7" to 5". This does not agree with the latest issued drawings as shown on attached SK1, which shows the edge of slab to center of beam as 7" on the north, east and south sides. Note that drawings 3486, 3492, 3493, 4095, 9044 & 9083 in the same area have not been marked at approval. Please confirm that the drawings are correct as submitted and no further action is required.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Edge of slab revised to coordinate with steel submittal, refer to SKA-4183.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1869 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1723	SSS - SE502 & SE503 Fouling Connections at Bus Deck Level	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 622 SK1: The connection for the horizontal HSS elevator beam per 1/S1-7630 and the connection for the elevator posts per 1/S1-7600 foul each other at the 2 noted locations. Please supply an alternate detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> At locations highlighted in the RFI, provide welded connection at the top of the 5/8" plate per 1/S1-7630, not a bolted connection as shown on CD RFI 622 SK1, with the following modifications: Reduce the width of the 5/8" plate per 1/S1-7630 at the top to clear the connection angles per 1/S1-7600 by 1". Increase the plate thickness from 5/8" to 3/4". Increase PJP weld size from 3/8 to 5/8". We disagree with the reason for RFI request. We categorize the RFI as change to be issued in future bulletin.		
T-1724	SSS - PE502 & PE503 Fouling Connections at Roof Level	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 623 SK1: The double angle connection per 1/S1-5010 fouls the web stiffener plate per 2/S1-5016. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the (2) noted W16x26 beams with a shear plate per 1/S1-5011 or supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per updated Sheet S1-5016 submitted with ASI 127 on 9/12/2014, the web stiffeners have been extended beyond the double angle connections for the W16x26 beams. See attached sketch SKS-0419 for reference. The double angle connection is to be made through the web stiffener therefore no change required. TT: We agree with reason for RFI Request "Verification", disagree with others. We categorize this as no cost clarification.		
T-1725	SSS - Missing Skewed Connection Details at Light Column	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 612 SK1: Details 7 & 8/S1-5010 do not give the necessary information for the connection when skewed connections occur on both sides. This information was requested in RFI T-1087 (SK 122, CD 094) but the requested typical			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to RFI response T-1719. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request. We categorize this RFI as answered in a previous RFI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1870 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1725.1	SSS - Missing Skewed Connection Details at Light Column	Closed	10/07/2014	10/17/2014	10/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
REQUEST: The previous response to this RFI (T-1725) does not take into account the difference in geometry between the light column and W27x84 on the north side of GL E when compared to the W27x84 on the south side of GL E. Please refer to SK RFI 052.1 (T-0770.1), which provided different dimensions for the two locations. In addition, this connection clarification was requested in SK RFI 122 (T-1087). See attached CD RFI # 612 SK1: Details 7 & 8/S1-5010 do not give the necessary information for the connection when skewed connections occur on both sides. This information was requested in RFI T-1087 (SK 122, CD 094) but the requested typical connection information was not provided. Confirm the connection as shown is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1871 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1726	SCS - Roof Seismic Connection Details	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	09/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: After reviewing the seismic joint details on sheets AI-2603, AI-8897 detail 2, AI-8898 detail 1, and AI-8613 detail 1 it is Shimmick's understanding that the seismic joint system only requires a vertical wall corner embedded angle at building lines B 10 & 20 and H 10 & 20. All other means of attachment for the seismic joint will be drill anchors at a later date. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to detail 1/A1-8613 (SKA-3963) of ASI-0124 for revised detail of seismic joint at Roof Park concrete parapet walls - embed has been changed to expansion anchors. Seismic Joint assemblies shall be installed to meet the performance requirements and per manufacturer's assembly instructions as specified in Specification Section 07 09 13.		
T-1727	SCS - Roof Sensors, Sky Light Drain, and Hose Bib Deck Connection	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Drawing L-2602 to 2627 shows moisture sensors, skylight one trench drain, and hose bibs. The drawings do not show the details for these items and whether or not they require a rebar or embedded anchor connection to the roof top structural deck. Please provide details and whether or not they require a cast in place connection to the roof top deck.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/9/2014: For moisture sensor, refer to 32 84 00. For Skylight One Trench Drain, refer to A1-8404. For Hosebibs, refer to plumbing drawings and schedules.		
T-1728	SCS - Roof Top Pylon Rebar Connection	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	09/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: S1-3281 detail 4 shows the roof top security pole with a bolted connection to the structural deck. Yet all security and lighting references on A1-2602 to A1-2607 and E1-2602 to E1-2607 are shown as pylons which is consistent with detail 7 that was added per addendum 5 issue for construction. Please identify where detail 4 is used on the A1-2602 to A1-2607 roof park level plan sheets.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>) Both details 4/S1-3281 and 7/S1-3281 are used at the Roof Park Level. For the purposes of these details, the terms "pylon" and "pole" are synonymous. Detail 4/S1-3281 is correctly titled: "Roof Park Security Pole and Mast Light Foundation" and detail 7/S1-3281 is correctly titled "Signage Pylon Footing Detail". The locations of Security/Mast-Light pylons and Signage pylons are called out on the Architectural Plans A1-2602 thru A1-2607 and Landscape Drawings L1-2602		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1872 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>For constructability reasons it is essential that access remains open for roof top operations with small cranes and man lifts for all trades.Shimmick requests approval to use drill and epoxy rebar connections after the roof top deck has been poured for the detail 7 pylon.</p>						
					thru L1-2607 (note that Landscape also references coordinated details on L1-7644). For dimensioned graphic representations of footings for both Security/Mast-Light pylons and Signage pylons, see Roof Park Slab Edge Plans on A1-2902 thru A1-2907.		
					2) Refer to RFI T-1711 response.		
T-1729	SCS - Roof Walking Path Foundation Rebar Connection	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>Per Drawing L1-2625 and L1-7661 detail 2 precast concrete walking path subslab units are supported by a CMU wall on a CMU support footing on a protection slab (all by others) and presumable on the roof top slab. This detail does not show rebar.</p> <p>Please confirm the support wall footing/protection slab does not require rebar to be embedded into the roof top structural deck.</p>				<p>It is confirmed the rebar in the CMU wall footing or the protection slab does not need to be embedded into the structural slab. Information regarding protection slab rebar has been provided with response to RFI P1-0461.</p>		
T-1730	SCS - Roof Top CIPAC Walls	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	09/26/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>Per specification section 03 33 00 Part 1 - 1.1 SUMMARY B. The extent of Cast-In-Place Architectural Concrete is indicated on the Drawings by the designation "CIPAC" A1-8645 to A1-8654 shows architectural concrete walls but Shimmick has not found the notation "CIPAC" for the architectural concrete walls.</p> <p>Please clarify if any additional roof top walls fall with in "CIPAC" requirements.</p>				<p>The abbreviation CIPAC as defined in sheet A-0015 means Cast In Place Architectural Concrete. Sheets A1-8645 to A1-8654 indicate the cast-in-place architectural concrete work as noted in the title of all these sheets and described in Specification Section 03 33 00.</p> <p>There are no other architectural concrete walls as defined by Specification Section 03 33 00.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1873 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1731	SCS - Roof Top Park Building Rebar Connection to Structural Deck	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Architectural drawings A1-2602 to A1-2603 & A1-6012 Note: "Roof Park building not in current scope of work. Refer to mechanical, electrical, plumbing and telecom drawings for extent of work to be included in this package." Structural drawings S1-2602 and S1-4103 show minimal details for roof park building walls. Please provide, if any, rebar needs in the roof structural deck placement for the roof park building.					The Roof Top Restaurant construction has not been deleted or deferred at this time. If TJPA directs a change in this status, revised CDs will be issued to WOJV.		
T-1732	SCS - Roof Circular Cafe Foundation Rebar Connection to Deck	Closed	09/22/2014	10/02/2014	09/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
A1-8630 shows a circular Glass Building Cafe that requires cast in place walls/foundation to be tied to the deck and extend above the elevation of the soil and landscaping. A 1-2605 shows a Note: "Alternate no 27 per section 01 10 30 Cafe structure deleted." 1. Is the foundation scope to remain even though the Cafe structure is deleted? 2. Shimmick requests a rebar embed detail for this interface if this structure is to be installed at a later date.					Refer Alternate 27 description and drawings; the café foundation wall remains and is capped with a structural slab. Refer to Architectural drawing A1-8630A and Structural drawings S1-2650A and S1-3281A.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1733	SCS - Bus Deck Embeds - Hose Bibb Location at Gride Line 10-13	Closed	09/23/2014	10/03/2014	09/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please see attached marked up drawings.				For Hose Bibb HB-4, a 3/4" CW connection with a sleeve size of 3" is noted. Refer to P1-0051 rev 4 'Pipe Sleeve Schedule'. Only 4" or larger sleeves are called out and located on the slab edge drawings. On A1-2883, the sleeve on the second level is not the same sleeve and should not be used for any bus deck related information.			
Drawing PI-2503 notes a hose bibb type HB-4 which leads directly to a 3/4" CW pipe through the bus deck level. However, this sleeve is not displayed in drawing AI-2893, the corresponding drawing for embed location dimensions. Drawing AI-2883 notes a similar sleeve within the same column cover through the second floor level with location dimensions.							
Please confirm that the noted AI-2883 sleeve dimensions may be used for the noted bus deck sleeve with missing dimensions. If not, please provide the dimensions for the noted bus deck sleeve with missing dimensions.							
T-1733.1	SCS - Bus Deck Embeds: Hose Bibb HB-4 at GL 10-13	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference RFI T-1733 and also attached marked up drawings.				George Metzger 10/10/2014:			
Drawing PI-2503 notes a hose bibb type HB-4 which leads directly to a 3/4" CW pipe through the bus deck level. However as this is a 3", this sleeve is not displayed in drawing AI-2893 which does not locate sleeves smaller than 4".				Bus deck sleeve for HB-4 at GL 11 F can be located within the column cover at 1'-6" west of GL 11 and 1'-3" south of GL F. Note that this information will not be reflected on the slab edge drawing as only 4" diameter sleeves or larger are located in the slab edge drawings.			
Please provide the dimensions for locating the noted bus deck sleeve.							
T-1734	SCS - Roof Architectural Stair 301 Joint Orientation	Closed	09/24/2014	10/04/2014	09/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page:1875 of 3091

Date:06/17/2015

Time:02:27 PM

Job:30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1735	<div>SCS - Roof Architectural Stair 301 Joint Chamfer</div> <div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company</div><div>Phil Militello</div></div></div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang</div>	Closed	09/24/2014	10/04/2014	09/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>A1-8645 shows horizontal and vertical lines between plywood sheets bolder than what is created by plywood alone. Specification Section 03 33 00 - 2.2 B Chamfer Strips: calls for 3/4" chamfer to be "used for horizontal joints between pours" Shimmick is assuming that the vertical lines are chamfer strips as well. Vertical chamfer strips would provide a weakened plane and help confine any vertical shrinkage cracks to the chamfer location.</div> <div><div>1. Please confirm only vertical 3/4" chamfer strips at the plywood joints is being depicted by the wall elevations on A1-8645.</div><div>2. Please provide additional direction if anything is required at the vertical and horizontal joints.</div></div>			<div>SUGGESTION:</div> <div>The assumption stated in the RFI is incorrect. Details 3 and 4 on A1-8645 show the layout of the W-17 modular façade trellis panels, as noted on the drawings and the in the titles of the details. The cast-in-place architectural concrete layout is shown in detail 1 on A1-8645. Elevation 1/A1-8645 references detail 5/A1-8648, which details the panel joints, reveals and tie hole layout.</div>			<div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>The assumption stated in the RFI that only vertical joints are shown in detail 1/A1-8645 is incorrect. The cast-in-place architectural concrete wall layout shown in detail 1 on A1-8645 clearly shows both horizontal and vertical joints. Typical formwork details are indicated in 1/A1-8645, which is detail 5/A1-8648 showing the panel joints, reveal and tie hole concept.</div> <div>Use drawing chamfer strips dimension in lieu of sizes in Specification Section 03 33 00 2.2 B.</div>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1876 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1736	SCS - Roof Architectural Stair 301 Construction Joint Spacing	Closed	09/24/2014	10/04/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Specification Section 03 33 00 - 3.4 A. "Install joints..., at locations indicated on Drawings or as approved by TJPA Representative." Construction joints are not called out on A1-2603, A1-8645, or S1-2603. Please confirm there is no restriction for the maximum construction joint spacing for architectural wall, otherwise provide a maximum allowable length for architectural wall pours.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/10/2014: In general, maintain a maximum concrete construction joint spacing of 60 feet. Per specification 03 33 00 3.4 and drawings, construction joints should occur at wall reveal design pattern layout only. Please see enclosed SKA-3795-R1.		
T-1737	SCS - Joint Spacing for Roof Top Earth Retaining Walls	Closed	09/24/2014	10/04/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: 03 30 02 - 3.2 JOINTS IN CONCRETE A. 3. "Maximum construction joint spacing in foundation wall, ground floor concrete slab, and interior walls is 60 feet." This statement does not make reference to roof top earth retaining non-architectural walls. S1-2602 through 7 and A1-2602 through 7 does not identify joint locations for the perimeter/scallop, seismic, sky light, and stair/elevator walls. Please provide maximum length of walls for roof top earth retaining non-architectural walls.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to detail 1/S1-4205 and building elevations starting with Sheet S1-4002 for the required wall joints and locations around the EBF link beams. Between two link beams, a single pour is acceptable at the north and south elevations (longer than 60 feet). For West and East End concrete wall joint locations, please refer to SKA-3653-R1 and SKA-3658-R1. Please submit final joint location layout submittal for final confirmation.		
T-1738	SCS - Construction Joint Relocation at Roof Seismic Walls	Closed	09/24/2014	10/04/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: S1-3282 detail 3 Concrete wall detail at seismic joint. Shows a construction joint above the chamfer. This seismic wall must accommodate both the roof top structural deck change in elevation of 1'-1 1/2" and a top of wall continuous elevation with a pop out detail. Per these restrictions, the control and change in elevation must occur at the bottom of the wall form and requires a			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor proposed joint location and profile as indicated in the RFI is acceptable.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1877 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	starter wall above the chamfer. Refer to drawing attachment A for further explanation.						
	Please confirm that a starter wall is acceptable.						
T-1739	SCS - Roof Top Exterior Walls and Scallop Walls Updated Drawings	Closed	09/24/2014	10/04/2014	09/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Per Meeting with WOJV and Designers on 9/2/2014 regarding options for the scallop wall changes in ASI 124, additional changes in the design for the rooftop exterior walls, including the scallop walls, were forthcoming.							
Please provide updated details and drawings.						The concrete parapet and scallop wall issued in ASI-0124 is revised to maintain the original distance from perimeter beam. Please refer to attached SKA-4265 for detail of typical flashing of junction with steel beam.	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1740	SCS - Confirming Construction Joint Increased Spacing	Closed	09/24/2014	10/04/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please reference specification section 03 30 02 3.2.A.3, RFI #T-1104, and rejected submittal number TG0702-503.0, in reference to Ground Level CJ layout.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The specification calls out 60' maximum CJ spacing in the ground floor concrete slab. RFI #T-1104 permitted TG 06.0 to use a maximum CJ spacing of 96'. The rejected submittal includes comments suggesting to reduce the number of pours in Comment #2 on Sheet CJ-000, specifically in the metal deck section. Further comments would require a 97' 6" span at First and Fremont Streets and a potential 120' span between GL 19 and Wall 421. In order to match both suggestions, TG 07.2 would need to also increase CJ spacing beyond the specified 60', similar to TG 06.0.					1) Confirmed		
1) Please confirm the ground floor 60' CJ spacing requirement only applies to the formed MFB/slab section and not the metal deck section.					2) Confirmed to allow submittal comments		
2) Shimmick requests permission to increase CJ spacing in the formed MFB/slab sections beyond the specified 60' to 120' to allow for CJs per the submittal's comments. If this proposed limit is unacceptable, please provide a maximum for use at Ground Level.					3) Confirmed		
3) Please confirm there is no maximum construction joint spacing for slabs on metal deck.							
T-1741	SCS - Upgrading Ground Level Mix Designs	Closed	09/24/2014	10/04/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please reference Sheets S1-2302 through S1-2307, Spec Section 03 30 02 2.1.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Between any single set of grid lines, the ground level features multiple mix designs. The ground level pandecking slabs S1, S3, and S10 have a 4,000 psi mix design. Between grid lines 16-17, 24-25, and 27-29, the pandecking slabs S11 and S12 have a 8,000 psi mix. Formed MFB/slab decks RCS 2 and RCS 16 have a 5,000 psi mix design. Currently each mix design would require					1) Contractor proposed increase in concrete strength acceptable at the locations indicated.		
					2) Contractor proposed increase in concrete strength acceptable at the locations indicated.		
					Incorporate changes to corresponding CJ submittal.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1879 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>separation by CJs. Shimmick plans to pour a continuous deck from north foundation wall to south foundation wall.</p> <p>1) Typical: Shimmick suggests to replace all the 4,000 psi pandecking mix on the ground level with the 5000 psi RCS mix to match the formed MFB/slab deck. Please confirm this is acceptable.</p> <p>2) Shimmick suggests to replace the 5,000 psi RCS mix on the ground level formed MFB/slab deck between GL 16-17, 24-25, and 27-29 with the 8,000 psi S11/S12 mix to match the pandeck. Please confirm this is acceptable.</p> <p>An attachment demonstrates the change in the mix layout on ground level. Final CJ location is pending submittal approval.</p>						
T-1742	SCS - ST201 Slope of Grade Beams	Closed	09/25/2014	10/05/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please see attached SKA-4052 (per RFI #T-1661), SKS-0398 & SKS-0400 (confirmed in RFI #T-1661and 1658), and Markup A1-2960A (per email from TT on 8/8). SKS-0400 visually shows the grade beams sloping but does not provide the exact percent of slope. Cross referencing the available sheets provides conflicting slopes for each beam.				1) Slopes of GB1 and GB2 are the same as that of the RCS3 slab which is 1.2%. GB3 and GB4 shall have a slope of 28%.			
				2) T/beam at the west ends for GB1 and GB2 shall be 19'-2". T/beam for GB2 on 1/S1-7001 will be updated in a future ASI.			
				3) Grade break for GB3 and GB4 occurs at the east face of the foundation wall.			
				4) Top elevation of GB3 and GB4 at east face of the foundation wall is 15'-7".			
				5) Top elevation of GB3 and GB4 at GL 1.4 can be determined from information provided in 1) and 4).			
		Note that markup A1-2960 has been superseded by drawings submitted with ASI 127 on 9/12/2014.					
The grade beams GB1 and GB2 (see SKS-0398 for naming) are indicated on Mark up A1-2960A as "Constant Slope: Projection of Ground Level Slab". SKA-4052 calls out a single west-east slab slope of 1.2%. However, SKS-0398 provides two unique end of beam top elevations for GB1 and GB2, suggesting that the beams have two different slopes. The grade beams GB3 and GB4 (see SKS-0398 for naming) are indicated on Mark up A1-2960A as "Slope to Foundation Wall", where the grade break occurs at the west face of the foundation wall at EL + 15' 7". 3/SKS-0400 visually indicates the grade break at the east face of the foundation wall. No elevation on the east							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1880 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	end of GB3 or GB4 is provided. The top of slab is provided, but 1/S1-5023 does not show a difference between top of slab and top of beam.						
	1) What are the slopes for GBI, GB2, GB3, and GB4? 2) What creates a difference in top elevation between GB 1 and GB2? 3) Where does the grade break for GB3 and GB4 occur? 4) What is the top elevation of GB3 and GB4 at the east face of the foundation wall? 5) What is the top elevation of GB3 and GB4 at GL 1.4, per 1/S 1-5023?						
T-1743	SSS - PE502 & PE503 Fouling Connection at Bus Deck Level	Closed	09/25/2014	10/05/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 627 SK1: The connection for the elevator post per 1/S1-7600 and the post foul the beam as shown. Please supply an alternate connection detail.				Connect the HSS18x6x5/8 to the W30x90 beams as shown in attached sketch SKS-0418 at the 4 locations highlighted in the RFI.			
				TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request "Engineering Conflict". We categorize this as a no cost clarification.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1881 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1743.1	SSS - PE502 & PE503 Fouling Connection at Bus Deck Level	Closed	10/29/2014	11/08/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 627.1 SK1: The horizontal connection angle for the HSS18x6x5/8 per SKS-0418 is inside the elevator opening, typical 4 locations. Confirm that is the intent or supply a solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The connection angle encroach into the opening shall be prevented as follows: Connect the HSS18x6 posts to the W16x26 beams per original design intent and as shown on SK1 in RFI T-1743. Cope bottom flange of the W30x90 beam partially at the HSS18x6 posts so that there is 1/2" clearance around the posts. Cut the horizontal leg of the L8x4 angle so that it clears the W30x90 beam web by 1/2". Weld the horizontal leg of the L8x4 angle to bottom flange of the W16 beam from top. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
<hr/>							
T-1743.2	SSS - PE502 and PE503 Erection Clarification at Bus Deck Level	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 4/S1-7108 Location: GL 24-25 Bus Deck Level Add'l Doc Ref: T-1743.1 (SK 841.1, CD 627.1), attached 3D model The response in RFI T-1743.1 (SK 841.1, CD 627.1) creates an access issue. The nut end of the 1 in diameter through bolt will not be accessible with the current proposed layout. Please provide a solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide a 5" diameter access hole in the W30x90 beam web to tighten the 1" through bolt at the top of the HSS post.		
<hr/>							
T-1744	SSS - Approval Comment Clarification at Cruciform Column GL 5	Closed	09/25/2014	10/05/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 628 SK1: Columns A1777 & A1778 occur on Grid 5 and according to Note 3 in detail 4/S1-5011, the connection as shown			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Shop drawing review comments are correct, shop drawings do not show the correct connection detail. Typically, detail 4/S1-5011 applies where "H" is		
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1882 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1745	BGP - Elevator Sill Support Angle Conflict From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto REQUEST: Please find attached drawings and picture. During the installation of Elevator Sill Support Angle at GL4.2/D.4, it was noticed there is a portion of L6x4x3/8 embed per detail 4/AI -7576 that will not be able to be installed due to the conflict with horizontal bracing member (see picture). Please confirm that it will be acceptable to discontinue the Elevator Sill Support Angle at the conflict location. The embed will be discontinuuous within 6" proximity of the bracing member.	Closed	09/25/2014	10/05/2014	10/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Omission of the conflicting section of angle is not acceptable for the final condition. It is within the contractor's means and methods to propose alternate detailing for review, if an alternate detail is required to accommodate their temporary works. Any alternate detailing shall be suitably equivalent for the purpose indicated in the contract drawings.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1883 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1746	BGP - Bar Layering Issues at Beam Intersection	Closed	09/26/2014	10/06/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please verify that per detail 1/S1-3600, the call out for 1 ½" - 2" clear between top and 2nd layer bars is a minimum distance between bars. As demonstrated in the attached picture, at the intersection of GL-3, GL-G, and GL-X, the 1 ½" - 2" clear cover is not attainable due to layering issues with intersection beams.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Grid 3 and Grid X MFB layering is per Elevations 1/S1-3603 and 2/S1-3653, respectively. The plan geometry of the intersection is per Detail 4/S1-3307. The specified bar clearance referenced in the RFI as 1-1/2 to 2" clear is incorrect as is the detail referenced. The specified bar clearance for MFB-3 is 2-1/2" and is not a minimum. Design intent for the MFB-X splice bars passing through the joint is for these bars to pass below ALL of the MFB-3 top bars, including MFB-3 add bars. Field observation indicates that the splice bars only pass beneath the MFB-3 topmost bars, above the MFB-3 add bars. The field layering configuration will only increase the specified 2-1/2" clearance marginally (within placement tolerance) and will be acceptable when all MFB top bars are brought to their highest elevation by crane or other means and subsequently secured.				
T-1747	SSS - ST201A Approval Comment Clarification at Bus Deck Level	Closed	09/26/2014	10/06/2014	10/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 630 SK1: The note on S1-2502 states "SEE 1/S1-5010 (SIM) FOR CONNECTION". This is insufficient information to detail these connections as detail 1/S1-5010 does not show a double angle connection inside the column profile. The beam will not be erectable and the bolts thru the beam web will not be accessible inside the column profile. The current connection is per typical detail 2/S1-5012. Confirm the connections at the noted locations are acceptable or supply a new detail.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide connection similar to 4/S1-5033 at the two locations, except, the 1 3/4" web doubler plates are not required.				
T-1748	SSS - Conflicting Instructions at Second Level Beam GL 1.4	Closed	09/26/2014	10/06/2014	10/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1885 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1749.1	SSS - PE502 & PE503 Conflicting Connection Details	Closed	10/29/2014	11/08/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 633.1 SK1 to SK4 for items 1 to 6: 1) The connection per 9/S1-5032 fouls the stiffener plates per 10 & 11/S1-7630. Provide a solution. 2) Confirm the shear plate per 1/S1-5013 may be pulled out as shown to be able to erect the beam as the other end of the beam has a double angle connection per 1/S1-5010 between the stiffeners per 10 & 11/S1/7630. 3) Confirm the stiffener plate per 10/S1-7630 may be located as shown to substitute as a shear plate per 1/S1-5011 or supply an alternate connection detail. 4) Confirm the shear plate per 1/S1-5013 may be pulled out as shown to be able to erect the beam as the other end of the beam has the same connection. 5) Confirm stiffener plates per 10/S1-7630 are not required at the noted locations. 6) Confirm stiffener plates per 10/S1-7630 are not required at the noted locations.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Stiffener plates per 10/S1-7630 may be waived at the 4 locations where Detail 'A' is called out on SK1 in the RFI. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. 4) Confirmed. 5) Confirmed. 6) Confirmed. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				
T-1750	SSS - Added Splice Due to Crane Capacity	Closed	09/26/2014	10/06/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Information Requested: Please verify it is acceptable to add an additional shop splice to the Built Up Members as shown in the attached sketches due to crane capacity. THC crane capacity is 40 Ton. By adding the additional splice we can build the members in two pieces allowing the Subarc welding to be completed inside along with all secondary fit up. When this is complete THC will move them outside and splice the two pieces together.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> New splices requested by the contractor at the locations indicated in the RFI are acceptable. TT: We agree with the reason for RFI request "Verification".				
T-1751	SSS - Upper Basket Column Pipes at Gridline 1	Closed	09/26/2014	10/06/2014	10/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1886 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Upper basket column pipes located at gridline 1/G and 1/C are shown to be concrete filled to top of pipe in S1-4018 Rev 4. Details shown in B/S1-4018 require a 2" diameter vent hole in the roof level cast nodes. Roof level cast nodes at these locations are 72-36 and 72-37 and according to machining drawing CN-0127 Rev 4 (issued 12/19/13), neither of these cast nodes have vent or grout holes.</p> <p>Currently, pipes are detailed with (2) - 5/8" vent holes approx. 7" from the top of the pipe so the pipes could be filled to this point. Please confirm currently detailed pipe vent holes can remain as is or provide new vent hole details for the pipe and/or cast nodes.</p> <p>Please note cast nodes 72-36 and 72-37 have already been released to Oregon Iron Works by Bradken.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1887 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1753	SSS - Stiffener Fouling Box Beam at GL 2-3	Closed	09/26/2014	10/06/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 631 SK1: The full depth stiffeners per 8/S1-8003 foul the Box beam as shown. Please supply a solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We assume that the reference to detail 8/S1-8003 in the RFI is incorrect and intended reference was to detail 6/S1-8003. At the location indicated in the RFI, run the stiffeners from the bottom flange of the WF beam to the underside of the box beam. Weld stiffeners per detail 6/S1-8003 except provide welding on two sides only, no welding required between the stiffener and the box beam. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
T-1754	SSS - ST202 Approval Comment Clarifications at Second Level	Closed	09/29/2014	10/09/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 629 SK1 The model has been built per the dimensions in 3 & 5/S1-7004. This approval comment directs us to confirm locations per A1-7004 in AS1-121 and introduces conflicting dimensions as A1-7004 shows different post locations than S1-7004. Per the American Institute of Steel Construction Code of Standard Practice Section 3. Design Drawings and Specifications, subsection 3.1, the structural drawings are the document Skanska used to locate the stair posts. Please clarify the conflicting information.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Architectural Details locate stair support posts according to typical structural stair details (sheet S1-7601). Actual stair layout and tread locations are determined by Architectural Drawings. At this location it is acceptable to have the landing and stair support beams not aligned to the center of the post.		
T-1755	SCS - Electrical Conduit in Foundation Wall	Closed	09/29/2014	10/09/2014	10/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: ES-2107(Dated: 04/24/14) , A1-3010(Dated: 07/18/14) Detail A & B on ES-2107 provides the section view for PG&E 12 KV Main Service coming into North Electrical			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The section views and elevations of the bottom of the conduits on details A & B on ES-2107 are confirmed. Refer to response to RFI T-1695 which includes updated ES-2107.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1889 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1756	BGP - Area 3 Concourse Rebar- Displacement of Top Added Bar Due to Congestio	Closed	09/29/2014	10/09/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Per the attached picture, please verify that is acceptable that a 2nd layer was created for top added bars due to congestion at beam and column intersection. This occurs between GL-3 & GL- 4 at GL-K.3.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable for the (3) beam bars indicated to be placed in a second layer. The layering, however, shall not interfere with the specified 1-1/2" clearance between MFB top bar layers. To this end, beam top second layers shall be introduced below the level of MFB add reinforcing as they typically have been. In the photograph attached to the RFI it appears that both beam layers have been placed between the MFB layers. This is not acceptable as it results in the depression of the MFB add layer beyond the specified 1-1/2".	
<hr/>							
T-1757	SSS - Rebar Shop Drawing Discrepancy at GL 32.4	Closed	09/30/2014	10/10/2014	09/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Please see attached marked up drawings. Submittal TG0600-318.2 and RFI T-1218.I note vertical rebar spacing of "Rebar option 2 SK3 #11@5" OC" on the south foundation wall at GL 32.4. RFI T-1372 notes "Contract Rebar WR2 #11@6" OC" vertical rebar spacing on the south foundation wall at GL 32.4. Please confirm which document to follow for planning and pricing of additional costs incurred by the changes if any.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 5" OC, per RFI T-1218.1 should be followed.	
<hr/>							
T-1758	SSS - Shear Plate Fouling Bolts at TR24.9	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 639-SK1: The shear plate will foul the flange bolts in TR24.9 for the column above if the beam is located per design dimension			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.	
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1891 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1761	SSS - Transfer Girder Stiffener Plate Access Holes	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: With reference to the transfer girder stiffener plates with C JP welds, please confirm it acceptable to terminate the we ld as per D1.8 Figure C-6.3 and SK1 attached.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed. Include stiffener access hole geometry in transfer girder shop drawings.		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1762	SSS - E510, E511, & E512 Angle Connection Clarification at Erection Tab	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 594 SK1: The L5x5 connection angle fouls the bolt on the erection tab as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W12x14 to the W12x14 per 1/S1-5011 or supply an alternate solution. This condition occurs at (6) locations.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1763	SSS - Moment Connection Clarification GL 22	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 603 SK1: It is not possible to connect the BU beam to the column flange per 4/S1-5012 because the 6" gap between the web doubler plates and the column flange is insufficient space for the shear plate. Confirm it acceptable to shop weld the web to the column flange as shown or supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1764	SSS - Train Box Column Cap Plates Misfabrication	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Two train box column cap plates (MK p395) have been cut undersize and are out of AISC tolerance as follows: (1) - p395 104"long - Cut to 103.8125"			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1892 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	(1) - p395 104" long - Cut to 103.75"						
	Skanska proposes to proceed with fabrication as is, by laying out the holes and machined channel from the center of the cap plate, see SK1 for reference. Please confirm this is acceptable.						
T-1765	SSS - Tapered Slab at Bus Deck Perimeter	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: 1)The perimeter Bus Level slab tapers from a 14" slab to 10" at the edge of slab, with the perimeter beam requiring 9" studs as per 9/S1-5004. Please confirm it is acceptable to provide two 9" studs on the framing steel to account for the sloping slab, see attached SK1 & 2 for clarification. 2)At the Bus Deck level node the slab tapers from a 14" slab to 6" at the edge of slab. Please confirm it is acceptable to provide 6" studs on the framing steel to account for the sloping slab, see attached SK1 for clarification.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				1-) The first pour for the perimeter slab will be 9 inches thick at the outer edge (see detail 1/S1-8000) therefore the stud length shall be accordingly. It is acceptable to have two studs at the tapering slab that are the same length as the ones at the spandrel beams. 2-) Acceptable to locally provide 6" studs. Indicate these studs clearly in the shop drawings.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1766	SSS - DCW Backing Bar on Moment Frame Columns	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Section 05.12.10 Structural Steel - Additional Seismic Requirements, 2.2 Fabrication Section C.2.A.1 (See SK1) states, "connections in which backing is not removed: backing shall be attached to the member or plate that does not have its surface prepared for the groove weld. Attachment shall be by either a 5/16" fillet weld or 3/16" groove weld along the complete bar length on the side of the bar opposite the groove weld" On shop drawing A1723 (See SK 2, SK3), section cut B & C show two continuity plates that are with-in approx. 2 1/2" of each other with a CJP DCW marked as the weld detail. In these conditions there is insufficient access to provide a continuous weld along the backside of the backing bar. Please confirm that in situations where there is insufficient access between the two continuity plates, the backing bar can be tac welded within the weld zone and left in place on one of the plates. The other plate will have the backing bar attached as per the aforementioned specification. However, on CS1 columns A1723, A1731, A1759 and A1760 the backing bar was tact welded within the weld zone in cases where the continuity plates were in close proximity. Please confirm these columns are acceptable. *Note - the typical continuity plates that are spaced properly have a double bevel prep and therefore will not be affected.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The moment frame beam continuity plates are per detail 5/S1-4202. At the contractor's request, a double sided CJP welded was accepted (see RFI T-0959) in lieu of the welding shown in this detail. Therefore, the continuity plate that lines up with the moment frame beam flange shall follow this detail, with or without a nearby second continuity plate. Where there is a second continuity plate nearby and there is insufficient access to it, it is acceptable to weld the its backing bar using tac welding and leave it in place as proposed in the RFI. Note that the spec section referred in the RFI is triggered when backing bar is not removed and does not apply to the seismic moment frame condition since the standard detail require backgouging and reinforcing fillet weld, or alternatively, double sided CJP welding. Provide additional information for the CS1 columns listed in the RFI. It is not clear if a) backing bars for both continuity plates were tac welded, or b) one was tac welded and the other one was fabricated per Specification Section 2.2.C.2.A.1, or c) one was tac welded and the other was fabricated with double sided CJP.				

T-1767	SSS - Weld Clearance Hole Size at Moment Frame Column Cruciform			Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer					To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton									
REQUEST: Several Moment Frame Columns have cruciform sections that weld over column web splice joints. The splice joint provides a transition from thick web to thin web. In a majority of these cases, the cruciform web as detailed has a 1" radius cutout to clear the column web splice joint. The 1" radius cutout is insufficient to adequately clear the tapered double bevel splice joint and provide space for runoff tabs necessary for the CJP weld.					SUGGESTION:				
					ANSWER: Confirmed				
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>Please confirm it is acceptable to provide a weld clearance hole in the cruciform section wide enough to clear the bevels of the column web splice joint plus 1" on each side of the bevel for weld runoff tabs. See attached sketch. If confirmed, this information needs to be shown on detail drawings.</div>							
T-1768	SSS - SLRS Bracing Connection Confirmations GL 22-24	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer</div> <div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>			<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>See attached CD RFI # 618 SK1:</div> <div>The following is a summary of consequences for the varying slopes on Grids 22, 23 & 24 as the diagonal bracing will no longer be in the same plane similar to the issues in RFI's T-1322, T-1322.2 & T-1513 (SK 515, 515.1 & 515.2, CD 382, 382.1 & 382.2.):</div> <div>1) The two ends of the W40x297's will not be flush with the connection ends due to varying slope between Grid 22 to the slope on Grid 23. Please provide a detail to address this issue.</div> <div>2) The 1 3/4" gusset plates per 1A/S1-5018 will have two beams coming in at compound angles. Please provide a solution.</div> <div>3) A shim plate will be required on top of the W40x277 & W40x297's to lift the 1 3/4" gusset above the flange of the W40x362's.</div> <div>4) Shims beveled in both directions, varying in thickness at each corner will be required on top and bottom of the W40x362's as the flanges are not parallel to the flanges of the W40x277 & W40x297's.</div> <div>5) The holes for the 1 1/2" A490-X-SC bolts will require oversize holes as the surfaces of the flanges and the 1 3/4" gusset plate are not parallel.</div>		<div>SUGGESTION:</div>		<div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Detail 1/S1-5018 calls for shim plates as required. We believe that shim plates with beveled in both direction will address the questions raised in this RFI. However, it is acceptable to both TT and AAI to slope the Grid 23 the same way as Grids 22 and 24 to avoid slope in two directions if it is no additional cost to TJPA.</div>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1895 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Confirm this is the design intent.							
T-1768.1	SSS - SLRS Bracing Connection Confirmations GL 22-24	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2505 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Grid Line: A & 23, H & 23 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1, SK2, SK3, RFI T-1768 Response				Confirmed that the T/steel elevations shown on SK3 are correct. Note that providing shims that are beveled in both directions to fill the gaps while maintaining erection tolerances is a means and method issue. Therefore we disagree with the cost and time increase claims associated with this RFI if Skanska wants to go with the other option (modifying slope at GL23).			
The response to RFI T-1768 confirmed that detail 1/S1-5018 calls for shim plates as required. The response also indicated that it is acceptable to slope Grid 23 to match Grids 22 and 24 - in order to avoid slope in two directions.				Reason for RFI (TT): Disagree with the reason noted in RFI: Engineering conflict, agree with other: verification. TT categorizes this as Shown in Contract Documents and Request for Substitution.			
Skanska has indicated that the second option is preferable, as the complex shims (as detailed in SK1 and SK1) would likely cause erection problems.							
Please confirm the top of steel elevations as shown in SK3, which would result from sloping Grid 23 to match Grids 22 and 24.							
T-1769	SCS - Foundation Wall Embeds: Plumbing at GL 6-10	Closed	10/01/2014	10/11/2014	10/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached marked up drawing.				See attached RFI T-1602.			
The noted natural gas pipe does not have a specified diameter. The pipe diameter is required to determine sleeve size and center elevation for sleeve placement.				The natural gas service sleeve size is 4".			
Please provide the diameter for noted natural gas pipe.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1898 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Please see Skanska's original RFI which is attached.

T-1773.1	SSS - AB Analysis - TB Column Base Plates	Closed	10/20/2014	10/20/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			

Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton

REQUEST:

This is a confirming RFI following our October 9, 2014 structural coordination meeting. The following items / actions were discussed:

1. For anchor bolts that do not clash with the column base plates but are out of AISC tolerance thus limiting the ability to adjust for structural steel fabrication and erection tolerances, the EOR takes no exception to modifying the base plate holes in the shop or field to suit the as-built anchor bolt position.

2. The EOR takes no exception to reducing the size of the plate washers above and below the horizontal stiffener/anchor plate in the column. This will be done to clear the fillet weld for the vertical stiffener below the horizontal anchor plate and to allow for consistent plate washer sizes. The plate washers will be larger than the major diameter of the anchor nuts. The attached spreadsheet details the sizes we will use at each location.

3. The EOR takes no exception to adding a spacer plate below the horizontal anchor plate and above the nut at the 2-1/2" anchor rod locations where necessary. This is necessary to accommodate out of tolerance anchor bolts so that the nut can clear the fillet weld between the horizontal anchor plate and the vertical stiffener below.

Please confirm the above items.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

- 1). Confirmed.
- 2). Confirmed.
- 3). Confirmed.

Reason for RFI: We agree with the reason "Field Conflict" noted in the RFI, but disagree with probably cost increase and time increase noted. TT categorize this as "request for corrective field work".

T-1774	BGP - Vehicle Ramp Corbel	Closed	10/03/2014	10/13/2014	10/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			

Co-Author:



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Refer to sheets A1-7401 and C1-5007.</p> <p>Based on workpoint elevations shown in Sheet A1-7401 the horizontal bearing edge of the vehicle and bicycle ramps appear to slope down gradually from West to East: 22.0' to 19.66' for the vehicle ramp and 17.96' to 15.66 for the bicycle ramp.</p> <p>However, the ramp section on Civil detail 7/C1-5007 shows one elevation of 19.00' for the section cut through the vehicle ramp and no cut through the bicycle ramp.</p> <p>Please confirm if the foundation wall corbels elevations are as shown on A1-7401 or if they are to be level as appears to be detailed in Civil drawings.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Arup's response:</p> <p>The foundation wall corbels which support the vehicle and bicycle ramps shall be level. Please see attached SK-C-0003, SK-C-0004, SK-C-0005, SK-C-0006 and SK-C-0007 for elevations and extent of corbels.</p> <p>TT's response:</p> <p>Corbel elevations and extent along foundation wall per updated civil and architectural drawings.</p> <p>Concrete Beam below ramp slab as called out on S1/S1-2251, to be updated to 36"x58". Provide reinforcement as called out on 1/S1-2251 (7-#10 top and bottom).</p> <p>AAI's response:</p> <p>Refer to attached SKA-4271 for updated information related to the concrete corbel elevation for the Vehicle and Bicycle Ramp.</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			
T-1775	BGP - Concourse Deck D211 Pilasters	Closed	10/03/2014	10/03/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>	<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>During installation of Formsavers at LC Deck D211 and D212, SCCI was directed by Carl Keim to remove two(2) pilasters at GL 11 between GL Band C as they were not required. (See attached photo).</p> <p>Please confirm this as built condition is acceptable.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Omission of the pilaster immediately south of the north door opening on Grid 11 was not directed by design team field representatives. Such direction was given for a second pilaster located further south along the same wall, as shown in RFI attachment A1-2203 Delta 0. The pilaster located further south is not required because there is no door for which one would be required, as shown in RFI attachment A1-2203 Delta 3. It is not acceptable for the northern pilaster to be omitted; however, the thickness of the pilaster is acceptable at 12". The pilaster shall be reinforced as a 1'-4"x12" pilaster per Detail 9/S1-9050.</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1900 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1776	SCS - Bus Deck Level Composite Slab Concrete Placement Sequence	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference 4/S1-5003 Please confirm the following sequence regarding the Bus Level Composite Slab. - Place 10" structural slab. (first pour) - Provide raked concrete finish, to achieve required amplitude. - Apply curing compound day of first pour. Please specify the cure time required for the 10" structural slab before the 4" structural topping slab can be placed.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed sequence is acceptable. Blast clean the curing compound before the second pour for achieving bonding between two pours. Alternatively, water cure with wet burlap may be use for the first pour. Curing time shall be in accordance to the specification. 2nd pour may be placed after the concrete for the first pour reaches 3000 psi mini.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1901 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1777	SCS - Concrete Placement Sequence GL 10-13	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference attached sketch. Please confirm, 1. Once A1 is poured and cured, is it acceptable to place A2-C2 in one pour prior to B1 and C1 being placed? 2. If #1 is confirmed, is it acceptable to then place A3-C3 in one pour, following A2-C2? 3. If #2 is confirmed, is it acceptable to then place A4-C4 in one pour, Following A3-C3?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See the response to RFI T-1778.		
T-1778	SCS - Ground, Second, Bus, and Roof Level Concrete Placement Sequence	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference attached sketch. Steel erection begins in Area C01, which is between gridlines 10-11. 1) The construction Joints in the trainbox walls do not line up with gridlines. Is it acceptable to align the fourth lift foundation wall construction joints with gridlines? Note that ground level slabs will also follow this layout as shown in the attached sketch. 2) WOJV believes that the formed and metal deck concrete at ground level GL 10-11 needs to be placed before pouring any other metal decks above this level. Please confirm this is correct. If required to place more east/west concrete at ground level prior to placing decks above, please provide requirements. 3) Please provide the required cure time of ground floor concrete before the placing of concrete in metal decks above ground level can be poured. 4) Once the ground level concrete reaches required strength is it acceptable to pour the 2nd level, bus deck			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger: 10/10/2014 1). Foundation walls below the topmost horizontal construction joint that are cast with the approved foundation wall mix in accordance with RFI T-1715 response shall have aligned vertical joints. The foundation wall within the projection of, and poured with, the Ground Floor slab and beams above this joint utilizing the slab and beam mix design need not have joints aligning with the foundation wall below. Note that many formed Ground Floor concrete construction joints cannot be located on the Gridlines due to MFB's. In the West Throat, construction joint location will be governed by where it would fall across intersecting formed framing members. Also refer to RFI-T-1740, T-1584, and Submittal TG0702-503 comments. 2). It is recommended that the entire ground floor slab for each wing be casted before pouring the above grade floor slab. It is to ensure that the ground floor slab can act as a floor diaphragm to distribute the seismic force induced from the upper floors (transmitted thru the longitudinal BRB frames and		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1902 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	level (1st 10" thick slab only), and roof level consecutively with no cure time requirement between deck pours?						
				basket column frames) to the train box walls.			
				3). It depends on how soon the floor is poured and how much risk (for seismic event) is tolerable. Each wing works as an independent structure (because they are separated by seismic joints) and its longitudinal seismic force will need to be transferred to the train box wall at the ground level. Without a complete load path, structural failure might occur in an earthquake event. It is recommended that the construction team to discuss this with TJPA and propose a construction sequence for us to review.			
				4). See response to item 3).			
T-1779	SSS - Cast Node PJP to Girder Flange	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
The PJP for the cast node base to girder intermediate flange runs over the radius of the slotted flange. Please confirm it is acceptable to use a 3/8" run off tab fitted into the slot to allow the PJP to continue around the node as required. See SK1 & SK2 for clarification.						Confirmed	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1903 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1780	SSS - ST501 & ST502 Paint Clarifications	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 641 SK1: Confirm the noted beams require IRFM-1 per D & E/A1-8663 and supply dimensions on plan to show the extent of the paint as A1-8663 & A1-9230 do not supply this information.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, the beams noted require IRFM-1. Dimension are not required as the IRFM-1 is applied to the entire length of the W33x118 (47) c=1 ¼ beams between GL 20.1 and 21 at C.3 and between GL 20.1 and 21 at F.7. To clarify: as there are no approved tested assemblies for alternating fire protection types on a single member, the entire length of beam requires a single type of fireproofing, in this case IRFM-1, from support to support.			
T-1781	SSS - W21 and W24 Connection Clarification GL 27.1	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	11/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 636 SK1: The W21x48 north of Grid D.4 and the W24x76 south of Grid E.6 can't be connected with double angles per 1/S1-5010 as the angles will foul the web stiffener plates per 2/S1-5016. Please supply a new detail.		SUGGESTION: Confirm it is acceptable to connect the beams per 1/S1-5011 except the W21 will have 4 bolts as shown and the W24 will have 5 bolts due to the limited space.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.			
T-1782	SSS - Stair Elevator Weld Clarification from WS4 Package	Void	10/06/2014	10/16/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By:							
REQUEST: The noted weld symbol has been interpreted as a weld only across the toe of the angles based on the single fillet shown and "BOTH SIDES" referring to both angles. This was marked the first time by TT in the WS4 approval submittal, requesting a double fillet weld. All previous sequences have been shop issued with a single fillet weld. Confirm that one single fillet per angle is correct.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1904 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1782.1	SSS - Stair Elevator Weld Clarification from WS4 Package	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 642 SK1: The noted weld symbol has been interpreted as a weld only across the toe of the angles based on the single fillet shown and "BOTH SIDES" referring to both angles. This was marked the first time by TT in the WS4 approval submittal, requesting a double fillet weld. All previous sequences have been shop issued with a single fillet weld. Confirm that one single fillet per angle is correct.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the interpretation noted in this RFI is correct.		
T-1783	BGP - Partition Wall - Top of Pier Bracing	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please see the attached clouded drawings, S1-9050, S1-9002, and S1-9001. Note 5 on detail 9/S1-9050 refers to detail 1/S1-9002 for the typical top of pier bracing details. Detail 3/S1-9001 depicts the bracing of an interior CMU/Concrete Pier below a metal deck. There are no other details shown on the contract drawings that depict bracing of interior CMU/Concrete pier below concrete concourse deck. Please confirm it is acceptable to omit the 3/8" thick plate on Detail 3/S1-9001 for bracing below concrete concourse deck. Otherwise, please provide a detail for bracing the top of an interior concrete pier to the concrete deck.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 3/8 inch plate should not be omitted. Detailing for top of pier bracing as shown on typical detail 3/S1-9001 applies for both concrete deck and composite deck conditions. Where composite deck is present, note (1) applies.		
T-1784	SSS - Shear Plate Connection Clarifications at Bus Deck Level GL 23.5	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 638 SK1: Confirm the connections per 7 & 8/S1-5010 with the shear plate per 1/S1-5011 for the W21x50 welded to the plates are acceptable as shown or supply a new detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1905 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1785	BGP - Area 2 South Splice Bar Correction	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: The southern #9A42 splice bars that are being corrected in the field should have been placed during the previous pour (D205). During the correction for Decks C203 and D204, it was discovered that there was not enough room to insert these bars from the East side of GL-X due to the proximity of the pour joint. Per the attached drawings, please confirm the constructible reconfiguration of the splice bars acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/9/2014: Confirmed.		
T-1786	SSS - Weld Detail Comment Clarification at Drag Beam GL 2	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 637 SK1: The approval comment is requesting verification for information that is not shown in detail 9/S1-8014. Confirm the weld shown applies to (4) sides.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The comment was due to incorrect location of welds shown in the shop drawings: welding shown on the sides vs top and bottom per detail 9/S1-5014. Welding can be applied at 4 sides at the contractor's option.		
T-1787	SSS - WS5 Beam Paint Clarifications	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 643 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Beams A11249 & A12166 in WS5 are not shown in drawings A1-8660 thru A1-8663 as requiring AESS/IFRM-1. Please clarify which architectural drawings indicate the noted finishes. 2) Supply specific information showing the extent of the AESS/IFRM-1 finishes on the noted (2) beams.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) For AESS at beams 11249 and 12166, refer to: 2/A1-7310, A/A1-7310, 1/A1-8152 and H/A1-8661 (ASI 127). 2) For extent of IFRM-1 in Gridline 3 beams, please see enclosed markup.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1906 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1788	BGP - Drawing Discrepancy With Wall Above Bike and Vehicle Ramp Slab	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: The Architectural Drawings including AI-7404, AI-7405, and AI-7407, shows TG0600 having no Vehicle or Bike Ramp walls above the ramp slabs. However, SI-2251 calls out Detail 5 on SI-3210, which shows a partition wall below the TG0600 scope line going from the top of the Vehicle Ramp slab to the bottom of the beams on the Ground Level. Please confirm which drawing set shows the correct scope line.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TT takes no exception to the concrete partition wall as shown on detail 5/S1-3210 to be included in TG07 Package. Partition dowels to be placed with vehicle ramp slab and TG06 Package. WOJV response: TG06 to incorporate rebar dowel/couplers for delineation as detailed in 5/S1-3210. TG07.2 to incorporate rebar and CIP concrete for vertical work above horizontal surface of vehicle structural ramp.		
T-1789	SSS - ST401 Brace Connection and Dimension Clarifications	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 586 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) These braces extend up to the underside of the W27x84 on S1-2604 as shown in snapshot from the model. Confirm no further action is required. 2) Confirm the red approval dimensions shown on E51 (SK1) are intended to be a revision to the information supplied previously as noted.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed 2) Confirmed		
T-1790	SSS - Weld Clearance Holes	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: XKT Engineering requests that the weld clearance holes located at column flange to web, weld transition points (full penetration to fillet welds), be eliminated (see attached drawing P1022). There is no code requirement for these holes. Welds would be detailed and welded in accordance with AWS D1.1, Section 2.8.2.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable at joints where three welds join. AWS section referred in the RFI does not address this condition. Where three welds join, access holes shall be used for proper weld termination.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1907 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-1790.1	SSS - Weld Clearance Holes	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: This RFI addresses the information requested and the response given to SK RFI 867 (T-1790). To clarify the applicability of the reference code, Skanska's fabricator has provided details on the fabrication of the column assemblies: · The web welds (splices) are welded first and NDT is performed- no access holes needed at ends of welds. · Web plates are fit/assembled to flanges. · Flange to web welds are made - again, no access holes are required. · There is no welding being performed through access holes for these conditions. There is no code or project requirement to install weld access holes given the order of operations. AWS D1.1, Section 2.8.2 addresses weld transition from full penetration to fillet welds as required on these flange to web welds. Given that the three welds are not done concurrently, please confirm that it is acceptable to eliminate unnecessary access holes.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to omit the weld access holes indicated in the RFI (at web transitions). Comply with AWS D1.1 for CJP to fillet weld transitions. TT: We agree with the reason for request: Alternate Proposal. We categorize this RFI as clarification on means and methods.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1791	SCS - Foundation Wall Telecom Sleeve Elevations	Closed	10/06/2014	10/16/2014	10/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference 4/TE1-5200, 1/TE1-8007 and 2/TE1-8007 Attached slab edge drawing note lateral locations of telecom sleeves through the foundation wall. Section detail 2/TE1-8007 depicts two embedded sleeves, one directly above the other, alongside the moment frame beams. Details 4/TE1-5200 and 1/TE1-8007 detail the corresponding opening for TSER room to lie between the moment frame beams. Elevations for the foundation wall telecom sleeves are not provided in the above drawings. Please provide elevations for the foundation wall telecom sleeves.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For Telecom sleeve elevations at the foundation wall requested in this RFI, refer to attached TSK-0048.				
T-1792	BGP - Eastern Wall Rebar at Seismic Joint	Closed	10/07/2014	10/17/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché				
REQUEST: Please confirm that the attached drawings for rebar placement is acceptable for horizontal rebar placement at eastern wall - seismic joint location.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> George Metzger 10/9/2014: Confirmed.				
T-1793	SCS - Exposed Concrete Roof Perimeter Wall Per ASI 0124	Closed	10/07/2014	10/17/2014	10/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: RFI # T-1697 requested confirmation for the use of snap ties for perimeter wall, scallop wall, and sky light wall locations. TJPAs answer: "The Design Team does not object to the use of Snap-off ties only at skylight wall locations." Spec 031001 - 2.2 B. 7. h. allows the use of snap ties for walls that will not be exposed. Architectural drawings AI-5002 and AI-8604 -through 8613 shows the roof level perimeter walls and seismic walls as not being exposed due to the GFRC fascia prior to ASI 0124. Questions:			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The Roof Park Level concrete perimeter wall and scallops will have exposed face and as such, it is different that concealed concrete walls. 2. The Roof Park Level concrete perimeter wall not need to meet requirements for cast-in-place architectural concrete specification, however, the Design Team hereby request a dedicated meeting with the contractor to review the constructability and technical issues of this work. Final determination of				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1909 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>1. Please confirm that per ASI 0124 the concrete roof perimeter walls/scallops will now be required to meet the specification requirements for exposed concrete walls.</p> <p>2. Please confirm that the concrete roof perimeter walls/scallops will not need to meet requirements for cast-in-place architectural concrete.</p>						
						</	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1795	SCS - Information Needed for Fascia Embed Layout	Closed	10/07/2014	10/17/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The perimeter wall for both the rooftop and bus level GFRC fascia panel and support steel found on A 1-8601 to A 1-8611 do not show vertical dimensions or horizontal layout for the embed locations. Please provide layout with vertical dimensions, horizontal layout, and embed plate size for the embed locations equivalent to what is provided for the roof park railing details on sheets AI-8680 to AI-8685.				The roof top and bus deck level GFRC fascia are being revised to metal cladding, embed locations and sizes cannot be provided at this time. This is a design build element and no subcontractor has been awarded a contract. Information will be proved as it becomes available. February 2015 is the anticipated award date of this subcontract.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1796	SCS - Sky Light Embed Layout Dimensions	Closed	10/07/2014	10/17/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

After searching through sky light drawings AI-8401 through AI-8479 and SI-8000 through SI-8020 Shimmick was not able find information providing the sky light attachment to top of wall embed sizes, anchor bolt length, and spacing of embeds. For the central sky light from grid line 19.1 to 22 on page A 1-8451 which shows the structural truss frames for the sky light, which determines the embed layout, the truss frames are called out as equally spaced between each grid line. This does not give you the complete perimeter and requires too many assumptions. Also on AI-8401Note2. Dimensional control sub part A. "Dimensional control shall be derived from the three dimensional (3D) computer model and the two dimensional (2d) drawings." Sub part B. "See sheet AI-0009 for an index of 3D models". The 3D models referenced on AI-0009 are models that Shimmick TG07 Superstructure currently does not have access to. Shimmick would prefer to have the embed information on a drawing sheet equivalent to what is provided for the roof park railing details on sheets AI-8680 to AI-8685.

Shimmick is requesting the engineer to provide sky light attachment to top of wall embed sizes, anchor bolt lengths, and spacing of embeds for the top of concrete skylight support walls?

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

The information requested cannot be provided at this time. The sky light is a design build element and no subcontractor has been awarded a contract. Information will be provided as it becomes available. February 2015 is the anticipated award date of this subcontract.

T-1797	SCS - Roof Top Sky Light Hand Rail Foundations	Closed	10/07/2014	10/17/2014	10/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Per LI-8683 the Sky light hand rail foundations are not tied to the structural deck with rebar and appear to be independent.

1. Please confirm that the sky light hand rail foundations do not need to be incorporated into Shimmick's roof slab detailing.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

- 1. Confirmed.
- 2. Confirmed.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1912 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>2. Also please confirm that the hand rail and foundation is outside of the scope of TG07's work package and the connection to the deck will be made at a later date.</div>							
T-1798	TTC - Civil Station to Architectural Gridline Correlation	Closed	10/08/2014	10/18/2014	10/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The Architectural and Civil drawings contain no correlation between Stations and gridlines. Please provide a correlation so that points can be referenced between different sets of drawings.					George Metzger 10/12/14:		
					On sheet C-0100, all relevant stations are provided with Northing and Easting. Also, intersection of Grids 1/E and Grids 2/W are provide with Northing and Easting.		
<hr/>							
T-1799	BGP - Slide Bearing Plate at Corbel Under SOG - Anchors	Closed	10/09/2014	10/19/2014	10/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference detail 7A on S1-3205.					No headed studs are required. There are #7 reinforcement welded to embed plate as shown on detail 7/S1-3205.		
Will the designer require headed studs to anchor the embed plate to the continuous concrete corbel?							
If so, please issue a sketch showing the anchor layout.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1800	BGP - Seismic Joint Assembly Mock-Up	Closed	10/09/2014	10/19/2014	10/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Section 07 09 16 - Part 1.6.E describes the requirements of the jobsite constructed Seismic Joint Assembly Mock-up. As discussed during TJPA Program QA/QC Coordination Meetings, confirm it is acceptable to employ "First-In-Place" interim inspection reviews of the actual seismic joint assembly installation in lieu of a job-site constructed mock-up.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Confirmed.		
					Discuss Owner credit for deletion of the 10' x 10' x 10' mock-up with TJPA.		
T-1801	BGP - D201&202 RCS-1 & RCS-7 Reinforcing Steel Field Change Confirmation	Closed	10/09/2014	10/19/2014	10/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please confirm the following: 1. Arrangement of RCS-1 top reinforcing hooks at the west foundation wall may be per the attached sketch. 2. Matching hooks may be spliced to RCS-7 top reinforcing above the knockout wall to conform to Detail 4/S1-3204. 3. Minimum splice length for RCS7 hooks is acceptable at 76" based on a 23" embedment of the typical bar into the foundation wall. 4. RCS-7 hooks may be omitted where congestion results in inadequate clear spacing. All such locations will be reviewed by the Structural Field Representative before inspection. 5. Top formsaver in Detail 4/S1-3204 may be relocated immediately below the top reinforcing of B60 to reduce top steel congestion in RCS-7.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					All items confirmed.		
T-1802	BGP - Area 16- East Wall Vertical Reinforcing- CDSM Encroachment	Closed	10/09/2014	10/19/2014	10/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1914 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Portions of the East Wall have CDSM encroachments -per RFI T-1372 and approved submittals require 6" spacing of vertical reinforcing. The original call out was for 17 Verts each face between GL C & C.3 and between GL G & G.2 (at 6" OC). We installed 13 each face in both sections (at 8" OC)- see attached drawing. Please confirm it is acceptable for the 8" spacing to remain and there is no further action needed.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-1803	SCS - Roof Edge of Deck Bent Plate From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang	Closed To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	10/09/2014	10/19/2014	10/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	REQUEST: S1-5000 detail 8 & 9 shows a bent plate as the typical edge of deck detail. The bent plate is also shown on SI-8008 for the sky light opening. SI-3282 details do not show a bent plate for the rooftop seismic detail 3, perimeter detail 2, and scallop wall detail 4 & 5. 1. Please confirm that the roof top seismic, perimeter, and scallop walls will have a bent plate per detail 8&9/S1-5000. 2. Please provide detail on what the scallop bent plate will look like (4&5/S1-3282). 3. Please confirm that it is acceptable for Shimmick to place a 1 inch hole in the bent plate to install a removable tie for overhang brackets. Holes for overhang brackets will be roughly 6' O.C.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: 1). Per details on sheet S1-3282, no bent plate will be needed. The slab beyond the supporting steel beam will be formed and casted. 2). See response to #1. 3). See response to #1.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1916 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>RFI #T-1710 Shimmick requested approval to relocate the construction joint from the wall to the deck and pour the chamfer with the scallop wall.</p> <p>Shimmick requests confirmation that this is acceptable for the entire perimeter and not just the scallop locations. Refer to perimeter wall detail 2 on S1-3282.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1917 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1809	SCS - Top Bar Clearance Per 4A/S1-5022	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Please refer to 4/SI-5022 and Detail 5/SI-3600 for top rebar cover on ground level moment frame beams. Detail 'A' calls for 2" clear for the top bars but detail 5/S1-3600 calls for 2.75" clear to the stirrup. Per conference call with Thornton Tomasetti on 10/9/14, the clearance for the top bars would need to be 2.75"(CLR) + .50"(#4 STIRRUP) + 1.50"(#11 REBAR-MAX SIZE) = 4.75". 4.75" top rebar clearance can be applied as a typical for the top bar in 4/S 1-5022. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Confirmed. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<hr/>							
T-1810	SSS - Grouting Train Box Column Base Plates	Closed	10/13/2014	10/13/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Structural Steel specification part 3.3E, requires the column base plates to be grouted immediately after plumbing the first tier of columns. Skanska's erection plans prepared by our structural engineer indicate that the grouting of the columns shall be done after erecting the EBF columns and tie-in steel at the bus deck and prior to setting the ancillary bus deck fill-in steel. See EP3.0 and EP3.1 attached for reference. This is done to allow for flexibility when plumbing and aligning the EBF steel. Please confirm that Skanska has the option to follow the EP3.0 notes for the timing of the column grouting operation.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: This is a "means and method" issue. The proposal by the contractor to delay the grouting is acceptable, as long as it will not cause any safety issue. Reason for RFI: Clarification of issue of means and methods Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1811	SSS - Missing Connection Details at Roof Level GL 27.1-29	Closed	10/13/2014	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 644 SK1: Confirm the connection as shown is acceptable or supply a new detail.				Confirmed. TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request: Insufficient information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			
T-1812	SSS - PE503 Fouling Brace at Slab Opening	Closed	10/13/2014	10/13/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 649 SK1: The brace per 1/S1-7600 fouls the slab opening. Please provide a solution.				Brace per 1/S1-7600 may be waived at the location highlighted in the RFI. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			
T-1813	SSS - SE201 & SE202 Edge Plate Approval Comment Clarification GL 4-5	Closed	10/13/2014	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory Kemerer</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
<div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
See attached CD RFI # 651 SK1: A slab opening is not shown on S1-2602 or A1-2892. 7/A1-2969 shows a series of circular openings but they are not included in the edge plate requirement per 8/S1-5002. Confirm the edge plate is not required or supply revised contract documents.				Confirmed, no edge plate is required. This Area will be sleeved.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1814	SSS - Approval Comment Clarification at Connection GL 4-5	Closed	10/13/2014	10/13/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 652 SK1: The connections as submitted are correct per 4/S1-5011 Note 3. Is the intent of the comment to revise the connections?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No, the comment in the submittal seems misplaced. The comment applies to member A12255 not A11447. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			
T-1815	SSS - SLRS Missing Connection Details GL 27	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 653 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 4: 1) Supply a connection detail for the L6x6x3/8 at the Type 3 drag connection per S1-5018. 2) 1/S1-5018 does not provide a detail for beams of varying depth. Supply a new detail. 3) Confirm it is acceptable to reduce the edge distance to 4" to avoid the plates fouling each other or supply a new detail. 4) The diagonal gusset plate per 1C/S1-5018 and the square gusset plate per 1A/S1-5018 foul each other as shown. Supply a new detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) See response to item 3 of RFI T-1057.1. 2) Provide double angle connections at the W40 and W30 beams in lieu of the Type 3 drag connection. 3) Confirmed. 4) The diagonal gusset plate per 1C/S1-5018 shall be cut and CJP welded to the square gusset plate per 1A/S1-5018 as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0423.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1815.1	SSS - SLRS Missing Connection Details GL 27	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1815 (SK 878, CD 653) See attached CD RFI # 653.1 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) The response to item 1 in RFI T-1815 (SK 878, CD 653) does not work because the vertical leg of the angle cannot be placed between the 1 1/2 dia. bolts per S1-5018 and the angle cannot be welded to the beam flange as it fouls the web stiffener plates per S1-5016. Review and supply a workable solution. 2) The (3) noted bolts for the bottom tie plate per 1/S1-5018 extend past the end of the coped bottom beam flange or do not meet the required edge distance. Provide a solution.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Stop the L6x6 angle at the flange plate such that 1/4" fillet welds top and bottom can be provided between the horizontal leg of the L6x6 angle and the flange plate. 2) The (3) noted bolts are waived. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			
T-1815.2	SSS - SLRS Missing Connection Details GL 27	Closed	12/10/2014	12/20/2014	12/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2506 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Grid Line: C & 27.1 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 653.2 SK1 Drawing S1-2506 shows W40 members connecting near grid lines C and 27.1. Connection information is missing for the tie plate to gusset plates as indicated below. 1) Supply details for the field weld between the 1 3/4" tie plate to the 1 3/4" gusset plate. 2) Supply details for the field weld between the 2 1/4" tie plate to the 1 3/4" gusset plate. Note that the plates do not align due to the varying beam depth. NOTE: this RFI applies to all similar connections between Grid 27.1 - 33.5 on the Bus Deck Level.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) It is unclear what weld details are being requested. We believe our response in RFI T-1815 to provide CJP welds is sufficient. 2) Provide welds as shown in attached sketch SKS-0443, where the "tie" and "gusset" plates do not align. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict and insufficient information. We categorize this RFI as Previously answered for 1) and no cost clarification for 2).			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1921 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1815.3	SSS - SLRS Missing Connection Details GL 27	Closed	04/10/2015	04/20/2015	04/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2507 Location: Zone 4, Bus deck Gridline: 27 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 653.4 SK1 and SK2 As discussed in previous meetings and per response to SK RFI 878.2B (T-1815.2), please confirm the CJP tie plate to gusset plate weld detail shown in the attached sketches is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with the reason for request verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification. Date answered by Design Team: 4/19/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 4/20/15		
T-1816	SSS - Conflicting Information at North & South Exit Mezzanines GL 20.1	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/28/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 655 SK1: This note states that the hangers are to be located below the beams on the Ground Level. Per S1-6050 and RFI T-1573 (SK 732, CD 537) the beam is located 8'-10 3/4 as is shown in this snapshot from the model. However, the yellow dimension notes that the dimension is not to exceed 8'-0. Please clarify this conflicting information.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 8'-0" max dimension requirement may be waived and the hanger may be aligned with the ground level beam at the location indicated.		
T-1817	SSS - Conflicting Dimensions at Second Level GL 14-15	Closed	10/13/2014	10/23/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 656 SK2 for item 2: 2) This string of dimensions does not add up to 42'-6. Confirm the dimensions as marked are acceptable as this steel is currently being fabricated.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1922 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1818	SCS - Roof Top Door Opening	Closed	10/14/2014	10/14/2014	10/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: A1-7013 Detail 1 plan view for stair 401 calls out door 03401 found on A 1-9706. The door height is 7'-0" and the width is 7'-0". A-0035 shows the door frames as 2" thick. Detail 1 of AI-0035 shows a 3/16 inch gap between the frame and the concrete wall. 1. Please confirm that Detail 1 is the correct detail for the roof top concrete wall door openings. 2. Please confirm that the rough opening for door 401 is 7'- 4 3/8" wide and 7'- 2 3/16" tall. 3. Please confirm that roof top door openings in concrete walls will always be 4 3/8 inch width and 2 3/16 inch height larger than the doors called out on the door schedule.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed 2) Confirmed 3) Confirmed CMGC shall confirm rough openings with expected trade bidders or ideally between trade shop drawing submittals.		
<hr/>							
T-1819	SCS - Grout Testing Requirements	Closed	10/14/2014	10/24/2014	10/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: According to Exhibit A, the contractor for TG07.2 will" Grout all TG07.I R Structural Steel column base plates and anchor bolts ... ". On Section 03 30 02 of the Specifications, title 2.8 MISCELLANEOUS CONCRETE PRODUCTS, it is indicated " Grout for base plate grouting shall be flowable consistency and have minimum compressive strength of 8000 psi at 28 days or as indicated on drawings" No information regarding testing requirements was found. Please provide information about testing requirements for Grout on Column Base Plates.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Revised Response 11/17/2014 Perform compressive strength tests of 2 in cubes per ASTM C109 taken during construction from the first placement of each type of grout for each day and at intervals thereafter as selected by the TJPA representative. A set of six specimens shall be made for testing at either 3 days and 28 days, or 7 days and 28 days as best suits erection sequence requirements.		
<hr/>							
T-1820	SSS - Fouling Stiffeners at CP8 Connection	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1822	BGP - Seismic Joint Vertical Wall Reinforcing	Closed	10/15/2014	10/25/2014	10/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: The configuration of welded reinforcing on the train box side of the seismic joint is installed as if there were an adjacent horizontal trough similar to the horizontal leg of the joint at the mat slab. There is no such trough on the walls. To accommodate the existing vertical west embed please see the following: 1. An additional #7 hook will be added to the foundation wall that will engage the welded angled bar and the welded deformed anchor - See Sketch #1 2. As necessary to provide 2" clear to the waterproofing or as is required to place foundation wall reinforcing, the welded angled hook may be field bent. Bending will be controlled as to not stress the bar end weld and bend radius will not be less than ACI minimum. See Sketch #1 3. Termination of north and south foundation wall horizontal reinforcing shall be hooked. Hooks shall be oriented per the attached sketch. See Sketch # 1. 4. The interior leg of 5/8" plate terminating at Grid A may be omitted and replaced with a formed edge-See Sketch # 1, reference AI-8881 detail 5. 5. Please confirm that the South East Termination Bars can be installed per attached Sketch #2 . 6. Please confirm that the North East Comer of the East Wall: Within the projection of the seismic joint toward the eastern CDSM wall, the interior foundation wall cross ties were not installed. Please confirm that this field condition is acceptable and that a uniformly detailed east foundation wall will resume in the second lift per the attached sketch #3. S1-3010 does not depict detail of terminated horizontal bars along North and South wall and Seismic Joint embed. Please approve the following sketches.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Items 1-6 and sketches are confirmed. Subsequent segments of the trainbox side of the seismic joint shall have welded reinforcing that mirrors that of the east side, except it will be permitted to have 48" long straight welded bars in lieu of hooks per Sketch #1. The contractor has omitted the last leg of joint plate terminating at Grid A on the western edge of the joint in the first vertical segment. This is acceptable. The contractor may include this plate in subsequent segments or omit and form at their discretion.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1925 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1823	BGP - Upturned Beam Conflict at GL 21	Closed	10/16/2014	10/26/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: various attached drawings. Sheet S1-2205 shows an upturned beam at GL 21. Due to a conflict with the internal bracing system please confirm it is acceptable to pour the upturned beam portion separately following the D221 pour with a horizontal cold joint between D221 and the upturned beam. Skanska's Anchor Bolt Layout Plan TG0702-070.4 sheet AB14 detail 18 shows the upturned beam column anchor bolts embedded 4'-0 1/2" into concrete. Detail 5 on S1-3621 shows the height of a typical upturned beam at 3'-3" above top of Lower Concourse concrete. This results in the anchor bolts being embedded through the upturned beam and the Lower Concourse. Please confirm it is acceptable to utilize couplers as seen in attached SKA to facilitate anchor bolt installation in this specified location.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed that it is acceptable to pour the upturned beam portion separately. 2) Confirmed that it is acceptable to use couplers to facilitate anchor bolt installation in this specific location.		
T-1824	SSS - Column Base Plate Grout Pads	Closed	10/16/2014	10/16/2014	10/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Skanska and their construction engineer, Hassett have evaluated several options for setting and securing the train box columns in position until the grouting operation has been complete. Based on Hassett's calculations the only feasible option to adequately stabilize the column is to utilize shim packs at each corner of the base plate. Due to the congestion of rebar at the base plate block-out, there is currently insufficient room to set shim packs on a flat surface, therefore Skanska propose to pour 10"x10" grout pads at each corner to achieve the required uniformed surface for shim packs, see attached SK-5.0 for clarification. Skanska propose to use TG07.2's Dayton Superior grout, previously approved in submittal TG0702-500.			SUGGESTION: Webcor expects Skanska to have these pads poured by early next week to allow the grout to be cured and achieve 8,000 PSI at 7 day break.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed procedure is acceptable in concept. Contractor and Sub-contractor, WOJV, Skanska and their construction engineer, shall confirm the grout pad is adequate for supporting the construction loads imposed and confirm that this meets all safety regulations. Reasons for RFI: Verification for issues on means and methods.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
T-1825	SSS - Connection Clarifications at Roof Level GL 27	Closed	10/17/2014	10/17/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 654 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 2:				1) Confirmed that it is acceptable as long as there is no added cost to TJPA.			
1) Since the PL 3" bend at Grid E.6 on Grid 30, the column will have to drop as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to drop the continuity plate as shown and moment weld the beam to the PL 3 1/2" or supply a new detail.				2) Confirmed that it is acceptable as long as there is no added cost to TJPA.			
2) Confirm the PL 3" per 8/S1-5020 is acceptable as shown on Grid 28.				Reason for RFI: Clarifications on issues of means and methods.			
T-1826	SSS - Fouling Stiffeners at East Zone Roof Level	Closed	10/20/2014	10/20/2014	11/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI # 659 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 5:				1) The double angle connections per 1/S1-5010 shall be made through the web stiffener plate at the beams noted in the RFI. Increase the height of the stiffener plates as required to match height of the connection angles.			
1) The web stiffener plates per 2/S1-5016 with revised length per ASI-127 will extend into the noted beam connections per 1/S1-5010. Please supply a new detail.				2) See response to 1).			
2) The web stiffener plates per 2/S1-5016 with revised length per ASI-127 will extend into the noted beam connections per 1/S1-5010. Please supply a new detail.				3) See response to 1).			
3) The web stiffener plates per 2/S1-5016 with revised length per ASI-127 will extend into the noted beam connections per 1/S1-5010. Please supply a new detail.				4) See response to 1).			
4) The web stiffener plates per 2/S1-5016 with revised length per ASI-127 will extend into the noted beam connections per 1/S1-5010. Please supply a new detail.				5) See response to 1).			
5) The web stiffener plates per 2/S1-5016 with revised length per ASI-127 will extend into the noted beam connections per 1/S1-5010. Please supply a new detail.				TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1927 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1826.1	SSS - Fouling Stiffeners at East Zone Roof Level	Closed	12/15/2014	12/25/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2606 Location: Zone 4, Roof Grid Line: E.6 & 31, Similar condition at GL 24.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1, RFI T-1826 Response Drawing S1-2606 shows a tapered girder (TPG1) connection near GL E.6 and 31. The web stiffeners at this location will foul additional beams as shown in SK1. Confirm the web stiffeners may be reduced by 2" as indicated by the dotted line to avoid fouling additional beams. This will also apply to Grid 24.9.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as No cost clarification.		
T-1826.2	SSS - Fouling Stiffeners at East Zone Roof Level	Closed	12/19/2014	12/29/2014	12/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2606 Location: Zone 4, Roof Grid Line: F & 31 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 659.1 SK1, RFI T-1826 Response, Response to Skanska Internal RFI 888.1A The response to RFI T-1826 provided clarification for web stiffener plates. This response reduced the clearance between the top and bottom edges of the deeper web stiffener plates and the flange to web welds of the Tapered Roof Girders. Per this response, the original 7/16" fillet weld will not work due to lack of clearance between the edge of the deeper stiffener plates and the flange to web weld of the tapered roof girder. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: In order to fit this weld, a 15 degree bevel would be required, effectively changing this weld to a PJP. Please see attached Weld Procedures.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the weld bevel and PJP weld in lieu of the 7/16" fillet weld is acceptable at the top and bottom edges of the web stiffener plate at the location highlighted in the RFI. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reason for request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as Other.		

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	S1-5010 does not provide a detail for a skewed double angle connection when the connection occurs on each side as details 7 & 8/S1-5010 are not symmetrical. Confirm the connection as shown is acceptable or supply a new detail.						
T-1834	SSS - Weld Detail Clarification at Ground Level Nodes	Closed	10/20/2014	10/20/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 662 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2 1) Confirm the effective weld size is 2" as shown and also confirm that the weld extension arrows hi-lited in red are not correct as those welds are 1/2" fillets per the hi-lited weld in detail 3. Please clarify the welding if this is not the intent. 2) Confirm all missing welds on drawing S1-4355 other than the welds noted in RFI T-1717 (SK 831, CD 619) may be taken from drawing S1-4351 or supply the missing welds.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					1). Confirmed that the weld is PJP weld with 2" bevel. Confirmed that the pointer highlighted in red is incorrect.		
					2) Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1931 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1835	BGP - Removal Sequence of Internal Bracing System Within Zone 4	Closed	10/21/2014	10/31/2014	10/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Further to last Monday's (10/13/14) meeting with TJPA, Arup, Turner and WOJV where the removal sequence of the internal bracing system within the Zone 4 East end Diaphragm was discussed, please confirm the following is acceptable:					TT's response:		
Remove the walers which are connected together in a sequence referred to as the observation method where one waler on the north and one on the south as well as the two cross lot struts attached to the walers would be de-stressed and removed at any one time. Once the first pair of cross lot struts have been de-stressed and removed and little or no movement has been recorded on the WOJV installed survey points or the Arup inclinometer's over the following 24 hours after de-stressing, the contractor can then proceed and begin de-stressing and removing the next pair of walers and struts to the east. This removal method would then be repeated until only four cross lot struts at that particular level remain; which are numbers ST-65 to 68.					The contractor shall submit necessary structural calculations in a Submittal to justify the proposed re-shoring procedure will not overload the train box structure, e.g., eliminating walers might cause the punching shear failure of the wall at the strut locations; it might also cause overstressing (in bending) of the train box wall.		
If acceptable, please specify 1) the movement tolerance for a given waler removed, 2) the observation period for analyzing movement, and 3) the acceptable means for monitoring for movement (survey, inclinometer, or both).					In addition, if any stress induced to a train box structure element as a permanent stress (e.g., vertical bending of the wall) that is additive to the stresses that the train box will experience during its service life (including effects of earthquakes), this stress shall be kept minimum (say not more than 10% of the capacity of the train box structure element).		
					Reason for RFI: Clarifications on means and methods issue.		
					Arup Response:		
					We take no exceptions.		
					The movement tolerances are those in the specifications.		
					We take no exceptions to the proposed monitoring duration.		
					Arup can produce manual inclinometer readings after each waler segment is distressed. Installation of targets on the inside face of the shoring wall and monitoring these targets during this activity is recommended.		
T-1835.1	BGP - Removal Sequence of Internal Bracing System Within Zone 4	Void	10/30/2014	11/09/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1932 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Further to last Monday's (10/13/14) meeting with TJPA, Arup, Turner and WOJV where the removal sequence of the internal bracing system within the Zone 4 East end Diaphragm was discussed, please confirm the following is acceptable:</p> <p>Sequence:</p> <p>1) Remove level C, B and A struts and walers from within the green clouded area up to GL- 32.2 once the the associated concrete slab or wall section has reached adequate strength and been rebraced.</p> <p>2) Remove level C, B and A struts and walers within the Blue clouded area STD-65 to 74, 82 & 83 once the the associated concrete slab or wall section has reached adequate strength and been rebraced.</p> <p>3) The sequence for de-stressing will be the diagonals struts should be all de-stressed prior to the 4 remaining cross lot struts (STD-65,66,67 & 68).</p> <p>Monitoring:</p> <p>Remove the walers sections (continuous waler is actually friction connected together) in a sequence referred to as the observation method where one waler on the north and one on the south as well as the two integral cross lot struts attached to the walers would be de-stressed and removed at any one time.</p> <p>Once the first pair of cross lot struts have been de-stressed and removed, the WOJV installed survey points (targets) on the inside face of the soldier beams of the CDSM shoring wall, the Global Analyzer and Arup inclinometers would measure internal bracing performance over the following 24 hours after de-stressing. If little or no movement has been recorded, the contractor can then proceed and begin de-stressing and removing the next pair of wailers and struts to the east. This removal method would then be repeated until only four cross lot struts at that particular level remain; which are numbers ST-65 to 68.</p> <p>Contract Specification 31-09-13 would be followed in case of movement, and the work would stop and the MRP Movement Review Panel would be convened.</p> <p>Please note the following:</p> <p>1) The east end rebracing sequence indicated in this RFI is the same rebracing sequence that has previously been</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1933 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>implemented in Zone 4 for Level D bracing removal as described in RFI T 1558.</p> <p>2) The east end rebracing sequence is also the sequence performed successfully in west end of the transit center excavation Zone 1.</p> <p>3) The east end rebracing will have raker bracing similar to the west end, the east end does again have additional reinforcing bar in structural concrete walls where rebracing rakers are supported per details on sheet SH-5301 in Submittal TG0300-553.</p> <p>4) The east end rebracing cross-lot or perpendicular sections are in accordance with submittal TG0300-553 and as has previously and successfully re-braced in zones 1, 2, and 3.</p> <p>If acceptable, please specify 1) the movement tolerance for a given waler removed, 2) the observation period for analyzing movement, and 3) the acceptable means for monitoring for movement (survey, inclinometer, or both).</p>						
T-1835.2	BGP - Removal Sequence of Internal Bracing System Within Zone 4	Closed	10/31/2014	11/10/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titcher	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Sequence:		Arup's response:					
1) Remove level A, B, and C struts and walers (two struts at a time, following discussion present in "monitoring" section below) area up to gridline 31.2 once the concrete has reached adequate strength.		We take no exceptions.					
2) Remove level A, B, and C struts within area (ST-65 to 74, 82, and 83) and all corresponding walers. once the concrete has reached adequate strength. The diagonal struts should all be de-stressed prior to the four remaining cross lot struts (ST 65, 66, 67, and 68).		The movement tolerances are those in the specifications.					
Monitoring:		We take no exceptions to the proposed monitoring duration.					
Remove the walers sections (continuous waler is actually friction connected together) in a sequence referred to as the observation method where one waler on the north and one on the south as well as the two integral cross lot struts		Arup can produce manual inclinometer readings after each waler segment is distressed. Installation of targets on the inside face of the shoring wall and monitoring these targets during this activity is recommended.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>attached to the walers would be de-stressed and removed at any one time.</p> <p>Once the first pair of cross lot struts have been de-stressed and removed, the WOJV installed survey points (targets) on the inside face of the soldier beams of the CDSM shoring wall, the Global Analyzer and Arup inclinometers would measure internal bracing performance over the following 24 hours after de-stressing. If little or no movement has been recorded, the contractor can then proceed and begin de-stressing and removing the next pair of wailers and struts to the east. Contract Specification 31-09-13 would be followed in case of movement, and the work would stop and the MRP Movement Review Panel would be convened.</p> <p>Please note the following:</p> <p>1) The east end rebracing sequence indicated in this RFI is the same rebracing sequence that has previously been implemented in Zone 4 for Level D bracing removal as described in RFI T 1558.</p> <p>2) The east end rebracing sequence is also the sequence performed successfully in west end of the transit center excavation Zone 1.</p> <p>3) The east end rebracing will have raker bracing similar to the west end, the east end does again have additional reinforcing bar in structural concrete walls where rebracing rakers are supported per details on sheet SH-5301 in Submittal TG0300-553.</p> <p>4) The east end rebracing cross-lot or perpendicular sections are in accordance with submittal TG0300-553 and as has previously and successfully re-braced in zones 1, 2, and 3.</p> <p>If acceptable, please specify 1) the movement tolerance for a given waler removed, 2) the observation period for analyzing movement, and 3) the acceptable means for monitoring for movement (survey, inclinometer, or both).</p>						
T-1837	SSS - Cast Node Repair LAST Temperature	Void	10/21/2014	10/21/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Galoyan					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1935 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>The AWS D1.8 Structural Welding Code - Seismic Supplement, and the Contract specifications, require that either:</p> <p>1) Each lot of weld electrodes (filler metals) used to make demand critical welds (DCW) must be tested in accordance with AWS D1.8 Annex A</p> <p>2) Filler metals may be exempt from individual lot testing, provided the electrode manufacture perform three (3) separate lot tests in accordance with Section 6.3.8.1</p> <p>Additionally, the testing specified shall be not less than the Lowest Anticipated Service Temperature (L.A.S.T.) plus 20 degrees F (AWS D1.8 Section 6.3.6).</p> <p>Bradken has made repairs to the ground node castings utilizing Hobart Brothers weld electrode in one, or both, types, of TM-771 and FabCO RXR (data and test reports attached). The weld repair(s) were not considered DCW welds, and were made in accordance with an approved repair procedure in conformance to the contract specifications.</p> <p>The attachment of the Ground Node to the Transfer Girder is specified in the drawing at the girder flange/web to casting interface to be a DCW. The required weld will intersect with this previously repaired weld metal. The Fabricator has qualified a welding procedure for the specified base metal combination (ASTM A572-50 to ASTM A216WCC). It is the understanding of the Code that this additional weld filler metal of the casting repair to be included in the final girder to casting weld must comply with the AWS D1.8 Seismic requirements in order to be in conformance to the Code provisions.</p> <p>The manufacturer has lot tested three (3) individual lots for each respective type in accordance with the AWS D1.8 requirements. (documents attached). However, the testing temperature was 70 degrees F, not at the Contract required L.A.S.T. of 25 degrees F plus 20 degrees F (45 degrees F).</p> <p>Please confirm that the three (3) ASW D1.8 Lot Tests for the TM-771 and the FabCO RXR weld electrode performed at a L.A.S.T. temperature of 70 degrees F, in lieu of the required 45 degree F, for the weld repair are acceptable:</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1936 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	1) Specifically to Ground Cast Node 5-02 And 2) To any future repairs in the DCW weld zone of the ground cast nodes						
T-1837.1	SSS - Cast Node Repair LAST Temperature	Closed	10/22/2014	11/01/2014	10/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisJim Bowers							
REQUEST: The AWS D1.8 Structural Welding Code - Seismic Supplement, and the Contract specifications, require that either: 1) Each lot of weld electrodes (filler metals) used to make demand critical welds (DCW) must be tested in accordance with AWS D1.8 Annex A 2) Filler metals may be exempt from individual lot testing, provided the electrode manufacture perform three (3) separate lot tests in accordance with Section 6.3.8.1 Additionally, the testing specified shall be not less than the Lowest Anticipated Service Temperature (L.A.S.T.) plus 20 degrees F (AWS D1.8 Section 6.3.6). Bradken has made repairs to the ground node castings utilizing Hobart Brothers weld electrode in one, or both, types, of TM-771 and FabCO RXR (data and test reports attached). The weld repair(s) were not considered DCW welds, and were made in accordance with an approved repair procedure in conformance to the contract specifications. The attachment of the Ground Node to the Transfer Girder is specified in the drawing at the girder flange/web to casting interface to be a DCW. The required weld will intersect with this previously repaired weld metal. The Fabricator has qualified a welding procedure for the specified base metal combination (ASTM A572-50 to ASTM A216WCC). It is the understanding of the Code that this		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Based on the data provided by W/O to date (see the attached), it appears that they will meet AWS D1.8 requirement. However it is contractor's responsibility to obtain the complete test data to confirm. Since the data was originally requested by OIW, it is their own risk if they decide to proceed without the complete data. 2). The CVN test requirement specified in the contract document may not be altered. Carlos de Oliveira 10/22/2014 RESPONSE: Section A3.3 of AISC 341 stipulates a minimum CVN of 20 ft-lb at 70 °F for base metals of heavy sections of structural steel in the SFRS. Note that the casting specification for the Transbay project requires the castings to exhibit a minimum CVN toughness of 25 ft-lb conducted at 70 °F, which exceeds the aforementioned requirements of the code. AISC 341 also stipulates CVN requirements for weld filler metals. The code requirements for the CVN of base metals is less stringent than the code requirements for weld filler metals. This is due to the fact that weld metal is less ductile than rolled (or cast) steel base metal and because welds have significant residual stresses locked into them during welding.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>additional weld filler metal of the casting repair to be included in the final girder to casting weld must comply with the AWS D1.8 Seismic requirements in order to be in conformance to the Code provisions.</p> <p>The manufacturer has lot tested three (3) individual lots for each respective type in accordance with the AWS D1.8 requirements. (documents attached). However, the testing temperature was 70 degrees F, not at the Contract required L.A.S.T. of 25 degrees F plus 20 degrees F (45 degrees F).</p> <p>Please confirm that the three (3) ASW D1.8 Lot Tests for the TM-771 and the FabCO RXR weld electrode performed at a L.A.S.T. temperature of 70 degrees F, in lieu of the required 45 degree F, for the weld repair are acceptable:</p> <p>1) Specifically to Ground Cast Node 5-02 And 2) To any future repairs in the DCW weld zone of the ground cast nodes</p>						
T-1837.2	SSS - Cast Node Repair LAST Temperature	Closed	10/31/2014	11/10/2014	11/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The AWS D1.8 Structural Welding Code - Seismic Supplement, and the Contract specifications, require that either: 1) Each lot of weld electrodes (filler metals) used to make demand critical welds (DCW) must be tested in accordance with AWS D1.8 Annex A 2) Filler metals may be exempt from individual lot testing, provided the electrode manufacturer perform three (3) separate lot tests in accordance with Section 6.3.8.1 Additionally, the testing specified shall be not more than the Lowest Anticipated Service Temperature (L.A.S.T.) plus 20 degrees F (AWS D1.8 Section 6.3.6).		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				1) Confirmed that AWS D1.8 lot tests for TM-771 weld electrode performed for Cast Node 5-02 is acceptable.			
				2). TM-711 weld electrode is acceptable to any future repairs; but complying to AWS D1.8 CVN requirements is not required for cast node repair.			
				Reason for RFI: Shown in contract documents.			
				Carlos de Oliveira 10/31/2014 RESPONSE: See attached document for response.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Bradken has made repairs to the ground node casting 5-02 utilizing Hobart Brothers weld electrode in TM-771 (data and test reports attached). The weld repair(s) were not considered DCW welds, and were made in accordance with an approved repair procedure in conformance to the contract specifications.</p> <p>The attachment of the Ground Node to the Transfer Girder is specified in the drawing at the girder flange/web to casting interface to be a DCW. The required weld will intersect with this previously repaired weld metal. The Fabricator has qualified a welding procedure for the specified base metal combination (ASTM A572-50 to ASTM A216WCC). It is the understanding of the Code that this additional weld filler metal of the casting repair to be included in the final girder to casting weld must comply with the AWS D1.8 Seismic requirements in order to be in conformance to the Code provisions.</p> <p>The manufacturer has lot tested three (3) individual lots of TM-771 in accordance with the AWS D1.8 requirements. (documents attached). In addition to the test results provided at 70 degrees F, Hobart has provided additional test data from three (3) lots at 0 degrees F. These additional test results exceed the contract required L.A.S.T. of 25 degrees F plus 20 degrees F (45 degrees F).</p> <p>Please confirm that the three (3) ASW D1.8 Lot Tests for the TM-771 weld electrode performed at a L.A.S.T. temperature of 0 degrees F for the weld repair are acceptable:</p> <p>1) Specifically to Ground Cast Node 5-02 And 2) To any future repairs in the DCW weld zone of the ground cast nodes</p> <p>Note: Additional test results for Fabco RXR weld electrodes will be provided when they are available.</p>						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1838	SCS - 4th Lift Foundation Wall - Moment Frame Beam Alignment	Closed	10/22/2014	11/01/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: See attached sketch. This RFI is related to RFI T-1467.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Ground level moment frame beams tie into the foundation wall. Due to level shoring towers, the moment frame beams will be step in elevation. The level moment frame beams will be interfacing with the sloped 4th lift foundation wall causing issues in alignment and constructability in the remaining foundation wall. SCCI proposes to have the top of 4th lift be 3'-11" below top of slab. This method will clear the alignment issues, provide a starter wall edge and will result in a 1"±1/4" encroachment of 4th lift wall into the moment frame beam.					The proposed encroachment is acceptable provided that:		
Please confirm it is acceptable for the 4th lift encroach into the moment frame beam by 1"± 1/4"					1. The specified placement elevation of intersecting reinforcing is not affected.		
					2. In the event of a wall overpour, all wall concrete interfering with the specified placement of intersecting reinforcing will be removed.		
					3. In order to meet the intent of contract specified clear cover (to intersecting reinforcing), the encroaching wall lip within the projection of intersecting framing shall have a roughened chamfer bushed down to the soffit of the intersecting framing.		
T-1839	SCS - Roof Top Bracket Attachment at Protected Zone	Closed	10/22/2014	11/01/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: SI-4205 Detail I EBF LINK BEAM DETAIL Note, "Welded, bolted, screwed or shot-in attachments for perimeter edge angles exterior facades, Partitions, duct work, piping or other construction shall not be placed within protected zone.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Acceptable		
Please confirm that it is acceptable to use Dayton C68-TY-Down Hanger's hooked to the back of the EFB link beam at the protected zone. This would provide an attachment point for temporary access Dayton C49 brackets. Once the deck and wall are poured the attachment coil rod will be removed and the C68 will remain in the concrete hooked to the EFB link beam.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-1840	BGP - Area 11-16 HRC 555 T-Head Lieu of Standard Hooks In EW Beams	Closed	10/22/2014	11/01/2014	10/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1940 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Please confirm it is acceptable to substitute HRC-555 T-Heads in lieu of standard hooks at 4-ft deep East-West Beams where they frame into Moment Frame Beams in Areas 11-16. Please reference the attached drawing for example.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
						1. HRC 555 T-Heads may be used for beam long bottom bar end conditions in lieu of hooks where beam long bottom bars are placed above the bottom bars of the supporting member.	
						2. HRC 555 T-Heads shall be staggered.	
						3. HRC 555 T-Head bars may be spliced to beam long bottom bars where the detailer has verified, on a case by case basis, that the resulting clear spacing does violate ACI clear spacing requirements and does not hinder concrete placement and consolidation. In this determination, consideration shall be given to the presence of beam short bottom bars. As a reduction in clear spacing will occur with the introduction of splices, the detailer will verify the clear spacing and determine the appropriate splice category per Detail 1/S3001.	
						4. Splices, when used, shall begin at the face of the supporting member.	
						5. Splices, when used, shall be alternated in single spans.	
						6. Splices shall not be used in continuous spans.	
						7. Splices shall not be used that overlap bundled bars.	
						8. RFI response may be used in beams other than 48" deep beams.	
						9. Contractor is responsible for evaluation and the selective implementation of the proposal for conformance with ACI and contract document clear spacing and lap requirements.	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1841	SST - Stair 304 Clarifications	Closed	10/28/2014	10/28/2014	11/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Q1: At the second level final landing, the stair stringers are to be supported per connection 3/S1-7601. There is no supporting beam on plan. Please clarify missing information for beam size. Q2: There is a stair landing elevation discrepancy: A/7007, 1/A1-7506 show the stair landing elevation at 39'-9. This will put the missing beam noted in Q1 at elevation EL. 39'-8 3/4" for the required 1/4" landing plate shown in the detail. 3/S1-7006 shows the stair landing at top of slab 39'-4 1/2" and a landing support 7 1/2" below at EL. 38'-9. Please clarify missing beam elevation. Q3: The architectural detail 1/A1-7506 and structural detail 3/S1-7601 show completely different support details. Please clarify which of the architectural or structural stair support details should take precedence -typical for all stairs.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The stair stringers shall be bent stringers and shall be welded to the bent plate at the south edge of the opening on 2nd floor level. Stair landing shall be supported on the flat portion of the bent stringers with connection between plate and stringers similar to detail 4/S1-7601. At the east stringer, the flat portion of the stringer shall be a C10x30 channel as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0427. Also, see responses to RFIs T-1266, T-1266.1 and T-1266.2. 2) Stair support beam is not missing. See response to 1). 3) Detail 3/S1-7601 governs over 1/A1-7506 at ST304 with the exception that the 1/2" plate at the end of the stringer shall be welded to the bent plate. Typically architectural drawings refer to structural drawings for stringer support details and in such cases structural details shall govern. The Architectural detail has been revised to match structural detail sketch SKS-0427, see attaches SKA-4296 & SKA-4297.	
T-1842	SST - Stair Stringer to Landing Beam Conn at the Offset WT	Closed	10/28/2014	11/07/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: (comments are revised in blue on attached sketch) Channel end plates are usually flush with the back and the tow of the channel. Olson has projected the end plate 1/2" past on both sides for welding to the supporting WT. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI's Response: The plate cannot project into the stair tread clearance because it would cause a tripping hazard. There is no issue with the plate projecting outward at the Toe of the Channel. TT's Response: Welding the end plate to the WT from back side as shown on SK-RFI2 in the RFI is acceptable.	
T-1843	SST - Edge of Slab for Stair Opening at Stair 403	Closed	10/28/2014	11/07/2014	11/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Q1: Stair 403 design is setup for 5'-6 stair clearances at ascending and descending flights and a 9 1/2" guardrail clearance. This creates a total wall to wall clearance of 11'-9 1/2". The slab opening at the concourse level in the north to south direction is currently at 12'-0 1/2". But the opening must be 12'-1 1/2" for the required clearances. See attached sketches for layout information. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See detail 1 & 5 on A1-7011 and stair section c/A1-7111 . Detail 1 shows the plan layout for stair 403 rising from Train platform level to Lower concourse level. It notes a 5'-6" stair flight width with a 7" guardrail clearance, totaling 11'-7" wall clearance. This 11'-7" wall clearance is carried through the Lower Concourse slab. The south flight face of wall dimension from Grid line E is 6'-0", the south edge of slab opening at the lower concourse level is 6'-1" from gridline E. The North Stair flight only shifts to the north 2-1/2" above the Lower concourse level slab. In summary, the central guardrail clearance from train Platform Level to Lower Concourse Level is 7" and from Lower Concourse Level to Ground is 9-1/2". There is no conflict with the Architectural Documents and revision to the slab edge opening is not required.	
T-1844	SST - Checkered Plate Stair Tread Clearance	Closed	10/28/2014	10/28/2014	10/30/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Q1: Architectural design for the setup of checkered plate treads shows the vertical bent lip fitting up tight with the bottom of tread's riser. As illustrated in the attached sketch, the vertical bend of the lip creates a natural radius that will clash with the riser if you were to create this tight fit. Please advise if it's acceptable to back-off the riser portion of the tread by 3/8" to create a gap that clears the lip radius.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. 3/8" gap is acceptable as shown on the sketch.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1943 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1845	SST - Floating Stair Connection Issue at Stair 401	Closed	10/28/2014	11/07/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel Avel Solomon							
REQUEST: Q1: Per the stair layout dimensions provided on 2/A1-7012, stair 401 nosing location at landing elevation 39'-9 will go 7" past the supporting column and beam per 3/S1-7009. As a result, the designed conneciton called out 10/S1-7601 will not work. The cantilevered beam has no purpose in this scenario. Please see included sketch and advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			AAI's Response: A sacrificial gage plate should not be required at this location, if the stair stringer extend to the back of landing kick plate return. TT's Response: The cantilevered portion of the W10x22 beam shall be waived. The slip connection at the base of the stringer per 10/S1-7601 shall be provided at the W10 beam perpendicular to the stringer with the 3/4" dia. bolt attached to beam flange. TT: We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				
<hr/>							
T-1846	SST - Cantilevered Support Beam Length at Stair 403	Closed	10/28/2014	10/28/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel Avel Solomon							
REQUEST: Q1: PER STAIR SETUP DIMENSION ON 5/A1-7011, THERE IS A 2'-4 OFFSET BETWEEN LANDING SUPPORT BEAM AND FIRST TREAD. THIS CREATES THE NEED FOR A 2'-10½ CANTILEVERED BEAM. 10/S1-7601 SPECIFIES 2'-0 MAX . PLEASE ADVISE SEE INCLUDED LAYOUT FOR MORE INFORMATION.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			The 2' max length requirement of the cantilevered W10x22 beam may be waived at the location highlighted in the RFI. A 2'-10 1/2" long W10x22 cantilevered beam is acceptable.				
<hr/>							
T-1847	SST - Ground Level Stair Landing at Curb & Built Up Slab	Closed	10/28/2014	11/07/2014	11/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel Avel Solomon							
REQUEST: Q1: PER S1-2204, THERE ARE B8 (36" DEEP) CONCRETE BEAMS AT THE NORTH AND SOUTH SIDES OF THE STAIR 403 LOWER CONCOURSE OPENING. THEN THERE IS A B4 (30" DEEP) CONCRETE BEAM AT THE EAST OPENING. THIS			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Connect the HSS post to the B8 concrete beam per attached sketch SKS-0426. Note that dimensions to locate HSS posts shown in the RFI are not correct and were removed from 3/S1-7011 in ASI 127. Refer to 5/A1-7011 for HSS post locations. Also, reference to				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1944 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1848	SST - Missing Landing Information at Stair 501	Closed	10/28/2014	11/07/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel Avel Solomon			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Q1: STRUCTURAL FRAMING SUPPORT PLANS ARE MISSING FOR LANDINGS AT -3'-1 AND +1'-7 -PLEASE FURNISH THIS MISSING INFORMATION. Q2: VERIFY LANDING AT EL. -11'-9 IS TRUE TO AGREE WITH ARCHITECTURAL ELEVATIONS. 4/S1-7016 CALLS THIS LANDING OUT AT -11'-9 1/8".			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) See attached sketch SKS-0431 showing the support framing for landings at EL -3'-1" and +1'-7". 2) T/landing (EL -11'-9") per architectural drawing governs.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1946 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div>Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel</div><div>Avel Solomon</div></div>							
<div>REQUEST:<div>1) There does not appear to be any specific detailing that allows for transverse drift to occur, without inducing loads in the stairs themselves. Is there an expectation that the stairs can handle this displacement-induced load demand? 2) We would like to modify the base detail of the typical stairs in order to add a second base plate with a horizontal slot in the transverse direction, in order to accommodate transverse drift without inducing load on the stairs. Do you have any issues or concerns with that? 3) We would like to ensure that there are adequate seismic gaps at the perimeter of the stair framing, in order to avoid inducing any horizontal seismic loading on the building framing members at the stair perimeter. In the process of accomplishing this, we may need to reduce slightly the overall widths or lengths of the stairs themselves ¿ possibly by one or several inches. Are there any specific reasons that this could not be done? Would this be acceptable to the design team? 4) We will list the vertical and horizontal stair reactions at the perimeter of the stair framing. Do you have any specific format that we should attempt to use for this effort? 5) We understand that the review of the stair drawings and calculations will not proceed through the City and County of San Francisco, but instead has been delegated to the design team. Is this correct? Please elaborate. 6) Please let us know the best persons to coordinate our efforts with, both at Thornton Tomasetti and at Pelli Clarke Pelli Architects.</div></div>		<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>1. The subcontractor shall design and detail the stair framing in accordance with the seismic design criteria specified in the General Note CD-6.</div> <div>2. See the response #1.</div> <div>3. Widths and lengths of the stairs cannot be reduced because their egress capacity is fixed to the given dimensions.</div> <div>4. The reactions shall be tabulated in sufficient clarity that can be understood by the EOR without further back and forth clarification. Each load case and load combination shall be clearly identified.</div> <div>5. Your statement is not correct. The Contractor shall obtain all approvals required by the Authorities Having Jurisdiction for the work designed and engineered by the Contractor. Contractor should contact TJPA and Authority Having Jurisdiction to determine what is required related to approvals by the Authorities Having Jurisdiction (Permitting Authorities). See Contract Document specifications for shop drawing submittal requirements. Design Team will NOT be performing a Peer Review or replacing the responsibilities of the Authorities Having Jurisdiction.</div> <div>6. If W/O agrees, the Design Team - TJPA Representatives may participate in the coordination sessions. However, the communication between Subcontractor and the Design Team - TJPA Representatives must be through General Contractor.</div>				
T-1849.1	SST - Coffman Engineers Stair Design Questions for SEOR	Closed	11/17/2014	11/27/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Edmond Sum		
<div>Co-Author:</div>							
<div>REQUEST:<div>The response to item #5 on RFI T-1849 is incomplete. As the TJPA is the Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) for the remaining code permissions, please confirm they will be providing the required permits and reviews for the stair</div></div>		<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>The response to RFI T-1849 is complete; RFI T-1849.1 is administrative. Refer to Contract Specification 01 14 10 and 01 14 10 APA regarding permitting. The TJPA may designate the City and</div>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	package shop drawings (TG07.5). If this is not the case, please confirm that no permit is required.						
	other qualified professionals for review of submittals. Provide complete calculations and shop drawings for review and approval; coordinate submittal submission with TJPA designated representative.						
T-1850	BGP - Sleeve Penetrations Below Bicycle/Vehicle Ramp	Closed	10/28/2014	11/07/2014	11/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titchie To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Per coordination meeting held on 10/9/14 between WOJV and the Design Team regarding sheet A1-7401 and utility sleeve changes under bicycle/vehicle ramps issued in ASI 127, please issue revised architectural layout and structural sketches detailing conduit penetrations under the bicycle/vehicle ramp.	SUGGESTION:				ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
						Refer to the attached sketches SKA-4289, SKA-4290, SKA-4291 for updated Architectural layout and SKS-0425 for Structural detail at foundation wall of Sleeve Penetrations below Bicycle and Vehicle Ramp.	
T-1851	SSS - Crash Rail Stiffener Plate Location	Closed	10/29/2014	11/08/2014	11/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: Confirm the vertical stiffener can remain in the same location with the concrete crash rail per ASI-127 as it was in the steel crash rail in F.O. 027. If not, provide the location.	SUGGESTION:				ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
						Confirmed that no change is required at the location of the vertical stiffener.	
						TT: We agree with the reason for request verification. We categorize this RFI as called out in contract documents.	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1852	SSS - Field Welds at Light Column	Closed	10/29/2014	11/08/2014	11/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Details 3-7/S1-6005 show connection lug plates field welded to base plates after field survey. Welding plates this size in position is not practical. Please confirm these welds can be carried out in the shop. We consider this a contractor's option.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The direction to weld on site after field survey was intended to allow for construction tolerance adjustments. It is acceptable to carry out these welds in the shop. Precise fit of pin through lug plates must be ensured.			
T-1852.1	SSS - Shim Plates at Light Column Interface	Closed	03/10/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-6005 Location: Roof Level Gridlines: 23 and E Add'l Doc Ref's: SK RFI 1049 SK1 Following response to RFI T-1852, the lugs plates at the interface between the light column structure and the tapered roof girders along gridline 23 and the W30X173 along gridline E will be field welded. To allow for adjustment in the horizontal plane, please confirm the option to include shims up to 3/4" (max shim pack thickness) between the girder/beam end plates and the connection lug base plate. Please refer to SK RFI 1049 SK1 for illustration.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The design of the connection does not allow for shim plates due to the high loads that are transferred from the Roof Park Level. As per drawing S1-6005, fabrication of lug plates is to be completed after survey on site. To accommodate 2 inch erection tolerance sideways, room for adjustment has been left on the connection plate on each side of the lug plates.			
T-1853	SSS - PE502 & PE503 Beam Flange Removal	Closed	10/29/2014	11/08/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 661 SK1: The flanges at the noted W6x25's will be removed full length per 3/S1-7630 due to their limited length. Confirm that is the intent.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. TT: We agree with the reason for request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as Called out in contract documents.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1949 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1854	SCS - Roof Top Pole Foundation Bolted Connection	Closed	10/29/2014	11/08/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: S1-3281 Detail 4 Roof park security pole and mast light foundation is anchored using bolts going through an angle iron and metal deck. For constructability reasons it is essential that access remains open on the roof top for operations needing crane and man lift support. Please confirm that it is acceptable for Shimmick to place the anchor bolts through the deck after the concrete deck placement and not before the concrete is placed resulting in access obstructions.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Confirmed. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-1855	BGP - Lower Concourse GL16 Escalator Opening As-Built Locations	Closed	10/29/2014	11/08/2014	10/31/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please see the attached surveyed As-Built Locations of the Escalator Blockouts at GL 16. As shown the thinner portion of the Escalator BO at GL 16/C is shifted approximately 4 1/2" South of the planned location(centered on larger portion of BO). Similarly, the thinner portion of the Escalator BO at GL 16/G is shifted approximately 5 5/8" North of its planned location. Please confirm the As-Built locations are acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: The as-built escalator slab edge locations, described in this RFI, are not acceptable. Remedial action is required to rectify slab edge to the designed location. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-1856	BGP - Knee Wall Mix Design	Closed	10/29/2014	11/08/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please confirm the following questions for the stem walls with elevated slabs:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: TT response to Item 1: Confirmed. It is acceptable to use Cemex mix design Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1950 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>1. It is acceptable to use Cemex mix design # 1558218, per submittal TG0600-204, when pouring the stem walls with elevated slabs. Reference RFI T-1394 - Sketch SKK-0353. Both RFI T-1394 - Sketch SKK.-0353 and submittal TG0600-204 are attached.</p> <p>2. Due to finish wall being concealed from view, please confirm the walls can remain unfinished.</p>		#1558218.				
			AAI response to Item 2:				
			Confirmed. The knee walls are inboard of the future platform walls and below the platform level and will eventually be concealed, therefore the walls can remain unfinished.				
T-1856.1	SCS - Knee Wall Finish	Void	11/14/2014	11/24/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Per RFI T-1856 response question #2 was not answered:							
Due to finish knee wall being concealed from view, please confirm it is acceptable the walls remain unfinished (not sacked & patched after stripping).							
T-1857	SCS - Roof Top Perimeter Wall Finish Requirements	Closed	10/29/2014	11/08/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Per the meeting with WOJV and Designers on 10/15/14 regarding changes to the roof perimeter wall in ASI 124 and RFI T-1793 response, Shimmick was to receive the new finish requirements for the exterior face of the wall and a delineation line for the new finish requirements. Shimmick has not received this information yet. Please provide.		The Roof Park perimeter concrete wall shall be finished per revised specification Section 03 30 02 paragraph 3.6 H (enclosed). Additionally, the wall will receive an elastomeric coating specified in Division 09. Refer to enclosed SKA-4265R for extent of concrete finish specified on Section 03 30 02 3.6 H and extent of concrete coating.					
T-1858	SCS - Opening blockouts through Ground Level	Closed	10/30/2014	11/09/2014	11/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang

REQUEST:

Due to the North to South shoring along the Lower Concourse Level, the concrete partition walls cannot be built until the Ground Level is poured and struts have been removed.

Since the Ground Level will be completed before the partition walls are built, SCCI proposes installing blockouts in the Ground Level above the walls in order to complete the concrete pours and vibrate for the partition walls in GL 10 to GL 13.

The blockouts will be 8" diameter circle, the rebar detail will be the one shown at 9/S1-5003. The blockouts will not be farther than 5' O.C. or closer than 2' 6" O.C. See the attached drawing for blockouts layout.

Please confirm this is acceptable.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

TT response:

In concept, blockouts in formed concrete and fill-on-metal-deck are acceptable for the purpose of pouring partition walls. Please provide specific details for each case for design team to review. The referenced Detail 9/S1-5003 is not applicable to formed concrete and does not meet requirements stated below.

Structural Requirements for Formed Concrete:

- Blockouts shall only be made in concrete slabs and not in beams.
- The pourback shall be secured to the blockout.
- Pourback shall not impinge on 1 1/2" minimum clear gap between soffit and top of partition.
- Blockout shall not be larger than reinforcing spacing.
- Reinforcing shall not be cut.

Structural Requirements or Fill on Metal Deck:

- Blockouts shall permit patching of metal deck prior to pourback with same gage sheet metal or matching metal deck.
- Reinforcing shall not be relocated or cut.

Details shall address waterproofing of cold joint in penetrations located outside of building envelope.

AAI response:

Further to TT's response, WOJV have indicated that the slab penetrations will be poured back before the slab is waterproofed.

Contractor to clarify and describe how 1 1/2" minimum clear gap between soffit and top of partition will be maintained during pour and firestopped after.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1952 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1859	SCS - Vertical Trim Bar Termination	Closed	10/30/2014	11/09/2014	11/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Please reference drawing 4/S1-3207, RFI T-1666, RFI T-1698 and see attached spreadsheet listing out the length of trim bar to be embedded into poured spans of 3rd lift for relevant openings. The foundation wall penetration detail 4/S1-3207 requires vertical trim bar of LTS + W above and below the opening. RFI T-1666 and RFI T-1695 responses have noted that a hook or head may be used to terminate trim bars where bar length exceeds height of wall. However the third lift will require embedded trim bars for all foundation wall openings where this detail is applied. seer proposes to terminate trim bars with hooks at the bottom of the 4th lift, similar to RFI T- 1666's response for the top of wall. Please confirm if terminating trim bars with hooks at the bottom of the 4th lift is acceptable or provide parameters for cases where this would be acceptable.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal is not acceptable. The contractor shall coordinate between packages and provide trim reinforcing in the third lift where it is required. For locations where the contract reinforcing was not provided in the poured third lift (various locations between Grids 6 and 18 as stated in the RFI attachment), resolution will occur through the NCR process.	
<hr/>							
T-1860	SSS - WS09 Approval Comment Clarification at GL 4	Closed	10/31/2014	10/31/2014	11/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 650 SK1: The connection as shown conforms to the requirements of 2/S1-5010 and the request for an additional bolt is not possible as shown in the snapshot. Please supply a new detail if the intent is to revise this connection.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide (8) A325-X bolts with 2 vertical columns of 4 bolts each. Horizontal spacing between bolts shall be 3". All other connection details shall be per 2/S1-5011. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.	
<hr/>							
T-1861	SSS - PE503 Fouling Brace at Bus Deck Slab Opening	Closed	10/31/2014	11/10/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>See attached CD RFI # 668 SK1: The brace per 1/S1-7600 fouls the slab opening. Please confirm that is acceptable or provide a solution.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>AAI: The Brace cannot foul the slab opening.</p> <p>TT: The brace can be waived at this location. In lieu of the brace, provide a full depth stiffener detailed similarly to the full depth stiffener on the other side of the beam as shown in detail 1/S1-7600.</p> <p>TT: We disagree with the reason for RFI request "Engineering Conflict". We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.</p>				
T-1862	SSS - PE503 Fouling Brace at Roof Level Slab Opening	Closed	10/31/2014	11/10/2014	11/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p>		<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>See attached CD RFI # 669 SK1: The brace per 1/S1-7600 fouls the slab opening. Please confirm that is acceptable or provide a solution.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The brace can be waived at this location.</p> <p>TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1954 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1863	SSS - E510, E511, & E512 Missing Slab Information	Closed	10/31/2014	11/10/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 673 SK1 for items 1 to 4: 1) The model and drawings match the elevation shown on S1-2305 which shows T/SLAB 12.73'. Confirm the TOC 12.58' shown on A1-2865 is correct and the model/drawings are to be revised. 2) Confirm the loose 1/4" bent plate over the beams is an acceptable edge between the knock-out and permanent slab since a structural detail is not provided. 3) Detail 6/S1-5004 noted on S1-2305 does not address the knock-out slab condition at a dropped slab condition as occurs here. Provide a detail showing the edge of slab requirements at both the top and bottom slabs. 4) Supply a detail showing the edge of slab requirement for the low slab.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Acceptable, except tack weld the ¼" bent plate to the two W16 beams. Also, the edge bent plate (A8525 in the submittal) shall be welded to the W36x160 beam (north of member A6674) and not to the W16 beam (A7949). This also applies to the bent plate at the south side of the escalator pit. Welding the edge bent plate to the W16 beam will make it difficult to remove the W16 beam for a future opening. 3) Provide slab edge details per typical detail 8/S1-5000 at the high and low slabs. For escalator pit at E510, E511, & E512, the north and south pit walls will be constructed with a bent metal plate. Refer to SKA-4294 & SKA-4295 and RFI TG7.3-065 response. 4) See response to 3).		
<hr/>							
T-1863.1	SSS - E510, E511, & E512 Inadequate Slab Information	Closed	03/20/2015		04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 8/S1-5000, 3/S1-7661, 2/S1-7661 Location: Ground Level, Zone 3 Gridline: 21-22, D.8- E.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 673.1 SK1 This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1863 (SK 906, CD 673) See attached CD RFI # 673.1 SK1 for items 1 to 4: 1) RFI T-1863 (SK 906, CD 673) requested edge plate per 8/S1-5000 and Package Number: TG0701-93.1 drawing 6664 notes that the edge plate is to be removed. Which information is current? 2) Package Number: TG0701-93.1 drawing 6685 notes that the edge plate detail is to be per 3/S1-7661. Confirm this is correct as this information was not noted in RFI T-1863 (SK 906, CD 673) and is not shown on the latest structural drawings. 3) Package Number: TG0701-93.1 drawing 6685 requests that detail 2/S1-7661 (similar) is to be applied here but			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Along the north, south and west escalator pit edges where the high slab is a knock-out slab, edge plate details as shown in the submittal and per response RFI T-1863 are acceptable. Review comments on members 6664, 7948 and 7949 shall be ignored. However, along the east edge of the pit, edge angle per 3/S1-7661 is required for escalator support. 2) Confirmed. See response to 1). 3) Edge plate on 6869 shall be removed and concrete wall detail with a WT support per 2/S1-7661 shall be provided per submittal review comment. 4) See response to 1). Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1864	drawing 6869 does not instruct us to remove the edge plate on the low beam. Please clarify what the intent is. 4) RFI T-1863 (SK 906, CD 673) requested edge plate per 8/S1-5000 and Package Number: TG0701-93.1 drawings 7948 & 7949 note that the edge plate is to be removed. Which information is current?						
	SSS - Missing Kicker Brace Information at Ground Level GL 21-22		Closed	10/31/2014	11/09/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
T-1865	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 674 SK1: The reference to detail 1/S1-7661 is not shown on S1-2305 and the kicker locations are not shown as is on S1-2403 at ST307 between Grids 11-12. Please supply the necessary information if these beams are to be revised prior to fabrication.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per discussion with TJPA, the originating comment in the shop drawing does not apply to Phase 1 work. All Phase 2 "future" escalator support and bracing are not part of TG07.1 scope. WOJV to confirm scope of work to be provided under this contract with TJPA.		
	SSS - Incorrect Weld Size at HSS Connections		Closed	10/31/2014	11/10/2014	11/07/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
T-1866	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 676 SK1: The noted weld size does not work for the HSS12x6x1/4's in details 4 & 5/S1-7003. Confirm it is acceptable to proceed with a 1/8" PJP weld or supply an alternate weld.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> In lieu of the 3/8" PJP weld, provide PJP weld with an effective size of 1/4" at the HSS12x6x1/4 beam connections. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
	SSS - Grout Hole Size at Light Tower Column Base Plate		Closed	10/31/2014	11/10/2014	11/11/2014	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1869	BKN - Light Column Cast Node Clarification	Closed	10/31/2014	11/10/2014	11/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Bradken, Inc. Wayne Braun			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: ASI 127 provided updates to AESS requirements for the light column cast nodes, indicating that the lower light column cast nodes (500, 600, 700 series) are to be AESS-1. As these lower light column cast nodes are to be coated with IFRM, please confirm that Bradken may forgo the SCRATA A1 Reference Comparator for these cast nodes, pursuant to the requirements of the cast node specification 05 15 21. If these cast nodes are to be changed, please provide an updated cast node specification 05 15 21. Please note that these cast nodes are in various stages of production, and some have already shipped.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ASI-0127 included a revision to the AESS diagram to clarify questions raised regarding the IFRM application to the Light Column. The intent of this clarifications should not affect the documented and agreed finish of the Steel Castings work. The surface finish of the cast nodes are to match the approved surface finish as indicated during the March 2014 Bradken site visit finish mockup review.		
T-1870	SCS - Horizontal CJ for Upturned Beams at GL 18, 26, 34, and 35	Void	10/31/2014	11/10/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By:				
REQUEST: Please reference S1-3660 through 3663, and TG03 Balfour Beatty Bridge submittal TG0300-201. Some challenges to pouring the upturn beam monolithic with the slab pour are: (1) Worker access is less than 5' from top of slab to underside of roadway and less than 3' to the underside of the steel framing. (2) The slab and beam must be finished per spec 033002 3.6.C to receive waterproofing in A1-8717. (3) There is minimal to no access at the upturn beam and under the temporary duct bank. (4) Large quantity of concrete to pour with difficult access. (5) The available road closure time for 1st/Fremont/Beale may not provide enough time to perform all the above. Given these restrictions, Shimmick requests approval to pour the upturned beam separate from the slab: Option 1: by placing a horizontal construction joint along the length of the upturned beam with top of keyway flush with top of slab. Option 2: by placing 2 vertical construction joints on either			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>side of the upturn beam. (preferred) Please confirm if either of these CJ proposals are acceptable. (WOJV: this option will not work due to internal bracing removal sequencing, refer to option 1)</div>							
T-1870.1	SCS - Horizontal CJ for Upturned Beams at GL 18, 26, 34, and 35	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: SCS - Horizontal CJ for Upturned Beams at GL 18, 26, 34, and 35 Please reference S1-3660 through 3663, and TG03 Balfour Beatty Bridge submittal TG0300-201. Some challenges to pouring the upturn beam monolithic with the slab pour are: (1) Worker access is less than 5' from top of slab to underside of roadway and less than 3' to the underside of the steel framing. (2) The slab and beam must be finished per spec 033002 3 .6.C to receive waterproofing in A1-8717. (3) There is minimal to no access at the upturn beam and under the temporary duct bank. (4) Large quantity of concrete to pour with difficult access. (5) The available road closure time for 1st/Fremont/Beale may not provide enough time to perform all the above. Given these restrictions, Shimmick requests approval to pour the upturned beam separate from the slab: Option 1: by placing a horizontal construction joint along the length of the upturned beam with top of keyway flush with top of slab. Option 2: by placing 2 vertical construction joints on either side of the upturn beam. (preferred) Please confirm if either of these CJ proposals are acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Option 1 is acceptable with a roughened construction joint.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1960 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1873	DAT - Missing Data outlet for LED Screen in W-5 System	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			Drawing TE1-2307 is accurate and correct, data outlet is shown on W-5 wall at grid line 32.4, coordinate height of outlet with LED screens.				
Alternate #18 calls for installation of LED screens into the W-5 Wall System of the Beale Street Lobby at Grid line 32.4. See Sheet A1-5301B(03/31/14). Power and data connection are required for LED Screen to function. E1-2307(02/21/14) calls for providing power to the screens but TE1-2307(02/21/14) doesn't depict data outlet for the same. Please confirm TE1-2307(02/21/14) is missing a data outlet for the LED screen and provide a data outlet for the same.							
<hr/>							
T-1874	SSS - Mis-drilled Hole in TR12 Web	Closed	11/03/2014	11/13/2014	11/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			Confirmed.				
Skanska's transfer girder fabricator TMF has mis-drilled (1) hole in the web of transfer girder TR12, girder segment A631. The as built hole centers are noted on SK1. Please confirm it is acceptable to drill the 15/16" hole at the correct location and provide a 1-15/16" slotted hole.			TT: We agree with reason for request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as request for corrective work.				
Note all other holes on the hole pattern are correctly located and drilled.							
<hr/>							
T-1875	SSS - ST401 Revised Beam Locations at Ground Level	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/07/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			Confirmed.				
The dimensions shown in Field Order 027 have been revised in ASI-127 as shown. Please confirm that the beam locations remain the same and only the bent plate for the edge of slab shall be modified to accommodate the revised opening dimensions.			TT: We agree with the reason for request: Verification.				
<hr/>							
T-1875.1	SSS - ST401 Slab Opening Dimension Clarifications	Closed	01/22/2015	02/01/2015	01/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1961 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: T-1875, S1-2304 (ASI 128) Location: GL 15-16 Add'l Doc Ref: CD RFI 672.1 SK1 The noted W33 beams were located 9" from the edge of slab opening. ASI-127 revised the dimensions from the edge of opening to the W33's as shown. RFI T-1875 confirmed that the beams may remain where they were prior to ASI-127 but the edge plates are to be moved to suit ASI-127. That will result in the slab opening dimensions changing to what is shown in blue. Confirm that is the intent.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is to be no change to the Architectural edge of slab. The beams and bent plates are to be located and sized as per the Architectural Edge of slab drawings submitted in ASI-0128.		
T-1875.2	SSS - ST401 Slab Opening Dimension Clarifications	Closed	02/13/2015	02/23/2015	02/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: T-1875.1, T-1875, S1-2304 (ASI 128), S1-2304 (ASI 127) Location: Zone 2, Ground Level, GL 15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 672.2 SK1 This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1875.1. The noted dimensions were revised on S1-2304 in ASI-127 from 9" to 11" on the north side and from 9" to 8 1/5" on the south side. Since moving the steel to suit these revised off-set dimensions would be substantial, RFI T-1875 confirmed that the steel could remain where it was and the edge plates could be moved to suit these revised off-set dimensions. The result of the response in T-1875 was that the architectural slab opening changed as shown on the left side. The response in RFI T-1875.1 now states that the architectural slab opening cannot be changed and must match A1-2864. Which RFI response is correct? Please note that the field work drawings to revise the edge plates to suit ASI-127			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The opening dimensions and architectural edge of slab on A1-2864 did not change in ASI-0127. Opening size was updated in the structural drawings in ASI-0127 to match architectural. This changed the edge distances to the W33 beams north and south of the opening which remained in their place. So responses to both RFIs T-1875 and T-1875.1 are correct. Contractor to provide revised bent plates per new edge distances shown on structural drawings. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for RFI: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as previously answered. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1962 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1876	SSS - Fouling Connection at Ground Level Operating Booths GL 30-31	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
have been issued for fabrication as this is in Sequence CS6.							
Depending on the response to this RFI, please issue instructions on how to proceed from here.							
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached CD RFI # 677 SK1: The connection for the W16x26 to the W40 is currently per detail 1/S1-5028 but it interferes with the connection for the W16x26 to W16x26 as shown. Please provide a connection for the W16 to W40 and W16 to W16.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					The three W16x26 beams in the north-south direction shall be lowered so that T/steel of these beams is flush with the underside of W16x26 beams in the east-west direction. Provide double angle connections per 1/S1-5010 at the W16x26 beams framing into the W40x503 beam. W16 to W16 beam connections shall be as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0429. Note that detail 1/S1-5028 is only applicable at beams with "*" symbol.		
					TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
<hr/>							
T-1877	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Missing Information at Ground Level	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
See attached CD RFI # 679 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Supply a deck support detail. 2) Supply a slab edge plate detail.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					1) The HSS beams follow slope of slab (flush with the underside of the deck).		
					2) Provide slab edge details per typical detail 8/S1-5000.		
					TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1877.1A	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Missing Connection Details at Ground Level	Closed	12/18/2014	12/18/2014	12/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie AzzolinoTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: 2/S1-7111 & A,B,C/S1-7139 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: E/32-32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1877, CD RFI #679.1 SK1</div><div>Please see the attached Skanska RFI 913.1</div><div>1.) RFI T-1877 revised the HSS beams for Elevator PE704 & PE705 at Ground level (drawing S1-7111 detail 2) to sloping beams under the slab.</div><div>The connection per 8/S1-7630 no longer works with the revised beams.</div><div>Please provide a new connection detail on both ends.</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>1) Provide connection per 8/S1-7630 at the HSS beam ends, except, provide 2 bolts at each connection. The HSS beam may be coped at the top as shown on SK1.</div><div>Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.</div></div></div>							
T-1877.1B	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Missing Connection Details at Ground Level	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	12/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie AzzolinoTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: 2/S1-7111 & A,B,C/S1-7139, 1/S1-7600 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: E/32-32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1877, CD RFI #679.1 SK1</div><div>Please see the attached Skanska RFI 913.1</div><div>2.) Elevator PE704 & PE705 at Ground level in CD RFI #679.1 SK1 (drawing S1-7111 detail 2) has connection angles per 1/S1-7600.</div><div>The connection angles per drawing 1/S1-7600 will have to be revised to bent plates.</div><div>Please confirm the revision to bent plates is acceptable.</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>2) Confirmed.</div><div>Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.</div></div></div>							
T-1877.1C	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Missing Connection Details at Ground Level	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	12/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1964 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 2/S1-7111 & A,B,C/S1-7139 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: E/32-32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1877, CD RFI #679.1 SK1 Please see the attached Skanska RFI 913.1 3.) Elevator PE704 & PE705 at Ground level GL E/32-32.4 shown in CD RFI #679.1 SK1 (drawing S1-7111 detail 2) has a horizontal HSS beam per B/S1-7139. Please confirm the HSS beam is to remain horizontal.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as Called out on contract documents.		
T-1878	SSS - PE502 & PE503 Conflicting Dimensions at Roof Park Level	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 681 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 6: 1) The noted dimensions do not match. Please clarify. 2) Confirm the beams are centered on the HSS columns. 3) Confirm the beams are centered on the HSS columns. 4) The noted dimensions do not match. Please clarify. 5) Confirm the beams are centered on the HSS columns. 6) Confirm the dimensions added to detail 2/S1-7110 are correct based on the 12'-1 dimension in detail 3/A1-2966. If not, clarify the dimensions.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Dimensions to locate HSS columns shown on A1-2966 are correct. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. 4) Dimensions to locate HSS columns shown on A1-2966 are correct. 5) Confirmed. 6) Dimensions are per SKA-4292 ; 12'-2".		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1965 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1879	SSS - PE502 & PE503 Conflicting Elevations at Roof Park Level	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 682 SK1: The noted T/STEEL elevations do not match. Which elevation is correct?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> GC to coordinate between trade sub-contractors. Top of steel shall be confirmed by Elevator sub-contractor. Notations to be revised.		
T-1880	SSS - PE502 & PE503 Connection Clarifications at Gusset Plates	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 683 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) The gusset plate fouls the HSS members. Please provide a solution. 2) Confirm the weld length for the HSS8.625X0.322 brace gusset plate can match the HSS10.750X0.500 to avoid splitting the column at an additional location			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The HSS machine beams shall be lowered to clear the gusset plates. However, T/steel of these machine beams cannot be lower than 102' -3". Note that this response supersedes response to RFI T-1879. 2) Acceptable at contractor's option. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
T-1880.1	SSS - Framing clarification on elevator PE502 and PE503	Closed	03/09/2015	03/17/2015	03/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-7236 Location: PE 502 and 503 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 683.1 SK1 This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1880 (SK 919, CD 683) See attached CD RFI # 683.1 SK1: In order to move the T/Steel of the Machine Support Steel to elevation 102'-9 as requested by Otis, the vertical leg of the upper L6x6 will have to be cut down to 3". Confirm that is acceptable or supply alternate instructions. NOTE: the steel in sequence ES5 has been issued to the fabricator for fabrication.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reason for request Verification. We categorize this RFI as request for substitution.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1882	SCS - Geothermal Manifold Conflict at Field 7, 8, and 11	Closed	11/04/2014	11/14/2014	11/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titcher</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please Reference RFI's T-1042 and T-1179				The configuration shown in RFI T-1882 does not comply with the Design Team response for RFI T-1042.			
As shown in the attached mark up, the geothermal manifolds penetrate the 4th lift walls. RFI's T-1042 & T-1179 confirmed elevations for the geothermal manifolds at GL 17.5 (Field 7 & 8) and GL 26.5 (Field 11).				Response to RFI T-1042 stated: "Riser penetrations into the building must occur within the beam space of the ceiling of the lower concourse level. The elevations shown on the sketches fall below the beam pockets and conflict with future emergency ventilation ducts within the building. Elevations shall be modified and resubmitted to verify that the pipes enter the building within the beam space. Risers 7 & 8 may be greater than 14'-0" below finished grade and should be reviewed by ARUP for confirmation."			
Per the confirmed manifold elevations, the upper sleeves at both locations enter the 32" roadway slab.							
Please provide the designers' intent for these manifolds to enter the roadway slab at only these locations. Please provide direction.				RFI T-1179, it's related sketches and the mentioned discussions, were entirely regarding the piping installation passing underneath future ductwork. It was not related to the sleeve heights which had already been dealt with in RFI T-1042.			
				There is no design intention, nor any confirmation, for the geothermal piping to enter the roadway slab at these locations.			
				The geothermal manifold pipe penetrations are to be lowered to avoid interference with the roadways slabs. Please submit modified pipe elevations, avoiding interference, as requested previously in RFI T-1042, together with a corrective action plan for review by the Design Team.			



PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1883	SSS - Bus Deck Crash Rail Detail Clarification	Closed	11/05/2014	11/15/2014	11/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: The bus deck crash rail details (S1-8000) were updated in ASI 127, and eliminated the bolted connections previously shown. Sheet S1-5031 shows field welds at the top flanges to accomodate the crash rail bolts. Please confirm that these welds are no longer required.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. TT: We agree with reason for request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as other.		
T-1884	PLG - Clarification on location of Sewage Ejector at Train Platform Level	Closed	11/05/2014	11/15/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: P1-0050 dated 04/23/14, P1-3001 dated 01/23/14 The Plumbing Equipment Schedule(P1-0050 dated 04/23/14) locates the Sewage Ejector (SE-B2-C-1,2) in B2640 (Electrical Room) but P1-3001 dated 01/23/14 depicts the same Sewage Ejector as in B2662 (Mechanical Room). Please confirm correct location for SE-B2-C-1,2 is B2662(Mechanical Room).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The correct location for SE-B2-C-1, 2 is Room B2662.		
T-1885	ELV - Clarification on Distribution Panel EDPH-B1-A-LRS	Closed	11/05/2014	11/15/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference : E1-0051, 26 24 16 APA- Appendix A HVAC Equipment Connection Schedule (E1-0051 dated 06/20/14) depicts Condenser Water Pump (CWP-B1-A-4) is powered by a Distribution Panel EDPH-B1-A-LRS. This distribution panel cannot be located in any of the electrical rooms on Lower Concourse and it is also not listed in the Panel Schedule in the specifications i.e., 26 24 16APA - Appendix A. Please confirm the location and panel schedule for the same.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Connect CWP-B1-A-4 to panel EDPH-B2-A-LRS. Panel located in electrical room B2280.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1969 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1886	HVC - Clarification on the room serviced by HP-3-A-6	Closed	11/05/2014	11/15/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: M1-0051 (06/20/14) & M1-2502 (06/20/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Water Source Heat Pump Schedule on M1-0051 dated 06/20/14 specifies HP-3-A-6 to service Roof Park BOH , but M1-2502 (06/20/14) depicts HP-3-A-6 is servicing Room No: 03224 (Service Elevator Vestibule). Please confirm HP-3-A-6 is servicing Room No: 03224, if not please advise otherwise.					HP-3-A-6 serves Service Elevator Vestibule 03224 as shown on drawing M1-2502. Schedule on Sheet M1-0051 will be updated to match floor plan in future issuance.		
T-1887	HVC - Clarification on Supply Fan designated as SF-4-A-1	Closed	11/05/2014	11/15/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: M1-0051 dated 06/20/14 & E1-0051 dated 06/20/14					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Fans Schedule on M1-0051 dated 06/20/14 specifies Supply Fan SF-4-A-1 to be installed in zone 1 at Roof Park Level but neither drawings M1-2602 thru M1-2607 nor the HVAC Equipment Schedule (E1-0051 dated 06/20/14) depicts power for this Supply Fan. Please confirm if Supply Fan SF-4-A-1 is in contract. If yes please provide exact location and power source for the same.					SF-4-A-1 is not in contract.		
T-1888	ELV - Missing designation for the step down transformer	Closed	11/05/2014	11/15/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: E1-3402					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet E1-3402 depicts a step down transformer in Electrical Room 02226 without any designation, please see attached sketch. Please confirm that a transformer is required at that location. If yes please provide a designation for the same.					Yes, a transformer is required at this location. The designation shall be 'ET-2-A-EMG'		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1970 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1889	SCS - Roof Skylight Shear Key Clarification for RFI T-1281.3	Closed	11/05/2014	11/05/2014	11/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: The detail provided in RFI T-1281.3 on SKS-0422 only shows the geometry for central shear key pocket locations that are square to the skylight ellipse. Please provide a detail for the grid line 11 and 28 shear key pockets that do not sit square to the ellipse as seen on detail 3 of S1-8008. Please see attached drawing for further explanation.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The details documented in SKS-0422 included with the RFI T-1281.3 response do NOT apply to the W-10 skylights. The sketch SKS-0422 only applies to the W-12 locations near Gridline 23, which are indicated on the plan view of SKS-0422 with the detail tag 4/S1-8016. Refer to the note on SKS-0422: "Note: information not shown or noted is per 4/S1-8016. Details on this sketch are modifications/additions to detail 4/S1-8016". Detail 3/S1-8008 is unchanged by the response to RFI T-1281.3 and SKS-0422. The shear key detail for the W-10 skylights at Gridlines 11 and 28 can be found on S1-6011.		
<hr/>							
T-1890	ELV - Missing power source for Electric Water Heater EWH-2-A-2 & EWH-2-B-1	Closed	11/05/2014	11/15/2014	11/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference: E1-0052 dated 06/20/14 Plumbing Equipment Connection Schedule on E1-0052 dated 06/20/14 doesn't depict power source for EWH-2-A-2 & EWH-2-B-1. Please confirm power source for EWH-2-A-2 & EWH-2-B-1.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Connect EWH-2-A-2 to panel LP-2-A-1. Connect EWH-2-B-1 to panel LPH-2-B-12		
<hr/>							
T-1891	SCS - Foundation Wall Plumbing Sleeve Sizes GL 1 to 6	Open	11/06/2014	11/16/2014	11/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached marked up drawings. Noted 8" SAN and 8" F plumbing pipes do not have a corresponding sleeve size on the plumbing sleeve schedule. SCCI requires the sleeve sizes for wall penetrations to adjust rebar layout accordingly.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The sleeves are 12" in diameter.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1972 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Please see attached references: S1-3701, SSS 051000 0561.1Sheet 674AC, and S1-3400. Detail 11/S1-3701 shows B88 framing into MFB 6 near GL G/9.9. TR9.9 has 3" diameter holes placed to allow for B88's bottom bars to pass through the web and terminate inside the concrete MFB.</div><div>The locations of the holes per steel shop drawings are too low to permit the noted lap splice based on the clear requirements set by S1-3400. The holes effectively align with the bottom of B88.</div><div>Shimmick proposes that (1) B88's elevation be adjusted to match TR9.9's rebar penetration to tie the concrete into the steel, or (2) new holes be placed on TR 9.9 to facilitate rebar penetration in S1-3701.</div><div>Please approve one of the above changes to facilitate rebar placement at TR 9.9, or provide an alternate detail to resolve the conflict.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>The contractor mis-read the drawing. The top of slab shall be @19.62, while 19.96 is the top of concrete pad over beam. However, the existing holes are still slightly too low (say around 2.5"). Shimmick shall increase the B22 depth slightly to allow proper cover for the 5-#10. Do not adjust the top of B88 elevation.</div>		
T-1894	SCS - Embedded Column at Foundation Wall - Position Splice	Closed	11/07/2014	11/17/2014	11/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titcher</div><div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang</div></div>		<div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>	<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Please reference RFI T-1625 regarding column vertical bar constructability.</div><div>See attached Bartec splicing system product data.</div><div>In the revised response to RFI T-1625, it is stated that hooks shall be provided as shown in construction drawings. This detail is not constructible with to the HRC 420 couplers at the top of the 3rd lift. SCCI proposes to utilize a position splice coupler from Bartec in lieu of the HRC 400 series on the rebar with hook. The Bartec coupler complies with Specification Section 03 20 02 - 2.3 - B.3 for type 2 couplers.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>For the purpose of splicing foundation wall embedded column hooked vertical reinforcing, the proposal is acceptable.</div>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please confirm if Bartec couplers are acceptable to be used at embedded columns to allow hook installation.</p>							
T-1895	SSS - SLRS Non-Erectable Connections GL 26-33.5	Closed	11/08/2014	11/18/2014	11/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p>			<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>See attached CD RFI # 670 SK1: The noted W40x297 beam must be erected vertically to slide the web between the (2) shear plates on the node. The result is that the connection per 1D/S-5018 on the other will not allow the beam to be erected vertically as the web will foul the W30x99 supporting beam. Confirm it is acceptable to extend the shear plate to bring the bolts outside as shown or supply an alternate solution. Note: this condition occurs repeatedly between Grids 26-33.5</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Confirmed.</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as clarification for issues on means and methods.</p>				
T-1896	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Connection Clarification at HSS Post	Closed	11/08/2014	11/18/2014	11/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p>			<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>See attached CD RFI # 685 SK1: Detail 1/S1-7600 cannot be applied at the noted location because the beam is a HSS12x6x5/8 per S1-7139. Confirm a brace is not required or supply a new detail. Note: the 1'-9 between the beams will not permit a brace with 1 to 2 MIN bevel as shown in 2/S1-7600.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Confirmed.</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.</p>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1897	SSS - Connection Clarifications at Bus Deck Perimeter Beams GL 27-33.5	Closed	11/08/2014	11/18/2014	11/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 686 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 6: The design intent in this revised connection for the W40 beams east of Grid 26 is not clear as it contradict various other details as listed below. The noted beams are currently connected to the perimeter beams per S1-8003. Please review and confirm for items 1 to 5: 1) Indicates W40 beam supported by perimeter beam and W30 at the opposite end. a) Confirm the connection to the perimeter beam is per 1/S1-8003 at the CP5 location. b) Confirm the other end of the W40 may be connected to the W30 per 1/S1-5011 except with a full depth shear plate and 7 bolts as there is insufficient room for a double angle connection per S1-5010. See enlarged typical detail on SK1 2) Confirm the connection for the W40 to the perimeter beam is per 1 & 1B/S1-8003 at the CP5 location. 3) Indicates W40 beam supported by perimeter beam and BU-40 at the opposite end. a) Confirm the connection to the perimeter beam is per 1/S1-8003 at the CP5 location. b) Confirm the other end of the W40 may be connected to the BU-40 per 1/S1-5011 except with a full depth shear plate and 11 bolts. 4) Indicates W40 beam supported by perimeter beam and W24 at the opposite end. a) Confirm the connection to the perimeter beam is per 1/S1-8003 at the CP5 location. b) Confirm the other end of the W40 may be connected to the W24 per 1/S1-5011 except with a full depth shear plate and 6 bolts. 5) Indicates W40 beam supported by perimeter beam and W40 at the opposite end. a) Confirm the connection to the perimeter beam is per 2/S1-8003 at the CP6 location with the brace omitted and the W40 connected to the 1 1/2" thick plate with 11 bolts per 1/S1-5011. b) Confirm the other end of the W40 may be connected to the W40 per 1/S1-5011 except with a full depth shear plate and 11 bolts. 6) If the noted connections are to be revised to suit S1-			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			1a) Confirmed.				
			1b) Confirmed.				
			2) Connection at the noted beams is per 1 and 1B/S1-8003, except, that the number of bolts, bolt sizes, bolt spacing and edge distances shall be 1/S1-8000.				
			3a) Confirmed.				
			3b) Confirmed.				
			4a) Confirmed.				
			4b) Confirmed.				
			5a) Confirmed.				
			5b) Confirmed.				
			6) The intent of the revision to detail 1/S1-8000 was to revise connections (bolt size and configuration) for beams along moment frame lines only (shorter beams in between not affected). Detail 1/S1-8000 will be updated to clarify this intent. LEV may be changed to 4" to fit the bolts within the available connection length.				
			TT: We disagree with the reasons for request: Engineering Conflict and Insufficient Information, agree with Verification . We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1975 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>8000, please note that the connections are not possible with the "LEV" & "S" values as shown. Confirm these values may be adjusted as necessary to fit in the required bolts.</div>							
T-1898	SSS - Light Column - Holes for Electric Lighting System	Closed	11/08/2014	11/18/2014	11/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please provide hole locations and orientations required for the lighting system cabling on the top ring of the light column (EL 98'- 9"). No detail is provided in A1-4650.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> GC to coordinate conduit routing locations and submit for Architect's review.				
T-1899	SST - Terrazzo SS Riser Clarification	Closed	11/08/2014	11/18/2014	11/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel Avel Solomon							
REQUEST: Attached are drawings A1-7511 and A1-7512 regarding the details for the stainless steel risers at the terrazzo stair treads (affected stairs are 205, 307, 308 and 309). Need clarification on the following items: Stair 307 specifies etched risers, while stairs 205, 308 and 309 are to be perforated. Please clarify the desired "etch". Do the risers on stair 307 have the same hole-pattern as stairs 205, 308 and 309? Is the etch an alternate finish? Please clarify design intent. With regard to the hole pattern, there is not enough information for the desired stagger or border (if required). Please clarify design intent. Olson Steel priced all of the risers as grade 304 stainless steel. Please confirm this is the desired grade versus grade 304L, 316,316L etc. Olson Steel priced all of the risers with a mill finish.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Confirmed, the etch-pattern for stair 307 is the same as hole-pattern for stair 205,308, & 309. The etch is not an alternate finish. Refer to SKA-4301 2. The etch-pattern and perforated-pattern are to use 3/4"Ø circle. The pattern is to start at the center on the plate and have a minimum of 1" side border. Refer to SKA-4302 for updated information. 3. Provide 316 or 316L Stainless Steel are preferred. 4. Confirmed, #4 brush				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1976 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
<div>Please confirm the risers do not receive any alternate finish (#4 brush, etc.).</div>							
T-1900	SST - Middle Handrail Location Clarification	Closed	11/08/2014	11/18/2014	11/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel		Avel Solomon					
REQUEST: Please see attached for a handrail location question. Olson has located the center stringers so that the handrail clearances are equal-equal. This creates uneven stringer to stringer clearances. Olson has done middle stringer centered between stringers and centered between handrail and it seems both meet code. Please note the architectural drawings have not located them correctly. Please advise.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The center stringers will be located Equal distance between the stair handrail typically as shown in attached sketch with originating RFI T-1900.			
T-1901	SST - Stair 304 Base Support	Closed	11/08/2014	11/18/2014	11/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel		Avel Solomon					
REQUEST: As per the edge of slab setup dimensions on A1-2863, the stair base support expansion anchor called out in detail 11/S1-7601 will be 1" from the edge of the slab. With a 3/4" DIA bolt and a 1/4" edge plate, that makes for only 3/8" total clearance of bolt and slab edge. This is not enough room for the expansion anchor to work as designed. Please advise on a solution.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Move the curb and edge of slab as shown in attached sketch SKA-4314 so that the expansion anchor is centered on the curb per detail 11/S1-7601. Provide kicker braces at the W16 stair support beam as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0430.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1902	SST - Terrazzo Tread Clarification	Closed	11/08/2014	11/18/2014	12/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Adamson Associates, Inc. Paul MacPhail	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel Avel Solomon							
REQUEST: One of the specified terrazzo tread suppliers, Wausau, has indicated that using only marble chips in the aggregate mix for the terrazzo stair treads is "unusual" as per Spec Section 09 66 14, section 2.4.C. Olson Steel priced the terrazzo stair treads from Wausau per this spec. Please confirm the design intent does not include any glass/mirror into the aggregate mix. Under Spec section 09 66 23 Epoxy Terrazzo Flooring, section 2.3.B.5 the terrazzo stair landings are specified to use an aggregate mix of 50% recycled glass/mirror and 50% natural marble/stone. The aggregate mix for the landings differs from the tread; please confirm this was the design intent.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Confirmed, terrazzo treads aggregate mix does not include glass/mirror. 2. The aggregate mix for the landings TERR-2, same as for the landings. Refer to the attached sections 09 66 23 and 09 66 14.			
<hr/>							
T-1903	SST - Stair 401 Structural Framing Clarification	Closed	11/08/2014	11/18/2014	11/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel Avel Solomon							
REQUEST: Q1. From the General Structural Notes note CD-13 on sheet S-0006, it is our understanding that the stair structure should not impose torsion on the superstructure members. However, for Stair 401 sheet A1-7111 shows the stair columns located eccentrically from the centerlines of the superstructure beams. In addition, Structural sheet S1-2404 calls out detail 9/S1-5027 which shows the superstructure beam supporting the stair column eccentrically. Is it acceptable to detail this connection as shown in 9/S1-5027 even though it applies torsion to the beam? Q2. Should the 3/8" side plate shown in detail 9/S1-5027 be installed for the full length of the beam?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Structural beam shown in detail 9/S1-5027 is designed considering the torsion induced by the eccentric stair post. Similarly, in detail 1/S1-7600 kicker braces have been provided at the structural beam to take torsion induced due to eccentric posts. General Note CD-13 applies where structural details do not show any kicker braces, stiffeners or side plates at the support beam or in cases where the eccentricity per contractor's design exceeds those shown in the structural details. Another example where General Note CD-13 would be applicable is elevator machine beams. Per detail 8/S1-5004 elevator machine equipment needs to provide bearing over full width of the beam flange to prevent torsion in the machine support beams. 2) Length of side plate to match length of opening per note 2 in detail 9/S1-5027. TT: We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1904	BGP - Partition Wall Top Brace Layout	Closed	11/11/2014	11/21/2014	11/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached for SCCI's interpretation of the layout of the top braces for the Train Level Partition Walls in Area 3 and 4 based on the structural details in the S1-9000's. Please confirm that the locations and spacing of the braces shown in the layout drawing are acceptable. Also please confirm or provide direction on several instances that are noted on the layout where SCCI was either unsure of the layout or had to space the braces beyond the specified maximum per the structural details.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Layout review of partition wall bracing shall occur through the submittal process. To assist the contractor with preparation of the submittal (and answer questions posed in the RFI attachment) the following general rules shall apply: - For connections to concrete slab, the 3/8" thick plate in Detail 3/S1-9001 is not required and the post-installed anchors may be installed directly to the L6x6. - The L6x6's in Detail 3/S1-9001 are not required to be directly opposite each other in the case of a corner pilaster. In the corner case, one should be centered on the pilaster opposite the return and the other as near to the reentrant corner as possible. - The L6x6's in Detail 3/S1-9001 are not required to be directly opposite each other in the case of a pilaster T-intersection. In this case, one should be centered on the pilaster opposite the intersection and the other as space permits. In the latter case, the length of L6x6 may be reduced to suit provided that a minimum of two anchors is provided. Small overhangs will be permitted. - Deviations in spacing of angle brackets in Details 7/S1-9052 and 4/S1-9051 will likely be acceptable. Acceptance will occur during the submittal review process. - It is not necessary that opposite angle brackets in Detail 4/S1-9051 be aligned. - Angle brackets at wall intersections that clash shall have the more restrictive wall face govern. Pilasters will generally take precedence over wall brackets.				
T-1905	SCS - Roof Top ASI-124 Perimeter and Scallop Wall Rebar Update	Closed	11/13/2014	11/23/2014	12/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1979 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1980 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1907	SCS - Moment Frame Beam spacing South of GL G and west of GL 10	Closed	11/13/2014	11/23/2014	11/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Please reference sheets S 1-2302 through 2311 for the ground level moment frame beams located South of GL G and west of GL 10. The locations of the moment frames referenced above require further information for detailing purposes and cannot be determined using General Notes GR 12 to 16. Reference the legend and callouts on each attached sheet to locate requested clarification, which match the below (6) requests. Please confirm or provide the following dimensions. 1 .Beams southwest of GL X: 8' 11" on center, except 9' 0" o/c at radius opening 2.Beams running east-west, located east of GL X: 9' 8 5/8" o/c 3.3 Radius Openings: Please provide North-South dimension from GL K or L to center of opening. 4.North concrete stringers connecting radius MFBs: Please confirm that beams are not curved. Please confirm the angles noted on Sheet 3. 5.South edge of Radius MFBs: Please confirm Sheet 3 correctly indicates sets of equally spaced beams. Please clarify whether the noted equal spacing occurs along the radius foundation wall or along the straight North concrete stringers. Please provide the distance between the equal sets, noted with ? on Sheet 3. 6.Please confirm that GL X and the noted set of equally spaced MFBs on Sheet 3 intersect, in order to provide a base point for future dimensioning.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			1) Confirmed.				
			2) Confirmed.				
			3) The centerlines of the two openings are 11' from GL L and are noted on A1-2870 submitted with ASI 127 on 9/12/2014.				
			4) Confirmed that the beams are straight and the angles noted on Sheet 3 in the RFI are correct.				
			5) The equal spacing between MFB beams shall be along the north concrete beams. The distances corresponding to '?' as noted on Sheet 3 are acceptable.				
			6) Confirmed.				
T-1908	BGP - Partition Wall - Pier Under Concrete Beam Detail	Closed	11/13/2014	11/23/2014	11/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Shimmick Construction Comp Henry Chiang			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: See attached clouded detail 3/S1-9003 regarding the double fillet weld. Due to sequence of construction, the weld shown on the drawing (currently shown as shop welded) will need to be field welded. Please confirm that it is acceptable to field weld a 1/4" single fillet weld as shown in the attached.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			Keep the double sided fillet welds at the location indicated in the RFI. In lieu of the 5/8 inch bent plate use a flat plate of the same thickness that is longer such that it can accommodate a L6x6x3/8 angle on the no beam side of the pier. Weld the horizontal leg of the angle to the flat plate at the near and far side using 1/4 inch fillet welds (i.e. welds perpendicular to				



the longitudinal axis of the angle).



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1910	BGP - As-Built Condition of Rebar Dowels for Shear Walls W390B and W390D	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/17/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: SCCI recently performed an as-built survey of the western-most Shear Wall rebar dowels for the 3rd Lift that were cast into the 2nd Lift Shear Walls and Lower Concourse. These dowels dictate the western face of the 3rd Lift Shear Walls as well as a couple of columns on the West Throat Slab and a B130/B131 Beam alignment. Out of the walls that were surveyed, two of the walls had rebar dowels that were several inches to the west of where they should have been. Based on the results shown in the attached drawings, please confirm that the resulting as-built conditions are acceptable for construction: 1. Encroachment of the western faces of W390B and W390D into the adjacent corridor. 2. New location of C19 Column above W390B (roughly 8" to the southwest in alignment with the western face of W390B below). 3. New alignment of B130/B131 Beam below the Vehicle Ramp as a result of the new C19 Column location above W390B			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The minor encroachment of shear walls into South West service corridor, location of C19 column above the shear wall and beam alignment below the vehicle ramp, resulting from the as-built location of the rebars, as described in this RFI, are acceptable.				
T-1911	BGP - Foundation Wall/Corbel Below Vehicle and Bike Ramp	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Please confirm the following items related to the Foundation Wall/Corbel below the Vehicle and Bike Ramp and the response to RFI T-1850: 1. The corbel supporting the slab for the Communication Vault Room between the Vehicle and Bike Ramp is level and the top of the corbel remains at EL+ 14.0' per Detail 5 on AI-7413 even though it is not indicated on SKA-4289 (A1-7401). 2. The corbels below the Vehicle and Bike Ramps extend to the outside faces of the walls for each ramp and the corbel supporting the slab for the Communication Vault Room spans the entire distance between the corbels under the Vehicle and Bike Ramp.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AA Response to questions 1 and 2 follows: 1) Refer to attached sketches SKA-4308 to 4312 for updated architectural drawings related to foundation wall/corbels. There is no concrete corbel spanning the foundation wall directly below the Communications Vault Room. Refer to SKA-4309 (based on A1-7413) for updated Detail 5. 2) Refer to SKA-4308 (based on A1-7401) showing the extent of Vehicle Ramp Corbel and Bicycle Ramp Corbel and Top of corbel elevations. Refer also to ARUP and TT drawings. Arup Response to questions 1 and 2 follows:				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>3. S1-2251 shows the extent of the 4th Lift Foundation Walls that is included in TG06's scope in order to support the Vehicle and Bike Ramp. The western extent of the 4th Lift Foundation Wall is shown where the inside face of the foundation wall intersects with the outside face of the Vehicle Ramp Wall. The eastern extent of the 4th Lift Foundation Wall is shown to extend roughly 9 feet past the outside face of the Bike Ramp Wall to Gridline W. Additionally, the only elevation information for the portion of TG06's 4th Lift Foundation Wall is "TG0600 Foundation Wall=3/4" Below Bike Ramp (Varies)." Please confirm the eastern extent of the 4th Lift Foundation Wall as described above (per S1-2251) is correct. If it is correct, please provide a top elevation for the foundation wall that extends out past the Bike Ramp to Gridline W.</p> <p>4. SCCI intends to pour the section of TG06's 4th Lift Foundation Wall in 3 different pours (see attached markup of S1-2251 for SCCI's proposed construction joint layout). Please note that these construction joints do not match up with the construction joints below in the 3rd Lift Foundation Walls. However, SCCI assumes that a similar condition to the 3 rd Lift Foundation Walls above the Knockout Walls (see RFI T-1569) exists due to the West Throat Slab separating the 3rd and 4th Lift Foundation Walls below the ramp.</p>				<p>1) There is no corbel at the Communication Vault Room between the Vehicle and Bike Ramp.</p> <p>2) Refer to SK-C-0003 and SK-C-0004 issued in response to RFI T-1774 for extent and length of corbels and slide bearing plate locations.</p> <p>TT responses to questions 3 and 4 follows:</p> <p>3) The information provided on Sheets S1-2310 in conjunction with A1-2870 include correct information regarding top of wall elevation change at the ground level. Refer to attached sketch SKS-433 for updated Detail 1/S1-2251, which will be issued as part of ASI 128, showing concrete corbel configuration.</p> <p>4) TT does not take exception to the construction joints shown in item 4 of this RFI.</p>		
T-1912	SST - Stair 403 Clarifications	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer</p> <p>Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel Avel Solomon</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>This question impacts stair 403 between concourse and ground level.</p> <p>1. Per the attached comments onSK-RFI-12A, the stair is currently setup to agree with 5/A1A7011and the structural steel locations noted by ASI-027. The new dimensions noted in ASI-127 will revise the edge of slab, thus revising the width of the stair well and the widths of the stairs inside it. Please furnish a revised detail.</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1) The revised edge of slab on structural drawing in ASI0127 was to match the edge of slab shown in the Architectural Drawings. The architectural edge of slab has been designed and dimensioned to match stair design on A1-7011 and did not change in the architectural drawings issued in ASI0127. The stair widths have not changed.</p> <p>2) The proposed stair widths are not needed, these</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1984 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>2. Per the attached comments on SK-RFI 12B,new stair width dimensions have been determined to be5'-4 and 5'-6 ½". Please verify these dimensions are correct. These new dimensions create uneven ascending and descending stair widths. Does the stair need to be re-centered to 5'-5 ¼" equal widths on each side or is it allowed to be uneven?</p> <p>3. Per the attached comments on SK-RFI-12C. the stair support columns would need to shift with the stairs and this creates a problem near the grid D.8 adjustment. The 2" shift south puts it too far off the edge of the concete beam below and 11/S1-7600 will no longer work. Please advise on a revised detail.</p> <p>*Please furnish revised details 2, 4, 5/A1-7011 to reflect changes on ASI-127 and furnish revised column edge detail to replace 11/S1-7600</p>						
T-1913	SST - Checker Plate Mid Landings at Detail 10S1-7601	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	12/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel		Avel Solomon					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
This question impacts all checkered plate mid-landings at detail 10/S1-7601					Provide a 3" gap between stair stringer and landing bent plate. Attach a Painted Galvanized steel bent closure plate to stair stringer so that the bent plate can slip past the landing bent plate. Refer to SKA-4330 for detail.		
Q1: At detail 10/S1-7601 there will be a checkred kicker plate butting up against the end of the stringer at the soudside stringer connections. The long slot and bolted connection that allows the stringer to float will not be able to float in the direction of the kicker plate that stops it. This is typical at midlandings. Please see included sketches and advise.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1914	SSS - PE201 Splice Location and Weld Clarification	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 493.3 SK1 & SK2: The response to RFI T-1692 (SK 681, CD 493) re the HSS6x6 to be continuous was implemented in the model and the Mill Order has been revised to maintain current submittal schedules as sis shown on attached SK2. The response in RFI T 1692.1 (SK 681.1, CD 493.1) confused this direction. At this time, for Skanska to move forward, they require a splice location and splice weld for the continuous HSS6x6x1/4 column. Confirm the proposed splice location and weld as shown on SK2 are acceptable.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
			In response to RFI T-1692, TT requested the contractor to make the HSS6x6 column at the north-east corner of PE201 continuous. That said, the beam to connection issue highlighted in the RFI could have been resolved even with the column remaining discontinuous. The top angle per typical detail 8/S1-7604 would be connected to the HSS 8x8x5/8 and the bottom angle would be connected to the HSS6x6 column. Although making the column continuous can be considered a minor change, the intent was to facilitate easier detailing and erection. Then we received RFI T-1692.1 stating that the change requires revisions to the model and material order. Our position in response to that RFI was that if the contractor is planning to send a bill to the owner for something of this nature, we'd prefer going back to the contract drawings, i.e., a discontinuous column per 12/S1-7604 at that location. The current RFI (RFI T-1914) states that the change was already made in the model and mill order has already been revised to maintain current submittal schedules. We note that the shop drawings for this area has not been submitted yet and it is not clear how the mill order would be affected from a minor modification such as this one. We suggest that this item to be added to next weekly meetings agenda for further discussion and final resolution.				
			TT: We disagree with reason for request "insufficient information". We categorize this RFI as "other".				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1986 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1914.1	VOID	Void	02/13/2015		02/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: RFI T-1941, 1/S1-5010, 3/S1-7015, 3/S1-7603 Location: Zone 4, Second Level, GL 27-28 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 697.1 SK1 The stringer connection per 3/S1-7603 fouls the W16x26 beam connection per 1/S1-5010. Please provide a solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide a full depth shear plate similar to 1/S1-5013 in lieu of the double angle to connect the WT per 3/S1-7603 to the W16 beam. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for RFI: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
T-1915	SSS - Moment Columns Stiffener and Continuity Plates	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: With reference to the Moment Columns stiffener and continuity plates with CJP welds, please confirm if acceptable to terminate the weld as per D1.8 figure C-6.3. This will be the same as requested and confirmed on Webcor RFI T-1761 for the transfer beams (see attached).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. TT: We agree with the reason for request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as clarification for issues on means and methods.		
T-1916	SSS - ST601A Fouling Connections	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 688 SK1: The W12x14 fouls the connection per 3/S1-5019. Please provide a solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide a shear plate connection at the W12 beam similar to that shown in SKS-0421 submitted with RFI T-1553.3. Move the W12 beam towards the slab edge and center the shear plate in the horizontal spacing between the bolts. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1987 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1917	SSS - Missing Connection Detail at Second Level Protected Zone GL 30	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 689 SK1: The C8x11.5 per 12/S1-5003 cannot be connected to the beam with a protected zone on Grid 30. Provide a solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Move the C8x11.5 towards GL D.4 and connect it to the flange of the moment frame column. Provide a shear plate connection similar to 8/S1-5012 with 2 bolts. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
<hr/>							
T-1918	SSS - Conflicting Gusset Plate Details at Kicker Brace Connections	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Detail 8/S1-3704 is referenced for the kicker braces east of Grid 27.1 north of Grid C.3 and south of Grid F.7 on the Ground Level. The detail shows a non full depth gusset plate and refers to detail 3/S1-3503, which shows a full depth gusset plate but also refers to 8/S1-5015. Detail 8/S1-5015 shows a non full-depth gusset plate. Confirm the gusset plates in detail 8/S1-3704 are non full depth as shown.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient information, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
<hr/>							
T-1919	SSS - Clashing Steel at SLRS Connection GL 33.2	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 691 SK1: As the noted W40x297 is not in plane with the bracing steel, the gusset plate at the top will foul with the beam and there will be a variable thickness gap at the bottom flange as shown. Confirm the beam may be moved south to avoid fouling the gusset plate similar to the west side or supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1988 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1919.1A	SSS - Bus Deck Level Connection Clarifications GL 33.2	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2507 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Gridline: C/33.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1919, CD RFI # 691.1 SK1 Please see the attached Skanska RFI 934.1. 1.) RFI T-1919 revised the beam location shown in CD RFI # 691.1 SK1 Please confirm the gusset plate is to be revised to the shape as shown in CD RFI # 691.1 SK1 per the response in RFI T-1919.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as No cost clarification.		
T-1919.1B	SSS - Bus Deck Level Connection Clarifications GL 33.2	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2507, 2/S1-5017 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Gridline: C/33.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1919, CD RFI # 691.1 SK2 Please see the attached Skanska RFI 934.1. 2.) RFI T-1919 revised the location of the W40x297 to avoid clashing with the gusset plate. By revising the location of the W40x297, the beam now fouls the connection for the W40x362 per 2/S1-5017 as shown in CD RFI # 691.1 SK2. Confirm it is acceptable to extend the 1" stiffener plate and connect the W40x297 with (11) bolts per 1/S1-5010 or supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as No cost clarification.		
T-1919.1C	SSS - Bus Deck Level Connection Clarifications GL 33.2	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1989 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2507, 2/S1-5010 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Gridline: C/33.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1919, CD RFI # 691.1 SK2 Please see the attached Skanska RFI 934.1. 3.)RFI T-1919 revised the location of the W40x297 to avoid clashing with the gusset plate. By revising the location of the W40x297, the beam now fouls the connection for the the CP4 connection per 1/S1-8002 as shown in CD RFI # 691.1 SK2. Confirm it is acceptable to extend the shear plate per 1/S1-5010 as indicated by the dotted lines and supply (11) bolts or supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 3) The connection at the W40x297 shall be per 1/S1-8003 (CP5 connection). CP4 connections occur at roof park level not bus deck level. The notch in the shear plate at the horizontal 1 1/4" stiffener as shown by the dotted lines is not acceptable. Provide a continuous full depth shear plate per 1/S1-8003 and provide horizontal stiffeners in between the vertical stiffener and shear plates. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as Called out in contract documents.				
T-1919.1D	SSS - Bus Deck Level Connection Clarifications GL 33.2	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2507, 2/S1-5011, 2/S1-5017 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Gridline: C/33.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1919, CD RFI # 691.1 SK3 Please see the attached CD RFI # 691.1 SK3: 4.) Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W40x149 per 1/S1-5011 and weld the shear plate to the PL 2" per 2/S1-5017 or supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 4) The W40x149 beam may be moved towards GL C and connected to the 1" stiffener plate per 2/S1-5017. Extend the 1" stiffener plate as required for a shear plate connection similar to 1/S1-5011. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as No cost clarification.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1990 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1919.1E	SSS - Bus Deck Level Connection Clarifications GL 33.2	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2507, 2/S1-5011, 2/S1-5017 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Gridline: C/33.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1919, CD RFI # 691.1 SK3 Please see the attached CD RFI # 691.1 SK3: 5.) Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W40x149 per 1/S1-5011 SIM. to the web reinforcing plate per 1/S1-5017 as shown or supply an alternate solution		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Provide shear plate connection per 1/S1-8003 at the W40x149 beam. If the shear plate clashes with the web reinforcing plate per 1/S1-5017, it is acceptable to weld the shear plate to the web reinforcing plate in lieu of the beam web. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as Called out in contract documents.			
T-1919.2	SSS - Bus Deck Level Connection Clarifications	Closed	01/19/2015	01/29/2015	02/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Shimmick Construction Comp Jeremiah Kent Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: T-1919.1 Location: GL 33.2 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached 3D model The response to RFI T-1919.1D tells us to move the noted W40x149 north and connect it to the PL 1" per 2/S1-5017 but this will result in the W40x297 and the W40x149 connecting to the same plate. Please review and provide another response to RFI T-1919.D		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The two W40x149 beams highlighted in the RFI (north and south side) can be waived. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification and change to be issued in a future bulletin.			
T-1920	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Missing Beam Loactions	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 693 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) The (4) noted beams are shown as not aligning with the W36 beams between Grid D.4-E.6 but locating dimensions are not provided. Confirm the (4) W12x14 beams may be aligned with the W36 beams or provide the locating dimensions. 2) The noted beam is shown located 5" north of the slab		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed that the W12 beams may be aligned to the W36 beams. 2) A1-2897 shows an array of sleeve openings at the highlighted location. The W12x14 beam shall be 5" from the edge of the sleeve openings.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1991 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1921	SSS - Inadequate Connections at Roof Level GL 28	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 694 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) There is insufficient room to connect the skewed W21 to the MF beam with double angles per S1-5010. Confirm it is acceptable to provide connections per 1/S1-5011 or supply alternate solution. 2) The 3/8 x 6 x 6 stiffener plate is not possible at 8 locations since Grid 28 only has drag plates as shown. Confirm that is the intent.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) It is acceptable to provide connection per 7/S1-5011 at the highlighted location. 2) Provide W21x55 beams for W-10 anchorage at GL 28 as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0435. The #9 bars shall be welded to the drag plate. Field weld the drag plate to the W21 beam flange as shown in the sketch. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI no cost clarification (item 1) and change to be issued in future bulletin (item 2).				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1993 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	2) The size of the base plate exceeds the 16 3/8" wide flange of the W40x503. Confirm that is the intent.			cost clarification.			
T-1925	SSS - Design Changes to TPG in CS3 ASI 127	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	11/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please refer to the changes to the dimensions of web stiffener plates at the TPG at GL 13 (CS3) in the revised S1-5016 drawing that was provided with ASI 127. These tapered roof girders have already been fabricated, and are currently in the shipping yard at the fabricator. (1) Please verify that the 48" length of the web stiffeners is required per ASI 127. (2) If so, please provide a field weld detail (see sketch SK1) for the additional 31" length stiffeners plates that will be field attached.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed that web stiffeners are required to be 48" long at GL 13 per ASI 127. 2) The 31" long stiffener plates shall be CJP welded to the existing 17" stiffener plates. TT: We agree with the reasons for request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				
T-1926	SSS - Lower Pipe Cap Plate Weld Information and Vent Hole Location GL 33.2	Closed	11/14/2014	11/24/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 695 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Supply specific welding information for the cap plate to the pipe. 2) Confirm it is acceptable to relocate the vent holes as shown to avoid fouling the erection aid plates.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Please see enclosed detail 4/A1-9318 for weld type. This is a new sheet part of ASI-0128. 2) Confirmed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1994 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1927	BGP - Partition Wall - Top of Wall Expansion Joint	Closed	11/17/2014	11/27/2014	12/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Judith Long				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please see the attached clouded details regarding the premolded expansion joint material. Similar to the removable expansion joint material (styrofoam) used for the vertical joints between the partition walls, please confirm it is also acceptable to use 1" removable styrofoam between the top of wall and ceiling at the horizontal expansion joint.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					This RFI is a Means and Methods issue by the trade contractor.		
					The design team does not provide direction for means and methods for construction.		
					This is to be coordinated with CM/GC and the details are to be followed for Final construction.		
T-1928	SSS - ST601 Missing Information at Ground Level	Closed	11/18/2014	11/28/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: In order to locate the connections to the stair posts/vertical bracing, please provide the following information: See attached CD RFI # 678 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) The posts do not land on beams when located per dimensions on A1-7020 and the beams located next to slab opening. Please clarify this conflicting information. 2) Vertical bracing is indicated on plan but elevations and connection information for the braces are not provided. Please provide the missing information.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					1) See attached sketch SKS-0438 that shows updated post locations per A1-7020. Provide W-16 supporting beams centered on the stair posts as shown in the sketch.		
					2) See attached sketch SKS-0439 that shows brace elevations, sizes and connection details. Provide 2L3 1/2 x 3 1/2 x 1/4 braces in lieu of the HSS6x6 braces. Note that the HSS6x6 posts are flush with the underside of the W10x22 beams at the intermediate landing shown on 2/S1-7012. Refer to SKS-0439 for HSS post to W10 beam connection details.		
					TT: We agree with the reason for request: Insufficient information. We categorize this RFI as Change to be issued in future bulletin.		
T-1929	SSS - ST601 Conflicting and Insufficient Information	Closed	11/18/2014	11/28/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: In order to locate the connections to the stair posts/vertical bracing, please provide the following information:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					1) Dimensions shown on SKA-4323 to locate posts supporting stair 601 shall govern. Dimensions to		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1995 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	See attached CD RFI # 684 SK1 to SK2 for items 1 to 10: 1) Dimensions hi-lited in yellow match 2/A1-7020 and the current model. Dimensions hi-lited in purple do not match 2/A1-7020 and the current model. Note that the structural drawings do not locate the posts supporting the stair landings closer to Grid 31at all. Please clarify the discrepancy. (The posts not located on the structural drawings are currently located to suit the Revit model) 3) Clarify the (3) braces indicated in blue and supply more information if they are required. 4) Braces are indicated on plan (green lines) but sizes and connection details are missing. Supply sizes and connection details for each end of every brace. 5) These dimensions do not match 2/A1-7509 (SK3). Please clarify where the steel is located. 7) Supply connection details for the HSS12x6 & HSS6x6 hangers to the underside of beams. 8) These posts are shown as single posts on S1-7012. Please clarify the discrepancy. 9) These dimensions do not match 3/S1-7012 (SK1). Please clarify where the steel is located. 10) 3/S1-7012 shows (4) vertical posts. Clarify why this detail shows (6) posts.						
					locate posts that support stair landings are typically shown on architectural drawings.		
					2) No question provided.		
					3) Highlighted braces are part of braced frames. Elevations and connection details for these braces are shown on S1-4150 and S1-4206, respectively.		
					4) Braces highlighted in green on SK1 in the RFI are HSS6x6x1/4 similar to the braces at the other landing (T/landing = 29'-10 7/8") in detail 3/S1-7012. Per section 1.5C of specification 05 51 00 STEEL STAIRS AND RAILINGS, connection details for brace and hangers at the stair shall be designed by the contractor's engineer.		
					5) Detail 2/A1-7509 has been revised. Refer to attached SKA-4324.		
					6) No Question Provided.		
					7) See response to 4).		
					8) Post numbers have been revised as per S1-7012. Dimensions shown on SKA-4323 to locate posts supporting stair 601 shall govern.		
					9) The two W18x119 beams shown on 4/S1-7012 shall be centered on the HSS 6x6 hangers that support the landing with T/landing elevation 29' - 10 7/8". Refer to SKA-4323 & SKA-4324 for HSS hanger locations.		
					10) The 2 central Post shown on 2/A1-7509 are not posts. They represent the HSS braces shown on 3/S1-7012.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1996 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1929.1	SSS - ST601 Conflicting and Insufficient Information	Closed	01/06/2015	01/16/2015	01/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 684.1 SK1 to SK2 for follow up on items 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9 : 1) The response to item 1 in T-1929 SKA-4323 has provided dimensions to locate the stair posts on the Second Level (4/S1-7012) but it remains unclear where the post locations are in details 5 & 6/S1-7012. Where do the dimensions in 4/SKA-4323 apply? Note dimensions of nearest HSS 12x6x5/8" from GL 30 in detail 2 and 4 are not consistent (13'-5" from Detail 4 and 13'-10 1/4" from detail 2. Please clarify. 2) Braces are indicated on plan (orange lines) but connection details are missing. Supply connection details for each end of each brace. 3) Previous response is complete 4) Previous response is complete 5) SKA-4324 provides revised east/west locations for the hangers below the second level. Confirm the north/south dimensions in 3/S1-7012 are correct. 6) The post to beam connection per 1/S1-7600 does not work at the double posts. Supply a new connection detail. 7) Previous response is complete 8) Previous response is complete 9) The response is not clear please provide a revised structural plan 10) Previous response is complete			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Dimensions provided on 4/SKA-4323 locate hangers that support stair landings at elevations EL 31' - 1 1/4" and EL 29' - 10 7/8". These hangers are shown on 3/S1-7012. The HSS12x6x5/8 posts shown in details 2 and 4/S1-7012 and noted in the RFI are two different posts. HSS12x6 in detail 2 is above the 2nd floor level, where HSS12x6 shown in detail 4 hangs below the 2nd floor. 2) Per section 1.5C of specification 05 51 00 STEEL STAIRS AND RAILINGS, connection details for brace and hangers at the stair shall be designed by the contractor's engineer. Note that if the stair landing needs to be laterally braced, lateral bracing shall be designed such that it does not penetrate the W-16 system wall shown on A1-7020. 5) North-South dimensions to locate the hangers were provided in 4/SKA-4323 submitted with RFI T-1929. 6) Connection at the top of the double posts may be provided per attached sketch SKS-0455 which is similar to 1/S1-7600. 9) The 4 corner HSS posts shown on 2/SKA-4324 (2/A1-7509) are HSS hangers that support the landing at EL 29' - 10 7/8" and are shown on 3/S1-7012. These HSS posts hang from W18x119 beams shown on 4/S1-7012. The middle two steel sections shown on 2/SKA-4324 are HSS braces between the corner hangers. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
T-1929.2	ST601 Fouling Connections at Second Level	Closed	02/13/2015	02/23/2015	02/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1997 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>Contract Doc Ref: T-2929.1, 4/S1-7012 Location: Zone 4, Level 2, GL 30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 684.2 SK1</div> <div>1) The connection per RFI T-1929.1, SKS-0455 extends into the stair opening as shown. Confirm that is acceptable or supply an alternate solution.</div> <div>2) RFI T-1929.1 SKS 0455 does not provide the thickness of the plate below the beam flange. Confirm 3/4" thick is acceptable or supply thickness.</div>						
T-1930	SSS - Stud Spacing Detail	Closed	11/18/2014	11/28/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div> <div>Gregory Kemerer</div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>		<div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>	<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Please reference detail 1/S1-5000, Typical Headed Stud Spacing Detail. Note #4 indicates the maximum number of studs permitted per individual metal deck rib is 3. Also provided in this detail is a plan view titled "Beams Perpendicular to Deck" where the plan shows a three stud per rib condition. Skanska note the three studs are spaced 2-5/8" in one direction and 3" in the other which nets a diagonal spacing of 3". Skanska is running into conditions where the number of studs versus the number of available ribs will exceed 3 studs per rib, particularly at the bus deck level. See below for 2 examples:</div> <div>1. Sheet S1-2507, near the south east corner a W30x99 beam with 68 studs. The bay width is 16' wide and when you subtract the width of the support girders and the ribs lost by the drag plates we only have 11 available ribs. This results in 6 to 7 studs per rib.</div> <div>2. In the same general area are diagonal beams with 10 studs noted. Again due to the relatively short length of beam and long drag plates we may only have one full rib and a partial rib in which to fit 10 studs. Net result is 6 to 7 studs per flute.</div> <div>Please confirm the following is acceptable: Where the</div>		<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>1. Number of studs in the W30x99 beam may be reduced to 33 from 68 so that there are 3 studs per rib.</div> <div>2. For the short diagonal W40 beams with Type 3 flange plate connections, provide number of studs as indicated on contract documents. Stud placement shall be as follows:</div> <div>a) Provide studs at a maximum spacing of 1 stud per foot for entire length of the beam top flange.</div> <div>b) If more studs that can be fit by (a) is specified on the drawings, place remaining studs at the same spacing as (a) starting from the beam ends.</div> <div>c) At locations where there is no rib over the beam due to flange plates, studs shall be welded to the flange plate and centered on the beam web.</div> <div>d) If there are 2 studs at a location, spacing between the two studs shall be 3' with the studs aligned in a direction perpendicular (parallel) to the flange plates (ribs).</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 1998 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1930.1	SSS - Stud Spacing Detail	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	12/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p>			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: 1/S1-5000 Location: Bus Deck Grid Line: Throughout Add'l Doc Ref's:</p> <p>The response to RFI T-1930 item 2(C) indicated that if studs are required where there is no rib over the beam due to flange plates, studs should be welded to the flange plates and centered on the beam.</p> <p>On the gusset plate on the SLRS framing at the bus level, the 12" studs indicated will project through the topping slab. The decker can provide 10" studs at no additional cost but these will only project 1-3/4" into the topping slab and not meet the 2" min requirement. If a custom stud length is required the decker will have additional material and labor costs as the stud welding equipment will need to be modified to shoot the custom length stud.</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable to use 10" studs at the flange plates.</p>			<p>SUGGESTION:</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Confirmed that 10" long studs are acceptable at the flange plates.</p> <p>Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reason for request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.</p>				
T-1931	SSS - Connection Detail for OCS Support Steel	Closed	11/18/2014	11/28/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Please provide a connection detail for the HSS shown in SK1.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The HSS to the web of a wide flange shall be similar to Detail 4/S1-7600, except changes the length of the connection angle from 8" long to 3 " long. Reasons for RFI: Shown in contract documents and No cost clarification.				
T-1932	SSS - Weld Detail Clarifications at TR33.2	Closed	11/18/2014	11/28/2014	12/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 704 SK1 for items 1 to 9: 1) Confirm the weld symbol is acceptable or clarify. 2) Confirm the weld symbol is acceptable or clarify. 3) Confirm the effective weld size is 2" as shown. 4) Confirm the added notes are acceptable or clarify. 5) Confirm the weld symbol is acceptable or clarify. 6) Confirm the effective weld size is 1" as shown. 7) Confirm if double prep is the intent on this weld similar to 5B/S1-4351 & 5B/S1-4355. 8) Confirm the boxed note is correct or clarify. 9) Confirm the arrows as shown are correct to designate weld to the joints or supply the missing welds.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Confirmed 2). Not acceptable. See detail 1, which shows a double bevel CJP weld of 4" shear plate to cast node. 3). No, 2" is the size of bevel. 4). Confirmed. 5). Confirmed. 6). No, 1" is the size of bevel. 7). Confirmed. Double bevel CJP was also called out in 1/S1-4352. 8). Confirmed. 9). Confirmed. Reason for RFI: No cost clarification.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2000 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1932.1	SSS - Weld Detail Clarifications at TR33.2	Closed	01/09/2015	01/19/2015	01/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-4352 Location: Cast Node to Transfer Girder Connections Gridline: Ground Level Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached sketch, RFI T-1932 RFI T-1932, item 2, requested confirmation that a 2" PJP weld would be acceptable for the two outer stiffener plates at the cast node to transfer girder connections (see attached sketch). The response indicates that a CJP weld is required. A CJP weld will work for the center plate, however the indicated locations (outside plates) will not work as only the outside plate edge is accessible. Please confirm the 2" PJP weld is acceptable at the outer stiffener plates or supply an alternate workable weld.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): No cost clarification.				
T-1933	ESC - Escalator Handrail Clearance	Closed	11/18/2014	11/28/2014	11/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Schindler Elevator Corporation James Wise REQUEST: ASME A17.1-2004 Safety Code for Elevators & Escalators Section 6.1.3.2.2 states: "The handrail shall be a minimum of 100 mm (4 in.) horizontally and 25 mm (1 in.) vertically away from adjacent surfaces, except that round fillets or beveled sides of the handrail stand are permitted to reduce the 25 mm (1 in.) clearance between the handrail and the point where the handrail stand is connected to the balustrade." Detail 3/A1-7550 shows a 3" clearance between the escalator handrail and the glass rail. This detail only references Escalators E409/E410, but may affect the other escalators on the project. Please confirm that the design will be adjusted to meet code for all the escalators on the job.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Guardrail clearance revised, refer to SKA-4316.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2001 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1934	SCS - Basket Column Fill	Closed	11/19/2014	11/29/2014	12/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
REQUEST: Please reference drawings S1-4000 through S1-4018 regarding filling basket columns. Currently, basket columns are shown to be filled with both concrete and non-shrink grout. SCCI proposes to fill all basket columns to the elevations shown with self-consolidating concrete. Please see attached submittal TG0702-123.1 for approved mix design. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to use self-consolidating concrete in all locations, as long as this does not create a constructability problem. GC confirm the diameter of the hole where non-shrink grout was previously expected, is workable for installation of self-consolidating concrete. Arup's response: The proposed concrete appears to be acceptable. TT's response: The grout port for non-shrink grout has 1" diameter, while the grout port for the concrete has a 3" diameter. Contractor to confirm if the existing grout port is adequate as they are.		
T-1934.1	SCS - Basket Colum Fill	Closed	12/05/2014	12/15/2014	12/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-4000 - S1-4018 Location: N/A Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1934 Per the response to RFI T-1934, it was requested that SCCI confirm the diameter of the hole where nonshrink grout was previously expected, is workable for installation of self-consolidated concrete. SCCI intends to pump self-consolidating concrete through the 3" port in the basket column cast node. The self-consolidating concrete will then be pumped from the bottom of the column to the final elevation in one lift. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor to verify whether the self-consolidating concrete can flow thru the hole in the bus deck cast node (most of them have a 1" diameter). Also, please note there is only one nozzle hole, so grouting thru the bus deck cast node is not possible.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1935	BGP - Grout Back Mat Slab Pile Block Outs	Closed	11/20/2014	11/30/2014	12/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please reference submittal #TG0600-204.2, Cemex mix design # 1558218. Per clouded note in detail 5 of attached contract drawing A1-8711, SCCI is required to grout pile blockouts after piles have been removed. Rather than grout the block out, please confirm it is acceptable to use mix #1558218 concrete to pour back the blockouts.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Confirmed. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<hr/>							
T-1936	BGP - Steel Jacket GL 1.4/D.4 - Ring Base Plate	Closed	11/21/2014	12/01/2014	12/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: The column at Gridlines 1.4/D.4 requires a post installed steel jacket. Please reference the attached clouded detail 6/SI-3503. Due to the added reinforcement around the column and field experience with drill and epoxy rebar dowels in this area, the possibility of post installing the ring base plate with postinstalled expansion anchors at shop drilled holes location is highly unlikely. Please confirm it is acceptable to exclude the ring base plate or please provide an additional detail that is more constructible for post-installed column jacket base plate attachment.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: The ring plate and anchorage may not be excluded. Refer to RFI P1-0294. Fabricate ring plate and locate anchors based on field conditions. Submit proposed modifications for review. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<hr/>							
T-1937	BGP - Zone 1 C-19 and C-38 Column in Conflict with Level A Struts	Closed	11/21/2014	12/01/2014	11/25/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Please see attached S1-2250, and attached rebar shop drawings. Please confirm it is acceptable to eliminate the stagger of the column dowels referenced on the attached drawings, in order to eliminate the conflict with level A struts.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: It is acceptable to eliminate splice stagger where it interferes with Level A excavation bracing. Maintain 2'-6" dimension from top of slab to splice level. Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2003 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1938	SSS - Missing OCS Switch Information	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 296.11 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 & 2: 1) This brace per 3/S1-9101 fouls the corner post above the plate. Confirm this one brace may be omitted or supply an alternate solution. 2) The diagonal brace per 3/S1-9101 fouls the horizontal HSS4x4x1/4 per 2/S1-9101. Confirm it is acceptable to adjust the angle of the brace to clear to HSS4x4 as required at this location and other similar locations or supply an alternate typical solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The OCS hanger support angled bracing layout has been revised and there should be no conflict, please refer to ASI-0128 details 2,3 and 4/A1-8550. 2. Same response as above.		
T-1939	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Fouling Connections	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 4, and SK3 for item 5: 1) The connection for the W21 per 1/S1-5010 fouls the Type 4 drag connection. Please provide a solution. 2) The beam connection per 2/S1-5011 fouls the bolts for the column base plate. Please provide a solution. 3) The beam connection per 2/S1-5011 fouls the bolts for the column base plate. Please provide a solution. 4) The kicker connection is too close to the PL 2 1/2" stiffener. Confirm it is acceptable to omit the kicker braces or to move them north to the W40x149 on Grid D.4. If not, supply an alternate solution. 5) The connections for the W24x104 & W30x90 foul the connection for the BU-56 to the column per 3/S1-5011. Please provide a solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Provide a shear plate connection at the W21 beam similar to that shown in SKS-0421 submitted with RFI T-1553.3. Number of bolts at the connection shall be per 1/S1-5011. Move the W21 beam away from the slab edge and center the shear plate in the horizontal spacing between the bolts. 2) Move the full depth shear plate (and the W30 beam) by a few inches so that it is centered in the spacing between the bolts at base plate. 3) See response to 2). 4) The 1 1/2" stiffener adjacent to the kicker brace may be waived at the two locations highlighted in the RFI. Note that the stiffener is incorrectly called out as 2 1/2" thick in item 4 of the RFI. 5) Provide shear plate connections at the W24 and W30 beams similar to 1). Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict and Alternate proposal, agree with verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2004 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1940	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Missing Base Plate Detail at HSS Posts	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 705 SK1: Please provide a detail showing the base plate for the HSS10x10 at the noted location with the support beams at varying elevations and slopes. Note: the opposite condition occurs between Grids D-D.4.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Provide a base plate connection similar to "TYPE 2" shown on CD RFI 146.1 SK2, except, there shall be 4 bolts on each side of the HSS. The base plate shall be oriented parallel to the W40x278 beam with the base plate connected to the W40 and TPG1 beam flanges. Provide shim plates between the base plate and the beam flanges as required.				
			Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				
<hr/>							
T-1940.1	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Missing Base Plate Detail at HSS Posts	Closed	01/06/2015	01/16/2015	01/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2607 Location: Zone 4, Roof Park Level Grid Line: D.4 & F.6/32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1940 Drawing S1-2607 shows HSS posts connecting over a tapered girder on gridline 32.4. (see attached sketch) These connections would require compound shims which would likely be problematic in the field. Confirm it is acceptable to supply a base plate as shown to avoid the compound shim that will be required between the base plate and the top of the TPG1. If not, confirm it is acceptable to provide 3/16" oversize holes in the 3.5" thick flange of the TPG1 in order to fit the bolts thru multiple layers with non-parallel surfaces.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Provide base plate connection per response to RFI T-1940. It is acceptable to provide shims and 3/16" oversize holes in the TPG1 flange.				
			Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				
<hr/>							
T-1941	SSS - ST603 Missing Information at Second Level Stringers	Closed	11/24/2014	12/04/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: To coordinate connections with Second Level Framing, please answer the following questions: See attached CD RFI # 697 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Please clarify what is meant by "SIM" as the connection in detail 3/S1-7601 is for channel stringers. 2) Supply the missing dimensions to locate the stair stringers (not shown on 3/A1-7022).	SUGGESTION:					
T-1941.1	SSS - ST603 Fouling Connections at Second Level Stringers	Closed	02/13/2015	02/23/2015	02/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: RFI T-1941, 1/S1-5010, 3/S1-7015, 3/S1-7603 Location: Zone 4, Second Level, GL 27-28 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 697.1 SK1 The stringer connection per 3/S1-7603 fouls the W16x26 beam connection per 1/S1-5010. Please provide a solution.	SUGGESTION:					
T-1942	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Kicker Brace Fouling Slab Opening	Closed	11/26/2014	12/06/2014	12/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
	REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 706 SK1: The kicker brace per 1/S1-7600 fouls the slab opening. Please provide a solution.	SUGGESTION:					
T-1943	SSS - ST601B Fouling Connections	Closed	11/26/2014	12/06/2014	12/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2006 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 707 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) A 1/16" gap remains between the beam flanges when they are centered under the curbs. Confirm this is the design intent or supply revised beam locations. 2) The double angle connections per 1/S1-5010 will not fit at the noted locations. Confirm it is acceptable to supply shear plate connections per 1/S1-5011 except they will be welded to the web stiffeners and the underside of the beam flange. If not, supply a new connection detail. 3) Confirm a shear plate per 1/S1-5011 may be used at the noted locations as 1/S1-5010 will not work opposite the connection per 9/S1-5032. If not, supply a new connection detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The short W27 beam may be moved towards GL F slightly so that there is 1/2" clearance between the beam flanges. 2) Provide shear plate connections at the noted W24 and W27 beams similar to that shown in SKS-0421 submitted with RFI T-1553.3. Number of bolts at the connection shall be per 1/S1-5011. 3) Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			
T-1944	SSS - Dimension Discrepancy at Glass Floor GL 20.1-21	Closed	12/01/2014	12/11/2014	12/02/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: See attached CD RFI # 648 SK1: 19'-11 3/4 x 4 = 47'-3. Please clarify the discrepancy as shown on SK1. This impacts the post locations per 1/S1-8016.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Locate the workpoints in 4 equal divisions of 47'-3 1/4" as noted in the dimension string.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1945	SCS - Foundation Wall Inner Vertical Bar Detail 4/S1-3206	Closed	12/01/2014	12/11/2014	12/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titché</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference RFI T-1625 & T-1894				Confirmed. At contractor's option, it is also acceptable to keep the HRC couplers and replace the top-of-wall hook with a head similar to that shown on Section 1/S1-3201.			
See attached marked up drawing of detail 4/S1-3206. Similar to the embedded column detail mentioned in RFI T-1625 & T-1894, detail 4/S1-3206 is not constructible with HRC 420 couplers. SCCI proposes to utilize the method approved for embedded columns in RFI T-1894, using Bartee position couplers in lieu of the HRC 400 series on the rebar with hook. As before, note that Bartee is not listed in spec section 03 20 02 acceptable products, but is an or equal.							
Please confirm if Bartee couplers are acceptable to be used at detail 4/S1-3206 to allow hook installation.							
T-1946	PLG - Missing Load Requirement for Pumps CP-3-A-1 & CP-B1-A-1	Closed	12/02/2014	12/12/2014	12/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Aseem Goyal</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: P1-0050 & E1-0052 dated 06/20/14 & Specification 26 24 16/APA				These pumps are 1/8 hp. Refer to the following electrical sketches for circuiting information:			
Neither the Equipment Schedule (P1-0050) nor the Electrical Panel Schedule (26 24 16/APA) depict load requirements for CP-3-A-1 & CP-B1-A-1. Please provide required load requirements.				SKE-RFI-T-1946-1			
				SKE-RFI-T-1946-2			
				SKE-RFI-T-1946-3			
				SKE-RFI-T-1946-4			
				SKE-RFI-T-1946-5			
T-1947	BGP - Embedded C-17 Column in Throat Wall 391 @ GL V/H	Closed	12/02/2014	12/12/2014	12/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titché</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2008 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please reference attached photo (1 page) and sketches (3 pages). Due to missing #10 column vert's in Throat Wall 391 at GL V/H, SCCI proposes the following corrective actions:</p> <p>1. In Throat Wall 391:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Add #10 dowels with approved HRC couplers, drill and epoxied into concourse deck below per sketches attached, using approved HILTI RE-500 SD Epoxy.- Add additional ties and salvage existing ties per sketches attached.- Pull horizontal bars into western most end of Throat Wall boundary while maintaining a minimum 81" lap splice.- Cast additional #10 column verts into Throat Wall which dowel into column above per contract plans and sketch attached. <p>2. In column above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Abandon the three (3) eastern most #10 column verts as shown on sketch.- All other bars installed per contract plans and/or sketches attached. <p>Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>		Confirmed.				
T-1948	<p>PLG - Missing Load requirements for Pump CP-3-B-1</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference: E1-0052 dated 06/20/14 & 26 24 16/APA-92</p> <p>Neither Plumbing Equipment Connection Schedule (E1-0052) nor the Electrical Panel Schedule(26 24 16/APA-92) specify the load for CP-3-B-1. Please provide required load requirements.</p>	Closed					
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>						
			<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			
			<p>These pumps are 1/8 hp. Refer to the following electrical sketches for circuiting information:</p>				
			<p>SKE-RFI-T-1948-1</p>				
			<p>SKE-RFI-T-1948-2</p>				
			<p>SKE-RFI-T-1948-3</p>				




Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2009 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1949	PLG - Missing Load Requirement for EWH-B1-A-3, EWH-1-C-1, EWH-1-C-2 & EWH-1-C-4	Closed	12/02/2014	12/12/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference : E1-0052 dated 06/20/14, P1-0050 dated 04/23/2014 & 26 24 16/APA					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Neither Plumbing Equipment Connection Schedule (E1-0052) nor the Electrical Panel Schedule(26 24 16/APA) specify the load for EWH-B1-A-3, EWH-1-C-1, EWH-1-C-2 & EWH-3-D-4. Please confirm EWH-B1-A-3, EWH-1-C-1 & EWH-1-C-2 are in contract, if yes please provide the load requirements for the same.					Yes, these EWHs are in the Contract Documents. Plumbing drawing P1-0050 indicates electrical info as follows:		
					EWH-B1-A-3 - 18 kW, 480V/3ph		
					EWH-1-C-1 - 18 kW, 480V/3ph		
					EWH-1-C-2 - 8 kW, 208V/1ph		
					EWH-3-D-4 - 8 kW, 208V/1ph		
					ASI-0128 electrical drawings will indicate correct electrical requirements as reflected above.		
T-1950	PLG - Electric Water Heater designation conflict	Closed	12/02/2014	12/12/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: E1-2402 dated 02/21/2014, P1-0050 dated 04/23/2014 & Location: Room No 02233					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Electric Water Heater in Room No 02233 is designated as EWH-5-A-1 in E1-2402 but Plumbing Schedule P1-0050 labels is as EWH-2-A-2 (See attached). Please provide equipment ID verification.					Equipment designation is EWH-2-A-2. ASI-0128 electrical drawings will reflect this clarification.		
T-1951	ELV - Clarification of the Room No. on 1/E1-3203	Closed	12/02/2014	12/12/2014	12/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: 1/E1-3203 dated 06/20/2014 & E1-2204 dated 06/20/2014					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Detail 1 on E1-3203 calls out Emergency Electrical Room No. as B1480 but E1-2204 refers to the same room as					Emergency electrical room number is B1325. Refer to ASI-0128 for correction.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	B1325. Please confirm the Emergency Electrical Room No. is B1325 in lieu of B1480.						
T-1952	ELV - Clarification on Numbered Notes for Junction Box on 5/E1-3204	Closed	12/02/2014	12/12/2014	12/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
	Reference: 5/E1-3204 dated 06/20/2014		Numbered note 6 does not apply to this particular junction box and should be replaced by numbered note 4				
	5/E1-3204 specifies Note 6 for the junction box on GL 1.4 & D.4 (See attached). Please confirm Note 6 does not apply to this junction box and should be replaced by Note 4 as it is relevant to the junction box in discussion.						
T-1953	ELV - Clarification on the tags of the Distribution Panel MS-B1-D	Closed	12/02/2014	12/02/2014	12/09/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
	Reference: E1-5010 dated 06/20/2014 & E1-5003 dated 06/20/2014		Power distribution as indicated by sheet E1-5003 is correct and supersedes sheet E1-5010. Refer to ASI-0128 for corrected sheet E1-5010.				
	E1-5010 depicts MS-B1-D calling out the same panel (DPH-B1-C-12) thrice, see attached. Please confirm power distribution through MS-B1-D specified in E1-5003 is correct and to supersede E1-5010.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2011 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1954	ELV - Clarification on the magnitude of current specified in Power Distribution Acc	Closed	12/02/2014	12/12/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Spec Section 26 07 00-13 dated 03/21/2014					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification Section 26 07 00-13 specifies the magnitude of current as 12000 amp in the Power Distribution Acceptance Test (See attached). Please confirm the magnitude of current should be 1200 amp in lieu of 12000 amp.					Magnitude of current shall be 1200A. Specification will be corrected in a future ASI.		
T-1955	BGP - West Foundation Wall As-Built Location	Closed	12/02/2014	12/12/2014	12/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Due to CDSM Encroachment, the thickness of the West Foundation Walls in the North direction in Area 3 was increased by 3 1/8" per RFI T-0576. During the Lower Concourse Deck D201/202 as-built survey, SCCI discovered that the CDSM encroachment was inadvertently taken into account twice. The result is that the starter wall and the corresponding 3rd Wall Lift Foundation Wall Rebar is approximately 3" thicker than planned(see attached drawing).					AAI's response:		
Please confirm the as-built condition of the North West Foundation Wall is acceptable and the wall alignment may be offset into the structure. The proposed inside face of the West Wall for the 3rd Wall Lift ONLY on the North Side is 1'-6 1/4." East of GL 1.					Architecturally there no objection to the slightly increased wall thickness at the one location described in this RFI. Please refer to TT's response.		
					TT's response:		
					Condition is structurally acceptable below grade. At grade, plain concrete (excessive cover) between outside face of foundation wall reinforcing and planned building line will not be allowed. Contractor shall propose method of providing reinforced concrete with specified cover at grade to make up any distance between offset wall and planned building line.		
T-1956	SCS - 4th Lift Foundation Walls - NW Corner CJ Layout	Closed	12/02/2014	12/12/2014	12/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please reference spec section 03 30 02-3.2.A.3 and the attached drawings.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Confirmed for all three questions.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2012 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1957	<p>SCS - Foundation Wall 4th Lift Vertical Unistrut Spacing Tolerance</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang</p> <p>REQUEST: Please reference T-1549 3rd Wall Lift Vertical Unistrut Spacing Tolerance.</p> <p>Per RFI T-1549, the vertical unistrut tolerances of plus/minus 4" off the 10' O.C. spacing was allowed on all 3rd lift foundation walls.</p> <p>Please confirm: 1. That the same tolerances apply to the foundation walls 4th lift. 2. That TG07.2 is to as-built unistrut layout in the field and install unistrut in the 4th lift to match.</p>	Closed	12/02/2014	12/12/2014	12/03/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Both items 1 and 2 of this RFI are confirmed acceptable.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2014 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>and install the sand oil interceptor and baffle wall below Lower Concourse Level. See RFI #T-0677.</p> <p>RFI #T-0677 (See attached) makes reference to the sand oil interceptor and baffle, however there is no Information or details about the location of the element.</p> <p>Please provide details for the sand oil interceptor and baffle wall.</p>		6001.				
T-1961.1	SCS - Baffle Wall Missing Dimensions	Closed	03/02/2015	03/12/2015	03/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: P1-6001 Location: Mat Slab Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A				Refer to the attached sketch for baffle and other oil sand interceptor dimensions.			
On Exhibit A it is indicated TG07.2 to "furnish and install the baffle wall below Lower Concourse Level".				Also refer to response to RFI #T-0677 BGP (August 2013) repeated below:			
Response to RFI T-1961 direct TG07 .2 to details 11 and 12 on drawing P1-6001. The information provided is not sufficient to build the baffle wall.				"The pit baffles are post-installed and will be part of the TG07.2 Superstructure Concrete Package. The baffles are to be 6" thick concrete walls with #5@8" OC EA WAY, bars centered in wall. Post-installed epoxy dowel embedment depths per structural General Notes."			
Please provide width, length and height of wall, concrete mix and reinforcement layout along with other detail views.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2016 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Reference: M1-0053(06/20/2014), M1-2506(06/20/2014) & Location: Room No-03540 Per M1-0053 FSD 3-D-3 requires a duct smoke detector but floor plan M1-2506 doesn't depict one. Please confirm Smoke Detector is required and provide applicable updated floor plan or sketch.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					FSD-3-D-3 shall be activated by Area Smoke Detector in Room 03540. See attached sketch "SKM-RFI-T- 1965-M1-0053.pdf" for updated schedule		
T-1966	SSS - ST201A Inaccessible Weld Access at HSS	Closed			12/08/2014 12/18/2014 12/19/2014 Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>		
	From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 2 & 3/S1-7003 Location: Zone 1, Roof Grid Line: E.6 & 1 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 692 SK1 Details 6 & 12/S1-7604 call out weld information for HSS members shown on 2 & 3/S1-7003. Both of the noted welds in SK1 cannot be made for the locations in details 2 & 3/S1-7003, as there will be no access after one member is erected. Confirm it is acceptable to weld the HSS8x8 on the south side only or supply an alternative solution.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Weld the HSS10x8 beam on both sides per 6/S1- 7604. It is acceptable to weld the HSS8x8 beam on the south side only due to restricted access on the north side. Note that the HSS8x8 beam shall be CJP welded at top and bottom per 12/S1-7604. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2017 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1967	SSS - Missing Connection Detail at Ground Level GL 34	Closed	12/08/2014	12/18/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2307 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Grid Line: C.3 & 34 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 708 SK1 Drawing S1-2307 provides information for W16 and W12 members near GL C.3 and 34. Insufficient connection information is provided. 1) Confirm it is acceptable to connect to the W16 with a shear plate per 1/S1-5011 as there is insufficient room for a double angle connection. 2) Supply an embed detail for the W12 to the concrete.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed that the W12 beam may be connected to the W16 beam with a shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011. 2) Provide a double angle connection with embedded plate similar to 1/S1-3705, except, provide 8 studs with 2 vertical columns of 4 studs each. Embedded plate dimensions shall be adjusted based on the reduced number of studs and edge distances per 1/S1-3705. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.				
T-1968	SSS - ASI 127 Missing Beam Locations at Ground Level GL 21	Closed	12/08/2014	12/18/2014	12/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2307, S1-6050 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Grid Line: C & 21, G & 21 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 709 SK1 ASI 127 added several beams shown on S1-2305. Locations for these beams were not provided. Similar beams have been located to suit the W-3 system as noted on S1-6050. Please provide the dimensions to locate the beams.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The noted beams shall be centered on the hangers that support the exit mezzanine slab as shown on S1-2252 and 1/S1-5034. The hangers supporting the exit mezzanine slab (T/slab EL = 1' - 7") shall be located per 1/S1-5034. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2018 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1969	SSS - FO 34 Missing Post Size at Roof Park Restaurant GL 4-5	Closed	12/08/2014	12/18/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2701 Location: Zone 1, Roof Grid Line: D & 4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 711 SK1 Drawing S1-2701 provides location and sizing information for HSS posts. A post near grid line D & 4 does not have a size indicated. Confirm the noted missing post size is HSS5x5x1/2 to match the south side of S1-2701.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reason for request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.		
T-1970	SSS - SE201 & SE202, FO 34 Fouling Connection Details	Closed	12/08/2014	12/18/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2701 Location: Zone 1, Roof Grid Line: E & 4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 712 SK1 Drawing S1-2701 shows (4) connections near grid lines E & 4. The connections are in conflict as indicated below: 1) The connection per 2/S1-5018 and 7/S1-2724 show contradictory information as the shear plate per 2/S1-5018 will foul the WT stiffeners in 7/S1-7024. Confirm it is acceptable to proceed per 2/S1-5028 and omit the WT stiffeners or provide a new detail. 2) The bolts per 7/S1-2724 PLAN VIEW-A & PLAN VIEW-B will foul the shear plates below. Confirm the bolts may be moved and the base plate enlarged as necessary to clear the shear plates.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed that the stiffeners per 7/S1-7024 may be waived and full depth shear plates per 2/S1-5018 may be provided at the 4 columns noted on SK1 in the RFI. 2) Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2020 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1973	SCS - Foundation Wall Pipe Sleeve Thickness and Base Metal	Closed	12/04/2014	12/14/2014	12/12/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titche</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference drawings 4/A1-8712 and specification section 22 05 29 2.3B.				Architectural detail governs for sleeve material. Pipe thickness shall be per ANSI specifications standard weight class for each pipe size diameter.			
Detail 4/A1-8712 calls out ¼" Thick Stainless Steel Pipe sleeve, specification section 22 05 29 2.3B states to "Provide standard weight galvanized steel pipe sleeves". Standard weight would govern the pipe thickness according to ANSI specifications derived from pipe diameter.							
There is a discrepancy in base metals used and thickness between the drawing and specification.							
Please confirm what document governs.							
T-1974	SCS - Vehicle Ramp West Wall	Open	12/05/2014	12/15/2014	12/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang</div><div>To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
RFI T-1788 stated that the wall on the west of the Bus Ramp is part of TG07.2 scope of work. Regarding this wall:				1. It is the subcontractors responsibility to coordinate with the TG6.0 scope to confirm what system will be used.			
1. Confirm if formsavers or dowels will be provided by TG06.0 for this wall				2. The aluminum louver is not part of TG7.2 scope.			
2. Confirm Alum Vertical Louver is not part of TG07.2							
T-1975	SCS - Vehicle Ramp West Wall Louver Blockout	Closed	12/05/2014	12/15/2014	12/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titche</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: A1-7407				Per updated architectural elevation, the seismic joint above the louver will be located between the louver and the beam shown on 5/S1-3210. The elevations of the beam soffit are shown on the same elevation. On			
Location: Area 1/2							
Grid Line: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1788							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2021 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>Aluminum vertical louvers are shown in the vehicle ramp wall (A1-7407 detail A).</p> <p>Details for the louver blockout cannot be located.</p> <p>Please provide details for the alum louver blockout including rebar details. Please pay special attention to the southernmost upper most southern corner of the louver where the concrete wall is less then 2" thick.</p>						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1977	SCS - Roof Ellipse Sky Light Brace Wall Layout Dimensions	Closed	12/08/2014	12/18/2014	12/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: A1-2903, A1-2906 Location: Roof Park Grid Line: 11, 28 Add'l Doc Ref's: The ellipse sky lights at Grid Lines 11 and 28 have sloping brace walls around the perimeter as seen on sheet A1-2903, A1-2906, and S1-8008. The north, south, east, and west brace walls that fall directly on grid lines have layout dimensions but the remaining 4 walls do not. Please see attached for further clarification. Please provide layout dimensions for the ellipse sky light sloping brace walls.				The location of concrete counterfort walls at the W-10 skylights shall align with the location of the W-10 workpoints provided in structural drawing S1-6011 and derived from the W-10 3d digital model. This information was provided in RFI T-1052 and coordinated with the Steel shop drawings TG0701-073.1 (CS1) and TG0701-074.1 (CS2). The W-10 skylight at GL-28 is similar. Note: The 3d digital model is an essential part of the Contract Documents as defined on A-0007 and A-0008 as well as other areas in the Contract Documents. Information contained in the 3d digital model is not contained in any other location in the Contract Documents.			
T-1978	SCS - Roof Top Perimeter Wall and Scallop Final Design	Closed	12/08/2014	12/18/2014	12/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: SKA-3890, SKA-3049-R1 Location: Roof Park Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1905, RFI T-1739 SKA-389 (A1-8685) detail 2 shows dimensions for slope at top of wall and layout dimensions for notch at top of wall for roof park perimeter wall. ASI-124 SKA-3049-R1 (A1-8608) provided a dimension for identifying the 1'-6" increase in height with a deck and wall overhang. RFI T-1739 SKA-4265 then showed a notch in the bottom of the wall which replaced the overhang detail. RFI T-1905 drawing SKS-0437 provided clarification for the change to rebar. Please provide a drawing that incorporates all intended elements with rebar details and the new dimension for the roof deck overhang into a final drawing revision.				Please refer to the enclosed sketches of the revised Roof Park perimeter concrete wall. Sketches contain: -Revised geometry of perimeter wall with required dimensions. It identifies the top of wall revised height referenced in previously submitted sheet with dimensions. -Revised concrete wall overhang detail as reviewed and agreed to with TJPA and WOJV in 12/4/2014 meeting. -Revised edge drip detail. -Concrete reinforcement on straight wall and scallop wall.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2023 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1979	SCS - 4th Lift Foundation Wall Pipe Sleeve Size Change	Closed	12/08/2014	12/18/2014	12/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: P1-0051 Location: 4th lift foundation wall Grid Line: See attached table Add'l Doc Ref's: TG0702-022 Please reference comments in the response to submittal package TG0702-022 - Comprehensive Layout Drawings - Foundation Wall Lift 4 - GL 6-10. Per the Pipe Sleeve Schedule on sheet P1-0051, all 8" ST penetrations that pass through the foundation wall are to use a 10" sleeve. Response comments in TG0702-022 state that the sleeve size should be 12" dia. Currently there are (10) 8" ST penetrations (see attached table for locations). Please clarify or confirm that all 8" ST penetrations are to use 12" sleeves.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See attached RFI T-1972 for response.	
<hr/>							
T-1980	BGP - #11 Rebar - Shear Wall at Lower Concourse	Closed	12/08/2014	12/18/2014	12/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Area 1 Grid Line: Y Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached shop drawing As can be seen in the attached photograph, the easternmost (3) of (12) shear wall boundary #11 's cannot be extended to their full development length above the Lower Concourse without intruding upon the corridor. Please confirm that these bars may be cut off and patched at the level of the Lower Concourse. The remaining (9) #11's will be extended to their planned development length with Type II couplers and tied for the first 1 '-0" above the Lower Concourse. The ties set length dimension will be reduced to suit			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Provide tie sets with corners fully engaging the embedded column bars. Field bend to suit provided tie bends satisfy ACI minimum diameters. Exterior hoop shall have 135 hooks at the ends. Exterior hoop may be built up from individual legs/shapes with 135 hooks at both ends. Single leg cross ties may have a 135 hook at one end and a 90 hook at the other provided the cross ties are alternated.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-1984	SSS - FO 34 Fouling Connection Details at Roof Level GL 6	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2701 Location: Zone 1, Roof Grid Line: E.2 & 6 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 716 SK1 Drawing S1-2701 provides the location for a post near grid line E.2 and 6. The connections for this post interfere with the beam connection below. 1) Confirm it is acceptable to locate the 2 bolts as shown and widen the base plate to clear the beam connection below. 2) Confirm it is acceptable to move the stiffener and bolts to clear the beam connection.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as Called out in contract documents.				
T-1985	SSS - FO 34 Fouling Connection Detail at Roof Level GL 4	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2701 Location: Zone 1, Roof Grid Line: F & 4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 717 SK1 Drawing S1-2701 locates a W16 beam 9'-11.25" East of grid line 4. This location causes the W16 connection to foul to connection to the BU-60x24 as shown in SK1. Please provide a solution.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Stop the W16 beam short of the bolts per 9/S1-5032 and provide a shear plate connection as shown in attached sketch. The shear plate shall be connected from east side of the beam web. Provide shim plate between the beam web and the shear plate as required. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				
T-1985.1	SSS - FO 34 Fouling Connection Detail at Roof Level GL 4	Closed	01/19/2015	01/29/2015	01/29/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: T-1985, 9/S1-5032 Location: GL 4 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached CD RFI 717.1 SK1</p> <p>See attached CD RFI 717.1 SK1. Stopping the W16 short to avoid fouling the bolts is a partial solution but the shear plate also fouls the 1 1/2" diameter bolts per 9/S1-5032 as shown and cannot be welded to the web of the BU-60. Please provide a workable alternate connection detail.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>As stated in response to RFI T-1985, the shear plate shall be connected from the east side of the beam web. A groove weld with an effective size of 1/4" may be provided from one side at the shear plate in lieu of the double sided fillet weld as shown on SKS-0441 submitted with response to RFI T-1985. If needed, shim plate may also be provided between the shear plate and the beam web so that the shear plate clears the bolts.</p>		
T-1986	SSS - FO 34 Missing Connection Detail at HSS Post GL 4	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/20/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p>				<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>		
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-2701 Location: Zone 1, Roof Grid Line: D & 4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 719 SK1</p> <p>Drawing S1-2701 shows a W12x19 member connection to a W16x36 near grid line D & 4.</p> <p>The post shown at this location appears to rest on the beam to beam connection.</p> <p>Confirm the beam to beam connection is per 1/S1-5010. If yes, supply a connection detail for the post to clear the beam to beam connection.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Confirmed. It is not clear what the conflict is from the sketch provided on SK1. If the beam stiffeners centered on the post and as shown on SKS-0434 submitted with RFI T-1923 are fouling the double angles, the stiffener plates may me moved slightly to clear the angles.</p> <p>Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Insufficient Information agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as called out on contract documents.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2028 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1987	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Connection Clarifications at Roof Level	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2607			1) Confirmed.				
Location: Zone 4, Roof			2) Confirmed.				
Grid Line: D.4 & 32.4, E.6 & 32.4			3) Provide a shear plate connection at the W30 beam similar to that shown in SKS-0421 submitted with RFI T-1553.3. Number of bolts at the connection shall be per 1/S1-5011.				
Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 720 SK1			Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.				
Drawing S1-2607 shows two angled beams at the corners of the PE704 and PE704 elevator structure.							
These connections are problematic.							
1) The dimensions shown are the minimum dimensions possible with the bent PL 3/4" with a 3" cold bending radius. Confirm they are acceptable or supply an alternate detail.							
2) Confirm the 5 1/2" dimensions may be reduced to 3 3/4" to avoid cutting the bottom flange flush to the web.							
3) Supply a connection detail for the W30x90 to the W40x278 as it fouls the connection per 9/S1-5032 as shown.							
T-1988	SSS - TPG1 Fouling Connections GL 32-32.4	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2607			Not acceptable. Provide a double bent plate connection per 7/S1-5010 at the W40x199 beam and a shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011 at the W40x264 beam.				
Location: Zone 4, Roof			Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.				
Grid Line: B & 32, G & 32							
Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 721 SK1							
Drawing S1-2607 shows two W40 beams connecting near a tapered girder TPG1.							
The connections per 7/S1-5010 for the W40x199 to the TPG1 and 1/S1-5010 for the W40x264 to the W40x199 will foul each other.							
Confirm it is acceptable to connect both beams per 1/S1-5011 as shown or supply an alternate solution. NOTE: the same condition occurs on the south side.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2029 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1988.1	SSS - TPG1 Shear Plate Connection Access GL 32-32.4	Closed	03/04/2015		03/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2607 Location: Zone 7, Roof Level Gridline: 32-32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1 This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-1988 (SK 968, CD 721) See attached CD RFI # 721.1 SK1: After applying the response per RFI T-1988 (SK 968, CD 721), it has become evident that access to the connection for the W40x264 is not possible as shown in Snapshot above. Please provide a solution. Note: the same condition occurs on the south side.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Bolt heads may be tack welded to the shear plate in the shop from the side where access is restricted and nuts may be tightened from the other side once the W40x264 is erected in place. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as clarification on means and methods.				
T-1989	SSS - Moment Symbol Connection Clarification at Bus Deck GL 33.2-33.5	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2507 Location: Zone 4, Roof Grid Line: B & 33, H & 33 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 724 SK1 Drawing S1-2507 shows moment connections at several locations to the exterior W40x362 beams. Moment symbols are not shown at the (3) noted locations in SK1. Confirm that is the design intent or confirm S1-2507 is to be revised with the moment symbols added.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Moment connections are required at the 3 noted beams. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Insufficient Information, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as Change to be issued in future bulletin.				
T-1990	ELV - Missing power source for Electric Water Heater EWH-2-A-2 & EWH-2-B-1	Void	11/05/2014	11/15/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: ANSWERED BY:							
REQUEST: Reference: E1-0052 dated 06/20/14		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2030 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-1991	<p>Plumbing Equipment Connection Schedule on E1-0052 dated 06/20/14 doesn't depict power source for EWH-2-A-2 & EWH-2-B-1. Please confirm power source for EWH-2-A-2 & EWH-2-B-1.</p> <p>SSS - Approval Comment Clarification at Bus Deck Level GL 22-24</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-2507 Location: Zone 4, Roof Grid Line: B & 33, H & 33 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 725 SK1, Skanska Shop Drawings 2872AB & 2873AB, TG0701-94</p> <p>The TT comments on drawing 2872AB in submittal package TG0701-94 noted "verify number of bolts per 1/S1-5010 for beams framing into BU44 beam. Typical." (The same condition occurs on drawing 2873AB)</p> <p>5 vertical bolts for the W21's and 8 vertical bolts for the W30's per 1/S1-5010 at the noted locations are not possible due to the 4" thick flange on the BU-44x36x1.5x4.</p> <p>Confirm it is acceptable to use the N-1 bolts similar to 12/S1-5010 at the noted locations or supply a new detail.</p>	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Confirmed.</p> <p>Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2031 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1992	SSS - PE704 & PE705 Fouling Steel and Missing Information	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 5/S1-7112 Location: Zone 4, Roof Grid Line: E & 32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 727 SK1 to SK3 Detail 5/S1-7112 shows several beam to post connections. Some of the information conflicts, and some of the information is missing. 1) The W12x19 in detail 4/S1-7112 fouls the W16x26 in detail 5/S1-7112, as shown in SK2. Please clarify. 2) The gap between the beams noted in SK3 is 1/8". Confirm that is the intent.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The T/steel of the machine beams is incorrectly called out on 4/S1-7112. T/steel of the machine beams shall be 103'-5" (datum to be confirmed with Elevator contractor). Move the W12 beams as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0442 and provide shear plate connections similar to 8/S1-5012 at the W-12 beams. 2) See response to 1). Reason for RFI (TT): Disagree with the reason noted in RFI: Engineering conflict, agree with other: verification. TT categorizes this RFI as no cost clarification.			
T-1993	SSS - Fill Plate on TR23 Bottom Flange	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-4308 & S1-5052 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Grid Line: A & 23 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 723 SK1 The TT comments on Skanska shop drawing 706AB from the TG0701-94 submittal package note "plate not required per note 2 on 4/S1-5052." A similar condition exists on Skanska shop drawing 727 in the same submittal package. Skanska agrees that it is correct that the plates are not required at this location per Note 2 in detail 4/S1-5052. As shown in the attached sketch, the plate is shown in detail B/S1-4308. Confirm the plate may remain.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that the plate may remain as long as there is no additional cost to the Owner. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reasons for request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2032 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1994	SSS - Connection Details on TR24	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1‐5011 Location: Zone 4, Roof Grid Line: Typ. Connection Details Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 726 SK1 The TT comments on Skanska shop drawing 708BC from the TG0701-121 submittal package included notes on connections. The noted connections are correct per 2/S1-5011 and per RFI T-0894 (SK 192, CD 143). (see SK1) 1) The (2) noted connections are correct per 2/S1-5011. Confirm the intent of the comment is to revise the connections. If yes, supply a detail as it is not possible to have 4 bolts per row as shown. 2) These connections with shear plates are correct per RFI T-0894 (SK 192, CD 143). Confirm the intent of the comment is to revise the connections.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Yes, the intent is to revise the connections. Provide (6) A325-X bolts in 2 vertical rows of 3 bolts each at the two W16 beams. 2) Shear connections per response to RFI T-0894 and as shown in the submittal are acceptable. Revisions to connections per review comments are not required. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.				
T-1995	SSS - ST601 Fouling Connections at Second Level	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2406 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Grid Line: D.4 & 31 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 728 SK1 S1-2406 shows a double angle connection near grid lines D.4 and 31. The double angle connection per 1/S1-5010 fouls the web stiffener per 3/S1-5019 by 1 3/16" as shown in SK1. Advise whether to reduce the length of the web stiffener by 2" or replace the double angle connection with a shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reducing the length of the web stiffener by 2" is acceptable. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-1996	SSS - TPG1 Approval Comment Clarification GL 24.9	Closed	12/09/2014	12/09/2014	12/23/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2606 Location: Zone 4, Roof Park Level Grid Line: D & F/24.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 736 SK1, Skanska Shop Drawings 2878 & 2910, TG0701-130 The TT comment on drawing 2878 in submittal package TG701-130 noted "provide connection per 9/S1-5032" (The same condition occurs on drawing 2910) Revising the connection for A2878 & A2910 to 9/S1-5032 from 1/S1-5010 causes a connection conflict with the connection per 1/S1-5010 for the W40x294. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the (2) W40x294's per 1/S1-5011 or supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> To resolve the connection conflict, provide connection per 9/S1-5032 in lieu of 1/S1-5010 at the W40x294 beam, except, the 3/8" web stiffener plates are not required at the W40x294 beam. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.	
<hr/>							
T-1997	SSS - ST601B Fouling Connections at Roof Level	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2606 Location: Zone 4, Roof Grid Line: F & 30 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 729 SK1 Drawing S1-2606 shows a connection near grid line F & 30. The connection per 1/S1-5010 will foul the connection per 9/S1-5032 at this location. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the W24x68 per 1/S1- 5011 as shown.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.	
<hr/>							
T-1998	SCS - Wall Opening Detail Conflicts for Horizontal and Diagonal Bars	Void	09/15/2014	09/25/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2034 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please reference detail 4/S1-3207 and RFI T-1666 about foundation wall opening conflicts. Since submitting RFI T-1666, more concerns regarding 4/SI-3207 have been brought to our attention.</p> <p>One of the concerns mentioned in RFI T-1666 was the case of additional vertical bars potentially conflicting with moment frame beam rebar. This issue can also occur with the diagonal cross bars and additional horizontal rebar.</p> <p>1. Please provide an alternative detail for cases where either additional horizontal bars and diagonal cross bars conflict with moment frame beam rebar.</p> <p>Due to the length of additional horizontal bars, wall openings near foundation wall CJs will cause the constructability issue of requiring rebar to be built out further to proceed with concrete pours.</p> <p>2. Please confirm that the alternate wall opening detail (requested in RFI T-1666) for additional vertical bar lengths can also be applied to additional horizontal bars.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			
T-1999	<p>SSS - FO 34 New Beam Fouling Existing Connection GL 5</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-2701 Location: Zone 1, Roof Grid Line: F & 5 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 735 SK1</p> <p>Drawing S1-2701 shows a W12 beam near grid lines F & 5.</p> <p>The added W12x19 in FO 34 fouls the existing connection per 2/S1-5018.</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>12/09/2014</p>	<p>12/09/2014</p>	<p>12/22/2014</p>	<p>Potentially</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			
			<p>Provide a shear plate connection at the W-12 beam similar to that shown in SKS-0421 submitted with RFI T-1553.3.</p> <p>Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2035 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please provide a solution.							
T-2000	SSS - CP6 Connection at GL 33.5 B &H	Closed	12/09/2014	12/09/2014	12/22/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2507 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Grid Line: H & 33.5, B & 33.5 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 738 SK1			1) Confirmed.				
Drawing S1-2507 shows CP6 connections at grid lines B/H and 33.5.			2) Not acceptable. Reduce the length of the web plate by 1" so that distance between the bolt centerline and the edge of the web plate increases to 2 1/2".				
The connections as shown cause a dimension to change and also cause a potential conflict with CP6 colt hole connections.			Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reason for request: verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				
1) With the 1 1/2" stiffener plate per 4/S1-8003 centered about the CP6 connection, the W40x149 will be located 5'-9 11/16 west of Grid 33.5. Confirm that is acceptable.							
2) The edge of the web reinforcing plate per 1/S1-5017 is 1 1/2" clear of the bolt holes for the CP6 connection. Confirm that is acceptable or supply a solution.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2001	SSS - AEES and Erection Aid Approval Comment Clarifications GL 24	Closed	12/09/2014	12/09/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: E/A1-8660 & A/A1-8662 Location: Zone 3 Grid Line: E/24 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 734 SK1, Skanska Shop Drawings 6805, TG0701-121 The AAI comments on drawing 6805 in submittal package TG0701-121 noted "AEES with IFRM-1 per E/A1-8660 and A/A1-8662". The approval comment is a revision to the contract documents as E/A1-8660 & A/A1-8662 are sections along Grid 23 and do not indicate that this beam on Grid E/24 requires AEES/IFRM-1. If painting is required on this beam, supply the extent on this drawing and on the MF beam on Grid 24 if required.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Painting and prep work for AEES and IFRM-1 are required for the beam at GL 24, as well as the beams at both sides of the Light Column on GL 23. For the extent of the painting and prep work, see the attached clarifications to the comments that were provided in Submittals TG0701-94 (ES3) and TG0701-121 (ES4). Details F/A1-8661 and A/A1-8662 have been revised for ASI 128 to clarify the AEES and IFRM requirements at these locations.		
T-2001.1	SSS - AEES/IFRM-1 Requirement at Roof Level GL 23E	Closed	01/19/2015	01/29/2015	01/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: T-2001, S1-2605 Location: GL 23E Contrary to the response in RFI T-2001, the extent of the painting for the beam on Grid E @ Grid 24 was not provided in the Submittal TG0701-121 (ES4). Supply the extent of the AEES/IFRM-1 requirement.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The full extent of the beam A6805 is AEES to receive IFRM-1. Refer to RFI T-2001 response for the sketches that already provided this information for this beam and the adjoining plate assembly.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2037 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2002	SSS - Approval Comment Clarification at Roof Level Connection GL 24	Closed	12/09/2014	12/19/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div> <div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: S1-2605 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Grid Line: E.6/24 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 732 SK1, Skanska Shop Drawings 2875, TG0701-121 The TT comment on drawing 2875 in submittal package TG0701-121 noted "bolt edge distance of 4" per 1/S1-5019". The requested 4" edge distance for the plate will foul the "k" distance of the incoming beam. The beam "k" distance is 3" + 1/2" plate radius (T & B). Please confirm is acceptable to use a 3" edge distance (T & B), if not, supply an alternate solution.</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div> <div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accepted Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Confirmed.</div><div>Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as a no cost clarification.</div></div>							
T-2003	SSS - TPG3 Approval Comment Clarification at Weld Termination GL 25-27	Closed	12/09/2014	12/09/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div> <div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: 9/S1-5026 Location: Zone 4 Grid Line: D.4 & E.6/25-27 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 731 SK1, Skanska Shop Drawings P537BB, TG0701-207 The TT comment on drawing P537BB in submittal package TG0701-207 noted "missing WAH". It is not clear what is meant by the noted approval comment. A WAH is not required in the 4" vertical plate but it seems WAH's are required where the CJP weld for the 4" flange plates terminates at the 4" vertical plate. Please refer to detail 9/S1-5026 and supply the dimensions for the WAH's if required.</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div> <div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accepted Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>We agree that WAHs are required where the CJP welded flange plates terminate at the thickened web as indicated in the RFI. The dimension of the WAH at this location is a means and methods issue and shall be executed per AWS D1.1. Limit the dimension of the hole perpendicular to the beam web to 2 inches. Note that the welding detail at thickened web to TPG web is incorrectly shown as fillet welds (double sided 3/4 fillet welds) in this shop drawing. As indicated on Detail 9A/S1-5026, double bevel CJP splice is required at the thickened web to TPG web connections. TT: We disagree with the reason for request: insufficient information. We categorize this RFI as clarification on means and methods and called out on contract documents.</div></div>							
T-2004	EAW - Metal Panel Wind Loading Factor	Closed	12/10/2014	12/20/2014	12/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2038 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Crown Corr, Inc. Erik Bryant			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Specification 08 44 27 Section 2.2H Location: Building Exterior Add'l Doc Ref's: RWDI dated June 7, 2014 The aforementioned report includes an importance factor of 1.15 and with the material safety factors to be utilized this may result in a complicated design and cost implications. Please confirm that the 150% is to be applied to the RWDI reported wind pressures for the structural analysis of the panels and the panels support structure.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Metal Panels and substructure must be designed to withstand the RWDI reported wind loads at either 150% or applicable LRFD load factors for strength design, whichever governs.				
T-2005	EAW - Uniformly Distributed Loads	Closed	12/10/2014	12/10/2014	12/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Crown Corr, Inc. Erik Bryant			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Specifcation 08 44 27 Section 2.2K Location: Building Exterior The upper capacity of the panels must be achieved under a uniformly distributed load of not more than 150 psf, acting perpendicular to the panel surface. The load acts on the net area of the perforated panel and needs to be considered in both directions (inward and outward). It is Larson Engineering Inc (LEI's) interpretation that the panel shall not exceed 150 psf for its ultimate static capacity but can be less as long as the wind loads under ASD design provisions are obtained. Please confirm this interpretation is correct. LEI intends to use a phi factor of 0.9 for the ultimate design capacity as a safety margin for the design of the panels and the panels' support structure. Please confirm this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We confirm that this interpretation is correct. We confirm that this phi factor is acceptable.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2039 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2006	SCS - Roof Sky Light Overhang Bent Plate Brace	Open	12/10/2014	12/20/2014	12/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>RFI #T-1872 Question 3. Please confirm that the skylight over hang bent plate will support the wet concrete deck weight. Answer 3. "Confirmed that the bent plate shown is to support the wet concrete weight (for the deck only). Verify location and dimensions of the bent plate with steel shop drawings."</p> <p>In response to answer 3 please see attached Skanska submittal 051000-0563 .1 shop drawings. The shop drawings show the sky light bent plate exceeding 2' in length without being supported by an angle brace required by contract drawing SI-5000 detail 9. Shimmick plans to pour the roof deck first and once the concrete has reached sufficient strength then pour the sky light wall on the concrete deck.</p> <p>1. Please confirm that Skanska will be installing an angle brace per S1-5000 detail 9 for bent plate over hang distances greater than 2 feet at the sky light opening.</p> <p>2. Please confirm whether or not Skanska will fill in gaps between bent plates as shown in the attached photo.</p>				<p>1. The bent plate at the skylight opening will be installed per detail 1/S1-8008, no angle brace included.</p> <p>2. Bent plate will be installed continuously around skylight opening, as shown on S1-2603.</p>			
<hr/>							
T-2007	SCS - CIPAC Walls at Bicycle/Vehicle Ramps	Closed	12/10/2014	12/20/2014	12/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Contract Doc Ref: A1-2310 (IFB 9.23.2013, IFC 3.31.2014 & ASI 127 9.12.2014)</p> <p>Location: Zone 1</p> <p>Grid Line: N/A</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>IFC issuance of drawings dated 3.31.2014 added notes designating "cast in place architectural concrete" at four faces of the bicycle and vehicle ramp walls. In ASI 127 issuance of sheet A1-2310 it appears the two inner wall designations for CIPAC are removed while the west face of vehicle ramp walls and east face of bicycle ramp wall</p>				<p>The two inner ramp walls are not intended to have the CIPAC designation and these annotations will be removed from A1-2310.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2041 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2009	SCS - Roof Park - Notch in Scallop Wall Fins	Closed	12/10/2014	12/10/2014	12/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-3282 Location: Roof Park Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Detail 7/S1-3282 shows a notch in the scallop wall fin. This notch is not shown anywhere else in the Contract Documents. Please provide locations where the notch shown on detail 7/S1-3282 occurs.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The notched fin walls occur at the Bus Deck Fountain, as noted in detail 7/S1-3282. Contractor to coordinate locations with Landscape drawings.		
T-2010	BGP - Extended Concrete Delivery Times - Cemex Mix Design #1574293	Closed	12/11/2014	12/21/2014	12/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 03 30 20 3.3c Location: N/A Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Cemex Letter, Set-Time Results. Please reference attached set-time results and letter from Cemex QC Mangaer, Robert Foley, regarding 7 day high early mix #1574293 . Please confirm it is acceptable to extend the delivery time of mix#1574293 to 2 hours?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It will be acceptable to extend the concrete delivery time as proposed in the RFI. The contractor shall be responsible for providing an end concrete product that meets the specifications.		
T-2011	BGP - Upturned Beam at GL 21 - Shoring Removal	Closed	12/11/2014	12/21/2014	12/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The response to RFI T-1823 states that it is acceptable to pour the upturned portion of the beam at GL 21			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2042 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	separately.						
	Please confirm it is acceptable to strip the Lower Concourse at this location(D22 I) prior to the pour of the upturned beam.						
T-2012	SCS - Plate and Bearing Pad Embeds at B141 Beams	Closed	12/11/2014	12/21/2014	12/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang		To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please reference drawing S1-2251 and detail 10/S1-3411				TG06 contractor will furnish plate and bearing pad embeds, TG7.2 contractor will provide installation.			
Foundation Wall and Corbels supporting B141 beams are under TG07 scope of work; however the bearing pad and plate embeds are not included in TG07 scope.							
Please confirm which package is responsible for furnishing the plate and bearing pad embeds.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2043 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2013	FRP - UL Listing Reference for Intumescent Fire Resistive Material (IFRM-2)	Closed	12/12/2014	12/12/2014	12/16/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Sheet A1-8662 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Detail A/A1-8662 (ASI 127 dated 9/12/14) Detail A/S1-6005 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Location: Light Column - Train Plaform through Roof Park Level Grid Line: 22-24 & D-F Add'l Doc Ref's: UL Design Listings (Design No. X674) Per the Fire Protection Matrix & Schedule/A1-8662, the UL Design Listing referenced for IFRM-2 is X674. Per Detail A/A1-8662, IFRM-2 is to be applied to the light column cast pipe members. Per Detail A/S1-6005, the light column cast pipe sizes are 32"x2.36", 30"x2", 28"x1.57", and 30"x1.57". The specific member sizes required by the contract documents are not identified within UL Design Listing X674 as tested assemblies. Please provide direction as to how UL Listing X674 is to be applied to the light column members, or provide a standard to be used for installation of IFRM-2 at the members not listed within UL X674.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The contractor is to follow manufacturer's rating formulas for calculating the thickness of the intumescent coating to meet the UL requirements. Refer to Specification Section 07 81 23 1.5 E for compliance requirements.		
T-2013.1	FRP - IFRM Thicknesses and Third Party Assessment Requirements	Closed	12/31/2014	12/31/2014	01/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



T-2014	SCS - Roof Architectural Wall Mix Design	Closed	12/12/2014	12/22/2014	12/15/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Claude Titcher	To: Turner Construction Company	Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2045 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: 03 33 00 1.1a, 03 33 00 1.5c, 03 30 02 2.1 Location: Roof Park Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>The Cast-In-Place Architectural Concrete specification, 03 33 00, refers you to specification 03 30 02 for concrete mix design.</p> <p>The concrete properties table in specification section 03 30 02 2.1 does not specifically call out a roof architectural wall mix design.</p> <p>Please confirm the 5,000 psi ¾ inch slabs, beams, and wall mix is the correct mix design for the root top architectural walls.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Per Table 2.1 in specification 03 30 02, the concrete for wall shall be 5,000 psi. Submit mix design for approval as required.</p>		
T-2015	<p>SSS - Framing Clarifications at Roof Level GL 4-6</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p>	Closed			<p>12/12/2014 12/12/2014 12/22/2014 Potentially <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>		
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-2602 & S1-2603 (ASI 127) Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: 4-4.5/C-D & 4-4.5/F-F.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 657 SK1 & SK2</p> <p>2.) The 7 beams shown boxed on CD RFI 657 SK1 (referencing drawing S1-2602 from ASI 127) have had their location dimensions that were shown in Field Order 27 removed.</p> <p>Confirm the dimensions still apply or supply the revised locations.</p> <p>3.) The beam size at 4/D on CD RFI 657 SK1 (referencing drawing S1-2602 from ASI 127) has been removed.</p> <p>Confirm the beam is still a W16x26.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p> <p>Skanska please note item #1 on CD RFI 657 SK1 references a valid drawing with issue date 5/30/2014.</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1) 1/S1-2701 is a valid drawing number. Sheet S1-2701 was issued with Roof Park Restaurant IFC package (5/30/2014) and again with ASI 128 (12/16/2014).</p> <p>2) Confirmed that the dimensions still apply. The dimensions to locate these beams were moved to sheet S1-2701.</p> <p>3) Confirmed. Beam size is shown on S1-2701.</p> <p>4) Dimensions to locate the W16x26 beam supporting stair posts are shown on S1-2701. The other (3) W16 beams shall be aligned to the W16 beam supporting stair posts.</p> <p>5) See response to 2).</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2046 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>4) The beams at 4.5-5.5/D and 4.5-5.5/F on CD RFI 657 SK1 (referencing drawing S1-2602 from ASI 127)were aligned as is shown in detail 1/S1-7102.</p> <p>Clarify the revised framing and supply the location dimensions for the (4) beams on each side.</p> <p>5) The 5 beams shown boxed on CD RFI 657 SK2 (referencing drawing S1-2603 from ASI 127)have had their location dimensions that were shown in Field Order 27 removed.</p> <p>Confirm the dimensions still apply or supply the revised locations.</p>						
T-2016	<p>SSS - Moment Frame Column Testing Requirements</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: Spec Section 05 12 10-8 Location: Moment Frames Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1</p> <p>Spec Section 05 12 10-8, Table 2.1 outlines the nondestructive testing requirements.</p> <p>Please review the following, and confirm:</p> <p>1) The moment frame columns that are being fabricated are currently being subjected to 100% UT and 100% MT on all weld configurations. However, Table 2.1 shows that only the demand critical welds and butt joints in the column splices should receive the aforementioned testing and that in general, the welds on the moment frame columns should be subject to MT on 25% of the joints and UT on 100% of the joints. Further, testing on the moment frame columns can be reduced as per AISC 341,</p>	Closed					
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>						
	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>1.) RESPONSE: The moment frame column NDT requirements on all weld configurations have been provided in specification section 05-12-10 and Structural Steel Additional Seismic Requirements, Table 2-1. This response has been coordinated with the EOR.</p> <p>Any decision to reduce the level of NDT must consider the criticality, redundancy, loading types, peak loads and other information in the domain of the EOR, in addition to weld reject rates, etc. This means that any allowable reduction in NDT is an EOR prerogative, and not a mandatory requirement. The EOR has agreed to allow such reductions per Note 2 below Table 2-1 which references AISC 341. However; AISC 341 (-05 & -10) stipulates that any reduction in NDT is for individual welders based on their reject rate. There is nothing in the AISC provisions (or in the project specifications) that suggest that any reduction in NDT</p>		12/15/2014	12/25/2014	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams</p>						



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>Appendix Q5.2. Please see attached SK1 that highlights the testing requirements, as understood by Skanska, for the moment frame columns and confirm this is correct.</p> <p>If this is not accurate, please supply the NDT requirements for the Moment Frame Columns.</p> <p>2) Please clarify the Table 2-1 remark under welds not described below, "MT 25% of joints, full length". It is our understanding that 1 out of every 4 joints will receive full length MT inspection and the next 3 joints will not receive MT. Please confirm.</p>						
					<p>be approved for a facility, only for individual welders whose reject rates do not exceed 5%. This RFI does not (in keeping with the AISC provisions) provide a blanket reduction for the facility.</p> <p>EOR has allowed for QA Special Inspectors to reduce the NDT of those welds on the moment frame columns (Non-demand critical welds and Non-butt joints in the column splices) to MT on 25% of the joints and UT based on the AISC provisions. However, this will require Skanska and QA Special Inspectors to verify statistically the acceptance/rejection rates of each welder or welding operator proposed for reduction with a request in writing from Webcor-Obayashi/Skanska. The statistics should include the number of 'welds' made, the number of 'welds' examined by MT and UT, and the number of 'welds' rejected by MT and UT to comply with the AISC provisions. QA Special Inspectors would then review the statistics prior to accepting any specific welder NDT reduction request. The QA Special Inspectors only are authorized to reduce the NDT of those specific welders and the QA Special Inspectors only are also authorized to rescind this.</p> <p>NOTE: Regarding any proposed "Reduction of Rate of Ultrasonic Testing" specified in AISC 341-10 (J6.2g) compared to 341-05 (Q5.2 g). This exempts Demand Critical Welds from any reduction in UT testing. UT Testing shall remain as per specification section 05-12-10 Structural Steel Additional Seismic Requirements, Table 2-1.</p> <p>2.) RESPONSE: Any decision to reduce the level of NDT to 25% for moment frame column Complete Joint Penetration (CJP) welds and per specification section 05-12-10 Structural Steel Additional Seismic Requirements, Table 2-1, and AISC as noted above, Four of Four (4 out of 4) welds will receive QA Special Inspectors AWS Code visual welding inspection with some reduction in MT inspection only at the discretion of the QA Special Inspectors who are only authorized to reduce the NDT to 25% for those individual welders whose reject rates do not exceed 5% as described above. The QA Special Inspectors only are also</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2048 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2017	BGP - Foundation Wall - 3rd Lift - West Wall Rebar Cover From: Webcor Construction LP To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: West Foundation Wall. W379. W380 Grid Line: N/A Add' Doc Ref': Field Report SS10-073, attached sketches. Please see attached sketches and field report #SS8510-073, sections 073.3.2 and 073.3.3, authored by Sean McNeill. Due to a variance in concrete cover at foundation walls W379 and W380 SCCI proposesthe following solutions. 073.3.2: Where the 4 instances occur, SCCI proposes to excavate behind the vertical dowel approximately 6"down to allow for field bending of thee dowel in order to achieve specified cover. Vertical will be identified, concrete will be excavated and dowel will be field bent away from face of wall. (Please reference attached sketch referencing issue #073.3.2) Please confirm this is acceptable. 073.3.3: Where condition occurs at wall W80, a 12"x 12"grid of #4 temperature steel will be added. This grid of temperature steel will be dobed off of existing contract bars in order to achieve specified cover. The approximate height of the grid will be 3'to 6'and approximately 15'to 20'in length. At the top of the wall clear cover will be set to specified amount. (Please reference attached sketch referencing issue #073.3.3) Please confirm this is acceptable.	Closed	12/16/2014	12/26/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			authorized to rescind this.				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Regarding TT Field Report Item 073.3.3 referenced in the RFI: The proposal is acceptable at the location of excess concrete cover. It is acceptable to use larger reinforcing bars in accordance with the availability of materials on site. Regarding TT Field Report Item 073.3.2 referenced in the RFI: Field walk with Charlie Marrow of SCCI and TT Field Representative, Sean McNeill, on 12/19/14 identified additional locations, over those mentioned in the RFI, of less than minimum required concrete cover both north and south of Wall 191. Definitive identification of all individual bars in violation was difficult due to inconsistencies in the profile of the wall starter lip just above the concourse and the fact that many of the wall starter bars (and coupler sockets) are slightly out of plumb. An acceptable course of action is for the contactor to complete the installation of wall reinforcing and secure the top of reinforcing to the waler above at the contract plan location so that all verticals are in a straight line. The contractor shall establish the theoretical wall face at the base and measure the available cover to the nearest wall reinforcing, tie, or coupler with plum bob, level, or equivalent means. Where the cover measures less than 1" (specified cover minus ACI 117 tolerance), the contractor shall have the option of field bending the starter bars or offsetting the formwork to achieve the target cover. Should the contractor elect				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2049 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2018	PLG - Missing information for Drain Assemblies TD-2 & AD-2	Closed	12/16/2014	12/26/2014	01/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Aseem Goyal	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc.		Mark Mikhail					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: P1-0051 dated 02/21/14, P1-2307 dated 08/06/14 & A1-2307 dated 09/12/14 Location: Zone 7, Ground Level Closest Column Line Intersection is GL - 33.5 & E Add'l Doc Ref's: L1-2307A dated 03/31/14, & L1-7386 dated 03/31/14			to offset the formwork, the amount of offset shall be no more than 1 1/2" (ACI 117 tolerance). The offset shall transition linearly from form to form so that there are no abrupt vertical discontinuities in the finish.				
Question : Drains and Cleanout Schedule (P1-0051) does not specify make and model of TD-2 and AD-2.The remarks refer to Landscape and Architectural plans (see A1-2307, L1-2307A & L1-7386) for information, but they too lack information for the same. Please provide required scheduled drain assemblies and update P1-0051 Schedule accordingly.			Refer to Landscape and Plumbing drawings and specifications.				
			The Landscape drawings indicate Area Drains in paving and one Trench Drain in paving on sheet L1-2307.				
			The Area Drain is specified in section 33 41 19 2.2 T. It is intended to be the Zurn Z400, Z400BZ or equal.				
			The Trench Drain is specified in section 05 60 00 2.3 D (grate), 05 60 00 2.3 E (frame) and 05 60 00 2.3 N (liner)				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2050 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2019	BGP - Skewed Electrical Junction Box at Column C173, GL 15/D.8	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: C173 Grid Line: 15/D.8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Photo The lower Electrical Junction Box embedded in column C173 @ GL 15/D.8 was inadvertently skewed (see attached photo) during concrete placement. Please confirm the as-built condition is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The current as-built condition of the lower electrical junction box embedded in column C173 @ GL 15/D.8 is not acceptable.				
T-2020	SCS - Moment Frame Beam 1 Beam Location vs Step Location	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	01/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-2864 Location: Ground Floor Grid Line: 16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1010.1 Please refer to RFI T-1010.1 question #5 response. The response to question #5 locates MFB 1, 8'-0" west of GL 16.9 to the beam center line. Drawing A1-2864 gives dimension of 7'-6", from GL 16.9 to a 1'-0" slab step. This would create the center line at 7.50' (LINE 16.9 to the 12" STEP) + 2.50'/2 (MFB1 divided by 2)=8.75'. Please confirm the dimension from GL16.9 to beam center of MFB 1. If the dimension is 8'-0", please provide a revised section of detail 2/S1-3703 reflecting the 12" slab step.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The MFB1 beam centerline shall be 8' from GL 16.9 per response to RFI 1010.1. Slab step shall be 6'-9" from GL 16.9 as shown in attached sketch SKA-4360 so that the step aligns with MFB1 beam face per 2/S1-3703.				
T-2021	SCS - Confirming RFI - Foundation Wall Vertical Trim Bars	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2051 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2307 Location: Foundation Walls Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached. Please reference RFI T-1666. In a breakout meeting held on 11-19-14, Shimmick was directed to detail a case-by-case solution to the foundation wall vertical trim bars that cannot be embedded in the 3rd lift, due to it already being poured. Four penetrations at GL9.9, GL12, and GL13, were detailed and sent to Thornton Tomasetti for comments. Per coordination with Thornton Tomasetti, please confirm that the attached sketches and comments are acceptable modifications to foundation wall trim bar reinforcing.	Claude Titche	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello SUGGESTION:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The RFI proposal is acceptable.		
T-2022 From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2701 Location: Zone 1, Roof Grid Line: F & 4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 718 SK1 Drawing S1-2701 shows a connection between a HSS post and a beam near grid lines F & 4. This HSS connection will not clear the beam to beam connection per 1/S1-5010 below as the bolts/stiffeners per 1/S1-2720 will foul the beam connection. Please supply a connection detail for the HSS5x5x3/8 post.	SSS - FO 34 Fouling Connection at HSS Post GL 4 Gregory Kemerer	Closed To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello SUGGESTION:		12/18/2014 12/28/2014 12/27/2014 Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A shear plate connection per 1/S1-5011 may be provided at the W16 beam in lieu of the double angle connection per 1/S1-5010 to avoid conflict with stiffeners per 1/S1-2720. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2052 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2023	SSS - Missing Information at Bus Deck Level GL 32.4-33.2	Closed	12/18/2014	12/28/2014	12/27/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPGregory KemererTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2507 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Grid Line: D & 33 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI # 737 SK1					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Drawing S1-2507 provides information for the framing of the bus deck near grid lines D and 33.					1) Confirmed.		
Some of the information is missing. Please provide clarification on the following:					2) Confirmed.		
1) Confirm 8/S1-5003 applies between Grids D-D.4, opposite of Grids E.6-F. 2) Confirm the noted symbols indicate bracing per 8/S1-5015 at (8) locations hi-lited. 3) Supply the missing clouded dimensions at (8) locations.					3) The kicker braces are centered on the W-3 connections below. W-3 connection workpoint locations are shown on A/S1-6058.		
					Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Insufficient Information, agree with verification. We categorize this RFI as Called out on contract documents.		
T-2023.1	SSS - Missing Dimensions at Bus Deck Level GL 32.4-33.2	Closed	01/19/2015	01/29/2015	02/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPAndrew KitchenTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: T-2023, S1-2507 Location: GL 32.4-33.2 Add'l Doc Ref: CD RFI 737.1 SK1					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contrary to the response in RFI T-2023 item 3, the requested missing dimensions are not clearly shown on S1-6058. Confirm the (6) clouded dimensions, or supply the dimensions if the shown dimensions on SK1 are not correct.					The 5'-11 7/8" and 4'-0 3/4" dimensions are confirmed to be the center points of the W-3 connections as provided in detail A/S1-6058. Refer to attached sketch SKS-0456 for information to locate kickers at beams supporting the W-3 system. The kicker angles shall be connected to the stiffener plates shown on 1 and 2/S1-8005. Coordinate between sheets S1-8005, S1-6058 and S1-6056 to locate the stiffeners and kicker angles. Note that the eight red W24x104 beams in the sketch are deleted.		
T-2024	SSS - Transfer Girder Studs and Rebar Holes	Closed	12/12/2013	12/22/2013	03/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPRobert KjomeTo: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div><div>Co-Author:</div></div>							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
At TR8 near grid line G refer to sketches CD RFI 220 SK1					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					RFI was re-named. See RFI T-1024 response.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2053 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

to SK3 for items 1 to 3:

1) Confirm the headed studs as shown are correct (work with item 2).

2) Detail 2/S1-5023 is referenced with a "SIM" designation and it is not clear what is required on grid 8 for the additional headed studs shown in detail 2/S1-5023. Confirm the headed studs as shown on SK3 are acceptable or supply a clarifying detail specifically for this location showing the stud locations.

3a) Confirm the 2" dia. hole locations as shown on SK3 are acceptable to clear the bolts in the bottom flange and the stiffeners.

3b) Detail 2/S1-5023 shows the holes at 5" OC but this contradicts the 6" OC shown in detail 7/S1-3701. Confirm the spacing shown in item 3a above is acceptable.

3c) Confirm the 3" dia holes are not required at grid 8 as they are not shown in detail 7/S1-3701. Supply location dimensions if they are required.

T-2025	SST - Stair 501 Landing Support Steel Size Change		Void	12/19/2014	12/19/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Gregory Kemerer	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:		
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel		Avel Solomon					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: 1/S1-2252 Location: Zone 3, Mezzanine Grid Line: C & 21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached sketch, RFI T-1848 Response							
The response to RFI T-1848 includes SKS-0431 which provides steel sizes that were previously missing from the plans.							
This sketch also changes a steel size that was previously provided by the 1/S1-2252 plan.							
Please confirm the MC4x13.8 is revised to a W 12x40.							

T-2026	SST - Stair 501 Missing Beam to Beam Support Detail	Open	12/19/2014	12/29/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2054 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<hr/>							
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel Avel Solomon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: 6/A1-7010 Location: Zone 3, Mezzanine Grid Line: C & 21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached sketch, RFI T-1848 Response							
SKS-0431 included with the response to RFI T-1848 provided checkered plate stair landing information for stair 501.							
The checkered plates landing at elevation 1' 7" will be made from W10x22 beams at elevation 1' 6-3/4". The beams that support these W10x22s are at elevation 0' 11-1/2". This creates a 7-1/4" elevation difference.							
Please provide an acceptable support/connection detail.							
<hr/>							
T-2027	SSS - Approval Comment Clarification at Rolled Beam Edge Plate GL 24	Closed	12/22/2014	12/22/2014	01/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: N/A Gridline: 24 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI-T-1334, TG0701-121, Shop Drawing 6716AC & 7386AC, CD RFI #733 SK1							
The attached CD RFI #733 SK1 shows the edge plate at curved slab edges approved in RFI T-1334.						The edge plate detail in RFI T-1334 was approved for the location highlighted in the RFI. It is acceptable to provide edge plate detail per RFI T-1334 at other curved opening edges, except, at the light column opening on ground floor for the reason stated in the submittal review comment. Provide bent plate detail per 8/S1-5000 at this location.	
Please supply a revised detail if the edge plate is to be revised.						Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.	

[illegible]



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2057 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2030	SCS - Elevation of Curbs at Transformer Vault Openings	Closed	12/23/2014	01/02/2015	01/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: 2/A1-3001 - 3003, A1-2862, A1-2865					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: Zone 1 to 3, Ground Level					Curb elevations are per attached sketches SKA-4380, 4383 and 4384. Typical detail for vault manhole curb is 8" below paved surface as in detail 4/A1-8718.		
Gridline: B/1.4-5, B/9.8-12, H/20.1-22					Refer to detail 5/A1-8718 for typical vault lift out panel curbs which are 10" below paved surface. Coordinate with landscape drawings for finished paving / sidewalk elevations and slopes. Drawings A1-3001 and A1-3002 detail 2 only show 'top of cover' elevations.		
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Please reference Detail 2 of Drawings A1-3001 - A1-3003 and See attached slab edge plan drawings with markups of slab opening curbs.							
On Drawings A1-2862, A1-2862 and A1-2865, Curbs are called out at the Transformer Vault room openings, however the top of curb elevations are not provided or called out as "Height to Be Coordinated". Detail 2 of Drawings A1-3001 - A1-3003 call out Transformer Vault curb elevations as Top of Cover. SCCI requires confirmation on curb elevations in order to appropriately plan for construction of openings on the ground level.							
Please confirm if A1-3001 - A1-3003 Detail 2, Top of Cover elevations are top of curb elevations for Transformer Vault room opening curbs, if not please provide elevations.							
T-2031	SCS - Elevation of Curbs at Air Vent Openings	Closed	12/23/2014	12/23/2014	01/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: A1-2864 - A1-2866					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: Zone 1 to 3, Ground Level					Refer to attached sketches SKA-4363, 4364 and 4365 for the top of curb elevations at the air vents. For details at air vents, refer to sheets A1-9303 and A1-9305; curbs are approximately 1'-2" below Finished paving / sidewalk.		
Gridline: C&G/14, C&G/22, H/26							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2058 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please see attached slab edge plan drawings with markups of slab opening curbs.</p> <p>On Drawings A1-2864 - A1-2866, Air Vent opening Top of curb elevations are provided on the slab edge plan. Elevations are not provided for the Northern Air Vent opening curbs on A1-2865. SCCI requires confirmation on curb elevations in order to appropriately plan for construction of openings on the ground level.</p> <p>Please confirm Air Vent opening Top of Curb elevations noted in attached slab edge plan and provide elevations for Air vent curbs without Top of Curb elevations.</p>						
T-2032	SCS - Elevation of Curbs at Service Vault & Fuel Fill Openings	Closed	12/23/2014	01/02/2015	01/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company		Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-2862, A1-2864, A1-2867 Location: Zone 1 to 4, Ground Level Gridline: B/1.4-2, B/15-16, C.3&F.7/33-34 Add'l Doc Ref: N/A Please see attached slab edge plan drawings with markups of slab opening curbs. The elevations are not provided for the curbs around the following openings: - North and South Service Vault openings noted on Drawing AI-2867 - Diesel Fuel Fill openings on Drawings AI-2862, AI-2864 SCCI requires confirmation on curb elevations in order to appropriately plan for construction of openings on the		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Curb elevations are per attached sketches SKA-4380, 4381 and 4382. For Diesel fuel fill opening curb elevations, refer also to typical detail 9/A1-8717 where curbs are 9" below paved surface. Coordinate with finish elevations indicated on Landscaping drawings. For Manhole opening curbs at service vaults, refer to details 1&2/A1-9251 where curbs are 10" below paved surface. For pull box curbs at service vaults, refer to 3/A1-9251 where stepped curbs are 5" and 10" below street paving. Refer to current Civil drawings in ASI 128 and coordinate with Landscape finish elevation.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	ground level. Please provide top of curb elevations for Diesel Fuel Fill opening curbs and the North & South Service Vault opening curbs.						
T-2033	SSS - Added Shear Studs on Decking Package TG701-92F	Closed	12/24/2014	12/24/2014	02/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: 2/A-8237		Confirmed that additional studs are required per					
Location: Zone 3, Roof Park & Bus Deck		review comments. Refer to drawings submitted with					
Gridline: E/19.9 thru 24.9		ASI-0128 that show updated number of studs.					
Add'l Doc Ref's: TG701-92F, SK RFI 993 SK1 & SK2		Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with the reason for					
Engineer's review comments on SK RFI 993 SK1 & SK2 from decking drawing package TG701-92F added 182 shear studs to the bus deck level and roof level		request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as called out on contract drawings.					
The added 182 shear studs to the bus deck level and roof level are not indicated on the latest structural drawings provided to Skanska.							
Please verify if the additional shear studs are required.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2060 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2034	SSS - Conflicting Connection at GL 33.5-E	Closed	12/24/2014	12/24/2014	01/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2607, 1/S1-5013, 2/S1-4018, 1/S1-8002 Location: Zone 4, Roof Park Gridline: E/33.5 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 740 SK1 The attached CD RFI # 740 SK1 at GL E/33.5 shows the connection for the W33x118 to the BU-40x22. The connection details for the W33x118 to the BU-40x22 show conflicting information. Per S1-2607 the connection is to be per 1/S1-5013 and per 2/S1-4018 the connection is to be per 1/S1-8002 for the CP4 connection. Please supply correct detail		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Connection at the W33x118 beam shall be a CP4 connection per 1/S1-8002. See S1-2607 submitted with ASI-0128 for updated connection symbol at the W33x118 beam. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as called out on contract drawings.			
T-2034.1	SSS - Conflicting Connection at GL 33.5-E	Closed	01/30/2015	02/09/2015	02/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2607, S1-8002 Location: Zone 4, Roof Park Gridline: E/33.5 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-2034, CD RFI 740.1 SK1 Per RFI T-2034, detail 1/S1-8002 was supplied for the W33x118 to the BU-40x22 connection at GL E/33.5. The connection per 1/S1-8002 will not work at the noted location: > 1/S1-8002 calls for 11 bolts but only 9 bolts will fit inside the W33. > the bottom flange of the W33 cannot be moment welded. Please see the proposed connection in the attached CD RFI 740.1 SK1. Confirm the connection is acceptable as shown or supply a new detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Number of bolts as shown on SK1 in the RFI is acceptable. Provide a moment connection through a WT welded to the bottom flange of the W33 beam similar to that shown in SKS-0376 submitted with RFI T-1520. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request: Engineering Conflict, agree with Verification. We categorize this RFI as Other.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2061 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2035	SST - Stair 301 Landing Support Framing Conflict	Closed	12/24/2014	01/03/2015	01/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel		Avel Solomon					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: 1/A1-7006, 1, 2/S1-7006, 6/S1-7601		Extending the header beam over the columns for stringer connections is acceptable.					
Location: Zone 1, Ground & Second Level							
Gridline: E/7							
Add'l Doc Ref's: CWSD RFI #27							
See the attached sketch.							
The beam and column locations at Stair 301 intermediate landing EL. 29'-0 1/8" are setup too narrow to support the outside stringers per required detail 6/S1-7601.							
Per the attached sketch, confirm the header beam can sit on top of the columns and extend East and West as required to support the stringers. If not, please advise on a solution.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2036	RFI T-2036 SST - Stair 205 Tread Nosing Location at 2nd Level	Closed	12/24/2014	01/03/2015	01/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel</div> <div>Avel Solomon</div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Contract Doc Ref: A1-2882, 2/A1-7310, 3/A1-7513</div> <div>Location: Zone 1, Second Level</div> <div>Gridline: F</div> <div>Add'l Doc Ref's: CWSD RFI #20</div> <div>See the attached sketch.</div> <div>Detail 3/A1-7513 at Stair 205 2nd level landing calls for a 1'-0 1/8" long tread.</div> <div>The layout dimensions provided by drawings A1-2882 and 2/A1-7310 position the stair so that the tread is 11 7/8" long.</div> <div>Please confirm an 11 7/8" tread length is acceptable. If not, should the stair move ¼" North to make the tread 1'-0 1/8"?</div>			<div>SUGGESTION:</div> <div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>The 11 7/8" tread length is acceptable. Refer to the attached SKA-4378 for revised detail.</div>				
T-2037	SST - Stair 901 Missing Structural Design	Closed	12/24/2014	01/03/2015	01/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel</div> <div>Avel Solomon</div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Contract Doc Ref: A1-7023</div> <div>Location: Zone 1, All Levels</div> <div>Gridline: V/3</div> <div>Add'l Doc Ref's: CWSD RFI #22</div> <div>There is no structural design information provided for Stair 901.</div> <div>Stringer size/type, landing support framing plans, and general stair support details are not clarified by the plans.</div> <div>Please furnish missing plans and connection call-outs.</div>			<div>SUGGESTION:</div> <div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>See attached sketch SKS-0448 that shows information on support framing at landings, stringer sizes and connection details at stair 901. Note that the information is provided for overall guidance and final design shall be done by stair contractor and its engineer.</div> <div>Reason for RFI (TT): None Given. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2064 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Please advise.						
T-2040	PFB - Prefabricated Guard Booth Electrical Clarification per Sheet Notes	Closed	12/24/2014	01/03/2015	01/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 13 34 24 Sheet E1-2310 Sheet E1-2306 Sheet E1-2502 Location: Ground Level Bus Deck Level Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Per Specification Section 13 34 24 (2.3) N.1 Prefabricated Guard Booths, "booth shall be delivered prewired and ready for site power connections by the booth contractor", referencing Sheet E1-2310, E1-2306, and E1-2502 for booth type 1, 2 and 3, respectively. 1.) Note 4 of Numbered Notes on Sheet E1-2310 states, "Equipment and devices will be provided with prefab booth." However, Note 4 on Sheet E1-2310 at Prefab Guardhouse 01960 states that it is "NIC". 2.) Note 6 of Numbered Notes on Sheet E1-2306 states, "Equipment and devices will be provided with prefab booth." However, Note 6 on Sheet E1-2310 at GGT Supervisor Booth 01622 states that it is "NIC". 3.) Note 5 of Numbered Notes on Sheet E1-2502 states, "Equipment and devices will be provided with prefab booth." However, Note 5 on Sheet E1-2502 at Bus Deck Superintendent Station 03260 states that it is "NIC". Please confirm that all electrical equipment, devices, and			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		This question is not a bid question. WOJV to confirm the following proposed response in relation to their division of work between trade packages.: All electrical equipment, devices, and site power connections for prefabricated booths are to be furnished and installed under the TG16.9 bid package. This equipment is noted as 'NIC' on electrical drawings because it is not under the electrical TG10.4 bid package. 'NIC' indicates work that is not in contract for this bid package. Refer to sheet note 'I' on electrical sheet E-0005. *Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		



*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2066 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2041	BSE - ASI 0128 Revision Narrative	Open	12/24/2014	01/03/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Kristen DeWitt							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 0128 Revision Narrative (dated December 16, 2014) Location: N/A Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A ASI 0128 Conformed IFC set was issued with a revision narrative that lists of the trade packages to which it applies. TG03 - Buttress, Shoring, and Excavation package was not included. Please confirm that the ASI 0128 Conformed IFC set is not incorporated into the TG03 Contract Documents.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-2042	PFB - Make-Up Air Requirements for Restrooms 01640, 01641, 01620, and 01621 per Closed		12/29/2014	01/08/2015	01/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheet M1-2306 Specification Section 13 34 24 Location: Restrooms 01640, 01641, 01620, 01621 Closest Column Line Intersections: 30 & 31 - C 30 & 31 - F.7 Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Sheet M1-2306 indicates that there are exhaust fans and supply air from the heat pump within Restrooms 01640, 01641, 01620, and 01621. No make-up air or return plenums are indicated on the mechanical plans. No louvers are called out within Specification Section 13 34 24 Prefabricated Guard Booths or on the architectural drawings. This condition may prevent the restroom doors from properly working.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Make-up air for these restrooms is ducted from the level below (10x10) and provided to each heat pump. Some of the supply air from each heat pump is directed into each restroom through diffusers, enough to match the exhaust from the restroom. Exhaust is pulled through diffusers, ducted through each fan (EF-1-D-1 and EF-1-D-2) and up to the roof. Terminate the exhaust with a counter-balanced backdraft damper (per spec section 23 33 13-2.9) and a 12x12 throat gravity ventilator (per spec section 23 37 23). EF-1-D-1 and EF-1-D-2 should operate when make-up air fan below (SF-B1-D-1) is ON. *Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2067 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please confirm no make-up air is required at these locations.</p>							
T-2043	PFB - Electrical Requirements for Booth Type 1 and 3	Closed	12/29/2014	01/08/2015	01/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14)				Symbol as shown on sheets E1-2310 and E1-2502			
Specification Section 13 34 24				indicates power/telecom surface raceway. Refer to			
Sheet E1-2310				specification 26 27 26 Wiring Devices, section			
Sheet E1-2502				(2.7)(E), for receptacles to be included.			
Location:				*Due to a difference in calendar month between date			
Ground Level				answered and date received, there was a delay in			
Bus Deck Level				posting this RFI.			
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 13 34 24 (2.3) N 1 Prefabricated							
Guard Booths indicates that electrical equipment and							
devices for Booth Type 1 and 3 are per specifications and							
drawings E1-2310 and E1-2502, respectively.							
No receptacles are shown within Prefab Guardhouse							
01960 on Sheet E1-2310 or Bus Deck Superintendent							
Station 03260 on Sheet E1-2502.							
Please confirm no receptacles, or any other electrical,							
other than the mechanical connections shown, are							
required within Booth Type 1 and 3.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2068 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2044	PFB - Telecommunication Requirements per Specification Section 13 34 24	Closed	12/29/2014	01/08/2015	01/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 13 34 24 Sheet TE1-5304 Sheet TE1-4306 Sheet TE1-4307 Sheet A1-8278 Location: Ground Level Closest Column Line Intersections: 30 & 31 - C 30 & 31 - F.7 Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Specification Section 13 34 24 (2.3) Q.1 a and b Prefabricated Guard Booths reference Sheets TE1-5304, TE1-4306, TE1-4307, and A1-8278. 1.) Sheet TE1-5304 was not issued. 2.) TE1-4306 does not show any telecom information within GGT Supervisor Booth 01622 or SMTFA 01642. 3.) Sheet TE1-4307 does not show a booth. 4.) Sheet A1-8278 was not issued. Please provide the referenced telecom information, or revise the specification to the intended reference documents.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Sheet TE1-5304 was issued with ASI-128 issuance on 12/19/14. 2. See attached sketch TSK-0049 & TE1-2306 Supervisor Booth 01622 and SMFTA 01642 for telecom requirements. 3. See attached sketch TSK-0050 telecom requirements; no booth shown. 4. Sheet A1-8278 has been deleted from the drawing set, and was NOT included in ASI-0128. Reference to sheets TE1-4307 and A1-8278 shall be removed from specification section 13 34 24 2.3.Q.1.b. Revised 13 34 24 2.3.Q.1.b shall read as: Booth Type 2: Refer to drawing TE1-2306, TE1-4306 and A1-8275. *Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
T-2045	PFB - Industrial Aliphatic Urethane Coating Requirement per Specification Section Closed		12/29/2014	01/08/2015	01/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 13 34 24 Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to enclosed markup of Specification Section 13 34 24 Prefabricated Guard Booths with revised paragraph 2.3 V and W for revised coating description. *Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>Specification Section 13 34 24 (2.3) V Prefabricated Guard Booths calls for a finish coat of industrial aliphatic urethane coating.</p> <p>ASI 128 deletes aliphatic urethane from Specification Section 09 91 00 (3.7) A Painting..</p> <p>Please provide a specification for the aliphatic urethane coating referenced in Specification Section 13 34 24.</p>						
T-2046	<p>FCL - Additional Final Cleaning Requirements per Specification Section 01 17 00</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14) Specification Section 01 17 00</p> <p>Location: N/A</p> <p>Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>Specification Section 01 17 00 (1.5) H Completion and Contract Close-Out indicates that there are additional final cleaning requirements in Section 01 74 23.</p> <p>Specification Section 01 74 23 has not been issued and is not shown in Specification Section 00 01 10 Table of Contents.</p> <p>Please provide Specification Section 01 74 23, or revise Specification Section 01 17 00 (1.5) H to reference the desired specification.</p>	Closed	12/29/2014	01/08/2015	03/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Ray Quesada		
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				Reference in Specification Section 01 17 00, paragraph 1.5 H has been revised from 01 74 23 to 01 15 00. Revised specification was reissued on January 23, 2015.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2047	PFB - Linoleum Sole Sourcing and Specifications	Closed	12/29/2014	01/08/2015	01/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: Specification Section 13 34 24 (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 00 05 20 (IFC Drawings for Main Package dated 3/31/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: N/A					Vinyl is not acceptable. Please refer to enclosed markup of Specification Section 13 34 24 with Linoleum and base materials.		
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A					*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 13 34 24 (2.4) A, B & C Prefabricated Guard Booths call out for the use of Linoleum.							
Per Specification Section 00 05 20 2.07 Agreement, sole source procurement is only acceptable with prior approval by TJPA. In addition, no specification has been provided for Linoleum.							
Please confirm it is acceptable to single source this sheet vinyl, and provide a specification for it.							
T-2048	PFB - Specifications for Aluminum Ceiling Tile	Closed	12/29/2014	01/08/2015	01/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 13 34 24 Specification Section 09 51 00					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: N/A					Specification 09 51 00 does not apply to the work of the Prefabricated Guard Booths. Perforated aluminum ceiling is included in Specification Section 13 34 24 / 2.2 E.		
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A					Please see enclosed markup of Specification Section 13 34 24 with a clarification on the ceiling panel color. The RCP of the Booth Type 3 is included removing the ceiling type callout for clarification.		
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 13 34 24 (2.4) A, B & C Prefabricated Guard Booths call out for the use of perforated aluminum acoustic ceiling tile.					*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		



12/29/2014	01/08/2015	01/08/2015	Potentially	
------------	------------	------------	-------------	--

Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger

ANSWER: **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Specification section 13 34 24 / 3.3C, shall be amended per this RFI to include:

Site Electrical Contractor shall coordinate locations for stub-in and termination of electrical circuits required to supply the electrical equipment within the booths.

*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2049.1	INT - Electrical Panel Requirements Within Prefabricated Units	Closed	01/12/2015	01/22/2015	02/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Contract Doc Ref: N/A			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Location: Prefabricated Buildings			Current booth design accommodates various power system requirements. Providing a single panel per booth would require redesign to consolidate circuits and number of power sources. Listed below are circuits per voltage, amperage, and power source:				
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A			Guardhouse				
Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI P1-2049			(3) 20A/120V emergency power [ELP-B1-A-LRS] [outlets]				
Per the response to RFI T-2049, the electrical within the prefabricated units are to remain as home runs to panels within the main TTC Building.			(1) 25A/208V emergency power [ELP-B1-A-LRS] [ACC]				
During the QBD meeting on 01/09/2015, it was agreed that the electrical within the prefabricated units is to be run to a panel attached to the prefabricated unit.			(1) 15A/208V emergency power [ELP-B1-A-LRS] [AC]				
Please confirm the electrical within the prefabricated units is to be run to a panel within the prefabricated units, and revise the electrical plans (i.e. show panel size and circuiting within prefab unit, and feeder size/home run information from within the TTC Building) to reflect the desired electrical routing.			(1) 20A/277V emergency power [EDMH-B1-A-LRS] [lights]				
			GGT/SFMTA Supervisor Booth				
			(5) 20A/120V normal power [LP-B1-D-1] [outlets, hand dryers, weather station]				
			(1) 20A/120V emergency power [ELP-B1-D-LRS] [FSD]				
			(2) 20A/120V emergency power [ELP-B1-D-EMG] [future detector, circuit camera]				
			(2) 20A/208V normal power [LP-B1-D-12] [EWH]				
			(1) 20A/120V normal power [LP-B1-D-12] [EF]				
			(1) 20A/277V normal power [LPH-B1-D-1] [HP]				
			(1) 20A/277V emergency power [EDMH-3-D-EMG] [lights]				
			Bus Deck Superintendent Station				
			(3) 20A/120V normal power [LP-3-A-1] [outlets]				
			(1) 20A/277V normal power [LPH-3-A-12] [HP]				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2073 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
			(1) 20A/277V normal power [DMH-3-A-1] [lights]				
			(1) 20A/277V emergency power [EDMH-2-A-EMG] [lights]				
			Provide toggle handle disconnect switches within each booth to terminate prewired booth circuits for connection by building contractor (as listed above). These disconnects can be located above in ceiling or below under floor in accessible location. Refer to specification section 26 27 26 (2.2)(B)(1) for single pole toggle handle switch requirements.				
T-2050	INT - Sample Requirements for W-12 Terra Cotta	Closed	12/31/2014	01/10/2015	01/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 07 42 13					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: N/A					Please see enclosed markup of Specification Section 07 42 13 Preformed Metal and Clay Panel Cladding with clay panel sample requirements.		
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A					*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 07 42 13 (1.6) J Preformed Metal and Clay Panel Cladding only calls for samples of metal panels.							
W-21 is Terra Cotta.							
Please confirm no Terra Cotta samples are required, or provide a listing of the desired samples.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2074 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2051	INT - Corrosion Analysis and Engineer Requirements	Closed	12/31/2014	01/10/2015	01/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 07 42 13				There is no requirement for a Corrosion Engineer for the preparation of the corrosion analysis. Specification Section 07 42 13 paragraph 1.9 C was revised on ASI-0128 to eliminate the Corrosion Engineer.			
Location: N/A							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 07 42 13 (1.9) C Preformed Metal and Clay Panel Cladding requires a corrosion analysis by a licensed engineer.							
Per previous discussions, QBD's (for example, TG07.3-145), and RFI's (for example, P1-0418):							
1.) ASI 128 was to remove the requirement for the corrosion analysis to be performed by a corrosion engineer from all specification sections.							
2.) The Contractor is to provide a component-by-component corrosion analysis report with their own forces, rather than providing an analysis by a corrosion engineer, when a corrosion analysis is called for in the specifications.							
Please confirm the corrosion analysis to be performed by a corrosion engineer is required per Specification Section 07 42 13 or revise the specification to be in accordance with previous discussions.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2075 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2052	EXP - Expansion Joint Through W-18 at GL 20	Closed	12/31/2014	01/10/2015	01/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheet A1-6005 Sheet A1-8880 Specification Section 07 09 13 Location: Bus Deck Level Closest Column Line Intersection: GL 20 Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Per Sheet A1-6005, the seismic/expansion joint at GL 20 passes through the W-18 system. No expansion joint is called out on Sheet A1-8880 and or in Specification Section 07 09 13 for a seismic joint within a cement plaster system. Please provide information on the seismic joint to be installed at the W-18 system.					Statement in this RFI is not quite correct, in ASI-0128 the seismic joint cover for the W-18 Portland Cement Plaster is contained in the Schedule in A1-8880 and indicated in 1/A1-8230. Clarification is required as to the model and material. Please refer to the enclosed marked up drawings and specification. Also, note other related minor revisions on the seismic Joint Assemblies specification. *Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
T-2053	BGP - W140-C23 Embedded Columns Rebar	Void	01/05/2015	01/15/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Area 16 Grid Line: 35 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1372 The area 16 East End Seismic Joint on the South Wall (W140) does not allow for the placement of all 56ea #11 vertical bars @5" OC as called out in RFI T-1372. Instead, only 48ea #11 vertical bars can be installed at 5" OC before the vertical bars interfere with the seismic joint. Note that C-23 embedded column only requires 48ea #11 vertical bars.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2076 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please confirm that it is acceptable to eliminate 2ea vertical bars on each face (4 faces for a total of 8 vertical bars) out at the eastern most end of Wall W140 at East Seismic Joint.</p>						
T-2054	SCS - Step in CIP Slab at GL G, Zone 1 and 2	Closed	01/05/2015	01/15/2015	01/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: 1/S1-3700, 2/S1-3702, 4/A1-2863, and S1-1003.			1) Acceptable where detail 1/S1-3700 is applicable.				
Location: Zone 1, 2			2) Acceptable where detail 2/S1-3702 is applicable.				
Grid Line: G							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached mark-ups							
Please find attached detail 1/SI-3700, 2/S1-3702, 4/A1-2863, and S1-1003.							
The elevation difference between the noted bottom of step and top of slab at Gridline G averages less than 4" per detail 1/S1 3700. The elevation difference required in detail 2/S1-3702 is nearly 1". See 4/A1-2863 markups attached noting the contract elevations provided. These small, top of slab differences will require an additional set of formwork and slow the schedule.							
Note that the slab steps will be later covered in 18" of asphalt as noted in S1-1003 and the concrete steps will not be seen.							
Please confirm the following is acceptable:							
1. Eliminate the first step at Gridline G in Zones 1 and 2 by sloping the top of CIP slab to the elevation of the metal deck slab, as shown in attached detail 1/S1-3700.							
2. Eliminate the step in 2/S1-3702 by sloping the slab to meet the elevation at the top of step. This would be applicable for all locations where this detail and similar occur.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2077 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2055	SCS - Cast In Place Bus Crash Rail Detail	Closed	01/06/2015	01/16/2015	01/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-8000 ASI 127					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: Bus Deck					1). Confirmed.		
Grid Line: N/A					2). Confirmed.		
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Reference attached markups on Sheet S1-8000 of ASI 127							
1) The CIP Bus Deck Crash Rail detail is currently shown as poured monolithic with the structural topping slab of the Bus Level composite deck. For forming reasons it isn't practical to place this wall with the same pour as the deck it sits on. Please confirm if the horizontal keyed joint for the crash rail can be relocated to the top of the structural deck as shown in the attached markups or advise how else the detail may be modified to separate vertical and horizontal elements.							
2) It appears the highlighted rebar callout of #5 @ 8" OC EF (Total) is a transcription typo. Please confirm the note should read #5 continuous EF?							
T-2056	BGP - Lower Concourse Wall Tags	Closed	01/06/2015	01/16/2015	01/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
As discussed with the Design Team, please confirm the attached SKA's are to be incorporated showing updated CMU tags to suit future CMU wall limiting heights, on Lower Concourse Wall Plans for Zones 6 and 7, to enable slight adjustment to coupler setting out at Gridlines B-C and G-H					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2057	ELV - Missing Feeder Tag Numbers	Closed	01/07/2015	01/17/2015	01/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (E1-2012, E1-2103, E1-2104, E1-2105, E1-2106) dated 12/16/14 Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Question : ALL clouded feeder pathways on ASI 0128 drawings E1-2102, E1-2103, E1-2104, E1-2105, & E1-2106 are missing their associated feeder tag numbers. Please provide these missing feeder tag numbers.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			Refer to the following sketches for feeder tag designations:				
			SKE-RFI-T-2057-1				
			SKE-RFI-T-2057-2				
			SKE-RFI-T-2057-3				
			SKE-RFI-T-2057-4				
			SKE-RFI-T-2057-5				
T-2058	SSS - Erection Issue at GL 32-32.4	Closed	01/07/2015	01/17/2015	01/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2607 Location: Zone 4, Roof Park Gridline: B/32.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1 Drawing S1-2607 shows a diaphragm beam being intersected by a tapered girder near gridline B/32.2. The small diaphragm beam highlighted in attached sketch is not erectable given the specified connections (double angle both side of tapered roof girder). Considering the size and location of the beam, please confirm the beam can be eliminated or supply a solution			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			Confirmed that the W24 beam can be eliminated.				
			Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with the reason for request: Alternate Proposal. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification or cost deduct.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2079 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2059	SCS - DBA's at Bus Level Seismic Joint	Closed	01/07/2015	01/17/2015	01/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2503, S1-5005 Location: Bus Deck Level Grid Line: 10 Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Please reference S1-5005 regarding the seismic joint detail at bus level. Drawing states "5/8" DEFORMED BAR ANCHOR (TYP AS SHOWN)@ 10" OC BETWEEN JOIST BOX". The joist box locations/dimensions and further DBA spacing/dimensions are required to detail the DBAs. 1. What is the north-south spacing between these joist boxes? 2. What are the plan dimensions for the joist boxes? 3. Please confirm the 10" OC DBA spacing is in the north-south direction between joist boxes. 4. What is the east-west spacing between the two DBAs shown in S1-5005? 5. Are the DBAs noted above (#5 at 10" o/c between joist boxes) required in the region where 2/S 1-5005 is valid (IE: at Bus Level Seismic Joints roughly between GLD and F)? 6. Detail 1/S1-5005 shows 3 of the 4 DBAs penetrating the joist box. Please confirm or revise the detail.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). See manufacturer catalog. 2). See manufacturer catalog. 3). Confirmed. 4). The DBA on the girder shall be placed 2" from the edge of the flange. The DBA near the edge of deck shall be 2" from the edge of deck. 5). No, DBAs are only required where the Section 1/S1-5005 applies. 6). DBAs are to be placed between the joist box as noted in the detail.				
T-2060	SSS - SE201 & SE202 FO 34 Missing Information	Closed	01/07/2015	01/17/2015	01/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2701 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Gridline: F/5 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1 Drawing S1-2701 shows a beam supporting elevator posts near gridline F/5. This beam was initially aligned with the W12x14 beams on either side, but was moved below the future elevator post in FO 34. The location of the moved W16x36 beam was requested in RFI T-1922, but the dimensions were not supplied and			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with the reason for request: Alternate proposal. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2080 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>the issue was deferred to the elevator contractor.</p> <p>To avoid holding up the fabrication of the beams and supporting steel, confirm it is acceptable to locate the beam aligned with the W12's and extend the new W12x19 as shown in current model.</p>							
T-2061	BGP - Telecom Sweeps Conflict at GL32.4	Closed	01/08/2015	01/18/2015	01/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titche	To: Turner Construction Company		Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: A1-2847 Location: Lower Concourse Grid Line: 33.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A				To avoid conflict with GL 32.4 MFB, move the 3 (three) eastern telecom sweeps near GL 32.4 2'-0" to the east. Refer to SKA-4389, SKA-4390 and SKA-4391.			
Plan Sheet A1-2847 shows two(2) groups of three(3) telecom sweeps on the South Side near GL 32.4. As shown, two sweeps in the Eastern group will conflict with the Moment Frame Beam located at GL 32.4.							
Please confirm this Eastern group of Telecom Sweeps can be moved 20" further East to avoid a conflict with the GL 32.4 MFB.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2081 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2062	SSS - Light Column Cast Node Ring	Closed	01/08/2015	01/18/2015	01/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-6005, S1-6006 Location: Zone 3 Gridline: E/23 Add'l Doc Ref's: NCR 7869-03 The internal diameter of the type 701 and 702 cast nodes varies by up to 3/8in. With this condition a tight fitting backing ring cannot be installed per AWS 5.22.1.1 which requires a fit to within 1/6in. Please confirm a PJP with an effective size of 2in can be provided in lieu of a CJP weld (Note; a CJP weld is not specifically called out in the contract drawings, however, note on S1-6006 states that all welds are to be CJP unless noted otherwise) Please find attached NCR generated by our light column fabricator for sketches and additional details.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We agree to formally treating this welded connection as a PJP having a 2-inch effective throat depth. As the contract documents originally require CJP welds, the NDT requirements for this weld are to remain unchanged. SBP agrees with the reason for request, stating that it is the result of contractor tolerance conflict.		
T-2063	SSS - Transfer Girder Stiffener Weld Clarifications	Closed	01/08/2015	01/18/2015	01/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-4354, S1-4350 Location: Gridline: 17, 19, 25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Table 1 For TR 16.9, 19.1 and 24.9, S1-4354 shows details for stiffeners and welding at the cast nodes. Please refer to SK1 and SK 2 and stiffener highlighted. No weld details are provided in detail 1 or 7 for this stiffener. Note 1 on detail 7 refers us to detail 2/S1-4350 which shows a 1/2" fillet for this stiffener. Please confirm 1/2" is correct for this specific stiffener on TR 16.9, 19.1 and 24.9. Please also confirm weld details for this stiffener at all locations listed in attached Table 1.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Confirmed that 1/2" is correct for this specific stiffener on TR 16.9, 19.1, and 24.9. 2). Confirmed the weld details in Table 1. Reason for RFI (TT): called out in contract documents		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2083 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2607, 2/S1-4205 Location: Roof Level Zone 4 Gridline: B&H/33.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached sketch Drawing S1-2607 shows a W40x503 beam on GL 33.2 connecting to the perimeter beams at GL B & H. These perimeter beams have stiffeners per 2/S1-4205. With the perimeter beam stiffeners shop welded, the W40x503 will not be erectable. Please confirm it is acceptable to ship the stiffener loose, to be field welded as shown in the attached sketch, or supply an alternate solution.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Shipping the stiffener loose as indicated in the RFI is acceptable. Proposed welding is acceptable given that welding is "Demand Critical (DCW)" per the contract drawings. Proposed location for the stiffener (12" from beam CL) is also acceptable. Reason for RFI (TT): Substitution request.		
T-2067	SSS - SLRS Bolt Up Connection Clarification GL 27.1-28	Closed	01/09/2015	01/19/2015	01/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2506, 1C/S1-5018 Location: Bus Deck, Zone 4 Gridline: B/27.1 & H/27.1 Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-1815, attached sketch Drawing S1-2506 shows beam connections near B/27.1 & H/27.1. Per 1C/S1-5018, these connections should have 10 bolts in each row. Due to the cut of the beam bottom flange it is not possible to fit the required 10 bolts in each row. Confirm it is acceptable to supply a total of 15 bolts at the bottom flange as shown similar to RFI T-1815 (SK 878, CD 653).	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2068	Lap Splice #14 to #11 at Gridline 18 and 26	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	01/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Please refer to the beam elevations shown on drawings S1-3660 and S1-3661. Both beams, at 2 locations on each beam, show #14 bar lapping with #11 bar using a standard top splice. General Note RE-9 (also see notes RE-7 & 8) on sheet S-0007 indicates Lenton mechanical coupler splices are required. S1-3001 does not provide a splice length for bars larger than #11. Please confirm no coupler is required, and provide the required standard top splice length.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As indicated in General Notes RE-9, mechanical couplers are to be used for bars larger than #14. Provide mechanical couplers (i.e., transition couplers in this case) at the locations highlighted in the RFI.				
T-2069	INT - Specifications and Details for Bus Deck Level Benches	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	01/22/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/2014) Sheet A1-2502 through Sheet A1-2507 Location: Bus Deck Level Closest Column Line Intersection: Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI P1-0498 Per the response to RFI P1-0498 there are benches on the Bus Deck Level which will be located, specified, and detailed in ASI 128. These benches have not been located, specified, or detailed in ASI 128. Please locate, specify, and detail the benches on the Bus Deck Level.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches SKA-4408 to 4411 for bus deck plaza seating, labeled and dimensioned. Refer also to specification 10 99 00 Building Specialties, issued with ASI 128. *Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2071	BOL - Design Build Bollards on Roof - Layout	Closed	01/13/2015	01/13/2015	02/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2086 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2073	BOL -Design Build Bollards on Roof - Finishes	Closed	01/13/2015	01/13/2015	02/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-2602, L1-2604, L1-2605, L1-2606 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Design Build Bollards have been added to the Roof Park in ASI 128 on sheets L1-2602, L1-2604, L1-2605 and L1-2606 at GL 5.7/G, GL 15.5/F, GL 21/G and GL 31/E.1.					Per review meetings with SFFD/DBI, the fire department equipment protection at Roof Park Level will be accomplished by concrete curbs/pedestals in lieu of the bollard requirements in ASI-0128. A 6" high by 3'-0" wide concrete curb will provide the required protection.		
Performance requirements have been indicated on these sheets for the bollards, however there are no details providing layout, finishes, footings and their attachment to structural or protection concrete slabs.					Please refer to attached sketches SKLA 363-1 through SKLA 363-5 for revisions.		
Please provide details and define the finishes of the design build bollards on the roof.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2087 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2074	BOL - Design Build Bollards on Roof - Footings	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	02/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-2602, L1-2604, L1-2605, L1-2606 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Design Build Bollards have been added to the Roof Park in ASI 128 on sheets L1-2602, L1-2604, L1-2605 and L1-2606 at GL 5.7/G, GL 15.5/F, GL 21/G and GL 31/E.1. Performance requirements have been indicated on these sheets for the bollards, however there are no details providing layout, finishes, footings and their attachment to structural or protection concrete slabs. Please provide footing details and their attachment to structural or protection concrete slabs for the design build bollards on the roof.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per response to RFI T-2073, bollard footing details and their attachment are not required.		
T-2075	BOL - Reference to Interim Location of HPU	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	02/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - A1-2206 Location: Lower Concourse Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A A1-2206 at GL 27.7/H on the Lower Concourse callout states that the location provided is an interim location of the HPU for wedge barriers at ground level. Based on a previous answer to RFI P1-0011, any reference to interim was meant to be removed. Confirm that this is not an interim location or if it is in fact an interim location, provide final location details for the HPUs currently located at GL 27.7/H on the Lower Concourse.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. The HPU location at GL 27.1 for ground level wedge barriers is not interim. Refer to SKA-4406		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2076	RPL - Tree on Café Lid	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-2605 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A A tree has been added to the roof park at GL 21/G, on top of the stem walls and lid of the future Roof Park Café. In previous meetings regarding temporary conditions for the W-20 Roof Park Café it was agreed that trees should not be planted on the location of future expansion. Please confirm that there is enough space for the root ball at GL 21/G or remove the tree and update/coordinate the drawings.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A tree at GL 21/G has been removed. See attached sketch SKLA 360.		
<hr/>							
T-2077	RPL - Missing Specification 06 15 35 Site Carpentry in ASI 128	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 00 01 10 Table of Contents, 06 15 35 Site Carpentry, 12 93 00 Site Furniture Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A In ASI 128 the 01 01 10 Table of Contents does not reissue or delete specification 06 15 35 Site Carpentry and it was not included with the ASI 128 issuance of the conformed set. However, specification 12 93 00 Site Furniture references specification 06 15 35 Site Carpentry. Please provide specification 06 15 35 Site Carpentry or revise the reference to it within specification 12 93 00 Site Furniture.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> "omit section 06 15 35 from table of contents (SKLA 359.01), clarify species and finish of wood (SKLA 359.02). See SKLA 359 for clarification"		
<hr/>							
T-2078	RPL - Roof Park Reference to Alternate 16	Closed	01/13/2015	01/13/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-5627, 01 10 30/APE - Schedule of Alternates for Main Package Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A In ASI 128 specification 01 10 30/APE Schedule of Alternates for Main Package, all alternates for the Roof Park have been removed. L1-5627 still references Alternate No. 16 regarding deletion of the greywater system. Please confirm that Alternate 16 is no longer applicable and reference to it should be removed from L1-5627.</div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>ANSWER: See attached sketch SKLA 358. Reference to Alternate 16 from L1-5627 is deleted.</div>	<div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div>			
T-2079	RPL - Reference to Roof Park Café Area of Alternate Deduct	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>		<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>					
	<div>Co-Author:</div> <div>REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-2633, 01 10 30/APE - Schedule of Alternates for Main Package Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A In ASI 128 specification 01 10 30/APE Schedule of Alternates for Main Package, all alternates for the Roof Park have been removed. L1-2633 still references and calls out an Area of Alternate Deduct at the W-20 Roof Park Cafe. Please confirm that reference to this Area of Alternate Deduct at the W-20 Roof Park Cafe is no longer applicable and reference to it should be removed from L1-2633.</div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>ANSWER: See attached SKLA-357. "Area of Alternate Deduct" callout has been omitted.</div>	<div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div>			
T-2080	RPL - Play Structure Anchor Assembly Footing Callout	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>		<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>					
<div>Co-Author:</div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2090 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-5604 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A L1-5604 callout for the Play Structure Anchor Assembly Footing references 1/L1-7665. This reference appears to be incorrect because detail 1/L1-7665 is for the Precast Concrete Roof Drain, however detail 2/L1-7647 shows the Play Structure Anchor Assembly Footing. Please confirm that 2/L1-7647 is the correct detail reference for the callout on L1-5604 for the Play structure Anchor Assembly Footing.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirm that 2/L1-7647 is the correct detail reference for the callout on L1-5604. See attached sketch SKLA 356-1.		
T-2081	SCS - Play Structure Anchor Assembly Footing Connection	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-2639, 2/L1-7647, 8/S1-3281 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A 2/L1-7647 shows the Play Structure Anchor Assembly Footing as part of the protection slab on the roof. 8/S1-3281 shows the Play Structure Footing as part of the structural slab on the Roof Park level. L1-2639 states that the Play Structure Footing layout is according to the play structure installers written instructions. Please clarify if the Play Structure Anchor Assembly Footing is part of the protection slab, as shown in 2/L1-7647 or if it is part of the structural slab as shown in 8/S1-3281. If it is part of the structural slab, provide the appropriate waterproofing details.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The play structure footings are tied to the structural slab per structural detail 8/S1-3281 issued with ASI 128. For waterproofing detail, refer to detail 2/A1-8851, typical WPM-3 waterproofing at buried structures. The Landscape drawing has been revised; see attached sketch SKLA 356-2.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2091 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2082	SCS - Play Structure Anchor Assembly Footing at the Shear Key	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	01/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-2624, L1-2639, 2/L1-7647, 8/S1-3281 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A 2/L1-7647 shows the Play Structure Anchor Assembly Footing as part of the protection slab on the roof. 8/S1-3281 shows the Play Structure Footing as part of the structural slab on the Roof Park level. L1-2624 shows Play Structure Footings at GL 15/G on a Shear Key. L1-2639 states to SSD for the Play Structure Post Footing at Shear Key, but the only detail in the Structural Drawings for the Play Structure Footing is the typical detail 8/L1-3281 which does not show the footing at the shear key. Please provide details for the Play Structure Anchor Assembly Footings at the Shear Key located at GL 15/G.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The play structure footings are tied to the structural slab per 8/S1-3281 issued with ASI 128. The revised shear key location is noted in the attached sketches SKA-4412 and SKLA 354 allowing the footing to be clear of the shear key. Also refer to RFIs T-2081 SCS and T-1976 SCS. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI		
T-2083	RPL - Vine Planting in Doorway	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-6606 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A L1-6606 shows a vine planting in front of the doorway at GL 25.5/E.2, outside of the planter. Confirm that there should be a vine outside of the planter in front of the doorway at GL 25.5/E.2 and define how it should be planted, or remove the vine and update/coordinate the drawings.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A vine planting in front of the doorway at GL 25.5/E.2 was removed. See attached sketch SKLA 362.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2092 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2084	RPL - Connecting Bridge at Roof Park Bus Fountain	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	01/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI - 128 - L1-2605 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A L1-2605 states that Structural Resolution is Pending at the Bridge on GL 21/B which are located within the Bus Fountain at the Roof Park. Confirm that the structural resolution that is still pending will not impact any of the elements of the Bus Fountain and if so define what those impacts will be.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The resolution of the Salesforce Tower bridge connection to the TTC is not in contract. Resolution is pending notice to proceed from the TJPA on an unknown schedule		
T-2085	SSS - W-20 Uncoordinated Drawings	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	01/22/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - S1-2650, S1-6100, S1-6101, S1-6102 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A W-20 is not coordinated in the Structural, Landscape and Architectural drawings. The Architectural and Landscape drawings show the W-20 stem walls with a concrete lid over the top so that the W-20 may be constructed in the future. The Structural drawings show two conflicting conditions for the Roof Park Cafe. 1/S1-2650 shows the stem walls while sheets S1-6100, S1-6101, S1-6102 show the final construction of the W-20 Roof Park Cafe in its entirety. Please clarify if the W-20 is meant to be constructed in its entirety or only the stem walls and concrete lid. Revise and coordinate the drawings with the required direction and define which drawings govern this scope.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per TJPA direction, the W-20 Café Building IS NOT part of the scope of ASI 0128. Please delete SBP's structural drawings S1-6100 thru S1-6102, which were inadvertently issued. The statement that the architectural and structural drawings are not coordinated is incorrect. AAI's & TT's construction documents in ASI 0128 are coordinated, and show the W-20 Café foundation walls capped, and without the Café structure.		
T-2086	SCS - Park Rail Uncoordinated Drawings	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	02/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2093 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 1/S1-3282, A1-8685 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Perimeter Guard Rail at Park Level is not coordinated in Structural and Architectural drawings. 1/S1-3282 is showing a different Perimeter Guard Rail at the Park Level than A1-8685. Please clarify which detail is correct and revise/coordinate the drawings.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Perimeter guardrail at Roof Park Level has been coordinated between structural and architectural disciplines, however detail 1/S1-3282 was inadvertently left in structural drawing. Please use architectural detail on A1-8685. Detail 1/S1-3282 will be removed from the structural drawings in subsequent ASI.		
T-2087	RPL - Fountain Drawings Removed in ASI 128	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	02/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L-0000 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A All fountain drawings (L1-7000 through L1-7071), except for hardscape, have been removed from the Landscape drawings. However, their removal is not indicated in L-0000. Confirm that the fountain drawings were meant to be excluded from the newly conformed ASI 128 and that their removal will not impact the fountain hardscape details, or provide the fountain drawings.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ASI-0129 was issued on 01/29/15 to include previously issued Fountain drawings which were inadvertently omitted from the ASI-0128 package. Please note there are no content changes to these documents. To match the documents issued with ASI-0128 the date was updated on these drawings to 12/16/2014 to avoid any confusion.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2094 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2088	SCS - Drill Into Structural Concrete at Seismic Joint for Bus Jet Fountain	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	02/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-7634 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A					Confirmed		
L1-7634 shows support angle bolted into the structural concrete for the glass shoe of the Bus Jet Fountain at the Seismic Joint.							
Confirm that these embeds may be drilled into the structural concrete of the seismic joint wall.							
<hr/>							
T-2089	SCS - Drill Into Structural Concrete at Seismic Joint for Bus Jet Fountain and Plan	Closed	01/13/2015	01/23/2015	02/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-7635 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A					Confirmed		
L1-7635 shows support angle bolted into the structural concrete for the glass shoe, gaskets and plant rail at the Seismic Joint.							
Confirm that these embeds may be drilled into the structural concrete of the seismic joint wall.							
<hr/>							
T-2090	RPL - Polystyrene Fill on Roof	Closed	01/14/2015	01/24/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-8623, L1-8624 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A					Confirm that polystyrene fill is meant to be and shall be geosynthetic fill. See attached sketch SKLA 361-1 and 361-2.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2095 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Details 1, 2 and 3 on L1-8623 and 1/L1-8624 call out polystyrene fill.</p> <p>Confirm that polystyrene fill called out is meant to be geosynthetic fill and revise accordingly. If it is not meant to be geosynthetic fill please provide specification requirements for polystyrene fill.</p>						
T-2091	TOP - Location of Protection Slabs	Closed	01/14/2015	01/24/2015	01/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REQUEST:		For the Protection Slab sheets, A1-2912 to A1-2931, the area that is not hatched requires a protection slab. Read these drawings in conjunction with the edge of slab plans; A1-2862 - A1-2871 for ground level and A1-2902 - A1-2907 for Roof Park level. For Ground level Protection slab: refer also to typical waterproofing details at train box lid 2/A1-8710, 2/A1-8713, and typical sections at roadways; A1-8717, A1-8881 and A1-8883.					
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheets A1-2912 through A1-2931		*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.					
Location: Roof Level Ground Level							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Per the Protection Legend on sheets A1-2912 through A1-2931, the hatch pattern indicates areas that do not require protection slab.							
The Protection Legend on Sheets A1-2912 through A1-2931 does not indicate which areas do require topping Slab.							
Please confirm that the areas that are not hatched require protection slab, or provide the areas that require protection slab, and revise the legend and plans to match.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2092	BGP - Chord Bars at Vehicle and Bike Ramp	Closed	01/15/2015	01/25/2015	01/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2251 Location: Bike Ramp Z1 Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached. Please confirm it is the Engineer and Designer intent to install the Chord Bars at the Vehicle and Bike Ramp per the attached TT sketch and NOT per the Contract Drawings or Shop Drawings (Submittal TG0600-331.1) which were returned "Approved As Noted."			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Regarding the permanent blockout at Grid 5: S1-2202 shows that chord reinforcing passes continuously south of the column. Submittal TG0600-331.1 is incorrect if the submittal implies that the chord reinforcing is not continuous. The chord reinforcing shall be continuous as shown schematically in the sketch included in the RFI. This issue is being tracked as BIM360 ID 000943 and shall be resolved prior to final rebar inspection. Regarding the temporary blockouts: Per S-0005, GR-4, Gr-5, and Gr-9, the contractor is responsible for the design of temporary blockouts. In order to avoid having to splice chord reinforcing within the temporary blockouts, the chords may be realigned similar to what is shown in the sketch included in the RFI. Note that the length of overlap of offset chords exceeds that of a typical lap splice and requires engineering design. The structural field representative will assist the contractor in determining required length and layout, should the contractor opt to offset the chords. Regarding chord reinforcing size and number: The chord reinforcing size and number is correctly indicated on the sketch included in the RFI. Design team is not requesting that the contractor do anything other than what is shown on the contract drawings; however, should the contractor wish to avoid coupling chord reinforcing within temporary blockouts, layout deviations similar to what is shown in the attached RFI will be acceptable after review by the design team. Any such modification is for the contractor's convenience and shall be at no cost to the owner.				
T-2093	ELV -Park Level - Tag Device HP-4-A-1 Duplication	Closed	01/15/2015	01/25/2015	01/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2098 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2095	SCS - Rebar Detail at MFB/Drag Beam Connection GL C and G	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-5022 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: C and G Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached</p> <p>Please reference Sheet S 1-5022 showing the typical steel to concrete connection at the ground level. Note the 1:1 slope from bottom of beam to bottom of flange in Detail 1B and 4A. Insufficient rebar details are available in this 1:1 slope in SI-5022. The details direct to the SI-37XX series for further rebar details. Sections are taken at various GLs at N/S Transfer Girders, but not between GLs at the E/W perimeter steel. The bottom bar embedment varies: 90 degree, 45 degree, and terminator ends are all used.</p> <p>Shimmick requires further rebar details in the 1:1 sloped region of the MFBs between GLs at the E/W perimeter steel along GL C and G to produce shop drawings. This RFI affects Submittal TG0702-076 for Ground Level 13-19 Rebar and has potential changes for Submittal TG0702-075 for Ground Level 10-13.</p> <p>1. Please provide a new rebar detail applicable to all MFB between grid lines, one each for GL C and GL G. Please include bent bottom bar requirements and stirrup requirements as applicable.</p> <p>2. Are bent bars, similar to those shown in the SI-37XX markups, required in the 1:1 sloped region of the MFBs between TRs along GL C and G?</p> <p>3. If bent bars are required per #2, please provide criteria</p>				<p>1). The intent of the bent bars was shown in many details in S1-37xx series details, e.g., Detail 7/S1-37-1, 10/S1-3703, 2 & 4/S1-3705. The 45 deg bent shall be placed as close as possible to the flange of the supporting steel spandrel beam and the vertical leg shall have a length equal to standard hook length. Please also see the response #3).</p> <p>2). Confirmed.</p> <p>3). Bent bars are to be used where the bottom of the beam has a 45 deg slope. Beam bottom flange slope is required where the bottom of the concrete beam is lower than the supporting steel beam.</p> <p>4). Confirmed that splicing the bent bar is acceptable. Please refer to detail 10/S1-3703 for splice detail.</p> <p>5). Where the concrete beam is supported by a spandrel beam at Grid C or G, the stirrup shall be placed starting from the face of supporting beam flange. Where the concrete beam is supported by a transfer girder, the stirrups shall start when there is a hole in the transfer girder that allow the placement of the stirrups.</p> <p>6). See response to item 3).</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2099 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>on when to apply each of the following bottom bar end conditions: 90 degree, 45 degree, and terminator ends. Shimmick would propose the criteria as the size of the 1:1 slope region.</p> <p>4. If bent bars are required per #2, Shimmick proposes that the bottom bent bars are added with a splice to facilitate placing the bar. Propose (a) splice length per splice schedule on S1-3001, to extend from start of 1:1 toward foundation wall, (b) to reduce bent bar size from matching MFB to a #5, (c) splice length per larger bar size.</p> <p>5. Please provide a distance from the GL G and C at which to stop stirrups. Alternatively, please confirm it is acceptable for stirrups to end when the MFB 1:1 slope begins.</p> <p>6. Does the 1:1 slope occur at the built up drag beams along GL C and G? Does the bottom of beam (a) slope to middle flange or (b) run straight into the steel web?</p>						
T-2096	ELV - Confirmation on Company Switch at Park Level	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128/E-0005, E1-2602, E1-2606, E1-5001, E1-5003) Location: (Zone 02, Park Level), (Zone 06, Park Level) Closest Column: (E1-2602/D.4,4), (E1-2606/D.8,29), (E1-5001/Park), (E1-5003/Park)			Drawings E1-2602 and E1-2606 are correct. Refer to the following sketches for clarification:				
Per ASI 118, the park level company switches were deleted in zoned 02 and 06. Per ASI 128 electrical plan drawings E1-2602 & E1-2606 the company switches were added back but they are still shown as "NIC" on E1-5001 & E1-5003. Per E-0005, NIC notes states, "Where "NIC" is indicated on the schedules for switchboards, panelboards, relay panels and lighting cabinets, contractor to provide the indicated overcurrent device, relay or dimming module. Feeder and branch circuit connections and conductors			SKE-RFI-T-2096-1				
			SKE-RFI-T-2096-2				
			SKE-RFI-T-2096-3				
			SKE-RFI-T-2096-4				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2100 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	are deferred for future work." Please confirm which drawing is correct in regards to the 200A company switches, the plan or the riser diagram.						
T-2097	SCS - Welded Bars at Cast Node/TRs - Missing Dimensions	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2304-S1-2306, S1-4109, S1-4304, S1-4354 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached. Please reference the following sheet path to reference welded bar conflicts at the Cast Node/TR connections: S1-2305 -> B/S1-4109 -> B/S1-4304 -> S1-4354. The below applies to 6 locations: C/16.9, G/16.9, C/19.1, G/19.1, C/24.9, G/24.9. In detail 3/S1-4354, the dimension for the distance between the bottom flange and the bottom edge of concrete is not provided. The distance at which bar 45 degree bends is not provided. Please provide the distance between the bottom flange and the bottom edge of concrete as marked.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The distance shall be equal to the slab bottom bars embedment length. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2101 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2098	SCS - Welded Bars At Cast Node/TRs Near Roadway Slab 1	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2304-S1-2306, S1-4109, S1-4304, S1-4354, 3/S1-4354 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached.			SUGGESTION:				
Please reference the following sheet path to reference welded bar conflicts at the Cast Node/TR connections: SI-2305 -> B/SI-4109-> B/SI-4304-> SI-4354. The below apply to 6 locations: C/16.9, G/16.9, C/19.1, G/19.1, C/24.9, G/24.9.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
1. In detail 3/S1-4354, the bottom bars on the transfer girders show a "TYPE 2 MECH COUPLER" joining the bent bar to the flange. Use of a standard coupler will not ensure correct final orientation of the 45 degree bend. Use of positional couplers for each bottom bar is cost prohibitive, since 26 bars are required at each of the 6 cast node connections. Results in a minimum of 156 couplers. Propose to eliminate the positional coupler in detail 3/S 1-4534 and use a single one piece bar, welded to the top of the bottom flange. Eliminates 156 couplers. Please confirm this proposal is acceptable.			1). Confirm that welding the bottom bars directly to the bottom flange of the transfer girder is acceptable. The weld size and length shall be the same as detailed on 3/S1-4354.				
2. In detail I/S1-4354, 1 of the bottom bars is shown with a Lenton half coupler similar to the top bars. Similar to above, the use of a standard coupler will not ensure correct final orientation of the 45 degree bend. Propose to eliminate this coupler and drape bar on either side of the plate, weld to plate or flange. Can place 1 bar on each face if needed. Please confirm this proposal is acceptable and if I bar on each face is needed.			2). We believe that the reference to Detail 1/S1-4354 is an incorrect, and it should reference to Detail 2/S1-4354. Confirmed that welding the bottom bars directly to the bottom flange of the transfer girder is acceptable, as long as there is sufficient access for field welding.				
			Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI				
T-2099	SCS - Welded Bars at Cast Node/TRs Near Roadway Slab 2	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2305, S1-4109, S1-4304, S1-4354, 1/S1-4354			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			The first proposal (fit all 26 bottom bars within the 2" stiffener plates by reducing sapcing) is acceptable as				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2102 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Location: Ground Level Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached.</p> <p>Please reference the following sheet path to reference welded bar conflicts at the Cast Node/TR connections: S1-2305 ->B/S1-4109 -> B/S1-4304 -> S1-4354. The below applies to 6 locations: C/16.9, G/16.9, C/19.1, G/19.1, C/24.9, G/24.9. Sheets from Skanska's Submittal TG0701-079 are attached as an example for C/16.9.</p> <p>In detail 1/S1-4354, 2 of the bottom bars sit on the outside of the 2" stiffener plates. All bottom bars are welded to bottom of flange. In cross referencing the Structural Steel Shop Drawings, the bottom flange extends no further than the edge of the 2" stiffener plate. There is no bottom flange on which to weld the 2 outermost bottom bars as shown in detail 1/S-4354. Propose either (a-preferred) fit all 26 bottom bars within both 2" stiffener plates by reducing spacing from 5" OC to 3" OC minimum, with bars field adjusted to avoid plates, or (b) weld the north bar to the north face of the 2" stiffener plate. Please confirm which proposal is acceptable. Rebar shops will reflect detailing change if acceptable.</p>						<p>long as there is sufficient access for field welding.</p> <p>Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.ζ</p>
T-2100	SCS - Beam layout Confirmation at Bollard Pit	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/22/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-2304 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: 14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached.</p> <p>Reference S1-2304 for the ground level bollard pit (South of GL G, between GL 14 and 15). Per approved submittal TG0702-027, the beam soffits are typically level in the east-west direction. The slab soffit slopes in the east-west direction. In the ground level bollard pit area, maintaining both the level beam bottoms and the sloping soffit will</p>				<p>Acceptable.</p> <p>Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2103 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2101	ELV - Tag ELRC-1-A-EMG Numbered Note Clarification	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128/Detail 1,E1-3301, 26 24 16apa, panel boards) Location: (Zone 02, Ground Level) Closest Column Line: (E.6,5) ASI 128 drawing E1-3301 adds "ELRC-1-A-EMG" to the electrical room 01243 with numbered note 5 attached to it. Please confirm numbered note 3 should be attached to ELRC-1-A-EMG in lieu of numbered note 5. Please note circuit ELP-1-A-EMG/2 is assigned to DML-1-A-1.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, numbered note 3 should be attached to ELRC-1-A-EMG.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2104 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2102	SCS - Widended Moment Frame Beam Ends	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 2/S1-3705, S1-3701,3702,3704,3705,3707 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: 13,15,21,23 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached. Several concrete sections reference a widened concrete MFB, but their location in plan view do not show the widened beam. Reference section 2/SI-3705 as an example. The section is first cut at GL C/11, where the widened end is shown in plan. Section 2/SI-3705 is later cut at GL 13, 15, 21, and 23, where the widened end is not shown in plan. Please confirm that the MFBs with widened ends occur when indicated the S 1-230# plans, and not when referenced by the concrete section. This solution would also apply to conflicts between plans and sections on Details: 9/SI-3701, 8/SI-3702, 9/SI-3702, I/SI-3704, 2/SI-3704, 2/SI-3705, 6/SI-3707.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The widen beam width shown in Section 2/21-3705 shall be followed. The concrete section is widen to provide sufficient concrete cover for the stirrups shown in the section. This shall apply to Section 9/S1-3701, 8/S1-3702, 9/S1-3702, 1/S1-3704,2/S1-3704, and 4/S1-3707. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI	
<hr/>							
T-2103	SCS - Ground Level Air Vent - Moment Frame Beam Conflict	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2304, S1-2864 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: 14/G Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached. Reference S1-2304 and AI-2864 for the Ground Level air vents. Cross referencing the two sheets results in a conflict between the openings, the TR girder running north/south, and the widened MFB. Find attached markup showing a partial plan view through the air vent slab opening at GL 14-G illustrating this conflict. To resolve this conflict, Shimmick proposes to center the openings between the MFB CLs. This will result in 4.5" from edge of opening to face of beam, and 3' 9" from GL			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches SKA-4418, 4420 and 4421, for revised locations of air vent openings and curbs near Gridlines 14 and 22 and both Gridline C and Gridline G. The revised openings are clear of the structural transfer girder below. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2105 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>14 to CL of opening. This proposed solution will apply at all GL intersections where this air vent opening conflict occurs.</p> <p>Please confirm this solution is acceptable, and/or please revise the slab edge drawings to reflect the moved openings.</p>						
T-2104	SCS - Rebar Detail for MFB14 at G16.9 - Roadway Slab Area	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
<p>Contract Doc Ref: 1/S1-3703, S1-2304</p> <p>Location: Ground Level</p> <p>Grid Line: 16.9/19.1</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached.</p> <p>Please reference Detail 1/SI-3703, showing the rebar detail for the MFBs bordering the roadway slab at GL 16.9/19.1. The detail shows the bottom of the concrete beam below the bottom of steel. At MFB14 at G/16.9, the bottom of the concrete beam is above the bottom of steel. Please see attached SI-2304 mark up cross referencing contract elevations. The above elevation conflict removes the need for the 4' 90 degree embedment and the welded couplers/bars at the bottom flange shown in SI-3703. No detail is currently available for the above situation.</p> <p>Please provide a new rebar detail applicable when the bottom of beam is above top of steel for MFB 14 at G/16.9. Please include an alternative for the 4' vertical embedment and the welded couplers/bars on bottom flange, both of which are not applicable in this case. Note that the new bottom bar end condition must correlate with the stiffener plates on the bottom of flange.</p>		<p>1). At Grid 16.9, where the bottom of the concrete beam is slightly above the transfer girder flange, extend the beam bottom bars (with hook end) into the transfer girder, 2" away from the first set of steel stiffener plates.</p> <p>2). At Grid 16.9, where the bottom of the concrete beam is slightly above the transfer girder flange, increase the depth of MFB 14 so that the bottom of the concrete beam is 2" below the bottom of the transfer girder, so that the 10#11 with coupler can extend into the MFB 14.</p> <p>Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI</p>					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2106 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2106	SCS - Conflict Between TR Girder Stirrup Holes and Concrete Beams	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Contract Doc Ref: S1-3705 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached. Please reference SI-3705, Sheet 631AC from SSS TG0701-074, and Sheet GN02F from SCS TG0702-075. All sheets are in reference to the concrete MFB framing into TR 12 at GL C as an example. SI-3705 shows 2" holes penetrating TR 12 at top and bottom of web for placement of stirrups. The steel shop drawing for TR 12 shows the hole layout. However, when detailing the MFB/TR connection at C/12, the stirrup holes fall outside the concrete beam bottom due to the 1:1 sloped region of the concrete beam (shown in SI-3705). The conflict is reflected in the rebar shop drawing. This results in exposed stirrups. Shimmick proposes that stirrups be eliminated when transfer girder stirrup holes fall outside the concrete limits. Please confirm this is acceptable. If this is not acceptable, Shimmick proposes to provide hanger bars through only the top holes in the web, with size to match original stirrups and fit concrete limits.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 3/S1-3705 shows that the concrete beam is framed into TR12, with bottom of the beam bearing on the TR12 bottom flange. The concrete beam bottom does not have 1:1 slope as stated in this RFI, so we cannot see problem in installing the stirrups per contract documents. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI				
T-2107	SCS - Chamfer Requirements for Ground Level Beams	Closed	01/16/2015	01/26/2015	01/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Contract Doc Ref: 03 10 01 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached. Please find attached Specification 03 10 01 sections 2.2.B.6 and 3.1.A.12, stating that Chamfers for Form Corners are "required for all exposed corners and edge of beam, walls and column forms".			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2107 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Note that it is not industry standard to chamfer inside comers of concrete beams. Only outside corners are chamfered. See attached sketch.</p> <p>Please confirm chamfers are only required on outside comers of concrete beams for the ground level.</p>							
T-2108A	SSS - ST603 AESS Approval Comment Clarifications GL27.1-28	Closed	01/19/2015	01/29/2015	01/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2406, 4/A1-7836 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: 27.1-28 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 744 SK1 See attached CD RFI 744 SK1: 2.) On shop drawing No. 7088 for beam A7088 in submittal TG0701-133, AAI noted "Exposed areas are AESS with IFRM-1 per 4/A1-7836. Clarify extent of prep and finish." Reference to detail 4/A1-7836 is not helpful in determining exposed areas. Please supply a sketch showing exact extents of paint and no paints zones on this beam to be primed for future IFRM.				Start from the W16x26 beam all the way up to and including beam A2897. See attached markup to RFI T-2108A-SK1. The remaining portions of the beam are to be prepped to receive SFRM.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2108 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2108B	SSS - ST603 AESS Approval Comment Clarifications GL27.1-28	Closed	01/19/2015	01/29/2015	01/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2406 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: 27.1-28 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 744 SK1 See attached CD RFI 744 SK1: 3.) In submittal TG0701-133, beam A7032 was not marked to be painted by AAI at approval. Is it AESS/painted? If yes, supply a sketch showing exact extents of paint and no paints zones on this beam to be primed for future IFRM.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Beam A7032 does not need primer to receive IFRM, follow typical procedures for SFRM.			
T-2109	SSS - ST603 AESS Approval Comment Clarifications GL28	Closed	01/19/2015	01/29/2015	01/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2406, 4/A1-7836 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: E/28 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 743 SK1 and TG0701-133 See attached CD RFI 743 SK1: On shop drawing No. 2897 for beam A2987 in submittal TG0701-133, AAI noted "Exposed areas are AESS with IFRM-1 per 4/A1-7836. Clarify extent of prep and finish." Reference to detail 4/A1-7836 is not helpful in determining exposed areas. Please supply a sketch showing exact extents of paint and no paints zones on this beam to be primed for future IFRM.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The full extent of beam A2987 is to be prepped and primed to receive IFRM-1.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2110	SCS - Layout for Roof Crane Concrete Pedestals	Open	01/19/2015	01/29/2015	01/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint V Spencer Sayles				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>Exhibit A pg. 16 Roof Crane Concrete Pedestals states: "Furnish and install 96 reinforced concrete Roof Crane Pedestals complete (including attachment to structure) to support future rooftop crane." The two attached drawings to exhibit A S 1 and S2 Crane Runway Elevation Details provide limited information and do not include location in relation to the roof park level drawings.</p> <p>1. Please provide location dimensions needed to include crane pedestals into roof deck shop drawings.</p> <p>2. Please confirm that a drill and through bolt attachment detail will be provided at a later date.</p>					<p>At this time the rooftop crane package will not be utilized as designed. Temporary elements will be dropped from the scope of work, a different hosting plan utilizing mobile equipment will be developed.</p>		
<hr/>							
T-2111	BGP - Bike Ramp Lost Formwork Foam	Closed	01/20/2015	01/30/2015	01/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Judith Long				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>Contract Doc Ref: 5/S1-3501</p> <p>Location: Vehicle Bike Ramp</p> <p>Grid Line: N/A</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached</p> <p>Detail 5 on plan sheet S1-3501 calls for structural polystyrene for area where formwork cannot be removed. RFI T-1706 confirms that foam shoring could be utilized for the entire B301 Bicycle Ramp due to the perpendicular wall blocking access under this portion.</p> <p>Please confirm the attached product data for EPS Foam is an acceptable lost formwork foam.</p>					<p>This RFI is rejected as the information should be issued as a submittal showing product data and location of where the product will be used on the Transbay Transit Center.</p>		
<hr/>							
T-2112	SSS - Shop Splice on Transfer Girder GL20.1	Closed	01/20/2015	01/20/2015	01/22/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please confirm it is acceptable to introduce a web shop splice 2'-6" from the north and south ends of transfer girder TR20.1. See attached for clarification.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2111 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2114	BGP - Elimination of Construction Joint - Area 15 Foundation Walls - 2nd and 3rd I Closed		01/21/2015	01/31/2015	01/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: N/A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: W133, W132, W144, W143					Confirmed.		
Grid Line: 31-32					Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI		
Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached							
Please reference attached comprehensive layout drawings of Area 15 Foundation Walls.							
Combined length of foundation walls 132 and 133 is 58'0" (North side). Combined length of foundation walls 143 and 144 is 58'-0" (South side).							
Please confirm is acceptable to eliminate the construction joint location between the subject walls, on North and South sides, at the 2nd and 3rd lifts.							
T-2115	INT - Ramps and Railings at Prefabricated Buildings	Closed	01/21/2015	01/21/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet A1-2502 (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14)					Specification Section 13 34 24 Prefabricated Guard Booth paragraph 2.1 A.3 states that the Prefabricated Booth manufacturer is to include the Bus Deck Superintendent Booth galvanized steel ramp and railings - the ramp described is located at the west side of the Superintendent Station. The ramp located to the south is a concrete ramp and is not part of the work of specification 13 34 24.		
Sheet SKA-4361 (A1-8168)					The manufacturer will design-build the Booth including ramp and railing to meet applicable codes and ADA, no details shall be provided.		
Location:					*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
Bus Deck Superintendent Station							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's:							
T-2028 Response							
Sheet A1-2502 at the Bus Deck Superintendent Station references A1-8168 for Prefabricated Booth details.							
Sheet A1-8168 was provided in the T-2028 RFI Response and calls out ramps and "HD galv st railing with extensions and guide rails" at the Bus Deck Superintendent Station.							
Specification Section 13 34 24 Prefabricated Guard Booth							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2112 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>does not specify railing requirements. Specification 05 75 00 Architectural Metal Fabrications does not specifically call out railings at Prefabricated Buildings.</p> <p>Per QBD/PRFI discussions, please confirm that the Prefabricated Booth manufacturer is to provide the ramps and railings for their booths and provide the details and specifications for ramps and railings called out at Prefabricated Buildings (Bus Deck Superintendent Station, for example).</p>						
T-2116	INT - Painting of Walls and Ceilings	Void	01/21/2015	01/31/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheet A1-9601 Sheet A1-9602</p> <p>Location: N/A</p> <p>Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>Paint finishes for walls and ceilings have been removed from spaces called out on Sheets A1-9601 and A1-9602.</p> <p>The spaces still call for floor coverings/rubber base & ceilings to be furnished and installed as part of the contract.</p> <p>Please confirm spaces shown not to receive paint on finish schedules are still to receive the remaining scheduled finishes (floor coverings/rubber base, ceilings, etc.) as part of the Phase 1 scope of work.</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2113 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2117	MME - 4' High Checker Boards at Stair 403	Closed	01/21/2015	01/31/2015	01/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheet A1-9602 Sheet A1-7502			Confirmed. The checker plate base has been removed from stair 403 and all other stairs.				
Location: Stair 403			*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: ASI 128 Revision Narrative (dated 12/16/14) RFI P1-0208 Response							
Per the Room Finish Schedule on Sheet A1-9602, Stair 403 requires a 4'-0" High Aluminum Checker Plate Base on all GB partitions.							
Per Sheet A1-7502 Typical Stair Details, ASI 128 Revision Narrative, and RFI P1-0208 Response wall checker plates have been removed from all stairwells.							
Please confirm that Aluminum Checker Plates have been removed from all stairwells and revise the drawings to match.							
T-2118	INT - Acoustics Report Reference	Closed	01/21/2015	01/31/2015	02/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Detail 3/A-0020			Acoustic Report is not part of the construction documents and will not be submitted. Please see revised note in Sheet A-0020 in the attached SKA-4432.				
Location: N/A							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Note #9 of Partition Notes on Detail 3/A-0020 refers to "Acoustics Report".							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2114 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	An "Acoustics Report" has not been provided with ASI 128. Please provide the "Acoustics Report" referenced in Note #9 of Partition Notes on Detail 3/A-0020.						
T-2119	BGP - Vehicle Ramp Blockout Detail and Bike Ramp Wall Dowel Misalignment	Closed	01/26/2015	02/05/2015	01/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Vehicle/Bike Ramp Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Please see attached sketches relating to the Vehicle Ramp Steel Column Blockout and the misalignment of several wall verticals on the Bike Ramp. Per discussions between seer (TG06), Skanska (TG07.1), seer (TG07.2), and the SEOR, please confirm the size and detailing of the blockout for the future steel column is acceptable. Per discussions between SCCI(TG06) and the SEOR, please confirm the attached proposal to fix the misalignment of several dowels in an approx. 6 foot section of wall in the North Bike Ramp Wall is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed for both items. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2115 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2120A	SSS - TR28 Missing Information	Closed	01/26/2015	02/05/2015	02/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: 1/S1-7015 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: D.8/28 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 749 SK1				1) See attached sketch SKA-4422 for post locations.			
The attached CD RFI 749 SK1 has missing dimensions at GL D.8/28.				Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reasons for request: Engineering Conflict and Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification and change to be issued in a future bulletin.			
Please supply the missing dimensions.							
T-2120B	SSS - TR28 Missing Information	Closed	01/26/2015	02/05/2015	02/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: 1/S1-7015, 2/S1-7663 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: D.8/28 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 749 SK1				2) Reference to 2/S1-7663 was incorrectly added on S1-7015 in ASI-0128 and will be removed in the next ASI. Connections at the top and bottom of the stair posts shall be per 5/S1-7603 as called out on 2/S1-7015 with the following exception: Stair post north of GL D.8 shall be welded directly to the MF column base plate with a 1/4" all around fillet weld in lieu of the base plate connection per 5/S1-7603.			
The connections for the posts per 2/S1-7663 will not work at the Transfer Girder with a 3 1/2" thick web.				Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reasons for request: Engineering Conflict and Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification and change to be issued in a future bulletin.			
Please supply a connection detail based on the actual condition at GL D.8.							
T-2121	SSS - Conflicting Information at Roof Level GL28	Closed	01/26/2015	02/05/2015	01/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div> <div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: A1-2906, S1-2606, S1-8008 Location: Zone 4, Roof Park				The correct top of concrete wall elevation is 87'-4 1/2".			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2116 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Gridline: E/28 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 752 SK1</p> <p>Drawing S1-2606 near GL E/28 references Detail 2 & 4/S1-8008 which indicates that the top of wall is at EL. 87'-4 ½.</p> <p>Drawing A1-2906 at the same location shows that the top of wall is at EL. 87'-4"</p> <p>Please confirm which information is correct.</p>						
T-2122	SSS - Wing Plate Detail at Girder Bottom Flange	Closed	01/26/2015	02/05/2015	01/29/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2252, S1-4350 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Gridline: B-D/23 Add'l Doc Ref's: Shop drawing 706BB from Submittal TG0701-94, attached SK1 Detail 3/S1-4350 shows a vertical CJP weld between the 3" thick wing plate and the bottom flange of the transfer girder. We would like to eliminate the requirement for this short length of vertical weld (approx. 1 5/8"). The length of the horizontal weld would be increased to compensate as the weld access hole can be reduced in width. Refer to the attached SK1. Please confirm that it is acceptable to eliminate the requirement for this short length of vertical weld.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eliminating the vertical CJP weld as proposed will significantly change the stress distribution in the 3" wing plate, which is not acceptable. Reason for RFI (TT): shown in the contract documents.	
T-2123	SSS - TG to Perimeter Beam Connection at GL11	Closed	01/27/2015	02/06/2015	02/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



T-2123.1	SSS - TG to Perimeter Beam Connection at GL 11	Closed	02/23/2015	03/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California Dis Ryan Clayton						
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-4350 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: 10.1-12/ C and G Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1, Shop Drawings 9553 and 9551 Per the response to RFI T-2123, please confirm the attached cover plate and weld designation is acceptable for the 5x6 hole pattern.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed for locations described in RFI T-2123 response. Reason for RFI (TT): " request for corrective field work "		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2118 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2124	SSS - OCS Hanger Clarifications	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	01/29/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-9100 to S1-9102 Location: Zone 4 Gridline: 31.7-32/C.3 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 296.14 SK1 See the attached CD RFI 296.14 SK1 referencing detail 5/S1-9100: 1. Please supply (4) missing dimensions. 2. Confirm the underside (bottom) of 1/2" plate elevation.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to the attached CD RFI 2124 PDF file with AAI response to the requested 4 dimensions and underside of 1/2" plate elevation.				
T-2125	ELV- ELRC-B1-D-EMG Missing Location	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref:[ASI 128/E1-2206,E1-3203,E1-5006/26 09 33] Location: Zone[06], Level [Concourse Level] Closest Column Line Intersection is [H,29] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A Per ASI 128, panel ELRC-B1-D-EMG was added to the riser diagram drawing E1-5006. The location for this panel is not shown on the lower concourse enlarged plans drawing. Please confirm ELRC-B1-D-EMG should be located in Electric Room B1644 (E1-3203/4).							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, ELRC-B1-D-EMG shall be located in Electric Room 1644. Extend existing 120V emergency power circuit ELP-B1-D-EMG/36 feeding (F)DML-B1-D-1 to ELRC-B1-D-EMG				
T-2126	ELV-ELRC-3-B-EMG-1 Missing Electrical Room Location	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref:[ASI 128/E1-2504, E1-3501, E1-5005/26 09 33] Location: Zone[04], Level [Bus Deck] Closest Column Line Intersection is [D.4,15] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, ELRC-3-B-EMG-1 shall be located in Electric Room 03480. Extend existing 120v emergency power circuit ELP-3-B-EMG-1/2 feeding DML-3-B-1 in same room to ELRC-3-B-EMG-1				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2119 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Per ASI 128, ELRC-3-B-EMG-1 was added to the riser diagram drawing E1-5005. The electrical room location for this panel is not shown on the bus deck enlarged plans. Should this panel be located in room Electrical Room #03480? Please confirm it is to be fed from ELP-3-B-EMG-1.</p>						
T-2127	ELV- ELRC-1-C-EMG Missing Electrical Room Location	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony</p>					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref:[ASI 128/E1-2304,E1-3301/3,E1-5006/26 09 33] Location: Zone[04], Level [Ground] Closest Column Line Intersection is [D,15] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A</p> <p>Per ASI 128, ELRC-1-C-EMG was added to the riser diagram E1-5006. This panel is not shown on the ground level electrical enlarged plans. Please confirm this panel is located in ER #01421 and should be shown on E1-3301/3 with a numbered note attached to it instructing us to provide a 120V emergency power connection to ELP-1-C-EMG.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>				<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Confirmed, ELRC-1-C-EMG shall be located in Electric Room 01421. Extend existing 120V emergency power circuit ELP-1-C-EMG/14 feeding DML-1-C-1 in same room to ELRC-1-C-EMG</p>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2128	ELV - Missing Emergency Lighting Relay Cabinets	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref:[ASI 128/E1-5301 thru E1-5303/26 09 33/APA]					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: Zone[02-03], Level [Ground]; Zone [02,04], Level [Second]; Zone[02,03,05,06], Level [Bus Deck];					Refer to attached SKE-RFI-T-2128-1 thru SKE-RFI-T-2128-10 for the following ELRC schedules:		
Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A]					ELRC-1-A-EMG		
Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A					ELRC-2-A-EMG		
The following Emergency Lighting Relay Cabinets are shown on drawings E1-5301 through E1-5303 and were all added per ASI 0128:					ELRC-1-B-EMG		
1. ELRC-2-A-EMG					ELRC-2-B-EMG		
2. ELRC-1-A-EMG					ELRC-3-B-EMG-1		
3. ELRC-3-B-EMG-1					ELRC-3-B-EMG-2		
4. ELRC-3-B-EMG-2					ELRC-1-C-EMG		
5. ELRC-2-B-EMG					ELRC-3-C-EMG		
6. ELRC-1-B-EMG					ELRC-B1-D-EMG		
7. ELRC-3-C-EMG					ELRC-3-D-EMG		
8. ELRC-1-C-EMG							
9. ELRC-3-D-EMG							
10. ELRC-B1-D-EMG							
The schedules for ALL of the above listed Emergency Lighting Relay Cabinets are missing from specification section 26 09 33/APA - ASI 0128. Without these missing schedules the Emergency Lighting Relay Cabinets, added by ASI 0128 cannot be properly quantified. Please provide these missing schedules.							
T-2129	ELT - Roof Park Restaurant Elevator in ASI 128	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Location: Grid 5 Roof Park					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Ref: A1- 3450, A1-3451 & A1-6251					1.) No - Webcor/Obayashi IS NOT to include the new Roof Park Restaurant elevator within its ASI-0128 pricing.		
Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A					2.) There will not be specifications, drawings and details issued for this work, as this is work is by the Tenant in a future Tenant fit out package.		
ASI # 128 shows a new, future two-stop elevator for the Roof Park Restaurant but specifications were not revised							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2121 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2130	ELT - Roof Park Restaurant Dumbwaiter in ASI 128	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Subject: Roof Park Restaurant Dumbwaiter (ASI # 128) Location: Grid 5 Roof Park Add'l Doc : N/A During Pre-Construction scope discussions regarding the Roof Park Restaurant, it was understood a dumbwaiter was to be included in ASI # 128. However, ASI # 128 Drawings and Specifications do not indicate a dumbwaiter requirement. Please advise if: 1.)Is Webcor/Obayashi to include the new Roof Park Restaurant dumbwaiter within its ASI # 128 pricing? 2.)If so, are there new specifications, drawings and details with which to price a dumbwaiter?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1.) No - Webcor/Obayashi IS NOT to include the new Roof Park Restaurant dumbwaiter within its ASI-0128 pricing. 2.) There will not be specifications, drawings and details issued for this work, as this is work by the Tenant in a future Tenant fit out package.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2122 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2131	TOP - Enclosed Space Requirements for Polish Concrete	Closed	01/28/2015	01/28/2015	02/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 03 35 43 Location: Bus Deck Level Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Specification Section 03 35 43 (1.4) C Polished Concrete Finishing requires that the space around the polished concrete be completely enclosed. The Bus Deck Level Polished Concrete is an exterior space. Please confirm areas around polished concrete does not have to be enclosed prior to installation.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. See enclosed markup of Specification Section 03 35 43.				
T-2132	TOP - Precast Concrete Tactile Guide Specifications	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheets A1-9562 through A1-9567 Location: Bus Deck Level Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Per Sheets A1-9562 through A1-9567, precast conc. tactile guides are required at the bus deck level pedestrian paving areas. No specification has been provided for the precast conc. tactile guides. Please provide a specification for the precast conc. tactile			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification Section 03 45 02 Precast Concrete Elements will be added to the Contract Documents in a future ASI. *Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2123 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>guide.</div>							
T-2133	TOP - Polished Concrete Layout and Color Scheme Coordination	Closed	01/28/2015	01/28/2015	02/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 03 35 43		For extent of Polished Concrete, refer to drawings A1-9501 and A1-9502; Ground Level to Roof Park Level Floor Finish orientation plans, which in turn reference partial floor finish plans that identify the polished concrete flooring (including EJ and CJ locations).					
Location: N/A							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 03 35 43 (1.4) D.1 Polished Concrete Finishing requires bidders to coordinate layout and color scheme of the work with the TJPA Representative.		The polished concrete described in the Specification is a finishing process with a clear sealer. The intent is to have a gray concrete. Please refer to enclosed markup of Specification Section 03 35 43 revisions that deletes all pertinent color references.					
No layout (beyond CJ and EJ locations) or color scheme has been provided.							
Please provide any layout information required beyond the EJ/CJ layout (if any) and all polished concrete color schemes.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2124 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2134	TOP - Polished Concrete Reinforcement Clarification	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 03 35 43 Sheet A1-9533					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: N/A					Specification Section 03 35 43 paragraph 2.3 K is revised to delete "Reinforcement 6"x6"x9"x9" galvanized 12 GA welded wire mesh" and add "Refer to notes on topping slab sheets A1-9520 to A1-9537." See enclosed specification markup of specification.		
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A					Topping slab note on A1-9533 is correct as noted.		
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 03 35 43 (2.3) K calls 6x6x9x9 galv. 12 ga. welded wire mesh reinforcement.							
Topping Slab Note 4.0/A1-9533 requires #4 rebar at 16" o.c. each way.							
Please clarify the desired reinforcement of polished concrete topping slabs.							
T-2135	TOP - Artist Requirements for Polish Concrete Samples	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 03 35 43					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: N/A					Confirmed. Artist requirements are deleted, see enclosed markup of Specification Section 03 35 43.		
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 03 35 43 (1.5) C Polished Concrete Finishing indicates that approved samples are to be used for the artist's samples.							
No artist requirements have been provided for this work.							
Please confirm there are no artist requirements for this scope of work.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2125 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2136	TOP - Terrazzo References per Specification Section 03 35 43	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 03 35 43 Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Specification Section 03 35 43 (1.5) B, D, G, and H Polished Concrete Finishing reference terrazzo and/or work associated with terrazzo. This is not applicable to polished concrete. Please revise the shop drawing requirements to conform with a polished concrete specification.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> All references to terrazzo are deleted, please refer to attached markup of Specification Section 03 35 43.		
T-2137	TOP - FL Clarification for Concrete on Structural Steel Building	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 03 35 43 Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Specification Section 03 35 43 (1.8) B.5 Polished Concrete Finishing requires a floor levelness of FL 40. Per ACI and structural concrete specifications, FL requirements are not applicable to concrete poured on a structural steel building. Please confirm that no FL requirements need to be met by this scope of work.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. FL requirements are not applicable to topping slabs. See enclosed markup of Specification Section 03 35 43.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2126 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2138	TOP - Field Condition Requirements for Polished Concrete	Closed	01/28/2015	02/07/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 03 35 43					Confirmed. Please see enclosed markup of Specification Section 03 35 43 Polished Concrete Finishing with revised paragraph 1.10 A requiring the environmental conditions meet the manufacture's written installation instructions.		
Location: Bus Deck Level							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 03 35 43 (1.10) A Polished Concrete Finishing requires that the polished concrete contractor maintain temperature above 50 deg F for 48 hours before and during polished concrete flooring installation.							
This will require the pedestrian area of the Bus Deck Level be temporarily enclosed and temporary heaters brought in.							
Webcor/Obayashi suggests revising the language to require environmental conditions meet the manufacturer's written installation instructions.							
Please confirm that Specification Section 03 35 43 (1.10) A Polished Concrete Finishing is to be revised to mandate the environmental conditions meet the manufacture's written installation instructions, and not what is shown in ASI 128.							
T-2139	TOP - Environmental Condition Requirements for Polished Concrete	Closed	01/29/2015	01/29/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 03 35 43					Confirmed. Please see enclosed markup of Specification Section 03 35 43 Polished Concrete Finishing with revised paragraph 3.3; Temperature shall meet the manufacturer's written instructions during installation.		
Location: Bus Deck Level							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2127 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Specification Section 03 35 43 (3.3) A Polished Concrete Finishing requires a temperature range between 50 deg F and 90 deg F.</p> <p>To avoid conflicts with the manufacturer's written installation instructions, Webcor/Obayashi suggests revising the language to mandate environmental conditions meet the manufacturer's written installation instructions.</p> <p>Please confirm that Specification Section 03 35 43 (3.3) A Polished Concrete Finishing is to be revised to mandate the environmental conditions meet the manufacture's written installation instructions, and not what is shown in ASI 128.</p>						
T-2140	TOP - Airblast Criteria Requirements for Seismic Joints	Closed	01/29/2015	02/08/2015	02/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 03 35 43 Specification Section 07 09 13 Location: Bus Deck Level Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Specification Section 07 09 13 (1.6) E.2 Seismic Joint Assemblies indicates that seismic joint assemblies specified in Specification Section 07 09 13 are subject to the loading requirements of Specification Section 08 05 13 Airblast Criteria for Glazing. Not all of the seismic joints identified within Specification Section 07 09 13 are integral to a glazing system. Please confirm that seismic joints specified in Specification Section 07 09 13 Seismic Joint Assemblies	SUGGESTION:					
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Confirmed. Only glazing/cladding seismic joints are subject to requirements of Spec 08 05 13.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2128 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>which are not integral to a glazing system are not subject to the requirements of Specification Section 08 05 13 Airblast Criteria for Glazing.</p>							
T-2141	SST - Stair and Railing Mock-Up Location	Closed	01/29/2015	02/08/2015	02/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titche	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel		Avel Solomon					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
As discussed in Olson Steel's QA-QC Meeting of Mutual Understanding on 12/23/14 with Turner/WOJV, and again in Olson's Preparatory and Initial DFOV meetings on 1/5/15, it was agreed that the Stair and Tailing Mock-up (One complete floor to floor exit stair mock-up complete with landing and railing per 05 51 00, 1.8 Quality Control, Part C) will encompass the Stair #403 stringers and landings from the Train Platform EL.-20'-0" to EL -18'-7 1/8". Olson Steel is currently fabricating this mock-up, and as agreed with Turner/WOJV, the mock-up will be fully assembled in Olson's San Leandro shop for the Design Team to review. This RFI is being submitted for record to revise the location of the mock-up to Olson's fabrication shop in San Leandro, CA. Since the mock-up is an actual portion of Stair #402, a secondary review can take place if needed once the stair is installed onsite.				Confirmed.			
<p>Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2129 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2142	SSS - Approval Comment Clarification at Beam Connection GL29-30	Closed	01/30/2015	01/30/2015	02/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/S1-5012, S1-2306 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: D.8 /29 - 30 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI #753 SK1, TG0701-135 The attached CD RFI #753 SK1 references Shop drawing 7094 from submittal TG0701-135 where TT commented "Copying of bottom flange not acceptable". Per detail 1/S1-5012, the beam has to be coped to fit the connection. Supply a new detail if this connection is not acceptable.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The W16 beam connection at the transfer girder shall be per 12/S1-5010 not 1/S1-5012 as noted in the RFI. Provide 2 bolts at the connection per 12/S1-5010. Bottom flange coping is not acceptable per review comment. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as Called out in contract documents.				
T-2143	TOP - Manhole Access Openings at Glass Building - Café (W-20)	Closed	01/29/2015	02/08/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Detail 1/S1-2650 Detail 1/A1-8641 Location: Glass Building (W-20) on Roof Park Level Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI Response P1-0341 Detail 1/S1-2650 calls depicts two manhole access openings and references architectural drawings for typical locations and dimensions. Detail 1/A1-8641 does not show manhole access openings. RFI Response P1-0341 states, "The two 30" access manholes shown on A1-8630A are deleted..." Please confirm the manhole access openings depicted in		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Round access holes are deleted, Architectural plan is correct. S1-2650 will be revised and issued in future ASI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Detail 1/S1-2650 are deleted per RFI Response P1-0341 and revise the drawings to match.							
T-2144	TOP - Seismic Joint Cover Clarification	Closed	01/29/2015	01/29/2015	02/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:		Confirmed. The seismic joint assemblies at Park Level shall be furnished and installed per specification 07 09 13, as noted in 05 60 00 (2.3-M). Refer to Landscape drawings for seismic joint cover infill materials at the Roof Park Level.					
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14)							
Specification Section 07 09 13							
Specification Section 05 60 00							
Location: N/A							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 07 09 13 (2.2) A Seismic Joint Assemblies identifies Construction Specialties, MM Systems, Michael Rizza, Specialties Building Components as acceptable manufacturers for FJC1, and the associated cover plate.							
Specification Section 05 60 00 (2.2) C Site Metal Fabrication calls out for the seismic joint cover manufacturer to be Specialty Design Group and makes no mention of the associated seismic joint assembly.							
Please confirm that the seismic joint assembly, including the associated cover is to be furnished and installed as specified in Specification Section 07 09 13 Seismic Joint Assemblies, and not Specification Section 05 60 00 Site Metal Fabrication.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2145	TOP - Slab Thickness Requirements at Grand Hall	Closed	01/29/2015	01/29/2015	02/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Detail 1/A1-9585 Sheets A1-9520 through A1-9537 Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI Response P1-0457 Detail 1/A1-9585 calls out for the Grand Hall topping slab thickness to be 3-5/8", with radiant floor heating tubes and #4 rebar. Notes on Sheets A1-9520 through A1-9537 confirm that reinforcement within topping slabs is to be #4 rebar at 16" o.c. each way. Based upon the minimum clearances and material thicknesses (1.5" clr. for tubing, ¾" nominal O.D. for tubing, 1" for rebar mat, ¾" minimum clr. for rebar), the topping slab minimum thickness would be required to be 4" (NOTE: 4" does not include any room for allowable tolerances), which exceeds the thickness called out on Detail 1/A1-9585. Please provide direction as to the desired topping slab thickness at the Grand Hall (NOTE: RFI P1-0457 previously changed the reinforcement to 6x6x4.5x4.5 within the Grand Hall).					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For reinforcing requirements at the Grand Hall topping slab, see attached sketches SKA-4435 and 4436. The notes on the topping slab have been revised typically and the detail at radiant floor has also been revised to match notes per the attached sketches.		
T-2146	TOP - Dowel Requirements at Polished Concrete Expansion Joints	Closed	01/29/2015	02/08/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Details 2 & 4/A1-9585 Specification Section 03 20 02 Location: N/A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2132 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i><u>Number</u></i>	<i><u>Subject</u></i>	<i><u>Status</u></i>	<i><u>Date Created</u></i>	<i><u>Date Required</u></i>	<i><u>Date Answered</u></i>	<i><u>Cost Impact</u></i>	<i><u>Proceed</u></i>
	<p>Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>Details 2 & 4/A1-9585 feature the expansion joints identified on the A1-95XX Series. Specification Section 03 20 02 (3.1) D.1 Concrete Reinforcement and Embedded Assemblies indicates rebar and WWF are not to be continuous between expansion joints.</p> <p>Details 2 & 4/A1-9585 do not call out for dowels at the expansion joints to prevent the slab edges from curling away from each other.</p> <p>Please confirm no dowels are required at the polished concrete topping slab expansion joints.</p>						
T-2147	TOP - Permanent Topping Slab to Knock Out Details	Closed	01/30/2015	02/09/2015	02/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Detail 1/A1-7572				Please refer to SKA-4431 for a typical detail for the knock out slab at the grand hall.			
Location: N/A							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Detail 1/A1-7572 appears to show a bolted connection between the edge of permanent terrazzo covered topping slab and the knock out panel topping slabs.							
No detailed information is given on the assembly (angle size, bolt size, how often does the bolted connection occur, what is the solid grey color, is this a typical detail at all edges of all knock out panels, etc.).							
Please provide the full detailing on the permanent topping							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2133 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2148	TOP - Alignment of Topping & Structural Slab Joints	Closed	01/30/2015	01/30/2015	02/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Detail 1/A1-7572			Confirmed, the joint between the topping slabs and the structural slabs are not to align.				
Location: N/A			Statement about the topping slab/terrazzo cracking because it moves independently from the structural deck is not quite correct. Slabs are not designed to be connected.				
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Detail 1/A1-7572 shows the topping slab extending past the edge of the structural slab joint (between permanent slab and knock out slab) by 3" with a steel angle pour stop.							
If the structural deck moved independently of each other (they are not tied into each other), there is a strong possibility that the topping slab/terrazzo will crack.							
Please confirm that the joint between topping slabs and structural slabs are not to align at the edge of knock out slab.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2134 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2149	TOP - Curb Requirements at Knock Out/Permanent Slab Joint	Closed	01/30/2015	02/09/2015	02/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheet S1-2305 Sheet A1-2865 Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Sheet S1-2305 and Sheet A1-2865 show 3 ea. structural deck knock out slabs between GL 20 and 22. Sheet A1-2305 shows topping slab over the same areas. At GL 21, the structural slab steps from 16.12' to 18.22'. No concrete curbs are called out to be installed around the knock out slab/permanent slab joint as the slab transition from 16.12' to 18.22' (i.e. the foam below the topping slabs will be visible when the knock out slabs are removed). Please confirm no curbs are required at the knock out slab/permanent slab joint.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Install concrete curbs along knock out slab as indicated in attached sketch SKA-4433. Refer also to sketch and response to RFI T-2147.		
T-2150	SSS - ASI 128 Slab Opening Note Clarification GL29-30	Closed	01/30/2015	02/09/2015	02/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2306 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: C.3-D.4/29-30 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 746 SK1 In the attached CD RFI 746 SK1, the hi-lited note shows a 5" Thick Slab. This note does not agree with the typical S10 Slab in this area. Please clarify the hi-lited note.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The [5" THK SLAB] annotation is misplaced and will be removed from the drawings in a future ASI. Slab type in the area is S10 as called out on the plan. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2135 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100


<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2151	BGP - Lower Concourse Wall Thickness - D226/D227	Closed	01/30/2015	01/30/2015	02/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Lower Concourse D226/D227 Grid Line: H Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI T-2056, Attached. The response to RFI T-2056 updated lower concourse wall thicknesses, however lower concourse deck D225 has already been poured with couplers cast at original thickness. Please confirm the clouded wall running along Gridline H shall be 9-5/8" thick CMU, all other walls to be installed per RFI T-2056. See attached.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. The clouded wall along GL H shall have couplers for 9-5/8" THK CMU and all other walls shall have couplers to be installed as per RFI T-2056.		
T-2152	SSS - PE403 & PE404 Post Location and Elevation Clarifications	Closed	01/30/2015	02/09/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2604, 1/S1-8006 Location: Zone 2, Roof Park Gridline: D-F/16-16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 747 SK1 Please see the attached hi-lited detail 1/S1-8006 on drawing S1-2604 between GL D-F/16-16.9: 1) Supply the post locations. 2) Confirm the top of wall (top of post) elevations are EL. 86'-8.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The embedded HSS posts align with the W-8 workpoints above, WP-17 and WP-37, as shown on 1/S1-6043. Center the embedded HSS post at WP-17 in the concrete wall 14-8" west of GL-16.9 and 7-1/8" north of GL-D.4 (WP-37 location is opposite). 2) The top of the concrete wall (and top of HSS post) is 85'-11". Refer to attached SKA-4423. Note that this adjustment must also be made for W-8 connections along GL-16.9. Revised drawings will be issued in a future ASI.		
T-2153A	SSS - PE201 Missing Information at Roof Level	Closed	02/01/2015	02/11/2015	02/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 5/S1-7003 Location: Zone 1, Roof Level			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) see below for requested dimensions.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2136 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>Gridline: E.6-F/1 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 748 SK1</p> <p>1. The attached CD RFI 748 SK1 shows detail 5/S1-7003 with missing dimensions labeled 1a thru 1i.</p> <p>Please supply missing dimensions 1a thru 1i.</p>			<p>1a- 5 1/2" - refer to sheets A1-7001 & A1-2964</p> <p>1b- 4" - refer to sheets A1-7001 & A1-2964</p> <p>1c- 4 1/2" - refer to sheets A1-7001 & A1-2964</p> <p>1d- 5 1/2" - refer to sheets A1-7001 & A1-2964</p> <p>1e- 1'-10" - refer to sheets A1-7001 & A1-7003</p> <p>1f- 1'-4" - refer to sheets A1-7001 & A1-7003</p> <p>1g- 1'-10" - refer to sheets A1-7001 & A1-7003</p> <p>1h- 1'-6" - refer to sheets A1-7001 & A1-7003</p> <p>1i- 1'-9" - refer to sheets A1-7001 & A1-7003</p>			
T-2153B	SSS - PE201 Missing Information at Roof Level	Closed	02/01/2015	02/11/2015	02/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: 5/S1-7003, 12/S1-5003 Location: Zone 1, Roof Level Gridline: E.6-F/1 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 748 SK1				Confirmed.			
2. The attached CD RFI 748 SK1 shows a slab opening in detail 5/S1-7003.				Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient Information, agree with verification. We categorize this RFI as called out on contract drawings.			
Per detail 12/S1-5003, confirm these C8x11.5 may span the distance as shown or supply alternate framing around the slab opening.							
<hr/>							
T-2154A	SSS - Conflicting Dimensions at Light Column Roof Level Connections	Closed	02/01/2015	02/11/2015	02/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	Status	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2154A	SSS - Conflicting Dimensions at Light Column Roof Level Connections	Closed	02/01/2015	02/11/2015	02/17/2015	Potentially	
						ANSWER:	
						Accept Suggestion:	
						1) T-2154A: confirmed.	
<div>REQUEST: <div>Contract Doc: A/S1-6005 Location: Zone 3, Roof Level Gridline: F.7/22 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 750 SK1, RFI T-1595</div><div>1. The attached CD RFI 750 SK1 shows highlighted ring elevations that were changed per RFI T-1595 (SK 748. CD 550).</div><div>The noted dimensions will change as shown with the change of the ring elevation.</div><div>Confirm the information in the noted RFI remains correct.</div></div>							
T-2154B	SSS - Conflicting Dimensions at Light Column Roof Level Connections	Closed	02/01/2015	02/11/2015	02/17/2015	Potentially	
						ANSWER:	
						Accept Suggestion:	
						2) T-2154B: confirmed	
<div>REQUEST: <div>Contract Doc: 3/S1-6005 Location: Light Column Cast Node LC302E Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 750 SK2, RFI T-1640</div><div>The highlighted dimension in detail 3/S1-6005 of the attached CD RFI 750 SK2 was confirmed in RFI T-1640 (SK 784, CD 582) item 3 as 1'-2 7/16.</div><div>Confirm the information in the noted RFI remains correct.</div></div>							
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div>							





Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2140 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2304, S1-2305 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: F.7/16 Add'l Doc Ref's: TG0701-78.1, Shop drawing No. A603AC Six additional holes were accidentally drilled in the web plate for transfer girder A603 at gridline 16. The holes are located at running dimensions of 28'-2 11/16" & 28' 9 1/4" just below the set of holes that are detailed, and have a 3" spacing consistent with the rest of the group. Please confirm it is acceptable to: (a) Leave as is or, (b) Install 6 A325 type 1 bolts in the mis-drilled holes.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Option b is acceptable. Reason for RFI (TT): We categorize this RFI as request for corrective field work.		
T-2157	MWP - Metal Wall Panel Mockup Locations	Closed	02/02/2015	02/12/2015	02/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Specification 07 42 13 Section 1.9K Specification calls for mockups to be sized at a minimum span of 2 panel joints in each direction (approximately 20 feet x 20 feet). The documents do not state specifically where onsite (gridline, etc.) the mockups are to be located, and if they will be left in place once approved. Please provide location for each of the required system mockups and confirm that approved mockups will be left in place.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The approved mockups will become the standard of workmanship for the Project. Remove mockups only after completion and acceptance of final work, unless its incorporation in the Work is authorized by the TJPA Representative. The following attached sketches locate the mockups: 1. W-16A mockup location is identified in SKA-4424 and SKA-4425. 2. W-21 mockup location is identified in SKA-4426, SKA-4427 and SKA-4428. 3. W-16B, W-17 & W-19 mockup location is identified in SKA-4429 and SKA-4430. Answered by DT: 02/03/2015 Closed by WOJV: 06/15/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2141 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2158	ELV - Telecommunications Underground Pull Boxes	Closed	02/02/2015	02/12/2015	02/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: [(ASI 128/TE1-2602 thru TE1-2607/27 05 33)] Location: [Zone 02 - 07], Level [Roof Park] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc Ref's: [N/A] The roof park level floor plan drawings has a box symbol "U" along with an identifier. Per the legend TE-0010, this symbol is a underground pull box. On sheet TE1-8013, detail 1 is the only underground pull box reference. Please confirm all park level pull boxes are indeed the detail, as shown, on sheet TE1-8013.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pull boxes as shown on sheet TE1-8013 are not for Roof Park Level. Underground locations designated with "U" are intended to be shared vaults on the Roof Park Level per Landscape drawings..		
T-2159	ELV - E1-4603 - Jet Fountain Lighting System	Closed	02/02/2015	02/12/2015	02/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref:[ASI 128/E1-0062, E1-4603/26 50 00] Location: Zone[03], Level [Park] Closest Column Line Intersection is [(C,9), (G,9)] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A Per ASI 128 narrative summary change description for drawing E1-4603, it states "No content revisions to sheet, previously issued version included with new date (markup)". 1. This creates an inconstructibility issue with the jet fountain lighting system as the +/-60 type E18 fixtures would remain NIC"[along with other electrical scope] per Add4 issued on 06/20/14. 2. In addition to the E18 fixtures, E2 is also shown as "NIC". Should this drawing be updated to include fixtures label "NIC"?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Light fixtures types E18 and E2 on sheet E1-4603 shall be included in scope of work. Refer to attached SKE-RFI-T-2159.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2160	EAW - Aluminum Plate Panel Color	Closed	02/02/2015	02/12/2015	02/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint VentureJonathan Flaming</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Crown Corr, Inc.Erik Bryant</div></div>			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: Specification 08 44 27 section 2.7 A</div><div>Location: Exterior Awning</div><div>Specification calls for Prefinished Duranur XL Three-Coat system (Basis of Design), color; Pearlescent White.</div><div>No paint color code is provided in the specifications for Pearlescent White and Pearlescent White was not listed in the Duranur Color List.</div><div>Provide paint color code for the Pearlescent White specified in 08 44 27 section 2.7 A.</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div></div><div>The aluminum panel color specified in Specification Section 08 44 27 paragraph 2.7 A will be modified as follows:</div><div>The Design Build Contractor will prepare 5' x 5' field mockup with the following colors:</div><div>1. Metal Panel and Patch Plates: PPG Duranar 'Getty White' #UC71283 WITH ADDED MICA. Paint manufacturer is directed to use the standard sample provided UC71283 and add mica, so that the final paint color might result in a different code number. In this alternate, provide sample without the clear coat for this mockup.</div><div>2. Alternate to sample 1. above: Metal Panel and Patch Plates: PPG Duranar 'Getty White' #UC71283 WITH ADDED MICA. Paint manufacturer is directed to use the standard sample provided UC71283 and add mica, so that the final paint color might result in a different code number. In this alternate, provide sample without the clear coat for this mockup.</div><div>3. Space Frame and struts: Color to match Benjamin Moore #BM 1550 'Cumulus Cloud'.</div><div>We emphasize that this color selection is for the mock-up only and the final paint colors are subject to change pending result of mock-up review in San Francisco. Per separate discussion with the Design Team, the Design Build Contractor has agreed to work this process with the current schedule, provided they receive the final color by April 16, 2015.</div><div>RFI Answered by Design Team: 02/11/2015</div><div>RFI Closed by WOJV: 04/28/2015</div></div>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2161	SSS - Light Column Pipe to Cast Node Joints	Closed	02/02/2015		02/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-6005, S1-6006 Location: Light Column Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: SK RFI 1015 SK1 & SK2 Pipe for the light column structure is specified on structural contract drawings S1-6005 and S1-6006 as API 5L Grade X52. Pipe has been ordered and delivered in conformance with this specification. Detail 6/S1-6006 shows the intended fit between the vertical pipe legs and the cast nodes. The castings have a machined feature on each nozzle end that is intended to slide into the pipe ends and act as a backing ring. The corresponding weld between these two components is called out as a complete joint penetration weld in the same detail. In accordance with AWS D1.1 Section 5.22.1.1, the separation between faying surfaces of butt joints landing on a backing shall not exceed 1/16". The allowable tolerances for API 5L Grade X52 pipe do not require concentricity (between internal and external bores) or even a constant wall thickness that would be required by AWS D1.1 to provide a complete joint penetration weld. Further, there is no requirement in the contract documents for additional machining to the internal bores of the pipe ends as would be required by AISC Code of Standard Practice. As a result our fabricator has encountered the following conditions: 1. Pipe does not fit over the machined backing ring at the cast node nozzle end as intended without additional grinding and/or machining 2. Pipe fits over cast node backing ring; however, pipe ID is not circular or concentric, resulting in excessive gaps that exceed fit tolerance requirements for a complete joint penetration weld. Further, the lack of concentricity may result in misalignment of the pipe and cast nodes in the vertical legs. 3. Ring pipe segments will be made from different pipe sections. Pipe ends from such sections will have varying		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response Dated 2.12.15: We see this as a means and methods of construction issue, as the fabricator and contractor are responsible for the coordination between structural steel and cast steel. Drawing 6/S1-6006 shows the required fit between the vertical pipe legs and the cast nodes. A CJP is necessary between the pipe and cast node, the fabricator's chosen solution must facilitate this. SBP disagrees with the stated reason for the RFI (engineering conflict), we classify this as alternate proposal submitted for approval. Revised Response Dated 3.9.15: For the ring splices of the horizontal rings located at elevation +12'-0" and +90'-11", it is acceptable to use PJP welds with a 2-inch effective throat depth. The NDT inspection requirements for CJP welds as per the contract document must be followed. For the cast node to cast node splices, located at the cast node ring at the lower concourse level (elev. - 8'-2"), the weld requirement was changed from a CJP in our response to RFI T-2062 dated 01/14/15. It was agreed that PJP welds with a 2-inch effective throat depth were acceptable to be used, with the NDT inspection requirements for CJP welds as per the contract document to be followed. For the remaining horizontal ring splices CJP welds must be used. For the vertical pipe splices, including pipe to pipe and cast node to pipe splices, CJP welds must be used.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>and unmatched IDs again inhibiting the installation of a tight fitting backing ring required to complete a CJP.</p> <p>For demonstration please refer to attached SK RFI 1015 SK 1 and SK 2 which shows actual dimensions for the first pipe section cut by our fabricator (p16056) and corresponding measurements from cast nodes 702-01 and 702-02 machined backing ring (see attached sketches). The sketches compare the measured pipe ID to the cast node backing ring OD. This piece does not fit against either of the cast nodes</p> <p>To resolve these issues we see the following options / solutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grind internal bores of pipe ends to allow fit against castings. This option would not permit the completion of complete joint penetration welds so the CJP weld designation requirement would have to be modified to a PJP by the design team. Gaps exceeding PJP allowances would have to be built up with weld metal. Please note; however, that this option does not ensure a correct alignment between the vertical pipe and cast nodes. 2. Machine internal bores of pipe ends to ensure a tight fit against the castings and correct alignment between the pipe and castings. The actual machining work to achieve this would be minimal; however, building machining fixtures and set up time for each pipe end would be significant. 3. For pipe to pipe welds in the ring sections, we suggest removing the CJP weld designation. <p>Please advise or provide a solution as the above options have cost and schedule impacts.</p>						
T-2161.1	SSS - Light Column Ring Splices	Closed	04/06/2015	04/10/2015	Potentially		<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2146 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: B/ S1-6006, C/ S1-6006 Location: Light Column at elevations +12' and +90' Add'l Doc Ref's: n/a For the ring splices of the horizontal rings located at elevation +12'-0" and +90'-11", it is acceptable to use PJP welds with a 2-inch effective throat depth. The NDT inspection requirements for CJP welds as per the contract document must be followed. At the +12 and +90 light column ring beams, please confirm that an effective PJP weld depth of no less than 1.5" is acceptable for the pipe to pipe splices. NDT requirements will per original RFI response.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We confirm that for the two horizontal light column rings located at +12 and +90, an effective PJP weld depth of no less than 1.5" is acceptable for the pipe to pipe splices. The NDT inspection requirements for CJP welds as per the contract documents must be followed.		
T-2161.2	SSS - Light Column Pipe Weld Joints	Closed	04/09/2015	04/22/2015	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>		
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-6005 and S1-6006 Location: Zone 3 Gridlines: 22-24 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK001 and SK002 As previously documented (Ref RFI T-2161), the pipe specified for the light column will result in interferences, gaps and combinations of interferences and gaps at pipe to cast node and pipe to pipe weld joints. Following our 08 April meeting, please confirm the following: 1. For CJP welds, when a gap fit is encountered, the opening can be filled with weld wire ('battered') to close any gap exceeding AWS D1.1 Section 5.22.1.1 allowance of 1/16". (See SK001 and SK002 for illustration of this condition) 2. For interference fits (clashes) in the ring splices, material is to be removed to achieve AESS fit at the joint outside diameters (-0, + 1/16")	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. To achieve CJP welds where there is a gap fit, it is acceptable to weld butter the inner diameter to build up material. It must be ensured that proper penetration is achieved. 100% NDT weld quality must be ensured. 2. For interference fits, machining or grinding to allow for minimum clearance is acceptable as long as the minimum wall thickness as per the pipe specification/contract drawings is adhered to. Answered by Design Team: 4/22/15 Closed by WOJV: 4/22/15		

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2148 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>2. Replace vertical stiffeners at transfer girder ends beneath castings to a single continuous end plate. The web and flanges will be CJP'd to the end plate. See attached SK2.</p> <p>3. Replace top horz plates at back of cast nodes to a single continuous plate and also remove 3" length of vertical weld at flange edge. Access hole would be extended/enlarged as shown. See SK3.</p> <p>4. Revise wing plate to bottom flange detail as shown in SK4.</p> <p>Note: All detail modifications proposed would be typical for transfer girders with ground level cast nodes only</p>						
T-2164	INT - Painting of All Exposed Surfaces	Closed	02/03/2015	02/13/2015	02/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:		No list shall be provided. All surfaces shall be painted, unless specifically identified in the Finish Column of the Room Finish Schedule with a "-" (dash/hyphen).					
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 09 91 00		In the case of the Portland Cement Plastering work, do not paint any plaster surfaces, follow the Portland Cement Plastering specification. The plaster fascias have an integral color as part of the finish coat, so they do not get receive PT-2 color.					
Location: N/A							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 09 91 00 (1.1) A.3 Painting states, "Paint all exposed surfaces whether or not colors are designated, except where the natural finish of the material is obviously intended or specifically noted as a surface not to be painted. Where items or surfaces are not specifically mentioned, paint these the same as adjacent similar materials or areas."							
Specification Section 09 91 00 provided specifications for the painting of CMU, cement plaster, and concrete.							
There are a significant number of surfaces which are		*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>unclear as to whether or not the natural finish is to be painted (eg. concrete walls in the Train Box/Lower Concourse) or are not specifically noted as not to be painted (finishes left blank on the Room Finish Schedule).</p> <p>Please confirm only surfaces specifically noted as being painted are to receive paint, or provide a specific list of (i.e. W-18 cement plaster, items left blank on the Room Finish Schedule, conc. & CMU walls not identified as being painted in the Train Box and Lower Concourse) items not to be painted.</p>						
T-2164.1	INT - Train Box B2200 Room Designations	Closed	02/27/2015	03/09/2015	03/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheet A1-9601 Sheets A1-2102 through A1-2111				For Train Box B2200 room designation on Sheets A1-2102 to A1-2111, refer to attached SKA-4496 to SKA-4503.			
Location: Train Box B2200							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
The Room Finish Schedule on Sheet A1-9601 calls out Train Box B2200.							
Train Platform Level floor plans on Sheets A1-2102 through A1-2111 do not designate room Train Box B2200.							
Please provide a room designation for Train Box B2200.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2165	TER - Epoxy Terrazzo Unit Price for Samples	Closed	02/03/2015	02/13/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 09 66 23 Specification Section 01 10 20					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: N/A			Reference to unit price has been deleted from 09 66 23 - Epoxy Terrazzo Flooring section. Please see attached mark-up.				
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 09 66 23 (1.4) C.1 Epoxy Terrazzo Flooring calls out for a unit price for samples.							
Specification Section 01 10 20 Unit Prices and Allowances does not identify this as a desired unit price.							
Please confirm unit pricing is not required for Epoxy Terrazzo samples.							
<hr/>							
T-2166	TER - Electronic File for Divider Strip Layout	Closed	02/03/2015	02/03/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 09 66 23					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: N/A			Refer to the attached "20140918_JC GRAND HALL (Layers by Color).pdf" file for Divider Strip layout.				
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 09 66 23 (1.3) D Epoxy Terrazzo Flooring states, "An electronic file is included in this package for installer?s use in the layout of the divider strips and colors to be used in addition to hard copy layout drawings in contract documents."							
No electronic file has been officially issued.							
Please provide the electronic file referenced in							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2151 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Specification Section 09 66 23 Epoxy Terrazzo Flooring.							
T-2167	FSP - Required Spacing between Sprinkler Heads	Closed	02/03/2015	02/13/2015	03/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Aseem Goyal	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Transbay Fire Protection		Kevin Malone					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Contract Doc Ref: A1-4506 & A1-4507/ Spec 21 13 19 1.3/B/7				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Location: Bus Deck Level (Between Grids 27 & 33.5)				Refer to enclosed Sketches SKA-4442 and SKA-4443			
Closest Column Line : N/A				with revised 6'-0" O.C. sprinkler layout at required			
Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A				area of building.			
Per Spec 211319 1.3/B/7.a closely spaced sprinklers (6' on centers) are required between 27 & 33.5. A1-4507 shows these closely spaced sprinklers at less than 6' on center. This is less than the minimum spacing between sprinklers allowed per NFPA #13 unless baffles are placed between the heads to prevent cold soldering. Baffles are not shown on sheets A1-4506 & A1-4507. Please confirm the closely spaced sprinklers will be spaced at 6' on center per specifications?							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>702-02 machined backing ring (see attached sketches). The sketches compare the measured pipe ID to the cast node backing ring OD. This piece does not fit against either of the cast nodes.</p> <p>To resolve these issues we see the following options / solutions;</p> <p>1. Grind internal bores of pipe ends to allow fit against castings. This option would not permit the completion of complete joint penetration welds so the CJP weld designation requirement would have to be modified to a PJP by the design team. Gaps exceeding PJP allowances would have to be built up with weld metal. Please note; however, that this option does not ensure a correct alignment between the vertical pipe and cast nodes.</p> <p>2. Machine internal bores of pipe ends to ensure a tight fit against the castings and correct alignment between the pipe and castings. The actual machining work to achieve this would be minimal; however, building machining fixtures and set up time for each pipe end would be significant</p> <p>3. For pipe to pipe welds in the ring sections, we suggest removing the CJP weld designation.</p> <p>Please advise or provide a solution as the above options have cost and schedule impacts.</p>						
T-2169	TER - Bicycle Wheel Channel Reference	Closed	02/03/2015	02/13/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14)				Confirmed. There are no bicycle wheel channels required in Phase 1.			
Specification Section 09 66 23							
Sheet A1-9645							
Sheet A1-9546							
Location: N/A							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A				Please make correction to the RFI references, sheet A1-9645 does not exist, you must mean A1-9545.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2154 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Specification Section 09 66 23 (1.3) E.2 Epoxy Terrazzo Flooring requires, "Coordinate installation of bicycle wheel channels in terrazzo work."</p> <p>Bicycle wheel channels are not shown in the contract documents (Sheet A1-9645 and Sheet A1-9546, for example).</p> <p>Please confirm no bicycle wheel channels are required in Phase 1.</p>						
T-2170	SSS - Light Column Cast Node Ring Joint Fit Up	Void	02/03/2015	02/13/2015			Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-6005, S1-6006 Location: GL 23 Add'l Doc Ref: AWS D1.1							
The cast node ring has been laid out, plumbed, aligned and leveled. The ring layout has been optimized to maintain circularity as well as vertical and horizontal alignment to the greatest extent possible.							
The weld joint design being used for these welds is BC-P2-GF which allows for a root opening of zero and corresponding "As Fit-Up" tolerance of +1/8", -1/16". Please find attached AWS D1.1 extract for this joint.							
Following layout and fit using the primary criteria of maintaining circularity of the ring and both vertical and horizontal alignment of the ring geometry, some root openings exceed the allowable fit up tolerance (see attached Photos 1 and 2). Please confirm we can proceed by "buttering" the joints at these locations (closing gaps with weld metal).							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2155 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2171	TER - Enclosure Requirements per Specification Section 09 66 23	Closed	02/03/2015	02/13/2015	02/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 09 66 23			Enclosure Requirements in Section 09 66 23 have been updated to meet manufacturer and installer recommendations. See attached mark-up of Specification Section 09 66 23.				
Location: N/A							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Specification Section 09 66 23 (1.3) C Epoxy Terrazzo Flooring requires any space receiving terrazzo flooring to be completely enclosed.							
Some areas receiving terrazzo are open air spaces (Public Lobby 02249, for example) and will require temporary enclosure. (Note: If the "W" system at the Grand Hall is not in place at the time of the terrazzo installation, it will also require temporary enclosure.)							
Please confirm environmental conditions required by the manufacturer's written installation are to be followed, and enclosure is not necessary unless required by the manufacturer.							
<hr/>							
T-2172	SSS - Transfer Girder Details	Void	02/03/2015	02/13/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-4350 - S1-4356 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached sketch SK2 - SK4							
Based on previous discussions regarding cracks and lamellar tearing experienced by one of our fabricators we propose making the following modifications to minimize reoccurrence; 1. Revise weld access holes in transfer girder web at interface with intermediate flange. See attached SK1 2. Replace vertical stiffeners at transfer girder ends beneath castings to a single continuous end plate. The web and flanges will be CJP'd to the end plate. See attached SK2							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2156 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>3. Replace top horizontal plates at back of cast nodes to a single continuous plate and also remove 3" length of vertical weld at flange edge. Access hole would be extended/enlarged as shown. See SK3</p> <p>4. Revise wing plate to bottom flange detail as shown in SK4</p> <p>Note: All detail modifications proposed would be typical for transfer girders with ground level cast nodes only</p> <p>Please advise.</p>						
T-2173	RPL - Utility Corridor Details	Closed	02/03/2015	02/13/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-1602 through L1-1607 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A				The design intent as put forth in the construction documents is to run all required conduits through the designated utility corridor to the Security Pylons.			
L1-1602 through L1-1607 show an outline for the main pathway of the utility corridor and vault. However, there are no details for the main utility corridor or any parameters for branches from the main corridor.				The conduits runs utilize the Security Pylons as pull boxes, in addition to the pull boxes identified in the drawings for wire splicing and other code and system requirements.			
Please provide details for the utility corridor and all parameters for branching from the utility corridor to security pylons, etc. Include details and parameters for trenching, backfill, coverage, routing requirements, trench dimensions, additional pull boxes, etc.				Conduits shall be installed per code and following layouts indicated in the electrical and telecom construction documents. Conduits shall not be run under or through tree rootballs. Security pylons are intended to be daisy chained. No additional pull boxes should be necessary.			
				Trenching, backfill and branching are means and methods of construction; the Contractor is required to submit shop drawings for review and approval. The design superimposed dead loads are specified on the contract documents (sheets S1-1013, S1-1014 & S1-1015). The trench and associated backfill shall not exceed the design loads indicated.			
				Refer to attached SKLA-376 for proposed trenching			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2157 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2174	RPL - Utility Corridor Distribution	Closed	02/03/2015	02/13/2015	02/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-1602 through L1-1607 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A L1-1602 through L1-1607 show an outline for the main pathway of the utility corridor and vault. However, there are no details for the main utility corridor or any parameters for branches from the main corridor. Provide the method and parameters for distribution of branching from the main utility corridor. Is the design intent to daisy chain security pylons, home run each pylon, etc.? Include parameters outlining the design intent of branching distribution from the main utility corridor, additional pull boxes in landscaping, security requirements, etc.				and backfill methodology for Roof Park utility corridors. Refer to response to RFI T-2173.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2158 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2175	RPL - Utility Corridor Access Point Details	Closed	02/03/2015	02/13/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-1602 through L1-1607, L1-7670, L1-7671, L1-7672 and L1-7673 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A L1-1602 through L1-1607 show an outline for the main pathway of the utility corridor and vault. However, there are no details for the main utility corridor or any parameters for branches from the main corridor. Distribution from the main utility corridor will likely require additional pull boxes/vaults which will need to be accessed. Confirm that Utility Vault details on L1-7670, L1-7671, L1-7672 and L1-7673 should be used for any additional access points required in the main utility corridor and utility corridor branches for distribution throughout the Roof Park. If not, provide details for additional pull boxes/vaults which will be required for distribution.				Refer to response to RFI T-2173.			
T-2176	RPL - Utility Corridor Conflict With Trees	Closed	02/03/2015	02/13/2015	02/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-1602 through L1-1607 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: Between GL C and D, Between GL F and G Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A L1-1602 through L1-1607 show an outline for the main pathway of the utility corridor and vault. There are many trees in conflict with the utility corridor which are placed directly on top or immediately adjacent to the utility corridor. See attached mark-ups showing conflicts with main utility corridor. Provide revised tree locations for those in conflict with the utility corridor and provide parameters for how far trees need to be from utility corridor and all future branching and routing through the roof park.				Refer to sketches SKLA-365-1 through 365-6 with relocated trees previously in conflict with utility corridor. Conduits shall not be run under or through tree rootballs. Also refer to response to RFI T-2173.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2159 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2177	RPL - Utility Corridor Conflict With Precast Roof Drain	Closed	02/03/2015	02/13/2015	02/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-1602 through L1-1607, L1-4602 through L1-4607 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: Between GL C and D, Between GL F and G Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A L1-1602 through L1-1607 and L1-4602 through L1-4607 show an outline for the main pathway of the utility corridor and vault. There are many roof drains in conflict with the utility corridor which are placed directly in the pathway of the utility corridor. See attached mark-ups showing conflicts with main utility corridor. Provide revised utility corridor pathway where pathway conflicts with roof drains and provide parameters for how far utility corridor and all future branching and routing through the roof park need to be from roof drains. Detail the condition when utility corridor interfaces with roof drains and drainage piping.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to sketches SKLA-365-1 through 365-6 with for the revised utility corridor locations to avoid conflicts with roof drains.		
T-2178	RPL - Utility Corridor Conflict With Play Structure Footings	Closed	02/03/2015	02/03/2015	02/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - L1-1604 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: Between GL 16-18 and GL F-G Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A L1-1604 shows an outline for the main pathway of the utility corridor and vault placed through the play structure footings located within the structural slab at the roof park level. See attached mark-ups showing conflicts with main utility corridor. Provide revised utility corridor pathway where pathway conflicts with play structure footings and provide parameters for how far utility corridor and all future branching and routing through the roof park need to be			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to SKLA-365-3 for the relocated utility corridor at the play area on Grid F.7 and Grid 16-18.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2160 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
from footings. Detail the condition when utility corridor interfaces with footings at the roof park level.							
T-2179	FSP - Fire Storage Tank Capacity	Closed	02/04/2015	02/14/2015	02/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal			
Co-Author: Transbay Fire Protection Kevin Malone							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: P1-5040, 21 13 19-3 Location: Train Platform Level Closest Column Line Intersection: Between B,C.3 & 4,5 Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A P1-5040 calls out the Fire Water Storage Tank as a 45,000 Gallon Tank. The Tank should be sized for the worst case hazard classification of the building. Per Specification 211319-3, the Bus Deck Level is Classified as Extra Hazard Group 1 with a design density of .24 over 4,000 sq. ft. If sizing the tank for this density it should hold 131,400 gallons. 4,000 x .24 = 960 gallons 960 gallons + 500 gallons hose allowance = 1,460 gallons 1,460 gal. x 90 minutes duration = 131,400 gallons Please confirm water storage tank sizing?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The building is not a high rise and a fire water tank is not required by code. The fire water storage tank is provided as a system enhancement. The 45,000 gallons provides 1,500 gpm for a 30 minute duration.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2180	SSS - Shop Splice on TG 1.4 & 2	Closed	02/04/2015	03/09/2015	02/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Contract Doc: S1-2302, S1-4300 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: D.4-F.7/1.4-2 Contract Doc Ref's: TG0701-87.1, Shop Drawings No. 652AC, 653AB, 676AB See the attached SK RFI 1021 SK1-3. Please confirm it is acceptable to introduce shop web and flange splices as indicated on the attached girder segments on GL 1.4 & 2.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Original Response dated 2.14.15. Contractor proposed shop splices indicated in the RFI are acceptable for the GL 1.4 girder. Splices shall be performed per Detail 1/S1-5014 (double sided CJP at the web and flanges). For the GL 2 girder, the sheet number (676AB) and piece configuration included in the RFI does not match those reviewed in the shop drawings (WS4). In WS4 shop drawings, GL 2 transfer girder piece numbers are 655 and 656 and a field splice as shown in the RFI does not exist on the western end of the girder. Therefore, the additional shop splice requests for GL 2 girder are not reviewed at this time. We suggest that this item be discussed in next week's coordination meeting or the contractor to submit updated information with consistent reference. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reason for RFI: Verification. We categorize this RFI as substitution request. Revised Response dated 2.23.15. Contractor proposed shop splices indicated in the RFI are acceptable for the GL 1.4 girder. Splices shall be performed per Detail 1/S1-5014 (double sided CJP at the web and flanges). For the GL 2 girder, the sheet number (676AB) and piece configuration included in the RFI does not match those reviewed in the shop drawings (WS4). In WS4 shop drawings, GL 2 transfer girder piece numbers are 655 and 656 and a field splice as shown in the RFI does not exist on the western end of the girder. SER has been contacted by Skanska on 02/18 to clarify that the field splice was added due to crane capacity limitations and to request TT review the location of the new field splice along with the locations of the shop splices presented in the RFI. The locations of the field splice and shop splices included in the RFI are acceptable. Splices shall be performed per Detail 1/S1-5014 (double sided CJP at the web and flanges). Updated shop drawings that reflect these changes shall be submitted for record. We note that field or shop splices shall not be introduced by the contractor without approval from the				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2163 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Add'l Doc Ref's: TG0701-074.1, SK RFI 1022 SK1</p> <p>At locations where deck panels span over heavily cambered beams, the panels bow due to the camber and do not bear on adjacent flat beams.</p> <p>A typical example at GL11-12/D where the deck panels spans from A4814 over A4807 (with 1-1/2" camber) and do not bear on A4808. This is typical at several locations throughout the building. See attached SK1.</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable to relief cut through the high flutes over the cambered beam to create bearing on adjacent beams for stud welding.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2183	SSS - Step in Slab Closure at GL19.1	Closed	02/04/2015	02/14/2015	02/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: 6/S1-3703				This is a means and methods related question. GC to provide direction to the sub-contractors.			
Location: N/A							
Gridline: 19.1							
Add'l Doc Ref's: SK RFI 1020 SK1, RFI T-1573.2				Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request: Insufficient information. We categorize this RFI as information needs to be provided by others.			
See the attached SK1.							
The response to RFI T-1573.2 located the center of the framing beam 7-1/2" from the step in slab.							
Detail 6/S1-3703 does not specify if a closure is required.							
Please confirm if required and provide material grade.							
T-2184	RPL - Incorporate P1-0152 Answer	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint VentureSihaya Roselle</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 04 22 00 3.2.B.1				See the attached SKLA 369.			
Location: Roof Park							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: P1-0152				This revision will be incorporated in a future ASI.			
The answer to RFI P1-0152 has not been incorporated into ASI 128. P1-0152 was answered before the 10/17/2014 cut off date and should be included per the ASI 128 Revision Narrative, section 1.1.A.							
Please incorporate the answer to P1-0152 into the specifications.							
T-2185	RPL - Incorporate P1-0352 Answer	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint VentureSihaya Roselle</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 32 18 16, section 1.4.B and 2.1				See attached SKLA-324. It will be incorporated in a future ASI.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2165 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2186	<p>Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: P1-0352</p> <p>The answer to RFI P1-0352 has not been incorporated into ASI 128. P1-0352 was answered before the 10/17/2014 cut off date and should be included per the ASI 128 Revision Narrative, section 1.1.A.</p> <p>Please incorporate the answer to P1-0352 into the specifications.</p> <p>RPL - Incorporate P1-0474 Answer</p> <p>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 12 93 20 3.3.A.2 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: P1-0474</p> <p>The answer to RFI P1-0474 has not been incorporated into ASI 128. P1-0474 was answered before the 10/17/2014 cut off date and should be included per the ASI 128 Revision Narrative, section 1.1.A.</p> <p>Please incorporate the answer to P1-0474 into the specifications.</p>	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>See attached SKLA-330.</p> <p>This revision will be incorporated in future ASI.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2187	RPL - Incorporate P1-0476 Answer	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 32 14 41 sections 2.3.M.1, 2.3.N.1, 2.3.O.1 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: P1-0476					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The answer to RFI P1-0476 has not been incorporated into ASI 128. P1-0476 was answered before the 10/17/2014 cut off date and should be included per the ASI 128 Revision Narrative, section 1.1.A.					Color will be to match stone. See attached SKLA 368.		
Please incorporate the answer to P1-0476 into the specifications.							
T-2188	RPL - Incorporate P1-0477 Answer	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 32 15 10 1.3G, 32 14 40 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: P1-0477					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The answer to RFI P1-0477 has not been incorporated into ASI 128. P1-0477 was answered before the 10/17/2014 cut off date and should be included per the ASI 128 Revision Narrative, section 1.1.A.					Omit reference to sand layer. Refer to attached SKLA-329.		
Please incorporate the answer to P1-0477 into the specifications.							
T-2189	RPL - Incorporate P1-0478 Answer	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	03/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 32 15 10 2.2.B Location: Roof Park					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					See the attached SKLA 374.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2168 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2191	RPL - Incorporate P1-0481 Answer	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 32 15 10 3.12.B.2 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: P1-0481 The answer to RFI P1-0481 has not been incorporated into ASI 128. P1-0481 was answered before the 10/17/2014 cut off date and should be included per the ASI 128 Revision Narrative, section 1.1.A. Please incorporate the answer to P1-0481 into the specifications.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached SKLA 328. Revisions will be incorporated in future ASI.			
T-2192	RPL - Incorporate P1-0493 Answer	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 32 14 40 3.3.A.1 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: P1-0493 The answer to RFI P1-0493 has not been incorporated into ASI 128. P1-0493 was answered before the 10/17/2014 cut off date and should be included per the ASI 128 Revision Narrative, section 1.1.A. Please incorporate the answer to P1-0493 into the specifications.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See the attached SKLA 372. This will be issued in a future ASI.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2193	RPL - Incorporate P1-0651 Answer	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Sihaya Roselle</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 32 15 10, 2.1.A				Omit word "mulch."			
Location: Roof Park							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: P1-0651							
The answer to RFI P1-0651 has not been incorporated into ASI 128 as stated it would be.							
Please incorporate the answer to P1-0651 into the specifications.							
T-2194	RPL - Incorporate P1-0665 Answer	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Sihaya Roselle</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 03 33 12, 1.4.A.4				Omit "at this time."			
Location: Roof Park							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: P1-0665							
The answer to RFI P1-0665 has not been incorporated into ASI 128 as stated it would be.							
Please incorporate the answer to P1-0665 into the specifications.							
T-2195	RPL - Incorporate P1-0666 Answer	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Sihaya Roselle</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 03 33 12, 1.4.A.5				Language for specification section 03 33 12 section 1.4.A.4 will be revised to the following text and reflected in an ASI:			
Location: Roof Park							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: P1-0666							
The answer to RFI P1-0666 has not been incorporated into ASI 128 as stated it would be.				"LEED submittal language for SSc7.1 is being added, but no minimum requirement language is being included because the roof is over 50%."			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please incorporate the answer to P1-0666 into the specifications.</p>							
T-2196	RPL - Site Precast Design Reference Sample	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 03 45 00, 1.3.C Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. The precast sample will be provided for the Precast Concrete Radial Planters at Street Level.				
03 45 00, 1.3.C states that a Design Reference Sample of approved architectural precast concrete color, finish, and texture will be pre-approved by a TJPA Representative. Confirm that this pre-approved design reference sample will be provided to the trade subcontractor performing this scope of work. Which precast elements will this design reference sample be provided for?							
T-2197	RPL - MRc5 Option 2 Language Required - CMU	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 04 22 00, 2.3.A.1.a. Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No minimum regional material content is required for specification 04 22 00. Only a MRc5 LEED data submittal is required.				
MRc5 Option 2 language is missing from 04 22 00, 2.3.A.1.a. Provide MRc5 Option 2 language for 04 22 00, 2.3.A.1.a.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2171 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2198	FSP - Clarification on Fire Protection Zoning	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Transbay Fire Protection Kevin Malone							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: P1-2003 & P1-2004 Location: Ground Level & 2nd Level Throughout Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A P1-2003 & P1-2004 show the Zone boundaries for the project. The Zoning plan for the 2nd Level shown on P1-2004 includes large areas of the building that protect the Ground Floor Level (See dark blue areas on attached P1-2003). In our experience, the Fire Department requires a sprinkler system be zoned from the floor level it protects. Please confirm that the areas of the 2nd level protecting the Ground Floor should be zoned from the Ground Floor.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There are other two story high spaces controlled by second level zone valves, for example Shaw alley and the passage at grid line 3. We considered the issue zoning and of zone control valve locations early on and what we currently show on our drawings was determined to be the most practical and consistent solution. The grand hall which is the largest two story space is supplied by four zone control valves that are not even located in this sector, two zone control valves are located on second level in Sector B and two zone control valves are located on second level in Sector D.				
T-2199	RPL - Circular Planter Field Mockup	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 04 43 00, 1.5.B and 1.5.C Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Stone quarry mockups are required for both Amphitheater Stone Slab Stairs and Circular Planters. Field mockup is required for the stone stair. Confirm that a field mockup is not required for the Circular Planters. If a field mockup is required for Circular Planters, provide the area in the drawings to be mocked up in the field.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, no field mock up required.				
T-2200	RPL - Circular Planter Attic Stock	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 04 43 00, 1.8.A.1 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Attic stock is required for the stone steps, but not for the circular planters. Confirm that attic stock is not required for the circular planters.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-2201	RPL - Stone Slabs For Walls	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 04 43 00, 2.2.A Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A 04 43 00, 2.2.A. states 'Stone Slabs for Walls'. Stone Slabs for Walls have been deleted throughout this specification. Confirm that 'Stone Slabs for Walls' should be replaced with 'Circular Stone Planters'.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2173 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2202	RPL - Rail Welds	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 05 60 00, 2.6.E.2					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: Roof Park					Confirmed.		
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
05 60 00, 2.6.E.2 states that perimeter skylight rails and handrails need welds to be ground smooth and finish so that joints are not visually detectable and rails appear as single pieces.							
Confirm that this requirement also applies to all plant rails and elliptical rails.							
T-2203	RPL - Metal Fabrications Protective Covering	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 05 60 00, 3.7.A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: Roof Park					Confirmed.		
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
05 60 00, 3.7.A states to apply protective coverings to prevent damage of metal fabrications.							
Confirm that this protective covering is meant to be a temporary protective covering during construction.							
T-2204	RPL - Bond Breaker Samples	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 07 92 14, 1.4.C.2					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: Roof Park					Refer to specification 01 13 00 part 1.8 D for quantity of samples required for submittals.		
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2174 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2175 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2207	RPL - Site Laminate Glass Graffiti-Resistance	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	03/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 08 81 00, 08 87 00 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
08 81 00 Site Laminate Glass Glazing does not reference 08 87 00 Graffiti-Resistant Glass Film.					Refer to revised Specification 08 81 00 markup in enclosed SKL-371.		
Confirm that there are no requirements for graffiti-resistant glass film for 08 81 00.							
T-2208	RPL - Mortar-Set Stone Paving Alternate	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	03/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 32 14 41, 01 10 30/APE Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Mortar-Set Stone Paving alternates have been removed per specification 01 10 30/APE. 32 14 41 shows deduct bid alternates in sections 2.2.A.2, 2.2.B.2, 2.2.C.2, 2.2.D.2, 2.3.A.2, 2.3.B.2, 2.3.C.2, 2.3.D.2.					See attached SKLA-368 R1. It will be incorporated in a future ASI.		
Confirm that there is no deduct bid alternates for mortar- set stone paving per specification 01 10 30/APE. If so, remove deduct bid alternates shown in 32 14 41.							
T-2209	RPL - Weed Barrier Installation Requirements	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 32 15 00, L1-9667 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					"weed barrier" is not "watering proofing and root inhibitor".		
					Weed barrier is to be installed per manufacturer's		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2176 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Specification 32 15 00 includes requirements for weed barrier. There are no installation requirements for weed barrier.						
	Provide installation requirements for weed barrier. Clarify if weed barrier is synonymous with root inhibitor called out in the drawings, for example on L1-9667.						
T-2210	RPL - MRc5 Option 2 Language Required - Play Area Surfacing	Closed	02/05/2015	02/15/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Sihaya Roselle To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 - 32 18 16, 1.4.B.2 and 2.1.B					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: Roof Park					See attached SKLA 370.		
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A					This revision will be incorporated in future ASI.		
MRc5 Option 2 language is missing from 32 18 16, 1.4.B.2 and 2.1.B							
Provide MRc5 Option 2 language for 32 18 16, 1.4.B.2 and 2.1.B							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2177 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2211	GCW - Glass Floor Vibration Requirements	Closed	02/06/2015	02/16/2015	04/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 08 88 53 Surfaces supporting functions in the Roof Park Level are subject to dynamic effects from Park users. The current glass floor specification does not seem to address any dynamic performance with respect to pedestrian comfort. There is no natural frequency, nor any kind of vibration criteria mentioned in the Specifications. Please confirm there is no vibration criteria required for the structural design of the glass floor at Roof Park Level.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to Specification 08 88 53 for added paragraph 2.3 P for system frequency requirement. Date Answered by Design Team: 02/24/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 04/16/2015				
T-2212	BGP - Concrete Ramps at Lower Concourse Step - GL9-11 N/S	Closed	02/06/2015	02/16/2015	02/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-2203 Location: Lower Concourse Grid Line: 9-11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached See attached drawings. Sheet A1-2203 shows a 6" thick concrete ramp at the North and South foundation walls between GL 9 and 11. These ramps are not shown on either slab edge or structural drawings. Please provide drawings detailing slab edge, rebar size, rebar spacing, finish requirements, and knee wall width.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI Response: Refer to SKA-4437 and SKA-4438 for the concrete ramps at the north and south foundation walls between GL 9 and 11 showing widths and heights. These ramps are part of Service Corridor B1348 (north) and Train box B1200 (south). Refer to A1-9601 and A1-9602 for ramp finishes. TT Response: For knee wall reinforcement, refer to 1/S1-9051. Provide #4 bars at 16" O.C. each way centered in the 6" concrete ramp slabs sitting on top of structural polystyrene.				
T-2213	SCS - Concrete Beam B78 at GL 9 Conflict	Closed	02/09/2015	02/19/2015	02/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2178 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2303, 8/S1-3701 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: GL9-H Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached</p> <p>Reference sheet SI-2303 and Section 8/S1-3701 for Concrete beam B78 located along GL 9 between GLG and H.</p> <p>S1-2303 shows B78 terminating at the face of concrete beams B87 and B88. Section 8/S1-3701 shows B78 bearing on the steel transfer beam and extending past B87 and B88.</p> <p>1. Please confirm whether B78 terminates or extends past B87 and B88.</p> <p>2. If the beam extends past B87/88 per Section 8/S1-3701, please provide the distance to which B78 extends, from south side of B87/88 to end of beam.</p> <p>3. If the beam terminates at B87 and B88, please revise Section 8/S1-3701 rebar details to match the new limits.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1). B78 terminate at the south edge of B87_B88.</p> <p>2). See #1</p> <p>3). Change to rebars shown in Section 8/S1-3701 will be provided in ASI 130.</p>		
T-2214	<p>SCS - Shrinkage and Temperature Bars Lap Location at One-Way Slabs</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>	Closed	02/09/2015	02/19/2015	02/17/2015	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-3500 Location: N/A Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached</p> <p>Please refer to the Shrinkage and Temperature Bars (S&T Bars) in details 1&2/S1-3500. There are no lap location instructions, i.e. to stagger or not to stagger, given for the S&T Bars.</p> <p>Please confirm that no stagger is required in the top/bottom S&T bars. If a stagger is required, please</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Confirmed that S&T rebar in one-way slab do not need stagger at lap splice.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2179 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2215	ELV - Low and Line Voltage Floor Box layout Relative to Finish Floor Pattern	Closed	02/10/2015	02/20/2015	02/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: ASI # 128 Sheet A1-9545, E1-2305 & TE1-2305 dated 12/16/14 Location: Grand Hall (Floor Finish - Terrazzo) Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A The TG10.4 package is currently in shop drawing production and will shortly begin ground floor detailing of the Grand Hall. Relative to the finish terrazzo floor design, are there any other spatial/dimensional requirements or floor box finish/trim requirements for Electrical, Telecommunication or Security floor boxes beyond that shown and/or specified in ASI # 128 Documents? Additionally, A1-9545 does not reflect all require floor box locations (see grid Line 19.4 on E1-2305 & TE1-2305). Please provide updated A1-9545 that reflects all Low and Line voltage floor box locations required per ASI # 128.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Drawings TE1-2305, E1-2305 and Specification Section 26 27 26 Wiring Devices in ASI-0128 submission provide the required information floor outlet types. Additionally, please refer to enclosed sketches SKA-4440 and SK-4441 for dimensioned outlet locations and floor outlets added to the floor finish layout at the Grand Hall		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2180 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2216	ELV - Electrical Room 01324 and Steel Beam Conflict	Closed	02/10/2015	02/20/2015	03/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 0128/E1-2303,2/E1-3301, S1-3111] Location: Zone[03], Level [Ground] Closest Column Line Intersection is [D,11] Add'l Doc's Ref's: SK# FEC0022 In the electrical room 01324(E1-2303), the west side of the room shows a steel beam in conflict with the electrical panels. Please confirm where to relocate these panels. See attached sketch SK# FEC0022 screen shot for additional information of the conflict. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch (SKE-RFI-T-2216-1) for revised electrical room layout.		
T-2217	RWP - WPM-2 Assembly Requirements at Grand Hall	Closed	02/10/2015	02/20/2015	03/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Detail 1/A1-9585 Specification Section 07 14 13 Location: Grand Hall Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Per Detail 1/A1-9585, Hot Fluid-Applied Waterproofing (WPM-2) is to be installed over the structural slab within the Grand Gall. Per Specification Section 07 14 13 Hot Fluid-Applied Waterproofing (WPM-2) is to be installed with protection board and drain board. Detail 1/A1-9585 does not show protection board or drain board over the WPM-2. Please confirm protection board and drain board are required as part of the WPM-2 assembly slab within the Grand Hall.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the Grand Hall, Room No. 01520 delete the WPM-2 waterproofing, protection board, and drain board.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2181 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2218	RWP - Floor Drain Requirements at Grand Hall	Closed	02/10/2015	02/20/2015	03/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Detail 1/P1-2305 Detail 1/A1-9585					Confirmed.		
Location: Grand Hall							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Per Detail 1/P1-2305, no floor drains are present under the terrazzo at the Grand Hall.							
Per Detail 1/A1-9585, Hot Fluid-Applied Waterproofing (WPM-2) is to be installed over the T.O. structural slab within the Grand Hall.							
Per detail 1/A1-9585, Crack Suppression Membrane (WPM-13) is to be installed over the T.O. the topping slab.							
Should a water intrusion occur between the structural slab and topping slab, the water may float the topping slab.							
Please confirm waterproofing is to be installed at the top of structural slab and topping slab, and no floor drains are to be installed within the terrazzo at the Grand Hall.							
<hr/>							
T-2219	SCS - Maximum and Minimums for Pendulum Bearing	Closed	02/11/2015	02/21/2015	02/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: 03 20 02 Location: Pendulum Bearing Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached					1) The displacement specified in the Specification 03 20 02 (4") is the maximum displacement demand that would be observed in the isolators based on structural analysis. For the bearing manufacturer, these displacements are the "minimums" they need to meet in order for the structure to function as designed. Note that self-centering is not an issue as the structure will center the isolators back after a seismic event.		
Specification Section 03 20 02 indicates some maximum loads and minimum displacement for each type of Pendulum bearing, however additional information is needed.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2182 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>1. Maximum allowable displacement (currently only have minimum).</div> <div>2. Maximum and minimum vertical loads at seismic condition (usually lower than the static case, for instance, AASHTO uses dead load as seismic).</div> <div>3. Maximum rotation in each direction or maximum in any direction.</div>			<div>2) Vertical loads provided in the specification 03 20 02, Section 2.6B are maximums and are governed by gravity loading combinations (2500 kips for Type A and 2000 kips for Type B). Under seismic conditions, for bearing Type A, maximum vertical loading is 2300 kips and minimum is 700 kips. For bearing Type B bearings under seismic load conditions, maximum vertical loading is 1800 kips and minimum is 550 kips.</div> <div>3) It is not clear to us why the maximum rotation is relevant for this type of bearing. Under gravity loads and long term deflections, the maximum rotation (in any direction) is estimated as 0.5 degrees.</div> <div>Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI</div>			
T-2220	SCS - Roof Level Interior Wall - Missing Wall Dimensions	Closed	02/11/2015	02/21/2015	02/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche</div> <div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang</div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Contract Doc Ref: A1-2904, S1-2604, A1-2965</div> <div>Location: Roof Level</div> <div>Grid Line: GL 16-E</div> <div>Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached</div> <div>Please reference Sheet S1-2604, A1-2904, and Detail 2/A1-2965 regarding Roof Level interior wall welded bar details.</div> <div>Reference the hook walls on SI-2604 near PE403 (between GL 16-17, D.4-E.8), added in ASI 128. While shown in Sheet SI-2604, the walls are not shown in AI-2904 or Detail 2/AI-2965. Please provide an architectural detail that provides dimensions for these walls.</div>			<div>SUGGESTION:</div> <div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>See response to RFI T-2152 and attached SKA-4423-R1.</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2183 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2221	SCS - Moment Frame Beam Spacing Along Radius Foundation Wall	Closed	02/11/2015	02/21/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2310, S1-2311 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Please reference RFI T-1907 titled "Moment Frame Beam [MFB] spacing South of GL G and west of GL 10." Further clarification of beam spacing and orientation is required to layout the beam locations along the Radius Foundation Wall. The contract drawings do not provide the required spacing and orientation of these beams. See attached beam layout sketch provided to confirm the below dimensions required. 1. Please confirm the total straightline distance between each of the (7) equally spaced MFB sets (as shown in the attached sketch), taken along the north concrete stringer beam. 2. Please confirm the distance between the equally spaced MFB sets and the CL of each neighboring column (as shown in the attached sketch), taken along the angle of the respective north concrete stringer beam. 3. Per RFI T-1907, the MFBs along the Radius Foundation Wall are equally spaced along the north concrete stringer beam. Please also confirm that these MFBs are perpendicular to the north concrete stringer beam.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed.		
			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
<hr/>							
T-2222	SCS - Roof Level Interior Wall - Detail Conflicts	Closed	02/11/2015	02/21/2015	02/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2604, S1-8006, S1-8008 Location: Roof Level Grid Line: GL 16-E Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Please reference Sheet S1-2604, Section 1/S1-8006, and Section 7/S1-8008 regarding Roof Level interior wall			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Section 7/S1-8008 shows a cross-section of the sloped counterfort walls and is called out on 1/S1-8006. Detail 1/S1-8006 is correct at the locations shown on S1-2604. The sloped counterfort walls shown in 1/S1-8006 occur at locations identified in the structural and architectural plans to coincide with W-8 system connections. Note that the top of wall elevation		
			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



shown in 1/S1-8006 has been modified per RFI T-2152 response, only at the specific locations identified in this RFI. Refer to SKA-4423 included with RFI T-2152.

Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2224	TER - Manufacturer (Fabricator) Clarification	Closed	02/12/2015	02/22/2015	02/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 09 66 23					Specification Section 09 66 23 (1.7) E describes the terrazzo Manufacturer (Fabricator) qualifications, while 09 66 23 (1.7) F describes the Installer's qualifications, the two entities may be one and the same provided they meet both qualification requirements.		
Location: N/A							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A					*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
Specification Section 09 66 23 (1.7) E identifies "Manufacturer (Fabricator) Qualifications."							
It is unclear who specifically is the "Manufacturer (Fabricator)."							
Please confirm that "Manufacturer (Fabricator)" refers to the trade subcontractor installing the epoxy terrazzo flooring on-site.							
T-2225	PLG - Missing Roof Drains at Roof Park Level at GL 4 & D	Closed	02/13/2015	02/23/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: P1-2602,2502, A1-2902 (ASI 128) Location: ZONE 1 , Grids 4 & D, Level: Roof Park Level Closest Column Line Intersection: 4 & D, 4 & F Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A					Roof drains at gridlines 4/D and 4/F are not required and have been removed from drawing A1-2904. Drawing will be issues in a future ASI.		
A1-2902 depicts two Roof Drains at Gridline 4/D & 4/F but these aren't shown on P1-2602, moreover P1-2502 doesn't depict any risers for the same. Please confirm these roof drains are required and, if so, provide updated drawings for the same.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2186 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2226	FSP - Fire Sprinklers in W14 Ceiling at Bus Deck Level	Closed	02/13/2015	02/23/2015	02/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Transbay Fire Protection Kevin Malone							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-4506 & A1-4507(ASI 128) Location: ZONE 4, Grids 27 to 33.5, Level: Bus Deck Level Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Reflected ceiling plans A1-4506 & A1-4507 do not include wide flat ribs for the closely spaced ceiling sprinklers at Grid B between 27 & 33.5. All other sprinklers in the W14 Ceilings are shown in these widened ribs. Another problem with the head spacing on the sheets is the distance between the closely spaced sprinkler and the most northern standard sprinkler located in the widened ribs. They are located 3'-9" apart but NFPA #13's minimum spacing is 6' on center unless baffles are placed between the heads to prevent cold soldering. Baffles are not shown on sheets A1-4506 & A1-4507. Please confirm widened ceiling ribs and baffles between heads will be provided.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See response to T-2167.		
T-2228	BGP - Pour Back of Upper Portion of Upturned Beam at GL 21	Closed	02/13/2015	02/23/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2205 Location: Lower Concourse Grid Line: GL 21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached. See attached RFI T-1823 which confirms it is acceptable to pour the upper portion of the upturned beam at GL 21 separately. Please confirm that is acceptable to pour the upper portion of the upturned beam at GL21 with approved foundation wall mix #1557216.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		
T-2230	BGP - East End Second Lift Walls and Deck 236 Corbel Rebar	Closed	02/13/2015	02/23/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2187 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2231	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-3205 Location: Lower Concourse Grid Line: GL35 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Please reference attached contract drawing SI-3205 detail 3, with mark-ups. SCCI will pour the second lift east end walls, 237, 238 and 239 separately from the D236 corbel, then pour the corbel with a 3-1 /2" starter wall for 3rd lift walls. There is #5 rebar@ 12" O.C. that extends into the 2nd lift wall. For the purpose of constructability, please confirm it is acceptable to rotate this #5 rebar up so it is no longer cast in to the 2nd lift wall.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Provide swellseal and injection hoses in added construction joint per Contract Documents.				
	VOID - SGN - Specifications for Stone Boulder	Void	02/14/2015	02/24/2015	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2231	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author:	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 10 14 16 Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Specification Section 10 14 16 (2.1) A Cast and Etched Graphics states "Stone boulders with inset metal letterforms. Refer to Landscape Drawings and specifications for 'stone' selection and specification." No stone specifications have been provided for the boulders. Please provide the stone boulder specifications.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2188 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2232	SCS - Bus Crash Rail Vertical Rebar Dimensions	Closed	02/15/2015	02/25/2015	02/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-8000 Location: Bus Level Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached The returned Submittal's TG0702-096 - REBAR - Shop Drawings - Bus Deck Level GL 10-13 and TG0702-097 - REBAR - Shop Drawings - Bus Deck Level GL 13-19 show engineer comments with conflicting vertical rebar spacing on the bus crash rails. Drawing MD-B10B from Submittal TG0702-096, engineer commented to provide verticals @6" EF. Drawings MD-BBB and MD-B16B from submittal TG0702-097, engineer "Confirmed", @8" EF, which matches SI-8000 (ASI128). Please advise which is to be followed for the attached highlighted locations.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> #5 at 6 inch is the correct spacing at the interior face and #5 at 12 inch is required at the exterior face, both to match the spacing of the dowels below. Refer to SKS-0457 which clarifies vertical rebar spacing at the top of the crash rail. Revised Sheet will be issued in a future ASI. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI				
T-2233	SCS - Slab Type and Connection Details at Roof Park Restaurant	Closed	02/17/2015	02/17/2015	03/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Detail 7/S1-2731 Sheet S1-2701 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Detail 7/S1-2731 indicates a concrete filled metal deck at the Roof Park Restaurant and directs that it is "per plan". Sheet S1-2701 does not identify the concrete filled metal deck nor provide attachment details to the CMU support walls.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to S1-2702 for slab type and orientation. Composite metal deck to CMU wall connection details per 10 and 11/S1-9001 apply at the roof park restaurant.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2189 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please provide the slab type and connection details at the Roof Park Restaurant.							
T-2234	TTC - Missing Drawing Reference	Closed	02/17/2015	02/27/2015	02/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: A1-6014, A1-9225		No updated drawings will be provided. Building					
Location: Zone 2, Train Platform		Section A/A1-6014 does not cut through the					
Gridline: B-C/13-14		IDF/Electrical Rooms shown in A/A1-9225. The					
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH1-CR #016		appropriate callouts can be found on the plan A1-2104.					
Unresolved issue from Phase 1. See attached.							
The Building Section (A1-6014) is missing a reference for the elevation detail (A/A1-9225) showing the IDF Room (B2480) and Electrical Room (B2481). This detail exists in the drawing set, but no callout is shown.							
Please provide an updated drawing with the callout shown.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2235	TTC - Missing Drawing Reference	Closed	02/17/2015	02/27/2015	02/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LPJeff Heath</div></div>			<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: A1-6024, C/A1-9225 Location: Zone 2, Train Platform Gridline: G-H/13-14 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH1-CR #017 Unresolved issue from Phase 1. See attached. The Building Section (A1-6024) is missing a reference for the elevation detail (C/A1-9225) showing the IDF Room (B2440) and Electrical Room (B2441). This detail exists in the drawing set, but no callout is shown. Please provide an updated drawing with the callout shown.</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>No updated drawings will be provided. Building Section A/A1-6024 does not cut through the IDF/Electrical Rooms shown in C/A1-9225. The appropriate callouts can be found on the plan A1-2104. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.</div></div>				
T-2236	TTC - Slab Layout Discrepancy	Closed	02/17/2015	02/27/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPStephanie Azzolino</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LPJeff Heath</div></div>			<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: A1-2883, S1-2403, 2/S1-7302 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: D-F/10-12 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH1-CR #070 Unresolved issue from Phase 1. See attached. There are contradictions between architectural slab edge plan (A1-2883) and structural floor plan (S1-2403) and structural detail plan (2/S1-7302). Differences are not only between the Arch Slab Edge Plan and Structural Floor Plan, but also between the Structural Floor Plan and Structural Detail Plan. At the clouded locations the layout of the slabs differ: 1) The size and shape of the slab opening shown on S1-2403 is different compared to the other two drawings. The slab opening (marked with green) still has a huge difference on each updated sheets.</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>1) Edge of slab on drawings S1-2403 and S1-7302 match the EOS shown on A1-2883. S1-2403 shows the EOS on 2nd floor level. The depressed pit slab area is shown as an opening on the 2nd floor and the depressed pit slab is shown on a separate partial plan 2/S1-7302. Steel and metal deck shop drawings have been reviewed and approved for this area indicating that the contractors have correctly interpreted the design intent on the drawings. 2) Slab step markers step down from the 2nd floor slab to the depressed pit slab and are shown correctly on A1-2883 and S1-7302.</div></div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please update sheet S1-2403 to correspond with the other two drawings.</p> <p>2) The slab step markers on 2/S1-7302 and A1-2883 are incorrect (shows step up instead of step down). TOC marked with yellow fills on A1-2883.</p> <p>The slab step markers on 2/S1-7302 and A1-2883 (per ASI 128) are still incorrect.</p> <p>Please update the slab step markers on sheets 2/S1-7302 and A1-2883.</p>						
T-2237	TTC - Curb Dimension Discrepancy	Closed	02/17/2015	02/27/2015	03/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2864, 1/S1-7660 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: E.6-F/15-16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH1-CR #071		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Unresolved issue from Phase 1. See attached.							
There is a contradiction between floor plan (A1-2864) and detail (1/S1-7660). Floor plan shows 0'-4 1/2" distance between the curb and escalator pit wall, but the detail does not indicate it.							
There is also a contradiction in the curb size. The architectural slab edge plan shows an 8" wide curb at the top escalator pit (16/D) and a 1'-2" wide concrete curb at the bottom escalator pit (16/F). The structural details (1/S1-7660) show a 10" wide concrete curb.							
Please provide updated curb dimensions on drawing A1-2864.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2192 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2238	TTC - Loading Dock Slab Slope Discrepancy	Closed	02/17/2015	02/27/2015	02/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-3105 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D-G/14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH1-CR #104 Unresolved issue from Phase 1. See attached. The slopes defined by the elevation points are different than the slope value marked on the floor plan. Following the elevation points results in a different slope (1.1% versus 1.0%) Please provide a revised sheet for A1-3105 with the corrected slope or elevations.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to A1-3105 issued with ASI 0128, dated 12/16/2014. Slopes are shown as 1.1%				
T-2239	TTC - Stair Landing Support Beams Missing	Closed	02/17/2015	02/27/2015	02/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-7013; A/A1-7112; 6/S1-7009 Location: Zone 2, Bus Deck Level Gridline: C-E/15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH1-CR #108 Unresolved issue from Phase 1. See attached. There is a contradiction between architectural section (A/A1-7112), floor plan (1/A1-7013) and structural floor plan (6/S1-7009). The architectural section and floor plan show a landing (marked with blue fill) at 75'-4" elevation but the structural floor plan (6/S1-7009) does not show this stair landing so there is missing information about the steel elements supporting the landing. Please provide a corrected structural floor plan 6/S1-7009.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Updated structural drawing will not be provided. Structural detail calls for bent stringer. Architectural details provide the dimensions.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2193 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2240	Slab Depression Discrepancy	Closed	02/17/2015	02/27/2015	03/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2303; A1-2863; 4/S1-3706 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: H-K/10.1-11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH1-CR #110 Unresolved issue from Phase 1. See attached. There is a contradiction between architectural floor plan (A1-2863), the structural detail (4/S1-3706) and the structural floor plan (S1-2303). Structural floor plan (S1-2303) shows slab depressions between the concrete beams with a defined northern extent. A1-2863 shows different shape. Section C/S1-3706 shows the same depression as the structural floor plan. If we follow the slab edge plan the pit will be in conflict with the concrete beams. Please provide updated dimensions on A1-2863 and provide dimensions on S1-2303.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Updated drawings will not be provided. Comprehensive layout shop drawings have been submitted and reviewed.		
T-2241	TTC - Curb Discrepancy at Slab Edge	Closed	02/17/2015	02/27/2015	02/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/S1-7660; 2/S1-7106; A1-2864 Location: Zone 2 Ground Level Gridline: D-F/16-17 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH1-CR #131 Unresolved issue from Phase 1. See attached. There is a contradiction between structural detail (1/S1-7660) and architectural slab edge plan (A1-2864). Structural callout floor plan (2/S1-7106) refers to detail 1/S1-7660 which shows a 10" curb next to the edge of the pit. The slab edge plan shows an 8" curb and the distance between the face of the curb and the edge of the pit is 4 1/2"			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Curb width and locations are per A1-2864. Refer to RFI T-2250 for response and structural sketch applicable to this area. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2194 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2242	BGP - Area 3 Skewed Elevator Pit	Closed	02/17/2015	02/27/2015	03/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
The structural callout floor plan (2/S1-7106) and structural detail (1/S1-7660) (PER ASI 128) plan do not agree with architectural slab edge plan (A1-2864) (PER ASI 128).							
Please update sheet A1-2864 to correspond with the structural callout and detail.							
From: Webcor Construction LP		Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: N/A							
Location: Lower Concourse							
Grid Line: E.2/2							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached							
The orientation of the Area 3 Elevator opening is askew between the Mat Slab and Lower Concourse. Please see attached as-built of the Mat Slab pit and Lower Concourse opening. The Mat Slab pit is approximately 1" North and rotated clockwise by 1/2" relative to the Lower Concourse opening.							
Please confirm the as-built condition is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2195 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2242.1	BGP - PE203 Skewed Elevator Pit	Closed	03/02/2015	03/12/2015	03/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titcher</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: 14-21-00		Whether this work is Phase 1 or Phase 2, the Design					
Location: Area 3		Team does not accept this non-conforming					
Grid Line: 1.7/E.2		Construction work. The elevator pit shall be corrected					
Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached		to the construction documents required dimensions					
Ref spec section Elevators 14-21-00 Dated December 16, 2014 and RFI 2242 response.		and orientation.					
After review with current scope phasing as of ASI 128, WOJV is unable to confirm with the elevator contractor whether this dimensional deviation will be workable as elevator PE203 Is not in the current project. Can the as built condition in RFI 2242 be accepted and incorporated into design and as-built drawings for Phase 2 buyout of this future elevator? Based on normal clearances typically incorporated into the sizing of elevator shafts their internal guiderail supports, it is anticipated this should be feasible.							
T-2243	SSS - Approval Comment Clarifications at Bus Deck Level GL 33.2	Closed	02/17/2015		03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Quang Le</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Turner Construction Compy Phil Militello</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: 2/S1-4116, 2/S1-4203, 3/S1-4203, and 1/S1-8000		1) The beam is correct as shown in the submittal, no protected zone at this location.					
Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level, GL 33.2		2) Confirmed the connection is correct as shown on the submittal.					
Add'l Doc Ref: Drawings 2911, 2912, and 2929.		3) The beam is correct as shown in the submittal, no protected zone at this location.					
1) This connection is designated WUF9 on 2/S1-4116. WUF9 is MF3 per 2/S1-4203 and MF3 as shown in 3/S1-4203 does not indicate a protected zone on this beam. Confirm the beam is correct as shown or supply more information if the beam is to be revised to show a protected zone.		4) The beam is correct as shown in the submittal, no protected zone at this location.					
2) This connection as shown is correct per detail 1/S1-8000 as it is on the opposite end of the crash rail. Confirm the connection is correct as shown or confirm the intent is to revise the connections from what is shown in the current structural drawings.		Reason for RFI (TT): We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2196 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>3) This connection is designated WUF9 on 2/S1-4116. WUF9 is MF3 per 2/S1-4203 and MF3 as shown in 3/S1-4203 does not indicate a protected zone on this beam. Confirm the beam is correct as shown or supply more information if the beam is to be revised to show a protected zone.</p> <p>4) This connection is designated WUF9 on 2/S1-4116. WUF9 is MF3 per 2/S1-4203 and MF3 as shown in 3/S1-4203 does not indicate a protected zone on this beam. Confirm the beam is correct as shown or supply more information if the beam is to be revised to show a protected zone.</p>						
T-2244	EAW - Park Level Loading	Closed	02/18/2015	02/28/2015	02/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Crown Corr, Inc. Erik Bryant						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
	Contract Doc Ref: 08 44 27 Location: Roof Park Perimeter Beam		The total relative deflection of the perimeter BU40 beams at the Roof Park Level is ¼" or less at the final condition, which includes soil loading and trees.				
	Please provide/verify the anticipated deflection at the perimeter of the park level at the completion of the concrete slab and once the soil and trees have been installed.		Reason for RFI (TT): None given by the contractor. We categorize this RFI as other.				
			Date Answered by Design Team: 02/25/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 04/15/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2197 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2245	EAW - Bird Control Devices	Closed	02/18/2015	02/28/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Crown Corr, Inc. Erik Bryant							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 08 44 27 Attached please find the marked up elevations and sections from Assured Environments. These mark ups of the typical space frame, show the suggested location of the bird control. Also included for review is product data and an attachment letter. Please review and comment on this this product and placement so that formal quotes can be finalized.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is not an RFI. It is an incomplete submittal in the form of a RFI. In order for us to review as a submittal we will need to see more detailed coordinated layouts and wiring details indicating points of connection for power and load information with voltage, phase and full load amps per connection point. RFI Answered by Design Team: 02/19/2015 RFI Closed by WOJV: 04/28/2015		
T-2245.1	EAW - Bird Control Devices-Additional Information	Open	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Ray Quesada				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Email Correspondence RFI T-2245 Per previous discussions (see attached e-mail correspondence), attached is additional W-1 bird control product and material data as requested by the design team. Please confirm these products, along with the extent of design submitted in RFI T-2245, are acceptable. If not, please provide alternate design/products.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Products as submitted and detailed are acceptable. These will be used for factory mock up and may be adjusted once the mock up is reviewed. Answered by PMPC: 05/07/2015 WOJV closed: 05/29/2015		
T-2246	SSS - ST201 & PE201 Approval Comment Clarifications	Closed	02/17/2015		03/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Skanska USA Civil West (Ryan Clayton				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Drawings E53 and E55 Location: Zone 1, West of GL 1			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) 2 Posts required only, the note has a Typo.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2198 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Add'l Doc Ref: Attached			2) Dimension should read as 12'-3 1/4".			
	See attached CD RFI 761 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 4: 1)The note states that 4 posts are required but only 2 posts are shown. Please clarify. 2)Confirm the dimension shown as 11'-11 should read 12'-3 1/4. 3) It is understood that the 4 beams indicated as +4 on plan are to be revised to EL. 86'-4 per E53 but it is not clear what is being requested for the HSS10x8x1/2 (Mark A13665). Please clarify. 4) Note 2 does not occur on E53. Please clarify what is being requested.			3) Maintain same datum 86'-4" for HSS 10X8X1/2. 4) Disregard Note 2.			
T-2246.1	SSS - ST201 and PE201 HSS Elevations at Roof Park Level	Closed	03/09/2015	03/20/2015	03/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 2/S1-7003, E53, E55 Location: Roof Park Level Add'l Doc Ref's: Cd RFI 761.1 SK1 This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-2246 (SK 1030, CD 761) item 3 See attached CD RFI 761.1 SK1: Due to the connection per 6/S1-7604 for the (2) HSS10x8x1/2's, they must be at the same elevation. The request to lower the noted HSS10x8 to T/Steel 86'-4 does not work. Confirm the member may remain at T/Steel 86'-4 1/4 or provide a new connection detail.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
				Confirmed. Steel member A13665 (HSS 10x8x1/2) may remain at the T/steel datum of 86'-4 1/4".			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2199 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2247	SSS- Approval Comment Clarification at Ground Level GL 22-23	Closed	02/17/2015		03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPQuang Le</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyPhil Militello</div><div>Answered By:Turner Construction CompanyPhil Militello</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2305, 6/S1-5015				We confirm that the brace connections per 6/S1-5015			
Location: Ground Level, GL 22-23				as shown in the submittal are acceptable and a			
Add'l Doc Ref: Drawing 6746 and 8082				revision per the review comment is not required.			
See attached CD RFI 755 SK1:				Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with the reason for			
The brace connection at the noted location has been				RFI: Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost			
provided per S1-2305 and 6/S1-5015 as shown.				clarification.			
Confirm the intent is to revise the brace connection at							
additional cost at this location as well as the location on							
the south side as marked on drawing 8082.							
T-2248	SSS - ST405 Missing Information	Closed	02/18/2015		03/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPQuang Le</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyPhil Militello</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: ST405 (ASI-128), 3/S1-7017				1) The proposed dimensions of 3'-4" clear & 5'-0" to			
Location: Zone 2, Second Level, GL 16-17				Grid line F are acceptable.			
Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 745 SK1, Drawing E18004, Stair				2) Connection detail as shown on 3/E18004 (page 6 of			
Landing Sketch				the RFI) where the stringer end plate is welded to the			
See attached CD RFI 745 SK1 for items 1 & 2:				edge bent plate and the L6x4 angle is acceptable. WT			
1)Supply the missing dimensions in order to locate the				per 3/S1-7601 is not required at the existing W21			
connection between stair stringers and floor steel.				beam.			
2)The stair connection as shown does not work with the							
actual condition. Supply a new detail.							
Please confirm the proposed dimensions and details from							
Olsen Steel are acceptable.							
T-2249	BGP - Column Jacket Grout	Closed	02/18/2015	02/28/2015	03/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPClaude Titcher</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyPhil Militello</div><div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-3503				Confirmed product submitted is acceptable for this			
Location: N/A				application.			
Grid Line: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2200 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2201 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2251	TTC - Beam Placement Discrepancy	Closed	02/18/2015	02/28/2015	02/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: S1-2404; 1/A1-9353		Structural drawings will not be updated. This issue has					
Location: Zone 2, Second Level		been coordinated with submitted Steel Shop					
Gridline: G/14-15		Drawings.					
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH1-CR #133							
Unresolved issue from Phase 1. See attached.							
There is a contradiction between the structural framing plan (S1-2404) and detail (1/A1-9353).							
The detail shows the exact position of slab penetrations (marked with yellow fill) from gridlines C/G. The framing plan shows the exact position of the steel beam (marked with red dashed line) from the slab edge (value: 1'-10 1/2") and also provides the distance from the slab penetration (5" typ 3 sides). If the dimension from the penetration edge is followed the distance from the gridline will be greater by 2 1/2".							
Under the design response on the structural framing plan (S1-2404) (PER ASI 128) the W27x84 steel beam stays 1'-10 1/2" from the slab edge. There is no dimension showing the place of the vertical W27x84 steel beam (marked with yellow highlighted) from the gridline 15. The slab penetration should be surround with TYP steel beams on 2 sides (5" TYP 2 SIDES).							
Please provide an updated sheet S1-2404 that includes the marked TYP comment and corrected dimensions.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2202 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2252	TTC - Beam Placement Contradiction	Closed	02/18/2015	02/28/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2303; 1/S1-7302; 6/S1-7660 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH1-CR #136 Unresolved issue from Phase 1. See attached. There is a contradiction between the structural framing plan (S1-2303) and structural detail (6/S1-7660). The S1-7302 callout plan on the S1-2303 structural plan refers to 6/S1-7660 detail. The detail (6/S1-7660) shows that the steel beams are aligned with escalator pit walls (marked with green fill). The framing plan (S1-2303) shows the exact positions of the steel beams (marked with red dashed line). If we follow the dimensions of beams on S1-2303 (2'-4" from D.8; 2'-4" from E.2; 1'-10 5/8" from E.6; 1'10 5/8" from D.4; 8" from the edge of the escalator pit), the steel beams will be in a different position than what is shown on detail (6/S1-7660). In this case the typical detail cannot be applied. Please provide an updated sheet S1-2303 with the corrected detail callout.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No revised drawings will be provided. This Virtual Building Comment has already been addressed by RFIs T-0868.2 and T-0951 and shop drawings have been reviewed and approved. Date Answered by Design Team: 2/18/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				
T-2253	TTC - Missing Information for Concrete Wall	Closed	02/18/2015	02/28/2015	02/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2203; A/A1-6013; A1-2223; 3/A1-9255; S1-2203 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Gridline: A-B /9-10.1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH1-CR #141 Unresolved issue from Phase 1. See attached. The ramp located at gridlines 9 to 10.1 and A to B are supported by a concrete wall (marked with yellow fill).			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For updated 3/A1-9255 and structural requirements for the ramp knee walls, refer to response to RFI T-2212. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2203 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>The A1-2203 plan do not define the type of the supporting wall. The A1-2223 plan shows a type 10 wall, the 3/A1-9255 detail shows a concrete wall, and the S1-2203 plan do not show any wall to the same place.</p> <p>The A1-2223 (PER ASI 128) drawing shows the type 10 CMU wall but the 3/A1-9255 (PER ASI 128) architectural detail plan shows the concrete ramp knee wall without thickness and refer to structural plan but the structural plans do not show walls in this area.</p> <p>Please update structural drawings to show walls in this area.</p>						
T-2254	SSS - TPG1 Bolted Connection Detail GL 31	Closed	02/18/2015		03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Turner Construction Comf Phil Militello				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	Contract Doc Ref: S1-2606 Location: Zone 4, Roof Level, GL 31 Add'l Doc Ref: CD RFI 756 SK1		Connection with 3 bolts is acceptable at the W18 beams highlighted in the RFI except that provide web stiffener plates welded to the beam web similar to 12/S1-5010.				
	See attached CD RFI 756 SK1: 4 bolts per 1/S1-5010 will not fit at the noted locations due to the thick flange of the TPG1. Please provide a solution.		Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for RFI: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2204 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2255	BGP - Knee Wall Vertical Reinforcement Issues	Void	02/18/2015	02/28/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto			Answered By:				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: SSK-0353 Location: Mat Slab Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Per plan SSK-0353 (RFI T-1394), the O.F. vertical reinforcement where the knee wall is 14" thick shows a standard hook. This will be problematic since this vertical threads into a formsaver at it's base and orientation is critical. SCCI runs into another issue at the I.F. vertical at the top of the knee wall where the thickness is only 10", but the hook length of the vertical should be 12". Please confirm it is acceptable to substitute the O.F. standard hook vert with a straight vert and cap, as shown in the attached Gerdau Detail (Proposed). Please also confirm it is acceptable to minimize the length of the I.F. vert hook to 8" so as to maintain the 314" minimum clear cover, also shown in the attached Gerdau Detail.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
T-2256	SSS - ST202 and PE203 Approval Comment Clarifications at Ground Level	Closed	02/18/2015		03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Submittal Package Number TG0701-087A Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 760 SK1 See attached CD RFI 760 SK1: The note as indicated on SK1 is not clear and contrary to what is shown on the structural drawings as shown on the left of S K1. Supply revised structural details if this framing is to be revised.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to revised framing shown in attached sketch SKS-0459 and issued with ASI-130. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for RFI: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				
T-2257	Type 3 Drag Connection Gusset Plate	Closed	02/18/2015		02/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: S1-5018 Location: Zone 2, Bus Deck Level, GL 12 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1, SK2, SK3, SK4, and SK5</div><div>Two type 3 drag connections have misaligned holes in the top gusset plate on the bus deck level. Beam A4844 on the north side is misaligned 5/8" and beam A9355 on the south is misaligned 1/4". The bottom gusset plate is 100% bolted.</div><div>Please confirm it is acceptable to ream the misaligned holes.</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>It is acceptable to ream the misaligned holes at the two locations described in the RFI.</div><div>Reason for RFI (TT): "request for corrective field work"</div></div>		
T-2258	BGP - Bike and Vehicle Ramp Column Reinforcing Termination	Closed	02/18/2015	02/28/2015	02/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From:</div>Webcor Construction LP</div> <div>Claude Titché</div> <div><div>To:</div>Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div><div>Co-Author:</div>Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto</div>			<div><div>Answered By:</div>Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: S1-2251 Location: Bike/Vehicle Ramp Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached</div><div>Rebar for the columns and pilasters in the Bike and Vehicle Ramp were fabricated and installed per the TG0600-331.1 shop drawing submittal. The shop drawings show the column rebar for the C37 columns extending past the ramp slab with couplers for future connection. It was later discovered after pouring the B301 and V301 slab that these columns are meant to terminate below the slab per 2/S1-3303. Please confirm the following actions are acceptable for the 3-C37 columns:</div><div>1. C37 at GL J/4: Cut column bars only that fall outside of partition wall 2" below TOC. Incorporate column bars that are that are within partition wall to partition wall reinforcing. Install partition wall formsavers over column with 48" embedment.</div><div>2. C37 at GL G/3: Cut column bars only that fall outside of partition wall 2" below TOC. Incorporate column bars that are within partition wall to partition wall reinforcing. Install</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>1. Confirmed</div><div>2. Confirmed</div><div>3. Confirmed</div><div>Also confirmed that 5000psi slab and wall mix may be used for Column X/H.5 to top of Bicycle Ramp.</div></div>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2206 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>(5) Ushaped caps bars transverse to the beam framing to match the column verticals: Dimensions approximately B=28, C=I 9, D=28. Install partition wall formsavers over column with 28" embedment (just above last pour).</p> <p>3. C37 at GL F.4/4: Cut column bars that are outside of partition wall at top of lowest tie set. Incorporate column bars that are within partition wall to partition wall reinforcing. Pour concrete cap on pilaster falling outside of partition wall at some future date providing 1-1/2" cover to highest reinforcing. Ghost partition wall formsavers over column.</p> <p>Also please confirm it is acceptable for the C14 column at GL X/H.5 to be poured monolithically with the 5000 PSI ramp slab and wall mix per Submittal TG0600-204 from the top of Lower Concourse (EL -5 ' -5") to the top of the Bike Ramp 8302 Slab (EL 7'-3").</p>						
T-2259	ELV - Overhead Contact System 2-0 Trolley Wire	Closed	02/18/2015	02/28/2015	06/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Edmond Sum					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Ref: CL-24710, CL-24718 dated 8/8/2014 Location: Mission/First Street Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : Field Order No. T-00033 - TG12.2 OCS The 2/0 trolley wire as shown as existing on drawing OV-01(CL-24710) and OV-09(CL-24718), from Mission to Natoma Street has been removed. Please confirm the drawings should indicate (N) 2/0 trolley wire to be installed and (E) dead-end assembly at Natoma street to be removed after (N)2/0 trolley wire is installed.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> New 2/0 trolley wire to be installed and (E) dead-end assembly to be removed after new trolley wire is installed. All of this needs to be coordinated with current construction work on Transbay Transit Center and the Transbay Tower. Answered by Design Team : 06/01/2015 Closed by Webcor : 6/17/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2207 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2260	ELV - Overhead Contact System - OCS Trough	Closed	02/18/2015	02/28/2015	06/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Ref: Drawing OV-11(CL-24720), detail 4 dated 8/8/14 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : Field Order No. T-00033 - TG12.2 OCS Will holes be available in OCS trough? Note 9 A-1 series drawings for 5/8" S.S. studs. What is the access to tighten 5/8" nuts on top of OCS trough? Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is a means and methods issue. SFMTA should coordinate with the CM/GC the sequence of construction. The holes in the OCS trough shown in AAI's drawings suggest that SFMTA installer will drill holes, or coordinate the hole location in advance with CM/GC and shop drill holes. It is up to the TJPA to coordinate the agency installer with CM/GC construction subs. Access to tighten the OCS bolt/nuts is readily available. Some areas of the OCS trough are below the ceiling; while the areas above the ceiling are accessible via W-14 removable panels. The W-14 DB Contractor has confirmed that ALL the corrugated ceiling panels are accessible via torsion springs. Answered by Design Team : 05/28/2015 Closed by Webcor; 06/02/2015		
T-2261	ELV - Overhead Contact System - Protection for Trolley Wires	Open	02/18/2015	02/28/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Ref: Drawings OV-04(CL-24713) and OV-08(CL-24717) dated 8/8/14 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : Field Order No. T-00033 - TG12.2 OCS Drawings OV-04(CL-24713) and OV-08(CL-24717), notes 2 and 3 indicate support of switch to structure, see A-1 series drawings. A-1 series drawings have not been provided. Please advise on who provides the trough for protection of 2/0 trolley wires?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2262	SSS - Additional Hole Drilled in TF9.9 Web	Closed	02/20/2015		03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2208 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: n/a Location: Zone 1, Tier 1, and GL 9.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1 An additional hole was drilled in the web of TR9.9, girder segment A675 at the field splice plate location. Please confirm if it's acceptable to leave as is and fill with a A325 bolt after the field welded splice is complete. See attached SK1.</div> <div>SUGGESTION:</div>				<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Mislocated hole indicated in the RFI is acceptable but shall be filled with a bolt. Reason for RFI (TT): We categorize this RFI as request for corrective field work.</div>		
T-2263	SCS - Foundation Wall Penetration Sleeve In Conflict With CDSM Pile	Closed	02/18/2015	02/28/2015	02/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
	<div>REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: North Foundation Wall Grid Line: GL15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached See attached mark-ups. Two (2) North Foundation Wall Sleeves between GL 15-16 conflict with CDSM wall soldier piles. Please confirm it is acceptable to move each sleeve 1' West to avoid conflict. The MEP sub-contractor, Desert Mechanical, has confirmed that moving the sleeves 1' west is acceptable. (see attached email).</div> <div>SUGGESTION:</div>				<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Confirmed. It is acceptable to move the 2 north foundation wall sleeves between GL 15-16 1'-0" to the west. Refer to SKA-4450. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI</div>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2209 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2264	ELV - OCS - Clarification on A1 Series Drawings	Closed	02/19/2015	03/01/2015	04/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Ref: OV-12(CL-24721) and OV-13(CL-24722) dated 8/8/14 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : Field Order No. T-00033 - TG12.2 OCS Drawing OV-12(CL-24721) and OV-13(CL-24722), Note 3, for OCS switch shield and drawing OV-13(CL-24722), note 4 OCS trough both state to see A1 series drawings. Please confirm notes are referring to Architectural Drawings till ASI 128.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, Architectural Drawings. Answered by Design Team: 04/23/2015 Answer Closed by Webcor: 04/24/2015				
T-2265	ELV - OCS - 4-Nobo's Support	Closed	02/19/2015	03/01/2015	04/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Ref: OV-07(CL-24716) and OV-08(CL-24717) dated 8/8/14 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : Field Order No. T-00033 - TG12.2 OCS Drawing OV-07(CL-24716) and OV-08(CL-24717) shows no-bo insulators on plan and trolley wires sectionalizing diagram. Please provide detail of how to support these 4 no-bo's.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please install No-Bo section insulator per manufacturer's instructions. Date answered by Design Team: 4/23/15 Date closed by Webcor: 4/24/15				
T-2266	ELV - OCS - Clarification on C1 Series Drawings	Closed	02/19/2015	03/01/2015	04/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Ref: OV-G2(CL-24708) dated 8/8/14 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : Field Order No. T-00033 - TG12.2 OCST Drawing OV-G2(CL-24708), note 16 and 17 indicates both streetlight and traffic signal, C1 series drawings. Please confirm these notes are referring to Civil drawings (till ASI		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, Civil Drawings. Date answered by Design Team: 04/23/15 Date Closed by Webcor: 04/24/15				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2210 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
128)?							
T-2267	ELV - OCS - Pole Foundation & Riser Conduit	Closed	02/19/2015	03/01/2015	04/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Aseem Goyal	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company		Orvil Anthony					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Ref: (CL-24724) , OV-08(CL-24717) & OV-G2(CL-24708) dated 8/8/14 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : Field Order No. T-00033 - TG12.2 OCS				Confirmed, riser conduit to pole #110 will be existing when new foundation is installed. Confirmed, pole #4023 foundation provided by others.			
Drawing CL-24724, note 6 indicates (E) 3" riser conduit to trolley pole locations P 110 and P 4023. Trolley pole P 110 will require a new foundation. Is the (E) 3" riser conduit at this pole location? Trolley pole P 4023 on drawing OV-08(CL-24717) shows note 19 on drawing OV-G2(CL-24708). Please confirm this pole foundation with the 3" riser conduit will be provided by others.				Date Answered by Design Team: 4/23/2015 Date Closed by Webcor: 4/24/15			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2268	INT - GB Ceiling Bulkhead Finish Requirements	Closed	02/20/2015	03/02/2015	02/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheet A1-8911 Sheet A1-9610			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Location: Roof Park Restaurant			Room Finish Schedule drawing A1-9610 is revised to add note stating that: WHERE ¿COMMENTS¿ COLUMN CALLS FOR ¿SHELL SPACE, FINISHES BY TENANT¿, IT SHALL MEAN THAT FINISHES ARE NOT INCLUDED, ANY GYPSUM BOARD SURFACES ARE FINISHED TO LEVEL 2 AND ARE NOT PAINTED. Drawing A1-9610 will be issued in future ASI.				
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A			*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
Sheet A1-8911 calls out for a GB ceiling bulkhead at the Roof Park Restaurant. Sheet A1-9610 does not identify this ceiling/soffit.							
Please provide finish information on GB ceiling bulkhead within the restaurant.							
T-2269	INT - Finish Requirements for GB Walls	Closed	02/20/2015	03/02/2015	02/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheet A1-9610			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Location: Roof Park Restaurant			The Room Finish Schedule have been revised to clarify the level of finish for areas noted as "finishes by Tenant". Note 3 was added to state the following:				
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A			WHERE ¿COMMENTS¿ COLUMN CALLS FOR ¿SHELL SPACE, FINISHES BY TENANT¿, IT SHALL MEAN THAT FINISHES ARE NOT INCLUDED, ANY GYPSUM BOARD SURFACES ARE FINISHED TO LEVEL 2 AND ARE NOT PAINTED.				
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
A1-9610 calls out for walls within the Roof Park Restaurant to GB/Glass & Exp Studs, but does not identify the finish level of the GB.			Room Finish Schedule drawings A1-9601 to A1-9606 and A1-9610 will be issued in future ASI.				
Please provide finish information of the GB walls.			*Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2212 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2270	MME - Timber Handrail Specifications	Closed	02/20/2015	03/02/2015	03/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Detail 4/A1-8916 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Detail 4/A1-8916 calls out for a timber handrail at the Roof Top Restaurant Terrace guardrail. No specification has been provided for the timber handrail. Please provide a specification for the handrail.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Section 05 75 00, item 2.4.C. for Roof Park Level Restaurant Guard Rail and Stair Railing.				
T-2271	FPR - Fireproofing Req. at HSS Columns Within Roof Park Restaurant	Closed	02/20/2015	03/02/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Note 1/S1-2701 Sheet A1-8662 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Per Note 1/S1-2701 the HSS columns within the Roof Top Restaurant are to be fireproofed. Per Sheet A1-8662, prefabricated intumescent fireproofing is only required at the Light Column, and structural steel columns at the Roof Park Level are to receive SFRM (see Structural Steel Column Fire Proofing Matrix and Fire Proofing Schedule). Please provide direction as to the type of fireproofing to install at the HSS columns within the Roof Top Restaurant.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Note 1 on sheet S1-2701 calls for "PREFABRICATED FIREPROOF COLUMNS: CONCRETE INFILLED HSS COLUMNS WITH 10 3/4" DIA OUTER SHELL." These columns are complete composite fireproof assemblies manufactured by Dean Lally and Blackrock, under the product names of "Fire-trol" and "Bridgeport" respectively. The manufactured product is usually supplied to receive painted finish.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2213 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>																																												
T-2272	T-2272 ELV - OCS Pole Foundations Clarification	Closed	02/20/2015	03/02/2015	04/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>																																												
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger																																																
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony																																																			
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref:[OCS/CL-24708, CL-24713,CL-24714, CL-24716, CL-24717, CL-24718, 12607-15/S1, 12607-15/S2] Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection is N/A Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A Drawing OV-G2(CL-24708), Note 11 states,"For pole foundation and related work, see S1 series drawings." There are a total of 18 foundations listed under note 11, the list is as follows: <table><tr><td>Drawing Number</td><td>Qty.</td><td>Pole Size</td><td>Pole</td></tr><tr><td>OV-04(CL-24713)</td><td>3</td><td>770</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>P111,112, & 117</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>OV-05(CL-24714)</td><td>1</td><td>767</td><td>P116</td></tr><tr><td>OV-05(CL-24714)</td><td>2</td><td>770</td><td>P114 & 119</td></tr><tr><td>OV-07(CL-24716)</td><td>4</td><td>731</td><td>P130,</td></tr><tr><td>133, 135, & 140</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>OV-08(CL-24717)</td><td>4</td><td>731</td><td>P105,</td></tr><tr><td>110, 120, & 125</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>OV-09(CL-24718)</td><td>4</td><td>731</td><td>P123,</td></tr><tr><td>124, 131, & 132</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> Drawings 12607-15/S1 and 12607-15/S2 indicate 3 different foundation types, but don't list what pole/pole number foundations are associated with either sections A, B or C as shown on drawing 12607-15/S2. Please advise.			Drawing Number	Qty.	Pole Size	Pole	OV-04(CL-24713)	3	770		P111,112, & 117				OV-05(CL-24714)	1	767	P116	OV-05(CL-24714)	2	770	P114 & 119	OV-07(CL-24716)	4	731	P130,	133, 135, & 140				OV-08(CL-24717)	4	731	P105,	110, 120, & 125				OV-09(CL-24718)	4	731	P123,	124, 131, & 132				SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For pole #P116, see sheet note 3 on OV-05 for Pole Foundation Work. For all other poles referring to "S1 Series Drawings", see S1-9101 in contract package for foundation work.. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/23/2015 Date Closed by Webcor: 04/24/15		
Drawing Number	Qty.	Pole Size	Pole																																																
OV-04(CL-24713)	3	770																																																	
P111,112, & 117																																																			
OV-05(CL-24714)	1	767	P116																																																
OV-05(CL-24714)	2	770	P114 & 119																																																
OV-07(CL-24716)	4	731	P130,																																																
133, 135, & 140																																																			
OV-08(CL-24717)	4	731	P105,																																																
110, 120, & 125																																																			
OV-09(CL-24718)	4	731	P123,																																																
124, 131, & 132																																																			
<hr/>																																																			
T-2273	SSS - Puddle Welding Gauge to Gauge	Closed	02/20/2015		03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>																																												
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Comφ Phil Militello																																																
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton																																																			
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 7/S1-5020 Location: Roof Level Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1 1) 7/S1-5020 details metal deck attached to 12 gauge closure with puddle welds (arc spot welds). AWS D1.3			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Seam welds in lieu of puddle welds as proposed are acceptable. 2) Either of the two options: seams welds or self-drilling screws are acceptable.																																														



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2214 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>does not allow arc spot welding sheet to sheet (table 1.3). As an alternative please confirm a 3/8? x1-1/2? arc seam weld is acceptable. Spacing requirements will remain at 12?.</p> <p>2) At a typical weld plate condition at high flutes as shown on SK1, please confirm it is acceptable to use #12- 14x1 HWH Tek 3 screws, spacing at 12?or a 3/8? x1-1/2? arc seam weld. See attached SK1.</p>						
		</					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2215 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>these specific locations. Please confirm locations/condition is acceptable on an individual basis or SCCI proposes to install an additional piece of unistrut to ensure the O.C. spacing is no more than 10' with +/-6" tolerance provided in RFI T-1549. This additional unistrut install will be performed similar to the method prescribed in submittal TG0600-926.</p> <p>4. Unistrut has been installed not per contract O.C. layout, and installed skewed. Please confirm it is acceptable to abandon this specific piece of unistrut and install two (2) replacement pieces on either side, which will ensure the O.C. spacing is no more than 10' with 6" tolerance provided in RFI T-1549. This additional unistrut install will be performed similar to the method prescribed in submittal TG0600-926.</p>						
T-2275.1	BGP - 3rd Lift Wall Unistrut As-built Condition	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: 3rd Lift Walls Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached			Please void this RFI and resubmit the Corrective Action Plan information as a Submittal.				
See attached drawings with SCCI revision markups in purple.							
Please confirm the following is acceptable:							
1. Revised unistrut spacing.							
2. Rather than remove unistrut called out to be abandoned, SCCI proposes to patch back unistrut with approved patching material per submittal TG0600-250.4.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2216 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2276	SSS - Clarification On Opening S1-2507 GL 32.2 and D.4	Closed	02/23/2015		03/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LPQuang LeTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2507, A1-2507 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level, GL 32-32.4 and D.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1				The sleeves shown on A1-2507 are correct.			
Per S1-2507, a blockout is called out at GL 32-32.2 and D.4 However, A1-2507 calls out sleeves.							
Please confirm which sheet is correct.							
T-2277	ELV - Landscape In Grade Electrical Outlet	Closed	02/23/2015	03/05/2015	03/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LPAseem GoyalTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
Co-Author: Fisk Electric CompanyOrvil Anthony							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: [L1-2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, & 2307/26 27 26] Location: Zones [2 - 7], Level [Ground] Closest Column Line: on L1-2302 - 1.4 & B.5				Outlets within in-grade retractable dispensers are shown on ASI-0128 electrical drawings at coordinated locations with circuiting information. Refer to detail 6/E1-6009 for retractable dispenser detail.			
The typical note, as shown on the ground level plan, is identified as "In grade electrical outlet". There is no corresponding in grade outlet shown on the Electrical drawings as referenced on the Landscape drawings. Are the outlets from the landscape drawings to be added to the electrical drawings? If so, provide details of in grade installation and circuiting.							
T-2278	INT - Wall Designations at the Roof Park Level	Closed	02/23/2015	03/05/2015	03/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LPTram NguyenTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheet A1-1355 Sheet A1-3450 Detail 1/A1-9030 Sheet A-0020				Wall tags noted on the attached sketches SKA-4473, 4474 and 4478 that correspond to the Roof Park Level Fire Life Safety Plan.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Location: Roof Park Level</p> <p>Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>Detail 1/A1-1355 shows walls in the Service Elevator Vestibule PK221 and Men's Restroom PK240 at the Roof Park Level Restaurant requiring 1HR and 2HR barriers.</p> <p>Per Sheet A1-3450, the same walls in the Service Elevator Vestibule PK221 are called out as non-rated walls.</p> <p>Per Detail 1/A1-9030, the east wall of the Men's Restroom PK240 is called out as a non-rated wall.</p> <p>Additionally, Sheet A1-3450 does not call out a wall type for the east wall of the "future elevator shaft".</p> <p>Please confirm the fire-rating and wall types required at the Roof Park Level Restaurant and coordinate the drawings to match.</p>						
T-2279	SSS - Clarification On Opening S1-2404 GL 16	Closed	02/23/2015		03/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2404, A1-2404, E1-2304, E1-3401, and A1-2884 (per ASI No. 128) Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: 16-16.9/ D Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1, 2, and 3.		The opening shown on A1-2404 & A1-2884 is correctly located by Electrical. Ignore opening shown on E1-3401, which is a result of out of date background.					
Opening locations for emergency generator differ per S1-2404 and A1-2404 as shown in WOJV1.							
Please confirm the correct opening location.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2218 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2280	TOP - Etched Concrete Specifications & Requirements	Closed	02/23/2015	03/05/2015	03/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheet A1-9562 Sheet A1-9563 Sheet A1-9565 Sheet A1-9566 Specification Section 03 30 02 Specification Section 03 35 43 Location: Bus Deck Level Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Sheets A1-9562, A1-9563, A1-9565, and A1-9566 show areas calling out for "Etched Concrete" on the Bus Deck Level. Specification Section 03 30 02 Cast-in-Place Concrete and Specification Section 03 35 43 Polished Concrete Finishing do not reference "Etched Concrete". No other specifications or requirements have been provided for "Etched Concrete". Please provide the specifications and requirements for the "Etched Concrete" called out on the Bus Deck Level.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached specification section 03 35 43 mark-up and SKA-4486.		
T-2281	TTC - Concrete Beam Layout	Closed	02/23/2015	03/05/2015	02/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2310; S1-2311 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Gridline: G-L/1-10 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #091 See attached Virtual Building CR #091. Dimensions have not been provided on the Framing Plans (S1-2310 & S1-2311) for placing the concrete beams			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to RFIs T-1907 and T-2221. Reason for RFI (TT): None given. We categorize this RFI as previously answered. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2219 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>marked with red lines.</div> <div>Please provide missing dimensions.</div>							
T-2282	TTC - Wall Thickness Contradiction	Closed	02/23/2015	03/05/2015	03/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: S1-2351;A-0022; A1-2963		AAI disagrees that the dimensions are missing.					
Location: Zone 1, Ground Level		Please refer to A1-2862 and A1-2863.					
Gridline: D-F/4-7							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #112		This is the third time WOJV has asked for clarification					
See attached Virtual Building CR #112.		on this issue related to actual vs. nominal dimensions					
There is a contradiction between the structural floor plan		of a CMU block wall. If WOJV still has a question on					
(S1-2351) and the architectural plans (A1-2862; A1-2963).		this issue please have Jeff Heath call George Metzger					
The CMU walls are annotated with 12" wide on the		to discuss this further so the design team can					
architectural plans. The A1-2862 slab edge plan refers to		understand your issue with an 8" block wall being 7					
the structural plans. The structural plan (S1-2351) shows		5/8" actual dimension.					
8" and 12" CMU walls in this area .The actual thickness of							
walls are 7 5/8" and 11 5/8" in the wall schedule (A-0022).							
Using actual wall thicknesses results in different							
dimensions on the architectural plan (A1-2963).							
Issue with 12" concrete walls is solved, but S1-2351							
(03/31/14, ISSUED FOR CONSTRUCTION) still includes							
noted 12" CMU walls. The 8" CMU still do not have							
dimension. ASI128 does not solve the issue.							
Please provide missing dimensions.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2220 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2283	TTC - Missing Detail Reference	Closed	02/23/2015	03/05/2015	03/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2203; M1-2204; M1-2205; M1-2206; M1-2207; A/M1-5002 Location: Zone1-4, Lower Concourse Gridline: A/8-9;12-13;17-18;21-22;26-27;31-32;33.5-34 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #121 See attached Virtual Building CR #121. There are references on mechanical floor plans M1-2203 and M1-2204 for section 1 on drawing M1-5002, but M1-5002 does not contain a detail number 1. The detail reference on M1-2203 drawing was corrected, but the M1-2204, M1-2205, M1-2206 and M1-2207 (PER ASI No. 0128) still contains the wrong reference. Please provide corrected detail reference.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As noted in the original CR#121 response for the detail references on M1-2203 and M1-2204, the "1" should be "A" on M1-2205, M1-2206 and M1-2207. These sheets will be corrected in a future ASI.				
T-2284	BGP - Geothermal Riser 7 and 8 Manifold Relocation	Closed	02/23/2015	03/05/2015	03/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Geothermal Risers 7 and 8 Grid Line: 17.5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached. As discussed in the 2/18/15 Construction Issues Meeting with Shimmick 7.2 and the Design Team. Please confirm the attached Corrective Action Plan for the relocation of the Geothermal Manifolds at Risers 7 & 8 is acceptable to avoid conflicts with the Roadway slab.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please void this RFI and resubmit the CAP information as a Submittal.				
T-2285	ELV - Installation of Light Fixture E18	Closed	02/23/2015	03/05/2015	03/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2287	SCS - Technical Design of Pendulum Bearing Isolators	Closed	02/23/2015	03/05/2015	03/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 03 20 02 Location: Pendulum Bearings Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Please find attached Mageba's RFI and Technical Proposal. 1. In the attached technical proposal Mageba have considered the maximum load stated at static, even though the isolators can handle the load at maximum displacement. For dynamic displacement, Mageba have indicated the maximum load possible considering the need for re-centering capabilities of the devices. This consideration had been done due to the following reasons: - The nominal friction coefficient of Robo Slide for these devices is approximately 4.0%. considering the loads indicated in the specification, in case of displacement, such loads multiplied by the friction coefficient would be too high., and the static re-centering will not be possible, especially due to the relatively small displacements. - After reviewing the design of the pendulum isolators, we Mageba, found that the only way Mageba can ensure re-centering is by adjusting the displacement to 5.9 inches, where we would have re-centering with the proposed maximum loads under seismic conditions. The maximum loads proposed for these isolators under seismic conditions and displacement of 5.9 are: Type A: 1,708 Kips Type B: 1,236 Kips - Note that for horizontals loads, the proposed devices would actually reach the minimum displacement for 4" with the requested maximum horizontal force, which are: Type A: 125 Kips Type B: 90 Kips However please note that due to the short displacement, high loads and friction coefficient, the static re-centering will not be fulfilled, only the dynamic re-centering would be ensured.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1-) This question is very similar to those in RFI T-2219. Information on displacement demands, vertical load demands and re-centering were provided in response to RFI T-2219 along with contract specifications. The vertical loads under gravity loads and seismic loads are very similar (see response to RFI T-2219) hence only single set of vertical loads were including in the specifications. As indicated in RFI T-2219 bearings will be re-centered by the trainbox walls (designed to remain elastic) and a self-centering mechanism is not relevant. See structural sheet S1-3135 to how the bearings are located within the structure. This sheet shows Gridline 35 bearings, Gridline 34 bearings are located similarly. Maximum loads provided in this RFI (1708 kips for Type A and 1236 kips for Type B) are lower than those provided in the specifications and are not acceptable, that said the bearings will not experience more than 4" displacement. The vertical reactions provided in the specifications need to be satisfied at 4" displacement. Horizontal reactions provided in the specifications shall also be satisfied at 4" displacement. 2-) Isolator technical specifications shall be submitted to the design team as a submittal not as an RFI. The submittals shall include bearing properties and attachment information to the structure. As indicated in Specification 032002, section 1.4.9, calculations shall also be submitted to show that attachments develop the forces that can be developed in the bearing.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please confirm if the loads indicated are acceptable or larger than the expected dead load of the structure on top of the isolators.</p> <p>2. The proposed technical design of the isolators intends to fulfill as much as possible the project specifications. Mageba needs the requested information and feedback on the proposed design and dimension to finalize the design.</p> <p>In The attached technical proposal, all the details for the dynamic parameters and performance for the two types of isolator are for review. The key part to clarify and agree on are the seismic loads and the re-centering capabilities, and where or not it would be acceptable not to have static re-centering capabilities for the minimum displacement.</p> <p>Please clarify and confirm the seismic lads and the re-centering capabilities, and whether or not it would be acceptable not to have static re-centering capabilities for the minimum displacement.</p>						
<hr/>							
T-2288	ELV - Light Fixture E18 Clarification	Closed	02/23/2015	03/04/2015	Potentially		<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: L1-7663, Detail 7 & 8; E1- 4603 - 4606				Fixture type E18 is the Fountain Light.			
Location: Zone[], Level [Roof Park]							
Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A]							
Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A							
Please confirm the light representation in the trough detail 7/L1-7663 is the same fixture as referenced on the electrical drawings fixture type E18?				Please note the fixture graphic indicated in the referenced detail is for reference only.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2289	SSS - Clarification On Opening S1-2306 GL 31	Closed	02/24/2015		03/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Quang Le</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div>Co-Author:</div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: S1-2306, A1-2306, A1-2866 Location: Zone 6, Ground Level Gridline: 31 and E Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1, WOJV 2 As shown in the attached WOJV1, a small opening is shown on S1-2306 but not shown on A1-2306. Also, openings are shown on opposite GL 31 for both S1-2306 and A1-2304. A1-2866 slab edge plan and MEP does not show any openings at GL 31 and E. Please confirm intention of openings and location.</div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>The openings shown on S1-2306 & A1-2306 are not required. The Edge of slab plan A1-2866 is correct.</div></div></div></div>							
T-2290	SCS - Top of Concrete Partition Wall Under Metal Decking	Open	02/24/2015	03/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Claude Titché</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang</div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: S1-9052 Location: Zone 1 Grid Line: GL3.5-5.5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached On the vehicle ramp the northernmost wall is underneath the steel structure between GL 3.5 and 5.5. Similarly room B1202 is also underneath the steel structure. Detail 7/S 1-9052 only provides typical top of concrete wall detail at the underside of beams or concrete slabs but does not apply to metal deck. Please confirm that the top of concrete wall at metal decks should be per the attached detail.</div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div></div></div></div>							
T-2291	FPR - SFRM Req. at HSS Columns Balance	Closed	02/24/2015	03/06/2015	03/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div>Co-Author: Clayton National</div><div>Richard Clayton</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2225 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Note 1/S1-2701 Note 2/S1-2704 Detail 2/S1-2731</p> <p>Location: Roof Park Level</p> <p>Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>Note 1/S1-2701 states "Prefabricated Fireproof Columns: Concrete infilled HSS columns with 10-3/4" Dia. outer shell." Note 2/S1-2704 states that the top of the HSS beam is at an elevation of 99'-0". The top connection illustrated in Detail 2/S1-2731 shows the encasement stopping about elevation ~ 98'-0". Will the balance of the column be fireproofed with SFRM?</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Confirmed. The balance of the column shall be protected with SFRM.</p>
T-2292	TTC - Detail Reference Error	Closed	02/24/2015	03/06/2015	02/25/2015		Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>		<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>			
	<p>REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-8203; 2/A1-8204; A1-8210 Location: Zone 3 / 4, Ground Level Gridline: 24.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR # 254</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building CR # 254.</p> <p>There are references on the section 2/A1-8203 for the detail 3/A1-8210, but the detail 3/A1-8210 shows a different detail.</p> <p>Please provide corrected reference on sheet A1-8203.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Detail reference was changed, drawing will be issued in future ASI.</p> <p>NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.</p>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2293	TTC - Missing dimensions in column claddings	Closed	02/24/2015	03/06/2015	02/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2203;A1-2204;A1-2202;A1-2205;A1-2206;A1-2207;A1-9205;A1-9211 Location: Zone 1-4, Lower Concourse Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR # 336 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #336 The floor plans and the details related in the reference that show the aluminum and GWB column claddings do not show a valuable dimension for the total thickness board-stud framing. The mentioned specification do not provide valuable information about these dimensions. The size of cladding metal framing is not provided by the revised detail 1/A1-9205 (PER ASI No. 0128). Please provide missing dimensions.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Specification Section 05 75 00 paragraphs 1.1 B; 2.4 A and 3.2 B.1 for installation requirements and submit shop drawings. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.	
T-2294	TTC - Wrong size of wall	Closed	02/24/2015	03/06/2015	03/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-7004; A-0021; A-0022 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D-D.4/2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #375 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #375. There are walls shown on the floor plan A1-7004/4 with type 40, with CC2 curbs below. The type 40 walls have 11 1/2" thickness (according the schedule A-0021/2), and the CC2 curbs have 5" thickness (according the schedule A-0022/2). If we follow the tags on the floor plan, and the schedules, there will be 6 1/2" wide part of the wall without support. Followed the floor plan A1-7004/4 and the schedules A-0021/2; A-0022/2 to model the walls and the curbs. The			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The CC2 curb (5" width) for gypsum wall type 40 is correct as noted on drawing A1-7004. Refer to detail callout on 8/A1-7004 referring to 1/A1-9355. This detail shows wall type 40 split on either side of the column at gridlines D.4 and 2 (and above and below as well). The curbs are below each of the metal stud cavities of the assembly, not the glass fiberboard. Refer also to slab edge plan A1-2882 with CC2 curbs noted and located with dimensions to gridlines.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2227 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>walls are clashing with the structural column.</p> <p>Please provide revised sheets.</p>							
T-2295	TTC - Not Enough Room for WP Assembly	Closed	02/24/2015	03/06/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: A1-8851 Location: Zone 1-4, Roof Park Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #385				No updated drawings will be provided. The WPM assembly is represented graphically in the Architectural drawings. The thickness of the WPM assembly, either real-world or virtual-world, will not be provided. The previous response from the Design Team stands: The protection slab and WP assembly total equals 4"-follow the elevations given on the protection slab plans.			
Please see attached Virtual Building CR #385.				Refer to specifications for WP membrane build up dimensions. Also account for the Electronic Frequency Vector Mapping systems requested by the TJPA. Coordinate with the manufacturer of the EFVM system.			
There is a 4" concrete protection slab on roof level and the assumed ~1" thick waterproofing assembly between the structural/built up slabs and the protection slabs.							
The architectural slab edge plans (A1-2902 to A1-2907) define the elevations of structural and built up slabs and the architectural protection slab plans (A1-2912 to A1-2917) provide elevations for the protection slabs. The difference between the elevations is 4".							
If we model the 4" protection slab with at given elevations, there won't be enough space to model the waterproofing assembly. If we model both the 4" protection slab and WP assembly, the WP assembly will be inside the protection slab.							
Please provide updated drawings showing the total thickness of WP assembly.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2228 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2296	TTC - Contradiction between the data	Closed	02/24/2015	03/06/2015	03/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2914; A1-2913; A1-2915 Location: Zone 1-4, Roof Park Level Gridline: General Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #386 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #386. The slopes of the protection slabs are 2.1% on the protection slab plan (A1-2914) but these are 2.0% if the elevations of the valleys and the ridges are followed. Protection slabs were modeled at the indicated elevations and with 2.0% slope. The value of the slopes and the elevations are still the same on the current drawings. Please provide updated sheets with corrected slopes.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Revised drawings will not be provided. The previous response from the Design Team is correct: The slope values are rounded off and indicate the direction of slope. Please use the spot elevation given on the drawings. This is a frivolous RFI, as it is identical to RFI T-2306.				
T-2297	TTC - Clashes between steel beams	Closed	02/24/2015	03/06/2015	02/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2604; 5/S1-4205 Location: Zone 1-4, Roof Park Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #387 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #387. MC10x41.1 steel beams are clashing with the W steel beams above. Detail shows those beam without clash, but if the MC beam centerline is heading to the desired locations the MC beam will clash with the smaller W beam above. W steel beams were modeled according to framing floor plans and the MC steel beams according to the 5/S1-4205 structural detail. Clashes remain. Please provide corrected sheets.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is a structural conflict for which a solution has been provided to Skanska and WOJV through RFI T-0763. Steel shop drawings related to steel affected by this condition have been reviewed and approved for fabrication. Revised drawings will not be provided. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2229 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2298	TTC - Missing Reference on plan	Closed	02/24/2015	03/06/2015	02/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2604; S1-6040 Location: Zone 2, Roof Park Level Gridline: E/17-19 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #395 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #395 There are details on the plan S1-6040 for the roof floor plan S1-2604, but the drawing S1-2604 does not contain any reference to S1-6040. The details on the plan S1-6040 will be used as references. Please provide corrected sheets.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The previous response from the Design Team stands. Typically S1-6000 series drawings document plans elevations, sections and details for the W- systems that are design build systems. Structural steel supporting the W systems are shown on S1-8000 series drawings and part of superstructure steel package. Scope delineation lines are shown on 8000 series drawings. Referencing sheets between these two different packages is not needed. Revised drawings will not be provided. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.	
T-2299	FPR - SFRM Req. at HSS Columns Bases	Closed	02/24/2015	03/06/2015	03/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Clayton National			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Note 1/S1-2701 Note 2/S1-2704 Detail 2/S1-2731 Location: Roof Park Level Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A At HSS prefabricated columns on the Roof Park Restaurant, the base of the column connection is not shown and the termination of the encasement that provides the fire rating is not detailed as to where it terminates. Will any SFRM be required at the base of the columns? If so, please provide a sketch of the portion of the columns requiring SFRM at the bases.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> SFRM extents are indicated in the enclosed sketch SKA-4477. Refer also to RFI T-2291 response.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2230 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2300	TTC - Missing profile type on roof canopy	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	02/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/S1-6035 Location: Zone 1, Roof Level Gridline: D-F/7-8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #403 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #403. The profile shown in the S1-6035 sheet for the roof canopy on gridline 8 does not have any reference about its type or dimensions. The type of the steel is still not shown on the plan 4/S1-6035 (PER ASI No. 0128). Please provide the type of steel on 4/S1-6035.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The type of steel for the welded T section is provided on detail 4/S1-6035. Match the pressure plates at all 3 sides of the glass. The W-8 canopies are a Design-Build system. As noted on S1-6035, final sections, dimensions and details shall be determined by the Design-Build contractor and approved by the TJPA representative. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2301	TTC - Contradiction between wall type	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-7311; 2/A1-9355 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: D.4/15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #407 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #407. There is a contradiction between wall types on escalator detail (2/A1-7311) and column enclosure detail (2/A1-9355). Wall type is still incorrect on 2/A1-7311 and 2/A1-9366 (PER ASI No. 0128). Please provide correct wall type.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Wall type noted on 2/A1-7311 is correct.				
T-2302	TTC - Missing information about wall	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	02/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2231 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: A1-2902 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: D-E.6/1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #409</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building CR #409.</p> <p>There is no information about highlighted walls on floor plans or structural plans.</p> <p>The walls are modeled as fin walls with 3'-6" height, 3'-8" length, 1'-0" thickness. The placement of them was scaled from A1-2902.</p> <p>The A1-2902 per ASI No. 128 has not contained the missing vertical dimensions.</p> <p>Please provide missing vertical dimensions.</p>					<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The top of wall elevation is clearly indicated on sheet A1-2905, in the structural detail 5/S1-7602 and in the previous response. The location of 5 walls is alignment with the steel beams west of gridline 1.</p> <p>NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.</p>	
T-2303	TTC - Contradicting curb dimensions	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: A1-2902; 1/A1-2951 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: F/1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #410</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building CR #410.</p> <p>There are contradicting dimensions for curbs on roof park level floor plan (A1-2902) and on enlarged detail (1/A1-2951).</p> <p>The curbs were modeled following the enlarged detail (1/A1-2951).</p> <p>Dimensions are incorrect on A1-2902 and 1/A1-2951 (PER ASI No. 0128).</p>					<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4451 for clarification of curb dimensions of 1/A1-2951. Also refer to RFI T-2304.</p>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2232 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please provide corrected dimensions.							
T-2304	TTC - Contradicting dimensions for wall and landing	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	02/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: 1/A1-2951		Wall and landing dimensions conflict for Stair 201 are clarified in the enclosed sketch SKA-4451.					
Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level							
Gridline: D/1							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #411		NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.					
Please see attached Virtual Building CR #411.							
There are contradicting dimensions for wall and landing on the enlarged floor plan (1/A1-2951). The landing and the wall is aligned on the floor plan, but the dimension values show different distances (2' - 4 1/2" and 2' - 5").							
The landing were modeled following the dimension values on the enlarged floor plan, and the wall is aligned to the edge of the landing. The wall's distance from the grid D is 1' - 6 1/2".							
Please provide corrected dimensions.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2233 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2305	TTC - Clash between HSS columns and interior walls	Closed	02/25/2015	02/25/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Contract Doc: S1-2503; 4/A1-7202				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level				Location of HSS columns is coordinated between			
Gridline: D-F/8-9				Architectural and Structural sheets. Updated			
Add?l Doc Ref?s: Virtual Building CR #419				structural model will not be provided.			
Please see attached Virtual Building CR #419.							
There are clashes between HSS 6x6x5/8 columns (marked with red fill) and interior walls. Framing plan (S1-2503) shows HSS columns exact position, Elevator Partial Plans (4/A1-7202) shows the interior walls exact position.							
Followed the mentioned plans when modeled the walls and columns. Clashes remain.							
The HSS columns have been revised on sheet S1-2503 (PER ASI No. 0128) but the issue cannot be evaluated without updating of the model content.							
Please provide updated model content.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2306	TTC - Contradiction between dimensions and slope	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2964 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: E-E.6/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #424 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #424. There is a contradiction between the marked built-up slab's elevation (green fill) and the built-up slab's slope on the slab edge plan (3/A1-2964). Followed the built-up slab elevations according to the slab edge plan, but the slab's slope doesn't match. Built-up slab's slope is 1.9%. Please provide updated model content.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Design Team is not responsible for the content of WOJV's Virtual Building model. Model content update will not be provided. The previous response from the Design Team is correct; follow built-up slab elevations.		
T-2307	TTC - Contradiction between dimensions	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 5/A1-7006; 1/S1-2651; 2/S1-3281 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: D.4-E.2/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #428 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #428. There is a contradiction between Stair 301 Partial Plan (4/A1-7006) and Roof Park Structure At Grid 8 (1/A1-2651) plan. Partial plan show the distance of the concrete wall (size: 10"; marked with red fill) from the gridline 7 at 11'-1 3/4", but the structural plan shows this same distance is 10'-11 3/4". Followed the 4/A1-7006 plan when modeled the concrete wall. Distance of the wall is 11'-1 3/4" from gridline 7. The dimensions still incorrect on 5/A1-7006; 1/S-2651 and 2/S1-3281 (PER ASI No. 0128).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Location of concrete wall at Stair 301 is per 4 & 5/A1-7006. Dimension will be removed from S1-2651 in future ASI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2235 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please provide corrected dimensions.							
T-2308	TTC - Incorrect Dimension of wall	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Contract Doc: 1/A1-9061				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level				Please refer to attached sketch SKA-4468 for updated			
Gridline: C-D/2-4				dimension at Jan Closet (B1291).			
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #433							
Please see attached Virtual Building CR #433.							
There is an incorrect dimension in Jan closet (B1291). The floor plan A1-9061 shows distance 5'-5" but in the model it is 5'-4 1/4".							
The floor plan A1-9061 shows distance 5'-5" it is incorrect.							
Please provide corrected dimensions.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2309	TTC - Clash between concrete footing and fine wall	Closed	02/25/2015	02/25/2015	03/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/S1-2752; A1-2914 Location: Zone 1-4, Roof Park Level Gridline: General Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #439 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #439. There is clash between fin wall and long concrete footing on the floor plan A1-2914. The floor plan A1-2914 shows position of long concrete footing. The floor plan S1-2752 shows position of fin wall. Followed the protection slab plan A1-2914 and typical plan S1-2752. Modeled with clashes between fin wall and long concrete footing. The east of GL 16.9 there is still clash. Please provide updated floor plan and detail.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4464. Footing size/shape are adjusted to fit next to structural fin wall.		
T-2310	TTC - Incorrect slope	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2864; S1-2304 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: A-B/15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #453 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #453. There is an incorrect slope value on the ground floor slab edge plan (A1-2864). Following the elevation values for the eyebrow slab on the slab edge plan and framing plan (S1-2304), the slope will be incorrect. The slab were modeled by following the elevation values. The slope value changed to 2.4%. As the Design Response says, the slope in vertical direction between GL C and GL A is 2.2%. If we count the			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The slope values are rounded off and indicate the direction of slope. Please use the spot elevation given on the drawings. No corrected drawings or model will be provided. This is a frivolous RFI, and is similar to RFI's T-2296 and T-2306.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2237 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>slope in horizontal direction between GL 15 (TOC 15.79') and GL 16 (15.52') - the distance between the two points is 42'-6" - it will be 0.64%. Therefore the absolute slope (counted in mathematical way) will be 2.3% instead 2.2% (see the Additional Screenshot).</p> <p>Please provide corrected slope.</p>						
T-2311	T-2311 ELV - OCS Missing A1 Drawings for Dead End Support	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	02/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
Ref: OV-11 (CL-247120) dated 8/8/14			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Location: N/A			A1 and S1 series drawings have been provided. This question of providing the architectural and structural drawings should be addressed by the contractor.				
Closest Column Line: N/A			Refer to 4/S1-9101 and 6/S1-9101.				
Add'l Doc Ref's : Field Order No. T-00033 - TG12.2 OCS							
Drawing OV-11(CL-24720), detail 5, note 10 and detail 3, note 1. A1 series drawings are not included for dead-end support and column plate. Please advise.			Additionally, coordinate with OV drawings, which are provided by TJPA.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2238 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2312	TTC - Missing topping thickness	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	02/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2305; 1/A1-8476; 4/A1-8476; 1/A1-8479; 4/A1-8479 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Gridline: D-F/22-24 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #539 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #539. Missing information about the thickness of terrazzo infill panel (marked yellow). The thickness of this layer is scaled from detail 4/A1-8479. It will be modeled with 2 1/8" thickness following the design response. Please provide updated sheet showing this information.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The previous response to this VB comment from the Design Team is correct. The terrazzo infill panel assembly will vary according to the successful bidder of the seismic joint cover work. The Basis of Design joint cover product is by Construction Specialties, which utilizes the SSRW1836 pan assembly with +/- 2 1/8" overall depth including the terrazzo substrate. Revised drawings will not be provided. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2313	TTC - Missing info about the size of the escalator soffit	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-7305; 1/A1-7554; 3/A1-7554; 4/A-0029; 7/A1-7555 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/21-22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #592 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #592. Missing dimension of W-16B SS escalator soffit's support from the detail drawing and section about soffit and escalator (A1-7554) and typical soffit and ceiling details (A-0029). The size of soffit support is scaled from soffit detail (1/A1-7554), the soffit is modeled with 6 3/8" thick (support size thickness is 6" and the W-16B metal panel thickness is 3/8"). Please provide missing information regarding the size of			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> W-16B assembly and support framing is by the contractor/manufacture. Refer to Specification Section 05 75 00 1.1 B. The previous VB comment response from the Design Team is correct. The detail and dimensions of the escalator soffit shall be provided by the escalator contractor/manufacture to match the Architectural design intent and agreed with the dimension of the escalator truss.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2239 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2240 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2315	TTC - Missing wall position	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/S1-7013; 1/S1-3286; S1-2606; A1-2906 Location: Zone 4, Roof Park Level Gridline: F-F.7/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #621 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #621. The position of the concrete wall on the Roof Park Level - Structural Framing Partial Plan (S1-7013) is missing. The Roof Park Level - Zone 06 Framing Plan (S1-2606) shows, the beam are centered below the concrete walls, but there is no information of the position of the yellow marked wall. 8'-8" distance was used between the concrete walls. The centerline of the concrete walls are aligned to the centerline of steel beams. Please provide missing information on the position of the wall.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This question was answered in previous RFI - Refer to response to RFI T-1623.				
T-2316	TTC - Missing information about slab	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2906; A/A1-7121; 1/A1-8860; 2/A-2964 Location: Zone 4, Roof Park Level Gridline: D.8-F/29-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #625 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #625. Missing information about the thickness of the rigid insulation on this location. The A1-8860 is a typical detail and shows the insulation is sloped to drain, but the floor plans do not show the elevation points or slope values. The A1-2906 Roof Park level zone 06 Slab edge plan shows a 6" sleeve, but does not show the exact location of this. The 2/A1-2964 Stair 601 - Lid drawing does not show this sleeve at all.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4485 for sleeve location.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2318	TTC - Contradicting opening position and width	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2906; B/S1-3271; 1/A1-9706 Location: Zone 4, Roof Park Level Gridline: E.2-F/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #637 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #637. There is contradiction between Roof Park Level Zone 06 Slab Edge Plan (A1-2906), Roof Park Structures - Concrete Elevation (B/S1-3271) and the Door Schedule Roof Park Level (A1-9706). The A1-2906 Plan shows there is a 6'-8 1/2" wide door opening (marked with red fill), the B/S1-3271 elevation shows a 6'-0" wide door opening and the A1-9706 Door Schedule shows 6'-4" wide door in the concrete wall. The related contradictions marked with red bracket. Followed the A1-2906 the door opening has been modeled 6'-8 1/2" wide. Please provide revised dimensions for the opening position and width of the door opening.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Roof Park Level slab edge plan A1-2906 for door opening location within concrete walls. Dimension with conflict on B/S1-3271 will be deleted in future ASI.				
T-2319	TTC - Missing size of connection plate	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	02/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2,7/S1-6101 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Gridline: F-H/21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #638 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #638. Missing information about size of connection plate (marked yellow) from the detail drawings (S1-6101) the missing dimensions are scaled from the detail plans from the Glazed Roof Park Café (W-20) plan (S1-6101). The connection plate is model with 7 3/4" x 6"x1 1/4" size according to 1-2/S1-6101 detail drawings. The scaled			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The previous VB comment response from the Design Team is correct. This is a design build system, the intent of the detail is shown in the drawing and General Note on drawing confirms it. Bolt spacing/base plate size will not be indicated in drawing. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2243 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2244 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2321	TTC - Missing dimensions on the Roof Park Cafe	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	02/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-8634; A1-8630; A-0002 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Gridline: F-H/21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #641 Please see attached Virtual Building CR #641. Missing dimensions of laminated glass beams (marked yellow) from the Roof Park Cafe on the W-20 Cafe Roof Plan (2/A1-8630) and Roof Edge Section @ Gutter (2/A1-8634). (The detail plan about roof edge (A1-8639; marked red and yellow) are missing from our drawings, but the drawing index shows it on the sheet A-0002. It was reported in CR#279.) The missing dimensions are scaled from the Roof Edge Section @ Gutter(2/A1-8634). They are indicated on the screenshots with red. The A1-8634 sheet is not included in ASI 128 package. The latest version of A1-8634 (rev #0 03/31/14 IFC) does not show the missing dimensions. Please provide a revised sheet A1-8634 including the missing dimensions.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The revised sheet was already provided as SKA-3248 with the previous response from the Design Team. The W-20 Glass Café Building has been removed from the Phase 1 work. Until such time when W-20 is added to the Phase 1 work will then Sheet A1-8634 be issued. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2322	TTC - Missing Beam	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	02/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2307; A/S1-6058 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: E/32.4-33.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #642 See attached Virtual Building CR #642. There is a contradiction between the Structural Ground Level - Zone 07 -Framing Plan (S1-2307) and the Structural Steel - Supported Glazed Curtain Wall (W-3)			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The previous response from the Design Team is correct. Sheet S1-6058 does not show scope of Superstructure structural steel. A revised drawing will not be provided				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2245 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>System Sheet (Beale Street) (S1-6058; TG 08.1 Package). The W30x90 Steel Beam missed from the Gridline E.</p> <p>The beam was modeled per the S1-2307 framing plan. The S1-2307 and S1-6058 (ASI 128) still show the contradicting information about beams.</p> <p>Please provide updated sheet with beam information.</p>						
T-2323	TTC - Contradicting position and content of section	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p>			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: 1,5/S1-6100 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Gridline: F-H/21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building CR #644</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building CR #644.</p> <p>There are few contradicting gridline (marked yellow) on the overall section (5/S1-6100). The position of the section (5/S1-6100) is shown on Plan - Roof Park Cafe Steel Frame View (1/S1-6100), it is parallel with gridline F.6. It causes that the appearing gridline should be only the gridline 21 on the overall section instead of the gridlines G/F-F.7.</p> <p>The position of overall section is modeled according to the Roof Park Cafe Steel Frame View (1/S1-6100), the correct position of gridline 21 is marked with red on the screenshot. The S1-6100 (ASI 128) does not solve the issue.</p> <p>Please provide revised sheet S1-6100 with corrected position and section.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The W-20 Café Building is circular and symmetrical about both axes. There is no material difference whether the section tag is rotated 90 degrees or not. The drawing gridlines have been updated accordingly and shall be issued in a future ASI.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG


30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2246 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2324	TTC - Contradicting position of a floor drain	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2864; A1-3105 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D.8-E.2/14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #202 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #202. There is a contradiction between a slab edge plan A1-2864 and A1-3105. The floor drain is in different position on each plan. Please provide updated sheet with corrected dimensions.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to A1-2864 issued with ASI 130 for floor drain location as indicated in A1-3105 and A1-2304.		
T-2325	TTC - Missing dimension on Second Level	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2402 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: C.3-D.8/1.4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #205 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #205. There are missing dimensions on A1-2402 about type 17 walls (marked with yellow). The walls were modeled according to the Design Model. The CC1 curbs under the walls were modeled aligned to the face of the walls, following the Design Model. The dimensions are still missing on the plan A1-2402 . The plans have not been changed. Please provide updated sheet with wall dimensions.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketches SKA-4480, 4481 and 4482 for dimensions to gypsum walls. For Second Level, both architectural and structural curbs have been called out and located on the slab edge plans (A1-2882 to A1-2887). Refer to A1-2882 for curb locations and types queried in this RFI.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2326	TTC - Contradicting types of walls	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-8168; A1-2502 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D-F/1-3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #207 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #207. The types of the walls are contradicting on the two added plan. The Design Model followed the A1-2502 plan. ASI 128 does not contain the plan A1-8168. Please provide updated sheet that includes plan A1-8168.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A1-8168 was issued with ASI-0130. Refer also to enclosed sketch SKA-4452, based on A1-2502 with gypsum wall tags removed.		
<hr/>							
T-2327	TTC - Contradicting types of walls	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-7202; 4/A1-7832 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D.4-F/8-9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #208 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #208. The types of the walls are contradicting on the two added plan. The Design Model followed the 4/A1-7832 plan. The type of the walls are 11. The wall types are still different on the plans. The plans have not been changed. Please provide revised sheets with the correct wall type.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4483 with typical note added about wall tags. These details are typical for second level elevators. The alphabetical letter(s) added to a wall type may vary at specific locations, depending on adjacencies, acoustical requirements and/or bracing requirements etc.		
<hr/>							
T-2328	TTC - Missing dimensoin on Second Level	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jeff Heath</div></div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: A1-2402; 8/A1-7004 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D.4-E/2-3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #209 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #209. There is a missing dimension about a wall(marked with yellow) on Second Level. The centerline of the wall was aligned to the centerline of the curb below. Please provide revised sheet with wall dimensions.</div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4481 R1 for wall tag and dimensions of gypsum board enclosure. Refer also to the second level slab edge plan that locates the concrete curbs below the enclosure (A1-2882).</div></div></div></div>							
T-2329	TTC - Contradiction between plans	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Stephanie Azzolino</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company</div><div>Phil Militello</div></div><div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jeff Heath</div></div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: 5/A1-7004, A1-2862 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: D-D.4/1-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #210 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #210. The 5/A1-7004 plan shows a CC curb (marked with green) but on the A1-2862 slab edge plan is not visible this structural curb. The curb will be modeled as a CC1 curb. Please provide revised sheet A1-2862 with CC curb.</div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4484 that notes and provides location for concrete curb below wall type 51 at ground level.</div></div></div></div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2249 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2330	TTC - Contradiction between types of walls	Closed	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	03/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3195; 1/A1-9001 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: E.6-F/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #211 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #211. There is a contradiction between the callouts 1/A1-3195 and 1/A1-9001. The types of walls are different on each plan. One of the wall has the same type number 17 but the comment is different. The other wall has different types number 8 and number 18. Followed the marked yellow types of walls because the Design Model contained that types. Please provide revised sheet with the correct wall type.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Wall types and comments on detail 1/A1-9001 are all correct. Detail 1/A1-3195 will be updated to match 1/A1-9001 and will be included with future ASI.		
T-2331	TTC - Contradiction on Second Level	Closed	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	03/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2402; A1-2403; A1-2882; A1-2883; 4/A1-9353; 1/A1-9353; 2/A1-9353 Location: Zone 1-4, Second Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #212 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #212. The A1-2402 plan shows the details number 4/A1-9353 and 1/A1-9353 as a typical plan between grid "C" and grid "G". These details show the type of wall is number 17 (marked with yellow) and the distance is 4'-11" from the grid. The A1-2882 sheet shows a CC1 curb (marked with green) and the distance is 4'-10" from the grid. If the elements are created according to the plans, the distance will be 1'-0" between the face of the curb and the face of the wall.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See SKA-4471 for revised details on A1-9353 addressing conflict.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2250 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2251 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2333	TTC - Contradiction between architectural curb and wall	Closed	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2882;A1-2402 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D.8-E/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #214 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #214. There is contradiction between the slab edge plan number A1-2882 and floor plan number A1-2402. The A1-2882 shows that the architectural curb has 1'-0 1/4" distance from the gridline number 5 (marked with red) but the floor plan shows another value. Because of this difference the wall will not fit properly with the curb. The plans will be followed. There will be a difference between the faces of curb and wall. Please provide revised sheets with corrected dimensions.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per specification section 05 41 00 3.2.J - Erection Tolerances, metal studs shall be centered on concrete curbs. AAI considers this to be a frivolous RFI.				
T-2334	FAE - Horizontal Lifeline Stanchion Design-Build Requirements	Closed	02/25/2015	03/07/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 11 24 23, WW1-5001 Location: Roof Park Level Specification section 11 24 23 states that the Horizontal Lifeline System is to be "design-build." Detail 1 on plan sheet WW1-5001 shows the pipe stanchion OD as "Typically 4.5" and a 20 ft. maximum spacing between stanchion supports. Please confirm that the Horizontal Lifeline System is a design-build system with a performance requirements and Detail 1 on plan sheet WW1-5001 is for reference only.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. The system is to be design build. Detail 1 on plan sheet WW1-5001 is for reference only.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2335	VOID	Void	02/26/2015	02/26/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
T-2336	TTC - Contradiction between types of wall	Closed	04/13/2015	05/11/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc: 1/A1-7832; A1-2402; 3/A1-7201; D/A1-7205;1/A-0020 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: E-F/3-4 Add'l Doc Refs: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #215 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #215. There are contradictions between the floor plan 3/A1-7201 and the detail 1/A1-7832. The architectural floor plan show that the indicated wall has a type number 11 and the comment is A,B. The detail which is on the section D/A1-7205 shows that the type of the same elevator shaft wall is 11 B (marked with yellow). Comment A is not founded in the wall schedule (A1-0020). The walls were modeled with type of 11 A,B,E. Contradiction has not been corrected .There is a contradiction between the floor plan 3/A1-7201 and the detail 1/A1-7832 (per ASI No. 0128). Please provide correct wall type.					Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4689, a general note was added to reference typical details and enlarged plans for additional wall type symbol indications. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015		
T-2337	TTC - Missing Door Dimension at 01221A	Closed	03/10/2015	03/20/2015	03/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc: A1-2302; 2/A1-7201 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: D-D.4/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #217					Please refer to enclosed Sketch SKA-4540 (A-0035) for Typical dimension of doors from corner wall.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2253 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #217. There is missing dimension on A1-2302 about number 01221A door (marked with yellow). The door will be modeled 6" from the face of wall (marked with red). The dimensions was not added (per ASI No. 0128). Please provide missing dimensions.						
T-2338	TTC-Missing Door Dimension at 01362A	Closed	03/10/2015	03/20/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2303; 1/A1-3100 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: E.6-F/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #218 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #218. There is missing dimension on A1-2303 about number 01362A door (marked with yellow). The door will be modeled 6 1/2" from the face of wall (marked with red). The dimensions was not added to the plans (per ASI No. 0128). Please provide missing dimensions.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4523 additional dimensions.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2339	TTC - Contradiction between dimension lines	Closed	03/11/2015	03/21/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3100; 1/A1-9001 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: E.6-F/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #219 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #219. There is a contradiction between the 1/A1-3100 and the callout 1/A1-9001. If the dimension line marked with yellow is followed the dimension line marked with red will be incorrect on the plan number A1-3100. Followed the callout A1-9001. Will be modeled with 1' 9 1/4". The dimension was not corrected on the latest plans. Please provide corrected dimensions.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch SKA-4523 dimensions that match the enlarged detail information.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2340	TTC - Incorrect Distance Between Curbs and Walls	Closed	03/11/2015	03/21/2015	03/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2883; 8/A1-8177 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: C-C.3/9-10 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #220 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #220. There is a contradiction between A1-2883 and 8/A1-8177. If the type 17 walls (marked with yellow) were modeled according to the 8/A1-8177 detail and the CC1 curb (marked with red) were created according to the A1-2883 plan the distance between the face of the wall and the face of the curb would be 0'-1 1/2" and 2". Elements were created according to the plans. The dimensions were not corrected (per ASI No. 0128). Please provide corrected dimensions.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Ignore the dimensions on A1-8177. Per specification section 05 41 00 3.2.J, Erection Tolerances, metal studs shall be centered on concrete curbs.		
T-2341	TTC - Contradicting Wall Types	Closed	03/11/2015	03/21/2015	03/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-9012; 4/A1-9352 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: C.3-D/8-9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #221 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #221. There is a contradiction between 1/A1-9012 and 4/A1-9352. The 1/A1-9012 shows a type 8W(marked with yellow) and a type 6(marked with green) wall but the 4/A1-9352 detail shows a type 8 and a type 7 wall at the same places. The 4/A1-9352 detail shows CC2 curb below the wall 8 and CC1 curb below the wall 7 but the 1/A1-9012 shows CC curbs below both. Walls and curbs will be created according to the 1/A1-9012 plan.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketches SKA-4488 and SKA-4525 for revised wall tags and curb information. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2256 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please provide correct wall and curb type.</p>							
T-2342	TTC - Contradiction Between Plans	Closed	03/11/2015	03/21/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-9350;A1-7004 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: 1.4-2/D.8-E Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #222 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #222. The plan A1-9350 shows a wall (marked with green) with type 11 and another wall (marked with blue) with type 11 but on the A1-7004/5 plan the walls have other types. The wall marked with green is type 27 and the wall marked with blue is type 11 A,Z. The walls will be modeled according to the A1-7004/5 plan. Please provide correct wall type.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to SKA-4526 for clarification			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2343	TTC - Contradicting Positions of Curbs	Closed	03/11/2015	03/21/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-7201; A1-2892 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Gridline: 4-5/E.6-F Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #223 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #223. There is a contradiction between the A1-7201/4 architectural callout plan and the A1-2892 architectural slab edge plan. The callout plan shows 4" wide curbs, but the architectural slab edge plan do not show. The curbs will be modeled according to the A1-7201/4 architectural callout plan. The curbs are not visible on A1-2892 (per ASI No. 0128). Please clarify curb width.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The curbs are to be poured as part of the topping slab and do not need to extend down to the structural slab.		
T-2344	TTC - Contradiction Between Types of Walls	Closed	03/11/2015	03/21/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-9021; A1-7841 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Gridline: D.8-E/ 3-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #224 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #224. There is a contradiction between the 4/A1-7841 detail and the 1/A1-9021 callout plan. The callout plan shows the wall has type 19 A1, G but the detail shows that the same wall has type 19 G. The wall will be modeled with type 19 A1, G according to detail 1/A1-9021. Please provide correct wall type.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, See SKA-4527 for clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2258 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2345	TTC - Reference Error on Bus Deck Level	Closed	03/11/2015	03/21/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1,2/A1-7837; A/A1-7107; B/A1-7234 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Gridline: D-F/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #225 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #225. The A/A1-7107 section shows the 1/A1-7837 detail to the Bus Deck Level, but this should be 2/A1-7837, because this detail shows the same wall types as the section. The B/A1- 7234 section shows the 2/A1-7837 detail to the Bus Deck Level, but this should be 1/A1-7837. The correct details were used until the modeling. The 2/A1-7837 to A/A1-7107 section, and the 1/A1-7837 to B/A1-7234 section. Please provide corrected detail reference.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See SKA-4528 & SKA-4529 for clarification.		
T-2346	TOP - Protection Slab Thickness Confirmation	Closed	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Detail 2/L1-7647 Sheet A1-8851 Protection Slab Plans (Sheets A1-2912 through A1-2917) Slab Edge Plans (Sheets A1-2902 through A1-2907) Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Detail 2/L1-7647 calls out for the roof top protection slab to be 3" thick. Sheet A1-8851, the protection slab plans (Sheets A1-2912 through A1-2917), and the slab edge plans (Sheets A1-			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. See attached SKLA 375.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2259 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2347	TOP - Protection Slab Requirement Information	Closed	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	03/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheets A1-9520 through A1-9537 Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Topping slab plans (Sheets A1-9520 through A1-9537) Notes 4.x gives information on "All Other Concrete Toppings". Protection slab plans do not give information on concrete, reinforcement, control joints, etc. Please confirm protection slab concrete is to follow Notes 4.x on the Topping Slab Plans.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Note 4. on the Roof Park Level Topping Plans (A1-9535 to A1-9537) include the Protection slabs. This was clarified in a previous RFI P1-0461.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject		Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2348	SCS - Ground Level CIP/Metal Deck Connection Conflict at Shaw Alley		Closed	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	03/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2303, S1-3700 Location: Shaw Alley Grid Line: GL 9-G Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached						1). Confirmed.		
Please reference S1-2303 and Section 2/S1-3700 for Ground Level CIP/Metal Deck connections at Shaw Alley. Section 2/SI-3700 cut on S1-2303 shows the Metal Deck slab support below the top of the steel beam. To match the cross referenced elevations provided on S1-2303 and S1-4003, the Metal Deck slab support must be above the top of steel beam. See sketch provided on S1-3700 attached for a proposed revised section detail. The revised deck location requires a change to the rebar detail.						2). Section 2/S1-3700 remain unchanged. The section on S1-2303 shall be changed to red-marked section shown on the sketch attached in this RFI question.		
1. Please confirm that the sketch correctly demonstrates the intended CIP, pandecking, and deck support listed.						3). The detail for rebars shall be similar to detail 11/S1-3700.		
2. If #1 is confirmed, please confirm that no DBAs are required in Section 2/SI-3700.								
3. I #1 is confirmed, please provide a new detail to supplement 2/SI-3700 that shows the rebar connection when the deck ab is supported above the top of steel beam.								
T-2349	SCS - CMU Walls at Ground Level North Loading Dock		Closed	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	03/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang								
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: A1-2863, S1-2303, A1-2963, S1-2351 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: GL 7/E.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached						CMU walls are required per Architectural drawings. Refer to the floor plans A1-2303 and A1-3100.		
Please reference A1-2863, SI-2303, and A1-2963 regarding the CMU Walls at the Ground Level North Loading Dock. At GL 7/E.6, A1-2863 indicates CMU walls that are not shown on S1-2303, S1-2351, or A1-2963. Dimensions for these walls are also unavailable on all architectural								



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2261 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2350	SCS - Beam B141 Corbel Support at West Foundation Wall	Closed	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	03/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: A1-2251, S1-3411 Location: West Foundation Wall Grid Line: GL V Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached						1. The sides of the corbels are in the same plane as the sides of the intersecting B141's. Refer to submittal TG0600-956 comprehensive layout.	
See attached S1-2251 and S1-3411 regarding the Beam B141 corbel support at west foundation wall. Sheet SI-2251 indicates that the B141 beams intersect the west foundation wall at an angle. The B141 beams are 4' -0" wide. Because the beams frame into the wall at an angle, the connection widths at the wall for the two beams are about 4' 1 1/2" and 4' 3 3/8". Detail 10/SI-3411 indicates the end support width as 4'-0". A rebar detail similar to Section F on Detail 10/S1-3411 is required for the 4' 1 1/2" and 4' 3 3/8" end conditions.						2. Centerline face of corbel may be located 1'-6" from foundation wall measured along a line intersecting the foundation wall at a right angle.	
1. Please confirm that the base dimensions of the B141 beams at their intersection with the foundation wall are 4' 1 1/2" and 4' 3 3/8". If not, provide the correct dimensions.						3. See 2.	
2. Please confirm that the corbel support is square to the B141 beam on top, and not square to the foundation wall.						4. RFI response is sufficient to dimension the corbel. Final dimensions will be reviewed as part of the submittal process.	
3. If #2 is confirmed, please provide dimensions for how far the corbel extends from the wall.						5. B141 concrete beams are separated from the foundation wall by a 1" gap on the tops and on the beam ends. They are separated from the corbel by the bearing plates. There is no rebar connection between the B141's and the foundation wall.	
4. Please provide a plan view at the corbels.						Notes: The pilasters and their projection into foundation wall are parallelograms. (5) #8 corbel u-bars are parallel to face of corbel. #5 closed ties are parallelograms. #10 primary reinforcing welded is welded to corbel face plate at an angle equal to the beam intersection angle with the foundation wall. Similar detailing for (10) #5 face and bottom bars.	
5. Please provide the rebar connection detail between							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2262 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	B141 beams and the west foundation wall.						
T-2351	PLG - Plumbing Invert at GL 11-D	Closed	02/26/2015	03/08/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal			
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST: Ref: P1-2202 Location: Lower Concourse Closest Column Line: 4-A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A At column line 4-A on P1-2202, the invert elevation of 8" sanitary line from reference(0) is 10'-0 1/4" however the sleeve per the design documents is at 12'-6"(12'-7 ¼") difference(below invert) 2'-7". This elevation is driven from column line 7-D; Please advise		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This condition has been resolved by rerouting the sanitary waste east of grid line 7, it has been relocated in the ground level ceiling in ASI 0130. Also, a sketch submitted by DMI on March 20 showed a sanitary waste rerouting at grid lines 3/F which I reviewed and approved (DMI will follow with a conforming RFI)			
T-2352	ELV- IDF Room 03484 Conduit Clarification	Closed	02/27/2015	03/09/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128/TE1-4504, Detail 4/TE1-5504] Location: Zone[04], Level [Bus Deck] Closest Column Line Intersection is [Between 14 and 15, C.3] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A There are conduit run discrepancies, as shown, on the attached TE1-4504 drawing. Please confirm the number of 4" conduit required for each clouded area.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please see attached sketch of locations.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2352.1	ELV- IDF Room 03484 Conduit Clarification	Closed	05/14/2015	05/24/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128/TE1-4504, Detail 4/TE1-5504] Location: Zone[04], Level [Bus Deck] Closest Column Line Intersection is [Between 14 and 15, C.3] Add'l Doc's Ref's: RFI T-2352 1. Per RFI T-2352 response, please confirm that there are a total of (10)-4"C entering the IDF room 03484. 2. Per RFI T-2352 response, please confirm that detail 4/TE1-5504 should be revised to show a total of (10)-4"C penetrations on IDF room 03484 north wall. 3. RFI T-2352 response shows (4)-4"C leaving from PB-1 and (4)-4"C leaving from PB-2 both going to TE1-5504. One of the (4)-4"C arrows has moved to point out the straight section between PB-1 and PB-2. The other arrow still shows (4)-4"C from PB-1 which is misleading. In order to get (4)-4"C from PB-1 to PB-2 and (4)-4"C from PB-1 to TE1-5504, this note would need to be (8)-4"C. Please confirm the number of conduits leaving both PB-1 and PB-2. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Yes, there are (10) 4" C entering IDF 03484 through the Plan North Wall. 2) Confirmed, detail update are not required. 3) Drawings are accurately depicted. Drawings do not show (8) conduits originating from the same location and terminating at the same location, therefore we would not label it as (8) 4" C. Drawing shows: (4) 4" C from PB1 to PB2 (4) 4" C from PB1 to IDF 03484 (TE1-5504) (4) 4" C from PB2 to IDF 03484 (TE1-5504) Answered by Design Team : 05/18/2015 Closed by Webcor : 5/19/2015				
T-2353	SSS - PE704 and PE705 Approval Comment Clarifications (VOID)	Void	02/27/2015	03/09/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:					
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Ref Doc: A1-7238 Location: Zone 07, Tier 1 Gridline: 32-32.4 and D.4-E.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1 and SK2 See attached CD RFI 759 SK1 & SK2: A1-7238 does not supply sufficient information for the requested additional steel. Please supply revised structural drawings for the added steel. WOVJ Comment: Elevator information currently coordinated with Otis.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2264 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2354	SSS - TR29 & TR31 Connection Detail Discrepancy	Closed	02/27/2015		03/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Quang Le</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2306, 2/S1-3704, S1-4306, S1-4307, 1/S1-4351, and 2/S1-4355 Location: Zone 06, Ground Level Gridlines: 29 and 31 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1 and SK2 See attached CD RFI 764 SK1: As shown on SK1, there is a discrepancy in the details for the noted connections at Grids 29 & 31 on the Ground Level. Detail 1/S1-4351 requires 90 bolts and detail 2/S1-4355 requires 96 bolts. Confirm it is acceptable to supply 94 bolts as shown in SK2.				Confirmed.		Reason for RFI (TT). Agree the reason noted as "Other, verification". We categorize this as no cost clarification.	
T-2355	EAW - Visual Mockup Adjustment	Closed	02/27/2015	03/09/2015	03/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Tram Nguyen</div></div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: Drawing A1-8112 Location: W-1 NE Corner Gridlines: 32.4 & 31.7 Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A The W-1 Exterior Awning mock up will have the lower struts in the correct project location. The upper struts will be moved down to fit the highlighted area shown in attached Drawing A1-8112. 1. Please confirm it is acceptable to use the highlighted area shown in attached Drawing A1-8112 for visual mock up pricing. 2. Please indicate if Bird Control, Lighting, and OCS rail are required for the visual mock up. If they are, please provide locations for these items.				1. Confirmed. 2. Bird Control, OCS pipe rail and lighting at lowest horizontal pipe should be included in the mockup. Bird control track should be located at the top and bottom horizontal pipe, as well as in the applicable struts of the awning mockup. The lighting should be included along the lowest horizontal pipe of the mockup - at minimum of two fixtures. The OCS rails (two - type 1 and type 3) should be included at the lowest horizontal pipe and the next one above. Please submit detailed shop drawings to confirm mockup layout and elements.		RFI Answered by Design Team: 03/04/2015 RFI Closed by WOJV: 04/28/2015	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2356	BGP - Modified Lower Concourse Bulkhead D229	Closed	03/02/2015	03/12/2015	03/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Lower Concourse Grid Line: GL 29 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Please confirm is acceptable to step the bulkhead for Lower Concourse Deck D229 6' to the west. See attached document.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		
<hr/>							
T-2357	SCS - Foundation Wall 4th Lift Sleeve Supports Cast Into Wall	Closed	03/02/2015	03/12/2015	03/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: 4th Lift Foundation Wall Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Please see attached photos and cut sheets regarding Foundation Wall 4th Lift Sleeve Supports. The Foundation Wall 4th Lift stainless steel sleeves are currently supported by P4100 unistrut assemblies set on the top of wall. Shirmick is requesting approval to cast these supports into the 4th lift pour as opposed to removing the supports prior/during the pour. Leaving the supports in place will keep the sleeves more independent from the rebar in case adjustments are needed on the rebar cage. Please confirm it is acceptable to cast the Foundation Wall 4th Lift Sleeve Supports into the foundation wall.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is a means and methods of construction. The Design Team does not take exception to the proposed embedded Unistrut, as long as they conform with concrete cover requirements for reinforcement.		
<hr/>							
T-2358	SSS - Deviation Request CN Type 19 WC0014 Dim#2	Closed	03/02/2015	03/12/2015	03/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2267 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2360	SCS - Foundation Wall Sleeve in Conflict with CDSM Pile - GL9-9.9	Closed	03/03/2015	03/13/2015	03/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: 4th Lift Foundation Wall Grid Line: GL 9-9.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached See attached mark-ups. One (1) North Foundation Wall Sleeve between GL 9-9.9 conflicts with a CDSM wall soldier pile. Please confirm it is acceptable to move the sleeve 2' East and drop the invert elevation up to ½" to avoid conflict with the CDSM pile. The MEP Sub-contractor, Desert Mechanical , has confirmed this move is acceptable. (See attached email)			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			AAI: It is acceptable to move the sleeve 2' to the East and drop the invert elevation 1/2". For updated location of this sleeve, refer to attached SKA-4492. MDS/WSP: It is acceptable.				
T-2362	SCS - Foundation Wall Formwork Cure Requirements	Closed	03/03/2015	03/13/2015	03/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 03 30 02 3.7A.5 Location: 4th Lift Foundation Walls Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Please find attached mark up of Spec 03 30 02 3.7.A.5 regarding Foundation Wall Cure methods. The direction is given to moisture cure all train box exterior walls. Shimmick is proposing an alternate moist cure method to the one prescribed in 03 30 02 3.7.A.5 to reduce follow-up weekend work for 4th lift Foundation Wall pours taking place on Thursdays and Fridays. To provide moisture cure for these Thursday and Friday wall pours, Shimmick will (1) leave the 4th lift formwork in place over the weekend, (2) place blankets on the top of the wall, and (3) place soaker hose along the top of wall to keep the concrete surface continually wet. Formwork would be stripped the following Monday and regular moisture cure per spec 03 30 02 3.7.A.5 will resume.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			Confirmed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2269 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>reinforcing bars as shown on Detail 5/S1-3204 and Elevation A/S1-3203. Please confirm that only (8) bars are required and that the longitudinal tie in the center of the wall in Detail 5/S1-3204 is not required.</p> <p>2. North Pilaster: Formsavers for the northern-most pilaster were installed in the Lower Concourse 4" to the south of where they needed to be. Please confirm it is acceptable to drill and epoxy #9 dowels at 10 1/8" embedment so the pilaster can be poured in the correct location (see attached sketch).</p> <p>3. 2nd Northern-most Pilaster: Formsavers for the 2nd northern-most pilaster were not installed. In order to accommodate the horizontal bars for the East Ramp Wall, please confirm it is acceptable to drill and epoxy #9 dowels at 10 1/8" embedment in the configuration shown in the attached sketch.</p> <p>4. Formsavers Without Proper Clearance: Per a walk with the SEOR, please confirm it is acceptable to abandon 9 select formsavers in the Lower Concourse out of the 160 vertical dowels in the East Ramp Wall due to clearance issues. Dowels will be installed at abandoned formsaver locations similar to RFI T-2065 and spacing of the vertical dowels will not be more than 16".</p>						
T-2364	SSS - Light Column to Edge of Slab Dimension Clarifications at Ground Level	Closed	03/04/2015	03/11/2015	Potentially		<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2305, A1-2865 Location: Zone 5, Ground Level Gridline: 23 and E Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1				Confirmed.			
See attached CD RFI 765 SK1: The 7" dimension from edge of slab to CL beam and the 17'-2 3/4 radius have been taken at the end of each of the 48 segments. The result is that the edge of slab will be 7							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2270 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	7/16" from CL beam and the radius will be 17'-2 5/16 at the center of each segment. Confirm that is acceptable.						
T-2365	Void	Void	03/04/2015			Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2366	SCS - Rebar From Expansion Joint Assembly GL 9.9 and 19.9	Closed	03/04/2015	03/14/2015	03/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Contract Doc Ref: S1-5005 Location: Roof Level Grid Line: GL 10, 20 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Submittal TG070-097 SCS-Response- REBAR - Shop Drawings - Bus Deck Level 13 to 19 Drawing Number MD-B16E show comments from AAI directing rebar detailer to remove rebar from expansion joint assembly at GL19 .9. TG0702-096 RESPONSE SCS -REBAR - Shop Drawings - Bus Deck Level GL70-13 Drawing Number MD-B10D does not have comment to change rebar detail drawn at GL 9.9. Detail 1/SI-5005 details rebar from expansion joint assembly to be the same as drawing MD-B16E. 1. Please provide correct detail for rebar at expansion joint at both GL 9.9 and 19.9. a. If rebar is to be removed please provide end detail/requirements.			Vertical deformed bar anchors in the slab at the expansion joint are to be provided "between the joist box" as noted on 1/S1-5005. Hooks at the horizontal rebar in the slab shall also be provided only between the joist boxes. The "joist boxes" or the cavities in the slab occur at regular intervals along the length of the seismic joint. Contractor to submit shop drawings for expansion joint per specification 07 09 15. Refer to manufacturer's shop drawings for joist box spacing.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2367	TTC - Missing Dimension of Door A1-2402, 3/A1-7201	Closed	03/11/2015	03/21/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2402; 3/A1-7201 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #227 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #227. There are missing dimensions of the highlighted doors (marked with green) on A1-2402 plan and also on 3/A1-7201 detail. The positions of the doors were not changed compared to the Design Model. See the dimensions on the screenshot. Please provide the correct dimensions.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4524 for dimensions to door edges.				
T-2368	TTC - Contradicting Types of Walls	Closed	03/11/2015	03/21/2015	03/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 4/A1-7201; A1-2502 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: E.6-F/3-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #228 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #228. There is a contradiction between the plans. The A1-2502 plan shows that the wall has a type 10 T but the A1-7201 callout plan shows 10 T,J comment for the same wall. The A1-7201 plan will be followed Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI statement is not correct. Both plans indicate matching wall type 10-CC / T, J.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2272 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2369	TTC - Contradiction Between Types of Wall	Closed	03/11/2015	03/21/2015	03/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-7201; A/A1-7232;A1-2402; 1/A-0020 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline:E.6-F/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #229 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #229. There is a contradiction between the floor plan callout 3/A1-7201, the section A/A1-7232 and the wall schedule. The floor plan callout and the section shows that the type of the walls is number 11/A but comment A is not founded in the wall schedule (A1-0020) The walls were modeled according to 3/A1-7201 and A/A1-7232. The type will be number 11 A1. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Use wall type 11-CC/A1.		
T-2370	TTC - Missing Dimensions of Doors at 1/A1-3220, 3/A1-7202	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3220; 3/A1-7202 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: C.3-D/2-8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #230 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #230. There are missing dimensions of doors1/A1-3220, 3/A1-7202 (marked in yellow fill). The distance is scaled from the plans. It will be 6" as seen on the screenshots. Please provide missing dimensions.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4524 and SKA-4487 for door to wall edge dimensions		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2273 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2371	TTC - Contradiction Between Wall Types	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1,2,3/A1-7880; 2/A1-7001 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: D-D.4/1-1.1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #231 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #231. There are contradictions between architectural detail plans 1,3/A1-7880 and 2/A1-7880 detail plan. The 2/A1-7880 and 2/A1-7001 plan shows the walls without any comment (type 11) but 1,3/A1-7880 shows the wall comment (type 11 E). Followed the wall types on 1,3/A1-7880 detail plans when modeled the walls. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. See SKA-4510 & SKA-4511 for clarification.		
T-2372	TTC - Contradiction Between Wall Types and Gridline	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 5/A1-8177; A1-2406, 2/A1-8161 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: D-D.4/27.1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #232 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #232. There are contradictions between Second Level floor plan (A1-2406) and 5/A1-8177 callout. The floor plan shows the type of walls (around the column) 17 but the callout shows the type should be 7. The 5/A1-8177 callout shows that this detail is at gridline number 16.9 but these columns are at gridline number 27.1 Followed 5/A1-8177 callout during the modeling. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Wall type 17 is correct. See the attached SKA-4508.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2274 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2373	TTC - Contradiction Between Wall Types 1/A1-7002;A/A1-7101	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-7002;A/A1-7101 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D-F/0-1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #233 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #233. There are contradictions between plan callout 1/A1-7002 and A1-7101 section. The A1-7101 section shows the walls without any comments (type 11, type 7) but the floor plan shows the walls with comments as 11 E, 11 A,C, 7 C,Z. The wall 17 is not shown on the floor plan callout. Followed the wall types on 1/A1-7001 detail plans when modeled the walls. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Please follow wall types on drawing 1/A1-7001.		
T-2374	TTC - The Width of the Curb is Contradicting at A1-2896, 2/A1-7571	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2896, 2/A1-7571 Location: Zone 4 Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/27.1-29 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #234 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #234. There is a contradiction between slab edge plan (A1-2896) and the architectural callout (2/A1-7571). The slab edge plan (A1-2896) shows that the width of the structural curb (marked with red) is 6", but the callout (2/A1-7571) shows 8" wide curb. Followed the A1-2896 Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Curbs noted on Edge of slab plan are correct, refer to SKA-4521 for clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2275 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2375	TTC - Incorrect Wall Dimension 1/A1-9023	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-9023 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/31-32 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #236 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #236. There is an incorrect dimension. The dimension of the wall (marked with red) is not exact. The wall has other references it will be followed. Please provide the correct dimension.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to sketch SKA-4512 for clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 3/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				
T-2376	TTC - Missing Dimensions from the Slab Edge Plan	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2896 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.4-E.2/27.1-28 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #237 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #237. There are missing dimensions of the concrete curb (marked with red) on the slab edge plan (A1-2896). The distance is scaled from the plan. The end of curbs were modeled 6'-1" from gridline 27.1. Please provide the missing dimensions.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to attached sketch SKA-4514 for clarification.				
T-2377	TTC - Wall Layout Difference at 1/A1-9023, 1/A1-7021	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Contract Doc: 1/A1-9023, 1/A1-7021 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.4-D.8/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #239</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #239.</p> <p>There is a contradiction between floor plan (1/A1-7021) and callout detail (1/A1-9023). The plans show different type and layout of the walls.</p> <p>The walls will be modeled according to 1/A1-9023 plan except the wall marked with orange. This wall will be 1 A1 not 1.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2277 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2379	TTC - Contradicting Wall Positions at A/A1-7301; 1/A1-7555	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A/A1-7301; 1/A1-7555 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D-D.4/5-6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #243 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #243. There is a contradiction between A/A1-7301 and 1/A1-7555. The A/A1-7301 section shows a wall(marked with yellow) on right from the structural steel beam. The 1/A1-7555 shows the same wall on left from the steel. Wall and ceiling were created according to the 1/A1-7555 detail (4" from the fireproofing of the steel, which is 2" by Phase3 RFI#092). Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to SKA-4530 for clarification.		
T-2380	TTC - Contradiction Architectural Curb Types at 2/A1-7020; 3/A1-2969; A1-2886	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-7020; 3/A1-2969; A1-2886 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: D-E.6/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #244 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #244. There is a contradiction between the floor plan and slab edge plan. The 2/A1-7020 plan shows CC2 and CC1 curbs(marked with yellow). The 3/A1-2969 shows CC2 curb(marked with green) instead CC1. The A1-2886 plan shows CC3, CC4 curb(marked with red) instead CC2 and CC1 curb(marked with red). Curbs were created according to A1-2886. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to SKA-4531 & SKA-4532 for clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2278 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2381	TTC - Contradicting Wall Types at 2/A1-7020; 1/A1-9015	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-7020; 1/A1-9015 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: D.4-E.2/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #245 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #245. There is a contraction between 2/A1-7020 and 1/A1-9015. The 2/A1-7020 plan shows type 31 wall(marked with yellow) but the 1/A1-9015 shows 31,A1,G type for the same wall. The wall was created with 31,A1,G type. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to SKA-4532-R1 for clarification		
T-2382	TTC - Contradicting Wall Types at A1-2402; A-0020	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2402; A-0020 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/4-6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #246 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #246. There is a contradiction between A1-2402 plan and A-0020 schedule. The A1-2402 plan shows 4 G walls (marked with yellow) but the A-0020 schedule does not contain the G comment for this kind of wall. Walls were modeled with type 4. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed SKA-4552 for revised wall tags for clarification		
T-2383	TTC - Contradicting Curb Types at 3/A1-2969; 2/A1-7020; A1-2886	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2280 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2385	TTC - Gap Between Curb and Door at 2/A1-7306; A1-2866; A1-2306	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-7306; A1-2866; A1-2306 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: E/28-29 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #251 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #251. If the curb is modeled according to the slab edge plan with a 3'-6" distance and the door (marked with yellow) is modeled to one side of the curb because the dimension of the door (wide of door 3'-4 1/2") is missing a gap will remain between the door and the curb. The door will be modeled 9 1/4" from the reference wall. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to SKA-4534 for dimension clarification.		
T-2386	TTC - Contradiction Between Type of Wall at A1-7821; A1-7238; A1-7204	Closed	03/12/2015	03/22/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-7821 ;A1-7238; A1-7204 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/32-32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #256 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #256. The plan 2/A1-7821 shows the wall (marked with green) with type 11 but the 2/A1-7204 and A/A1-7238 shows the same wall with type is 11K The wall will be modeled with 11 K type. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, wall type will be 11 K. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
T-2387	SSS - Roof Drag Plate Deck Closure	Closed	03/05/2015		03/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2281 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Ref Doc: 7/S1-5020 Location: Zone 2, Roof Level Gridline: 3 and 4 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1 Detail 7/S1-5020 calls out a 12 gauge closure stitch welded with 1/8" fillet 1" on 12", please confirm if alternative deck closure details A, B or C attached are acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail A is acceptable as an alternate to detail 7/S1-5020, except the Z-plate shall be 12 gauge as called out in the drawings. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reasons for request: Alternate proposal and Verification. We categorize this RFI as request for substitution.			
T-2388	SSS - Clearances at ShawAlley Bridge Isolation Bearings	Closed	03/05/2015	03/16/2015	03/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Ref Doc: S1-2503, S1-5021 Location: Bus Level and Zone 3 Add'l Doc Ref's: E83 Please confirm horizontal and vertical clearance requirements for the rubber isolation bearings. Please note the following; 1. W12x65 has been trimmed to provide a 1/2" gap to the W40 flange per RFI T-0932 2. Steel has been fabricated and shipped to our staging yard		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The rubber isolation bearings have sufficient horizontal and vertical clearances. Modifications to supporting steel at the isolation bearings are not required.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2282 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2389	SSS - Post Size Revisions ST406 CS06	Closed	03/05/2015		03/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2604 Location: Zone 4, Roof Level Gridline: 15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: LTR-WOJV-187, E51, SK1 Per CS06 submittal package, the HSS 8x8's revised to HSS 8x6's at CS06 ST401 at roof level (gridline 15-16). The posts have already been fabricated and erected. Field modifications in this case would be difficult considering the beams that are connected to and supported by these posts. WOJV: Per the construction issues meeting on 3/4/15, please confirm the solution is to increase the wall thickness by 1" uniformly.				Confirmed. As discussed and agreed at March 4, 2015 meeting, due to fact that the steel work is already erected; uniformly increase the thickness of each CIPAC wall by 1" to the inside of each wall along exterior Park Level Stair 401 (PK401			
<hr/>							
T-2390	SSS - Alignment of Elevator Posts and Kicker Braces	Closed	03/05/2015		03/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Add'l Doc Ref: SK1, SK2, SK3, SK4, SK5, SK6 Please refer to SK 1 to SK 6 for items 1 and 2 below: 1. The attached sketches show new elevator post locations (verified by elevator contractor) along with the original kicker brace locations in our current model. Confirm kicker braces can remain at current locations or verify they must be moved and aligned with the post locations. Alternatively, please verify if there is a maximum offset that would satisfy the design requirements 2. This plan seems to indicate that the (5) elevator posts apply from the Lower Concourse Level to the Roof Level. S1-7136 & S1-7137 show a different post pattern with HSS16x8 posts and horizontal W6x25's between the Ground Level and the Bus Deck Level. Confirm the information on this sheet replaces the information on the structural drawings.				1) Kicker braces can remain at current locations if the distance between the new post locations and the kicker braces is less than or equal to 2'. If the distance is greater than 2', move the kicker braces to align with the new post locations. 2) Refer to RFI T-2392 response. 3) Refer to RFI T-2392 response. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reason for request: Verification. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification and previously answered.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2283 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
3. What is the maximum vertical length/span allowed for all 12x6x5/8" elevator posts without horizontal support?							
T-2391	SSS - PE201 Framing Clarifications	Closed	03/06/2015	03/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Quang Le	To: Turner Construction Company		Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California Dis		Ryan Clayton					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: 1/S1-7001		1) Horizontal HSS beams have been provided for guide rail support at PE201 as shown on contract documents. If Otis requests any changes to the elevator support framing indicated in the contract documents (for e.g. using vertical posts in lieu of horizontal beams for guide rail support), they shall design the post sizes and detail connections to existing framing. In addition, Otis shall submit calculations to show that design criteria (e.g., deflection requirements) can still be met with these modifications.					
Location: Zone 2		2) See response to 1).					
Gridline: 1		3) Refer to sheet A1-7001 for reference to the orientation of the elevator plan.					
Add'l Doc Ref's: Otis Sheet 1/7, CD RFI 789 SK1							
See attached CD RFI 789 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 3:							
1) HSS12x6x5/8 per 03.05.15 conference call. To be confirmed.							
2) The elevator posts are not shown on the current structural drawings. Please indicate the vertical extent of the added posts on SK2.							
3) Supply the directional orientation of this elevator plan.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2392	SSS - PE502 & PE503 Post Support Clarifications	Closed	03/06/2015		03/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Quang Le</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-7137, S1-7138				This RFI is not clearly presented and could lead to misunderstandings. Cover page includes a single question, however there are two separate questions in other pages. It is unclear whether some of this is internal within the contractor and their subs or whether they are directed to the design team. The Design Team's response assumes the red comments are from Otis and Blue ones are from the contractor, and that the contractor is seeking answers to both questions in the RFI.			
Location: All Elevators							
Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 791 SK1, CD RFI 790 SK4							
See attached CD RFI 791 SK1:				1) It is not clear if the spacing mentioned in the Otis comment is the spacing understood by the contractor. Otis seem to be referring to plan spacing of the supports (elevator posts) and contractor seem to be referring to spacing of horizontal bracing of elevator supports between different floors. Contractor may want to clarify this further. We can confirm that the design intent only, as it is put forth in the construction documents, which is, posts typically go unsupported from floor to floor, unless otherwise noted in the contract drawings.			
All elevator posts currently shown on the structural drawings span unsupported from floor to floor except as shown on S1-7137 & S1-7138 @ PE502/503 (referenced in CD RFI 790 SK4). Please confirm that this remains the intent or supply revised structural drawings or details if this is to be revised.				Given this status, the Design Team is unable to confirm, nor verify this information without a complete shop drawing submittal process.			
				2) Elevator support framing as put forth in the construction documents is based on the on the design criteria provided by Division 14. If Otis requests any changes to the elevator support framing indicated in the construction documents (for example, reduce number of posts), it is required that they submit calculations to show that design criteria (e.g., deflection requirements) can still be met with those modifications.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2285 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2393	VOID	Void	03/06/2015	03/12/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: VOID		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
T-2394	Plumbing invert RFI at GL 14-A	Closed	03/06/2015	03/06/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST: Ref: P1-2204 Location: Lower Concourse Closest Column Line: 14-A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A 6" sanitary line (elevation from 0) 10'-2 1/2"; sleeve 10'-5" (10'-6") difference (below invert) 3 1/2". This is elevation is driven from column line 11-D; DMI suggested to move penetration to the other side of the column between 11 & 12 in the retail space above. There was an additional issue that was pointed out with Mechanical pipe (riser CW B-2 on M1-2203) (see attached) No sleeves were shown on the slab edge drawings (A1-2863) Please advice.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Refer to attached sketches for relocation of riser SAN-B3 on the east side of grid line 11, south of grid line D. 2. Riser CW-B2 on sheet P1-2204 requires a 3" sleeve and as such it is not shown on the slab edge drawings.			
T-2395	Plumbing Inverts at GL19.1-J	Closed	03/06/2015	03/16/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal			
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST: Ref: P1-2205 Location: Lower Concourse Closest Column Line: 19.1-J Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A 6" sanitary line (elevation from 0) 6'-6"; sleeve 9-5' (9'-6") difference(below invert) 3'-0". 8" storm drain (elevation from 0) 7'-7 3/4"; sleeve 9-5' (9'-6") difference(below invert) 1'-10 1/4". See meeting minutes from 2-12-2015. Re-route of pumped sanitary line (design) DMI suggests adding a storm drain connection at column line 22-J? Will require redraw of storm drain lines (P1-2205)		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The pumped sanitary was rerouted in ASI-0130 to connect to the lateral at 13/J instead of the lateral at 19.1/J. 2) A revised routing for the 8" storm drain originating from riser ST-C2 was shown on ASI-0130. DMI (Larry Michel) has contacted us and we worked-out, on the phone, a partially revised routing through the south corridor, which solved the issue. DMI to follow up with a confirming RFI.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2396	Plumbing Invert at GL 27.1-C	Closed	03/06/2015	03/16/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: P1-2206 Location: Lower Concourse Closest Column Line: 27.1-C Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A Please confirm if the following locations for plumbing inverts are acceptable: 1) *NEW*Column line 27-A 6" sanitary line (elevation from 0) 6'-3 3/4 "; sleeve 6-60 ' (6'-7 1/4") difference(below invert) 3 1/2". This elevation is driven by concrete beam at column lines 27.1-C (see attached). 2) *NEW*Column line 33.5-A 8" storm drain line (elevation from 0) 6'-5 3/4"; sleeve 4-25 ' (4'-4 3/4") difference(below invert) 1". This elevation is driven by concrete beam at column lines 28-C (see attached). 3) *NEW*Column line 33.5-A 6" sanitary line (elevation from 0) 3'-3 1/4"; sleeve 4.25 ' (4'-4 3/4") difference(below invert) 1'-1 1/2". This elevation is driven by beam at column lines 30-C.3 (see attached).			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Refer to the attached sketch. Due to structural and site utility constraints the slope between 27.1/C and point of connection to street sewer will be approx. 0.6%. Provide as much slope as possible between 28/E.6 and 27.1/C. 2) The storm drainage routing has been revised per attached sketches. The offsets were revised on second level and ground level for risers ST-D1 and ST-D3 such as the horizontal runs in the lower concourse ceiling are reduced. 3) The sanitary waste horizontal run originated from riser SAN-D4 has been relocated north of grid line C and the riser itself has been relocated east on grid line 30. Refer to attached sketches	

T-2397	Plumbing invert RFI at GL 14-A33-F	Closed	03/06/2015	03/16/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Ref: P1-2206 Location: Lower Concourse Closest Column Line: 14-A33-F Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A *NEW*Column line 32 on Lower Concourse level P1-2206, P1-2207 - 4" SAN-AD is in conflict with the ceiling (see attached) . This elevation is driven by steel beam at column lines 33.2-f (see attached) please advise.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI response: Refer to SKA-4562 and SKA-4563 for updated AD locations at the Ground Floor Level based on SAN/AD piping rerouting on SKP1-2207. MDS/WSP response: Refer to attached SKP1-2207 for SAN/AD piping rerouting as discussed in the coordination meeting.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2398	TER - FI Requirements for Terrazzo	Closed	03/06/2015	03/16/2015	03/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 130 dated 2/27/15) Specification Section 09 66 22			Please refer to enclosed markup of Specification Sections 09 66 22 3.2 B and 09 66 22 3.2 C updated per P1-0457 RFI Response.				
Location: N/A							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI Response P1-0457							
Per RFI Response P1-0457, the following revisions were to be made:							
1. Reference to tolerances is to be removed from Specification Section 09 66 22 (3.2) B Terrazzo Epoxy Crack Suppression System.							
2. Specification Section 09 66 22 (3.2) C Terrazzo Epoxy Crack Suppression System was to read: "Before installation of the moisture control system, engage a California licensed surveyor or civil engineer to make a survey of the floor to confirm the flatness SOFf of 50 and elevations as indicated on drawings using a self propelled profilometer or a similar instrument that will give an accurate measurement downloadable to a computer in the form of a floor survey. Report any deviations from the floor flatness criteria or floor level to General Contractor for correction."							
Specification Sections 09 66 22 (3.2) B and 09 66 22 (3.2) C have not been updated to reflect the revisions stated in RFI Response P1-0457. Please provide an updated Specification Section 09 66 22.							
T-2399	TER - Terrazzo Surface Prep Revisions	Open	03/06/2015	03/16/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 130 dated 2/27/15) Specification Section 09 66 23							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2288 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Location: N/A</p> <p>Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI Response P1-0686</p> <p>Per RFI Response P1-0686, "Reference to the preparation of the concrete slab and installation of the terrazzo crack suppression system shall be deleted from section 09 66 23."</p> <p>Specification Section 09 66 23 Epoxy Terrazzo Flooring has not been updated to delete references to the preparation of the concrete slab and installation of the terrazzo crack suppression system.</p> <p>Please provide a revised Specification Section 09 66 23 that reflects RFI Response P1-0686.</p>						
T-2400	INT - Changes to Sheet A1-9820	Closed	03/06/2015	03/16/2015	03/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:		Confirmed. The black rectangle illustrated on details 1 & 2 of A1-9820 (not A1-8646) are AWP-1. Refer to SKA-4493 with revised graphics for A1-9820.					
(Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 130 dated 2/27/15) Details 1 & 2 /A1-9820							
(ASI 118 dated 6/20/14) Details 1 & 2/A1-9820							
Location: Lower Concourse							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Details 1 & 2/A1-8646 of ASI 130 shows black rectangles above the acoustic isolation windows.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2289 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2401	Details 1 & 2/A1-8646 of ASI 118 calls for AWP-1 at the same locations.						
	Please confirm that the black rectangles depicted in Details 1 & 2/A1-8646 of ASI 130 are AWP-1 or provide information on the black rectangles.						
	SST - Guardrail Post to Concrete Slab Detail		Closed	03/09/2015	03/19/2015	03/11/2015	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP	Claude Titche	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
	Co-Author: Olson and Co. Steel	Avel Solomon					
T-2402	REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
	Contract Doc Ref: A1-7523			Please refer to Specification Section 05 75 00			
	Location: Ground Level			Architectural Metal Fabrications 3.2.G.3. Also refer to			
	Grid Line: GL 15-16			attached Sketch SKA-4491 for details.			
	Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached						
T-2402	See attached.						
	Please furnish a connection detail for guardrail post to the concrete slab.						
	VOID		Void	03/09/2015			Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP	Quang Le	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:			
	Co-Author:						
T-2402	REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2290 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2403	SCS - Pulling Eye Dimensions	Closed	03/10/2015	03/20/2015	03/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-9052 Location: Transformer Vaults Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Detail for pulling eye is shown at 6/ S1-9052. 1. Please provide dimensions and thickness of the pulling eye. 2. Please confirm is it acceptable to field weld the pulling eye onto the embedded plate.				1) The pulling eye shall be a 1" thick bent rod and the centerline distance between the two "legs" of the pulling eye shall be 6". 2) Confirmed. Provide all-around 5/16" fillet welds at the pulling eye "legs".			
T-2404	SCS - Wall Plate Under Door Opening	Closed	03/10/2015	03/20/2015	03/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-9244 Location: Electrical Rooms Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Details for partition walls show wall plates at the interior of the electrical rooms. Detail D/A1-9244 shows a wall plate continuing along the wall face under the door opening. Please confirm this is not the designer's intent to have this plate be continuous under the door opening.				Confirmed. The CIP steel plates does not continue along the face of the wall under door openings.			
T-2405	SCS - Wall Plate Welding	Closed	03/10/2015	03/20/2015	03/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: A1-9243 Location: Partition Walls Grid Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached				Use continuous 3/16" double fillet weld for the 13" long corner cover plates not directly anchored to the wall. For updated typical corner and cover plates detail at wall corners, refer to attached SKA-4513.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2291 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	At the interior comer of concrete partition walls. Detail H/AI-9243 Note #2. Comer plates are 13"-long, not directly anchored to the wall and continuously welded to adjacent longer plates at room comers (typ). Please confirm a 3/16" fillet weld is acceptable.						
T-2407	FPR - Fireproofing Requirements for Beam A2987	Closed	03/11/2015	03/21/2015	03/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Contract Doc Ref: Sheet A1-6006 Detail A/A1-7307 Detail A/A1-7805 Details 1, 4, & 6/A1-7836				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Location: N/A		Confirmed. Beam A2987 is to receive IFRM-1 as stated in RFI Response T-2109. Detail 6/A1-7836 is clarified in attached sketch SKA-4504.					
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI RESPONSE T-2109							
Sheet A1-6006 illustrates a beam supporting the escalator at GL 28/Second Level and calls out Detail A/A1-7307 and Detail A/A1-7805.							
1. Detail A/A1-7307 references Detail 6/A1-7836. Detail 6/A1-7836 shows the beam fireproofed with SFRM and enclosed in a rated wall enclosure.							
2. Detail A/A1-7805, references Detail 4/A1-7836. Detail 4/A1-7836 shows the beam fireproofed with IFRM and enclosed in a rated wall enclosure. Furthermore, Detail 4/A1-7836 references Detail 1/A1-7836. Detail 1/A1-7836 shows the rated wall enclosure beginning 1'-5" off of the center line of GL E.							
By these details, beam A2987 (as referenced in RFI T-2109) would be approximately half SFRM and half IFRM.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2292 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>RFI Response T-2109 states, "The full extent of beam A2987 is to be prepped and primed to receive IFRM-1."</p> <p>Please confirm that the entire length of beam A2987 is to receive IFRM-1 as stated in RFI Response T-2109 and revise the details to match.</p>						
T-2408	FPR - Fireproofing of Column Encased in Concrete	Closed	03/12/2015	03/12/2015	03/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Tram Nguyen	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Clayton National		Richard Clayton					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: Detail 1/A1-8900 (SKA-4477)		Revise the note to read, "Fireproofunjacketed portion of prefabricated column that occurs above the floor slab, if any."	Fireproofunjacketed portion of prefabricated column that occurs above the floor slab, if any.				
Location: N/A							
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: RFI Response T-2299							
Per RFI Response T-2299, the note on Detail 1/A1-8900 (SKA-4477) that occurs below the T/O slab elevation line indicates SFRM at theunjacketed portion of column. Thisunjacketed portion of the lower column will be encased in the concrete floor slab. Per the manufacturer's requirement, the slab needs to precede the fireproofing.							
Please confirm theunjacketed portion of the column that is encased in the concrete floor slab requires SFRM as shown in Detail 1/A1-8900 (SKA-4477).							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2293 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2409	TTC - Contradiction Between Wall Types at 3/A1-7836; 2/A1-7308	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-7836; 2/A1-7308 Location: Zone 2, Bus Deck Level Gridline: E-E.2/17-18 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #581 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #581. Contradiction between 3/A1-7836 Section Detail - Escalator Soffit/w-5 Interface and 2/A1-7308 Escalator E407& E408 - Plan at Bus Deck Level plans about a type of a wall. A1-7836 shows it is a type 14 wall but the 2/A1-7308 shows it is a type 10 wall. Modeled this wall with type 10 according to the 2/A1-7308 Escalator E407& E408 - Plan at Bus Deck Level. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, the correct wall type is 10. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2410	TTC - Contradiction Between Section and Detail Drawing at A1-2106; A1-6026; A/A1 Closed		03/13/2015	03/23/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2106; A1-6026; A/A1-9225 Location: Zone 4, Train Box Gridline: F-H/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #583 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #583. There is a contradiction between Train Platform Level Mech. Rooms and Section (A/A1-9225) and Building Section At Gridline G Zone 6 (A1-6026). Mech room's shape is different on the drawings. Mech room was modeled following A/A1-9225 detail. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to SKA-4536 to SKA-4538 for updated section references for IDF Room B2641/B2640 and other MEP Rooms at the Train Platform Level. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2411	TTC - Contradicting Information About the Top of Concrete LID Elevation	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP</div></div><div><div>Julia John</div><div>Jeff Heath</div></div></div> <div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: B/A1-9226; 1/S1-9003; 2/S1-5000 Location: Zone 4, Train Platform Level Gridline: D.8-E.2/34-35 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #584 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #584. There are contradicting information on Train Platform Level Mech. Room and Sections (B/A1-9226). Typical CMU Details (2/S1-9003) defines the type of the Concrete LID which is S1. Typical Metal Deck Details (2/S1-5000) defines the thickness of Concrete LID which is 7 1/2". If the Concrete LID is modeled according to the dimension line (marked with red arrows) it will be higher than the elevation line shows. If the Concrete LID is modeled according to the elevation line (marked with green arrow) it will be lower than the dimension line shows: 15' 9 1/2" instead of 16' 0". The elevation tag will be followed (It is supposed that the height dimension could be 16' 0" MAX according to the A/A1-9226 detail). Please confirm.</div></div>	<div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>					
			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			16'-0" dimension is confirmed. Refer to A1-9226 issued with ASI-0130.				
T-2412	TTC - Missing Information About Location of CMU Wall	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	03/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP</div></div><div><div>Julia John</div><div>Jeff Heath</div></div></div> <div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: 1/A1-3020 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C/22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #585 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #585. The 1/A1-3020 - Lower Concourse Level North Passageway Plan & Section does not show the exact location of tagged 3 wall (marked with red). The missing distance is scaled from 1/A1-3020 and the</div></div>	<div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>					
			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			For missing dimension, refer to SKA-4456 issued with the response to TG013.2-014.				
			NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	wall is modeled at 6' -10" from gridline 22. (2015.01.22)						
	Please provide missing information.						
T-2413	ELV-Jet Fountain Means and Method	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	04/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham		To: Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: L1-7021 - 7049 Location: Zone, Level: Park Level Jet Fountain Closest Column Line Intersection is N/A Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A Please provide where the optimum location for the conduit penetration from the RNCP's to the jet solenoids.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For Purpose of Pricing ASI # 129 assume each RNCP as located within the center of each Nozzle Group for which the RNCP's serves.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2414	ELV- E-2 Light Pole Park Level	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	04/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128/ Drawings: TE1-4602 - 4607; SE1-2602 & 2607; Specification: 12 93 10; 26 50 02; 26 50 01 Details Drawings: L1-9632-9634; Detail 4, SE1-4001 Location: Zone 02 - 07, Park Level Column Line: Park Perimeter Park Pathway Lighting is shown to be an E-2 Fixture that require a number of questions to be answered; 1. Per Spec Section 12 93 10 2.2.B the Beacon is Amber. Typically, Beacons are Blue. Please confirm Amber as the required color. 2. Is it acceptable for the beacon to be an LED light? 3. What is the intent of how the beacon lights are to operate? Panic Switch? Blue Phone? 4. Is the operating device of the beacon also to connect to video surveillance system? If not provide operational sequence from initiation to intended results. 5. E2 is specified as Fluorescent but the Cut Sheet indicates Metal Halide. Please confirm lamping requirements and would it be acceptable to use LED fixtures in lieu of either Fluorescent or Metal Halide? 6. Is there a specific design for the acrylic light housing? (Frosted, Prismatic, Fresnsel, etc). 7. Please confirm there are no speaker on the plain poles, only on the component poles. 8. Please confirm there are no cameras on the plain plains, only the component poles? Also confirm one or two cameras. 9. Per Specification 26 50 02 - 3 a custom color is required for E2 pylon housing. Please provide finish		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Confirmed 2. Yes 3. Roof beacons are part of the mass notification system. The beacons will sequence same as the roof level fire alarm strobe notification devices, with input from the fire alarm system through the MNA connection/interface. 4. No. The Park Level Beacons are not connected to video surveillance system. In terms of sequence of operation, the Park Level Beacons are to be arranged to operate automatically upon receipt of a fire alarm signal at the TTC fire detection and alarm system to coincide with the emergency evacuation plan/emergency voice communication system sequence of operation during a fire emergency. In addition, the Park Level Beacons would also be arranged to automatically activate in response to various non-fire event scenarios as prescribed by the TTC Concept of Operations and Emergency Operations Plan. In addition, capability to manually activate the Park Level Beacons by designated TTC management staff or security staff is to be provided to allow for manual override/control of the Park Level Beacon system. The Park Level Beacons are only to be used for Park Level Occupant Notification to alert hearing impaired individuals of an emergency event and that upon alerting individuals, further response/actions via message board display, signage and/or TTC security staff assistance would further direct individuals as to whether to evacuate the Park Level, relocate to another portion of the Park Level or to take other action as prescribed by the Emergency Operations Plan. The Concept of Operations and Emergency Operations Plan are to be developed by the TJPA and its security director and are not yet finalized. 5. a. Per Specification Section 26 50 02-2 dated 17 December 2013, lamping for E2 to be (2) 32-watt T8 fluorescent (3100 lumens, 42000 hrs rated life, 3000K, 85 CRI) (Osram Sylvania FO32/830/XPS/ECO). Per			

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>The attached document is the manufacturer's pre-submittal specification review comments for specification 26 33 54. The product line offered for this specification section is the Staco Energy Products Co FirstLine P924, three-phase emergency lighting Inverter. Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>						
T-2416	ELV- 4" Inch Concrete Housekeeping Pad	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	04/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony</p>		<p>ANSWERED:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: 26 24 12 Location: Zone: N/A , Level :N/A Closest Column Line Intersection is N/A Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A</p> <p>Per specification section 26 24 12.3.1.D it states "Install main switchgear on 4 inch high concrete housekeeping pads which shall follow the contour of main switchgear with 1 inch of overlap on all sides." In lieu of the 4 inch high concrete housekeeping pad, please confirm it is acceptable to install a 3-1/2 inch (standard 2x4 framing) pad.</p>		<p>ANSWERED By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This is acceptable.</p>			
	<p>REQUEST:</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2299 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2417	Voided	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128/EI-4602-4607, L1-7040-7049, 7035 Location: Zone 02-07, Level Park Level Closest Column Line Intersection is Typical: L1-7040(7,C) Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A Park level jet fountain and jet fountain lighting: The landscape drawings show the use of a submersible junction box for the control wiring to the jets in the fountain trough, there are no specifications stating the box requirements. Attached is a data sheet of the box for this intended use and purpose, which will be used for the jet fountain for work shown on the drawings listed above.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-2418	ELV- Roof top Park Electrical Means & Methods	Open	03/13/2015	03/23/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128/ E1-2602, E1-7053, TE1-2602 Location: Zone 02 , Level Park Closest Column Line Intersection is N/A Add'l Doc's Ref's: Caddy Cut SHT Attached are sketches of the intended means and methods to be used for the roof top park electrical installation, including a cut sheet of the product to support the conduits on the concrete topping deck. All conduit penetration form the bus deck level will be installed and assumed to be poured in the deck. The conduit supports will be fastened to the topping deck via an adhesive. We are assuming all conduit penetration through the trough walls of the jet and lighting trough will be part of the precast scope of work. Please advise.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2300 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2419	ELV- Telecommunication Underground Pull box	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128/TE-0010, TE1-2602 thru TE1-2607/27 05 33) Location: Zone 02 - 07, Level Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection is N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Per the response to RFI T-2158, it states "Please read specification 27 05 43 Section 2.1 A-G for Underground vault and pull box sizes. Use appropriate size unit for number of conduits and cables." The specification 27 05 43 section 2.1 C-G list different dimensions for vaults and pull box. Based on the RFI response, it is unclear if this symbol "U", as shown on the legend (TE-0010), only represents a pull box. Fisk is not the designer and therefore will need to know what type of box is required for each location shown on the plans. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The RFI's stated response to RFI T-2158 is incorrect. WOJV to provide Fisk with the correct response to RFI T-2158, which is attached.		
T-2420	TTC - Missing Information and Contradiction	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-7821 Location: Ground Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #257 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #257. The 4/A1-7821 plan shows a type 3 wall but it does not have any information about the place of wall. The detail shows there should be a curb below the wall but according to the A1-2867 plan the curb has an exact position that is why the curb could not be below the type 3 wall even though the 4/A1-7821 shows this. The wall will be modeled 2-1/4" distance from the face of the elevator wall and the type 3 wall will float. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI disagrees that there is "Missing Information and Contradiction" as stated in this RFI. The location of the type-3 wall is shown relative to the curb below on details 4/A1-7821 and 3/A1-7823. The opening in the curb is located on A1-2867. The finished opening at the elevator door can be found on 2/A1-7204. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2421	TTC - Contradiction Between Plans	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-7821; A1-7238 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/32-32.4 Add'l Doc Refs: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #258 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #258. The plan 4/A1-7821 shows the wall (marked with green) with type 29 or 39 on the ground level but the section shows this wall with type 39 B. The wall will be modeled with type 39 B. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, the wall type is 39 B. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
T-2422	TTC - Missing Information About Position of Doors	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-9021; 4/A1-7201; 4/A1-7202; A1-2502; A1-2503 Location: Bus Deck Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #259 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #259. There is no information about the position of these doors: 03221A; 03227A; 03227B; 03227C; 03227D; 03227E; 03227F; 03227G. The doors were modeled according the client model. Please provide missing information.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches SKA-4553 and SKA-4554 for wall elevations; refer to dimensions on zone plans and enlarged plans locating panel joints. The wall elevations also show reference to enlarged door elevations with door jamb details references. The door jamb details show relationship between door frame and centerline of panel joints. Locate doors with the above mentioned information. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
T-2423	TTC - Gap Between Curb and Wall	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2302 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-8168; A1-2892; A1-2502 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.4-E/2-3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #261 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #261. There is a gap between the concrete curb and interior wall. The sheet A1-2892 shows the position of curbs and the sheet 3/A1-8168 shows the exact position of interior wall. The 3D model shows there is a huge gap between the curbs and the walls. The walls and the curbs will be modeled according to the plans. Please confirm	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to A1-2502 with reference to sheet A1-8168. 3/A1-8168 issued with ASI 130 provides the nominal booth dimensions. Curbs are correct per A1-2892. Refer also to specification section 13 34 24. Date Answered by Design Team: 3/25/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015		
T-2424	TTC - Contradicting Curb Types	Closed	03/13/2015	03/23/2015	03/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Heath						
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-7204; 5/A1-2969 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: D-D.8/32-32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #262 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #262. There is a contradiction between A1-2887, 3/A1-7204 and 5/A1-2969. The 5/A1-2969 and A1-2887 plan show CC2 type curbs (marked with green), but the 3/A1-7204 plan shows CC3 curbs to the same place. The curbs will be created with CC2 curbs according to the 3/A1-7204 and the A1-2887 plans. Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no contradiction. Please refer to SKA-4542 (enclosed with response for RFI T-2435) for the CC3 type curb corrected to read CC2.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2303 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2425	TTC - Contradicting Wall Types	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A/A1-7239; 1/A1-7832; 3/A1-7204 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: D.4-D.8/32-32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #263 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #263. There is a contradiction between a detail and a section, and also a floor plan. The 3/A1-7204 plan and the A/A1-7239 section shows a 11 J wall (marked with green) but the 1/A1-7832 detail shows a 11 B wall at the same place. The wall was created with a 11 J type according to the floor plan and the section. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, wall type is 11 K,J. Details on sheet A1-7832 apply to multiple locations. Refer to Zone and enlarged plans for all wall types and qualifiers. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.			

T-2426	TTC - Contradicting Wall Types	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-7204; A/A1-7238; 2/A1-7832 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/32-32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #264 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #264. There is a contradiction between a detail and a section, and also a floor plan. The 3/A1-7204 plan and the A/A1-7238 section shows a type 11 K,J wall (marked with green) but the 2/A1-7832 detail shows a 11 wall at the same place. The wall will be created with a 11 K,J type according to the floor plan and the section. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, wall type is 11 K,J. Details on sheet A1-7832 apply to multiple locations. Refer to Zone and enlarged plans for all wall types and qualifiers. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2427	TTC - 2D Wrong Position of Section	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: 2/A1-7020; C/A1-7121</div><div>Location: Zone 4, Second Level</div><div>Gridline: E.6-F/30-31</div><div>Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #265</div><div>See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #265.</div><div>The C/A1-7121 section (marked with yellow) shows a type 8 F wall (marked with green) but this section crosses a type 4 wall (marked with red). There is a 8F type wall on 2/A1-7020 plan but it is far from the section.</div><div>The walls are created according to the 2/A1-7020 plan.</div><div>Please confirm.</div></div> <div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div> <div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Please refer to attached sketch SKA-4541 for clarification</div><div>NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.</div></div> <div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
T-2428	TTC - Contradiction in Curb Marking	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: A1-2607; 5/A1-7204; B/A1-7238; A1-2907</div><div>Location: Zone 4, Roof Park Level</div><div>Gridline: D-F/32-32.4</div><div>Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #266</div><div>See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #266.</div><div>There is a contradiction between plans about the walls under the marked interior walls on the roof park level. The A1-7204 plan shows these walls as curb but the B/A1-7238 section and the A1-2907 plan show that these elements are concrete walls.</div><div>Because of the sizes of the elements should be structural walls. The structural walls are belonging to superstructure.</div><div>Please confirm.</div></div> <div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div> <div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Confirmed. Curbs shown on Architectural drawings are also shown as concrete walls on structural drawings.</div><div>NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.</div></div> <div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>							
T-2429	TTC - Contradiction Between Types of Walls	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2305 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-7306; 2/A1-7022; B/A1-7022; 1/A1-7845 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: D.8-E/28-29 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #267 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #267. There is a contradiction between the callouts 2/A1-7306, 2/A1-7022 and detail 1/A1-7845. The walls marked on the 2/A1-7306 callout do not have any type but another callout and a section show type 62 for these walls. The detail 1/A1-7845 shows that the walls should be 7, 8 or 19. The walls will be modeled according to 2/A1-7022 and B/A1-7022. Please confirm.	Julia John Jeff Heath	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello SUGGESTION:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Detail 1/A1-7845 does not directly apply to this location. The Detail is to show design intent that will be applied to this and different location throughout the project. Date Answered by Design Team: 3/27/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015		
T-2430	SCS - Insufficient Clear Cover for DBA's Between GL19.9-21	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-3703, S1-5022 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: GL19.9-21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Between grid lines 19.9 and 21 we have a condition where the top of the slab is too close to the top of the steel drag beam to accommodate the concrete clear cover of the deformed bar anchors in the slab as shown in 7/S1-3703. "h" per detail 1/SI-5022 is less than 5" and falls under detail 1B/SI-5022. Note that the 10" slab is lower than as shown in typical detail 1B/S1-5022 and 7/S1-3703. The DBA connection detail must be changed to permit sufficient concrete cover. Please confirm that at GL 19.9 and 21, the DBAs may be welded to the web 4" below the bottom of top flange similar to attached SK V1 and 1A/S1-5022. The proposed	Claude Titche	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello SUGGESTION:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2306 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
DBA location will be inside the 10" slab and will have sufficient concrete cover.							
T-2431	SCS - Insufficient Clear Cover for DBA's Between GL22-24	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titche		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-3703, S1-5022 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: GL22-24 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Between grid lines 22 and 24 there is a condition where the bottom of the slab is too close to the top of the steel drag beam to accommodate the concrete clear cover of the deformed bar anchors as shown in 9/SI-3703. Please confirm that deformed bar anchors are not required per 7/S1-5022. If DBAs are required, please provide revised concrete elevations to achieve contract required cover. SK-V2 shows the condition at grid line23 .		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that no DBA is required per 7/S105022. Extend both the top and bottom slab rebars to Grid G (1 1/2" clear from the continuous bent plate).			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2307 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2433	SCS - Rebar/Coupler Connections at TR22 and TR 24 Along GL G	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-3705, S1-3707 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: GL22-24, G Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached Please reference SI-2305, SI-3705, and SI-3707 regarding the Concrete/Steel Connections at TR 22 and TR 24 along GL G. Refer to Section 6/SI-3702 cut on sheet SI-2305 on GL G, called out as being typ @GL 22 & 24. When cross referencing the elevations provided on S 1-2305 with the concrete/steel beam depths, B/O steel is about 1.5' below BIO concrete at GL 22 and 24. Section 6/SI-3702 shows B/O steel above BIO concrete. Under the provided elevations, the "5-#11X8'-6" W/LENTON HALF COUPLERS" at the bottom flange cannot be provided as required by Section 6/SI-3702. Section 3/S1-3705 correctly reflects the concrete/steel elevations referenced on S1-2305. Please confirm that Section 3/S1-3 705 may be used for the rebar/coupler connections at TR 22 and TR 24 along GL G in place of Section 6/SI-3702.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed that Section 3/S1-3705 applies to Grid 24. At Grid 22, use 3/S1-3705 SIML (no stepping in the steel transfer girder).				
T-2433.1	SSS - TR22 and TR24 Overlaying Hole Locations	Closed	05/26/2015	05/26/2015	06/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 3/S1-3705, RFI T-2433 Location: Ground Level, Zone 3 Gridlines: 22 and 24 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1, SK2, and SK3 This is a follow up RFI to T-2433. Skanska detailed and received shop drawing approvals for transfer girder details at gridlines 22 and 24 per detail 6/S1-3707(ASI 128 Ref S1-2305). Following coordination between Webcor and Shimmick, Skanska was then			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1). Confirmed. 2). Confirmed. Stud to be 1 1/2" away from the edge of hole. Reason for RFI: not provided by Skanska. TT categorize this as ¿no cost clarification¿. Answered by design team: 5/29/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/1/15				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2308 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>instructed to change these details and to follow 3/S1-3705 (following the response to RFI T-2433). As a result, some of the revised hole locations clashed with holes that were already drilled in the web plate during prefabrication. This revision present two issues. Please refer to attached overlay sketches showing clash conditions:</p> <p>1. New holes clash with existing holes. Please confirm we can use existing holes and the requirements for the revised holes can be waived. This only applies to clash conditions highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>2. Please confirm studs can be moved to avoid existing holes. Please provide minimum acceptable offset from a hole for relocating these studs.</p>							
T-2434	TTC - Contradicting Type of Curb	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 4/A1-7020; D/A1-7121; 3/A1-7822 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: E/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #268 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #268. There is a contradiction between the callouts 4/A1-7020, section D/A1-7121 and detail 3/A1-7822. The callout shows a type CC curb below the type 61 wall but the section and detail do not shows curb at same place. Followed the detail 3/A1-7822 and the wall will be modeled without any curb. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Wall does not extend down to ground and does not require a curb. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2435	TTC - Contradicting Curb Types	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A/A1-7238; 1/A1-7834; 3/A1-7204; A1-2887 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: D-F/32.4-33 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #269 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #269. There is a contradiction between A/A1-7238 section and 1/A1-7834 detail. The A/A1-7238 section shows a CC2 curb below the type 3 wall (marked with green) but the 1/A1-7834 detail does not show the curb below it. The 3/A1-7204 plan show a type 3 wall and a CC2 curb below and on the plan this wall seems continuous so the wall marked with yellow has not got any on the 3/A1-7204 plan it has just on A/A1-7238. Curb was created according to the 3/A1-7204 plan and A/A1-7238 because these plans have the latest revision date. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Edge of slab plan shows the correct location for the CC2 location. Refer to SKA-4542 & SKA-4543 for clarification. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.			
<hr/>							
T-2436	TTC - Contradicting Section Positions	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A/A1-7121; 2/A1-7020; A/A1-6006; A1-2406 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: D.8-E.2/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #270 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #270. The A/A1-6006 section shows the A/A1-7121 callout (marked with yellow). The 2/A1-7020 plan shows the same callout as a section. However, on the 2/A1-7020 plan the A/A1-7121 section is between E and E.2 grid, but the A/A1-6006 section is between D.8 and E grid, so the A/A1-7121 section is on two places at the same time. A/A1-7121 section created according to the 2/A1-7020		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Section will not be revised; this is a frivolous RFI. The discrepancy in the exact position of the section tag on 2/A1-7020 with respect of the Building Section is irrelevant to the drawings and information contained therein.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2310 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2311 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2438	TTC - Missing Dimension of Door	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2406 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: D-D.4/31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #274 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #274. There is missing dimension of door (marked with yellow fill). This door is not found on 1/A1-9017 callout. The distance is scaled from the plans. It will be 2'-8 3/4" as on the screenshots. Please provide missing dimension of door.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4544 for clarification.			
<hr/>							
T-2439	TTC - Reference Error on the Bus Deck Level	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: B/A1-7819; 3 & 4/A1-7820 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/31-32 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #275 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #275. There is a reference error on the sheet B/A1-7819. The plan shows the yellow marked callout as 4/A1-7820 but this callout is about the elevator door not restroom door. The 3/A1-7820 plan shows the restroom door. The doors will be modeled according to the sheet 3/A1-7820. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. The correct reference is 3/A1-7820.			
<hr/>							
T-2440	TTC - Contradicted Wall Type	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2313 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-7845; 1/A1-7021; 1/A1-9023 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.8-E.6/31-32 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #279 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #279. There is a contradiction between sheets 1/A1-7021, 1/A1-9023 and detail 3/A1-7845. The 1/A1-9023 and 1/A1-7021 show the wall type is 19 with comments G and A1 but the detail does not show the type 19 for the wall. The wall will be modeled with comment G and A1 according to the floor plans. Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Wall type 19 A1,G shall be used. Detail 3/A1-7845 is a general reference to indicate the design intent that will be applied to this and different locations throughout the project.		
T-2443	TTC - Missing Dimensions and Wall Types	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-8160; 8/A1-8177 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: C.3/31; F.7/29 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #280 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #280. There are missing dimensions and types about the walls (marked with yellow) around a column. The general note does not contain any information about these walls. Walls will be created according to the 8/A1-8177 detail. Please provide missing dimensions and types.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is a frivolous RFI. The dimensions and wall type are clearly identified in the referenced detail 8/A1-8177, as well as in the floor plan A1-2406. No revised drawings will be provided.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2315 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Gridline: D.4-E.2/27-29 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #282</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #282.</p> <p>The 2/A1-7022 plan shows a wall (marked with green) with type 31 but the 1/A1-7836 section shows the wall with type 31 C.</p> <p>The wall will be modeled with type 31.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						
T-2447	TTC - Missing Dimension	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>		<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>			
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: 1/A1-7020 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: E-E.2/31-32 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #283</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #283.</p> <p>On the 1/A1-7020 plan there is missing a dimension about the wall (marked with green).</p> <p>The missing distance is scaled from the plan and it will be 2'-0 1/4 "</p> <p>Please provide missing dimension.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The face of wall type 61 is 4" from face of W-16A Cladding. Please refer to sketch SKA-4548 for clarification.</p> <p>NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2316 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2448	TTC - Missing Information About the Finish of the Top of Wall	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-7020 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: E-E.8/31-32 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #285 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #285. There is no section or detail on the 1/A1-7020 plan which shows the top of walls (marked with green) and do not have any information about the area (marked with red). There will not be modeled ceiling. Please provide missing information.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to attached sketch SKA-4549 for clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 3/25/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				
T-2449	TTC - Missing Element and Missing Dimension	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 4/A1-4306;A1-9603;A1-9003;A1-2306 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: C-C.3/30-31; F-G/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #287 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #287. The A1-4306 plan does not show any ceiling at the two rooms (marked with yellow) but the 4/A1-9003 shows that there should be ceiling. The edge of the ceiling is not exact on the plans. Section 4/A1-9003 should not represent the ceiling in 01620, 01621, 01622, 01640, 01641, 01642 rooms. Please clarify.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Booth RCP is not shown on A1-4306 because the exact extent and layout is by Booth Type 2 manufacturer. Booth outline complete with a reference note was added in the attached sketch SKA-4546. Ceiling extent and exact edges will be shown on Booths' shop drawings, as these are prefabricated units. For Booth basis of design, please refer to drawing A1-8275. Drawing A1-9003 states that it shall be used ONLY for quantifying restroom accessories to be provided with Prefabricated Booths (Type 2) referenced in specification Section 13 34 24 & Sheet A1-8275, for Booth basis of design, please refer to A1-8275. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2317 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2450	TTC - Wrong Reference at 1/A1-7022; A1-2306	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-7022; A1-2306 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: D.4-E.2/28-29 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #288 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #288. The A1-7022 sheet contains the 1/A1-7022 plan but there are no plans that refers to this. The 1/A1-7022 shows the reference is on A1-2306 (marked with green) but this sheet does not show the callout. The 1/A1-7022 will be created and the elements are modeled according to it. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.		
<hr/>							
T-2451	TTC - Missing Dimensions	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4302; A1-4303; A1-4304; A1-4305; A1-4306; A1-4307 Location: Ground Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH-CR #022 See attached Virtual Building ARCH-CR #022 The exact position of the exterior lighting fixtures are missing. The position of the lighting fixtures will be scaled from the reflected ceiling plans. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to drawings A1-8225, which documents the design intent. The exact dimensional locations for the light fixtures are dependent on the Design Build solution for the W-3 glazing system. The design parameters for the W-3 system allow a wide range of Design Build solutions that are anticipated to have impacts on the exact locations of the light fixtures. The Virtual Modeling process is ahead of the WOJV contracting process on this item. No additional dimensions will be provided. Date Answered by Design Team: 3/19/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2318 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2452	TTC - Contradiction Between Dimensions of Monument Boulders and their Footing Closed		03/17/2015	03/27/2015	03/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2862; L1-2312 Location: Zone 1, Ground level Gridline: B/1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH-CR #036 See attached Virtual Building ARCH-CR #036 The architectural slab edge plan A1-2862 shows the footings of pylons and monument boulders with dimensions. The landscape plan L1-2312 shows the monument boulders above the footings with dimensions. There are contradictions between the dimensions (marked with red fill) of the footing and the dimensions of the monument boulders. The exact position of signage pylons are not shown on the landscape plan L1-2312 (marked with yellow fill). Architectural slab edge plan will be followed to model the footings, landscape plan will be followed to model the monument boulder and the signage pylons will be modeled to the center of the footings. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The previous response from the Design Team is correct. Follow the Architectural plans for locations of footings, pylon signage and monument boulders. Landscape plans will be revised in a future ASI.		
T-2453	TTC - Contradiction Between Dimensions of Monument Boulders and their Footing Closed		03/17/2015	03/27/2015	03/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2862; A1-2863; L1-2312; L1-2313 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: G-J/1-10 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH-CR #037 See attached Virtual Building ARCH-CR #037 There are contradictions between the position of the monument boulder footings and the position of the monument boulders (marked with red fill). The architectural slab edge plans A1-2862, A1-2863 show the footings of pylons and monument boulders with dimensions. The landscape plans L1-2312, L1-2313 show			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Previous response from the Design Team is correct. Follow the Architectural plans for locations of footings, pylon signage and monument boulders. Landscape plans will be revised in a future ASI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2319 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2454	the centerline of monument boulders and precast planters with dimensions. The exact position of signage pylons are not shown on the landscape plans L1-2312, L1-2313 (marked with yellow fill).						
	Architectural slab edge plan will be followed to model the footings, landscape plan will be followed to model the monument boulder and the signage pylons will be modeled to the center of the footings.						
	Please confirm.						
	TTC - Contradiction Between Architecture Floor Plan and Electrical Floor Plan	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4252; E1-4252 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: J-K/1.4-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL-CR #008 See attached Virtual Building EL-CR #008 There is a contradiction between the architecture floor plan and electrical floor plan. The floor plan E1-4252 shows a lighting fixture but the floor plan A1-4252 doesn't show it. Followed the electrical floor plan E1-4252 and modeled the marked lighting fixture based on it. Please confirm.	Julia John Jeff Heath SUGGESTION:	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Confirmed. Please refer to SKA-4545 for updated lighting fixture layout based on E1-4252 issued with ASI-0128. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2320 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2455	ELV - 600V Wire and Cable Quality Assurance Clarification	Closed	03/16/2015	03/26/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref:[ASI 128/26 05 19] Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A The contract specification Section 26 05 19 for the 600 Volt wire and cable, under Article 1.3 Quality Assurance; states that wire and cable shall be of the same manufacturer for the project duration. Multiple manufacturers shall not be permitted. Based on the listed manufacturers provided within this specification section, the contractor view's Article 1.3 to mean that all cable shall be from one manufacturer for each type of cable listed, not a sole source for the entire list of cable. This would mean that all THHN or THWN shall be from a single manufacturer, all RHH/RHW-2 cable would be form a single manufacturer, as well as all Metal clad cable would be from a single manufacturer. We believe that this is the intent as Division 25 and 27 outline other manufacturers for the various other cables such as CAT 5 and CAT6. Based on the specification there is no one single cable manufacturer that can produce all of the specified cable. Therefore the contractor, will be submitting on multiple manufacturers for each type of cable, and once approved the contractor will select a single manufacturer for each type of cable and will only procure and install the selected single manufacturer for each type of cable throughout the project. Fisk standard submittal packages will at a minimum include three manufacturers, who are either listed or an approved equal. We would like to continue with this standard policy in order to avoid having one manufacturer as a sole supply source. Please confirm this as acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - no exceptions taken.		
T-2456	TTC - Contradictions Between Architecture Floor Plan and Electrical Floor Plan	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	03/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2321 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Contract Doc: A1-4305; E1-4305 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Gridline: C-G/20-21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL-CR #010</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building EL-CR #010</p> <p>There are contradictions between architecture floor plan and electrical floor plan. The floor plan E1-4305 (Printing Date: 06/20/14) shows some lighting fixtures but the floor plan A1-4305 (Printing Date: 12/16/14) doesn't show any of them.</p> <p>Followed the electrical floor plan E1-4305 and modeled the lighting fixtures based on it.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						<p>The noted fixtures on the Electrical lighting floor plan (E1-4305) will not appear on the Architectural RCP (A1-4305). The noted fixtures are located in the Security and Information desks referenced from A1-2305.</p>
T-2457	TTC - Missing Slab Penetrations	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-2204; A1-2863; A1-2864 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level - Ground Level Gridline: G-H/11-12; E.2-E.6/15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP-CR #010</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building FP-CR #010</p> <p>The marked vertical SPDR and FSP pipes which are indicated on the plumbing plans P1-2203 and P1-2204 are not marked on the slab edge plans A1-2863 and A1-2864.</p> <p>Followed the plumbing plans P1-2203 and P1-2204 to model the pipes and followed the slab edge plans A1-2863 and A1-2864 to model the penetrations. Clash will remain between the pipes and the slab if there is not any penetration shown on the slab edge plans.</p> <p>Please clarify.</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>For standpipe FSP B8 'UP' called out on P1-2203, refer to P1-2303 for location where the sleeve would penetrate the ground level slab. This standpipe sleeve falls within the Stair 301 shaft (no slab, therefore no sleeve provided). There is no clash, A1-2863 does not require any revisions and is correct as is.</p> <p>FSP B7 'UP' on P1-2204 indicates the sleeve location at lower concourse (as on A1-2204); refer to P1-2304 for location where this FSP B7 'DN' penetrates the ground floor slab. The sleeve highlighted in this RFI query does not go up at that point. There is no clash, the required 10" sleeve is already indicated on A1-2864 and this drawing does not require revision, as it is correct as is.</p>	<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2458	TTC - Missing Slab Penetrations	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2107, A1-2847 Location: Zone 4, Train Platform Level - Lower Concourse Level Gridline: G-H/32-32.4; D.4-D.8/31.7-32 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP-CR #015 See attached Virtual Building FP-CR #015 The vertical SPDR pipe which is indicated on the plumbing plan P1-2107 is not marked on the slab edge plan A1-2847. (2015.01.20.) Followed the plumbing plan P1-2107 to model the pipes and followed the slab edge plan A1-2847 to model the penetrations. Clash will remain between the pipes and the slab if there is not any penetration shown on the slab edge plans. Please clarify.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no clash between pipes and slab. Drawing P1-2107 is correct. The SPDR does not go up to the Lower Concourse Level. Note 13 on drawing P1-2207 refers to the sprinkler control test and drain assembly, which drains locally in the Train Platform Level. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2459	TTC - Missing Slab Penetrations	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	03/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2205; A1-2865 Location: Zone 3,4, Train Platform Level - Ground Level Gridline: B-C/27-28; B-C/21-22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP-CR #016 See attached Virtual Building FP-CR #016 The vertical FSP pipe which is indicated on the plumbing plan P1-2205 is not marked on the slab edge plan A1-2865.(2015.01.20.) Followed the plumbing plans P1-2106, P1-2205 to model the pipes and followed the slab edge plans A1-2846 and A1-2865 to model the penetrations. Clash will remain between the pipes and the slab if there is not any penetration shown on the slab edge plans.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no penetration required, as the FSP goes up only to the Passageway Level (sheet P1-2220), it does not go up to Ground Level, thus there is no clash.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2323 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please clarify.							
T-2460	TTC - Missing Slab Penetration	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: P1-2205, A1-2865 Location: Zone 3,4, Lower Concourse Level - Ground Level Gridline: D.4-E.2/31.7-32; E.6-F/24-24.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP-CR #018				Please refer to P1-2305 for where sprinkler riser, FSP C5 penetrates the Ground Level (not P1-2205 FSP C5 'UP' which is the Lower Concourse Level). Slab penetration is not missing and shown as a 10" sleeve matching P1-2305. A1-2865 will therefore not be modified and is correct as is.			
See attached Virtual Building FP-CR #018				NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.			
The vertical FSP pipe which is indicated on the plumbing plans P1-2205 is not marked on the slab edge plan A1-2865. (2015.01.16)							
Followed the plumbing plans P1-2205, P1-2207 to model the pipes and followed the slab edge plans A1-2867 and A1-2865 to model the penetrations. Clash will remain between the pipes and the slab if there is not any penetration shown on the slab edge plans.							
Please clarify.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2463	TTC - Missing Sanitary and Vent Branch Pipes.	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	04/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2022; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Foundation Level; Train Platform Level Gridline: B-C/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #004 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #004 Foundation Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2022) shows FD-3 and FSK-2 which are not indicated on Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030). These are marked with red. The same equipment are marked with the same color fill on the plumbing floor plan and on the riser diagram. (2015.01.22.) Equipment will be modeled according the plumbing plan P1-2022. (2015.01.15.) Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Piping, cleanouts and drains are already installed. Sheet P1-2022 is correct. Refer to attached sketch for revised P1-5030.		
T-2464	TTC - Contradiction Between Plumbing Plans, Missing Sanitary and Vent Pipes	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	04/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2102; P1-5030; P1-3002 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: C.3-F.7/4-6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #009 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #009 Train Platform Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2102) shows sanitary and vent pipes which aren't indicated on Train Platform Level Enlarged Plan (P1-3002) and on Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030). These are marked with green dashed lines. The sanitary branch pipes are not connected into the main sanitary line. (2015.01.14.) Sanitary and Vent pipes will be modeled according the plumbing plan P1-2102. The sanitary pipes will be connected into the main sanitary line. The green dashed			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Both drawings are correct. Refer to attached sketch of sheet P1-3002		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2326 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>line symbolizes the pipe extension, 'connection' label marks the connection with the main line.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>							
T-2465	TTC - Missing Sanitary and Vent Branch Pipes	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	04/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: P1-2102; P1-2202; P1-5030		The floor plan P1-2102 is correct. There is sufficient information on the floor plan for the work to be clearly defined. The riser diagram P1-5030 will not be updated.					
Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level							
Gridline: A-C/1.4-3							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #010							
See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #010							
Horizontal and vertical Sanitary and Vent pipes and fixture units are shown on the Train Platform Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2102). These can not be found on the Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030) only the fixtures. These are marked with red. (2015.01.15.)							
Sanitary and Vent pipes and fixtures will be modeled in accordance with the plumbing plan P1-2102. (2015.01.15.)							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2327 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2466	TTC - Missing Sanitary and Vent Branch Pipes	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	04/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3002; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: C.3-D/2-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #012 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #012 Horizontal and vertical Sanitary and Vent pipes are shown on the Train Platform Level Enlarged Plan (P1-3002). Some of the sanitary and vent branch pipes can not be found on the Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030). These are marked with red. P1-3002 (ASI 128) plan shows combination standpipe sprinkler riser (tag 6) and irrigation service (tag 7) which connect into SAN system. Combination standpipe sprinkler riser should connect into fire protection system and irrigation service should connect into irrigation system. (2015.01.23.) Sanitary and Vent pipes will be modeled according the plumbing floor plan P1-3002. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The sheet notes on drawing P1-3002 for the piping below Restrooms B1240 and B1243 are the same notes shown on drawing P1-3017. A general note has been added to P1-3002 (see attached). The riser diagram has been updated in a previous bulletin.		
T-2467	TTC - Missing Sanitary and Vent Branch Pipes	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	04/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3002; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-C/5-6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #013 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #013 Horizontal and vertical Sanitary and Vent pipes are shown on the Train Platform Level Enlarged Plan (P1-3002). Some of the sanitary and vent branch pipes can not be found on the Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030). These are marked with red. (2015.01.14.) Sanitary and Vent pipes will be modeled according the			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The sheet notes on drawing P1-3002 for the piping below Restrooms B1240 and B1243 are the same notes shown on drawing P1-3017. A general note has been added to P1-3002 (see attached). The riser diagram has been updated in a previous bulletin.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2328 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	plumbing plan P1-3002.						
	Please confirm.						
T-2468	TTC - Contradicting Drain Box Connection	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	04/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company		Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/P1-3008; 4/P1-3008; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level; Ground Level Gridline: E.6/6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #024 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #024 Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030) shows, that Drain Box Restroom 01363 Area (marked with yellow frame) is connected into a pipe system (indicated with purple fill) which can not be found in this area. The Drain Box Restroom 01363 Area should be connected into the pipe system which indicated with green fill. The pipes which are connected to the Drain Box are marked with red arrows. The same branch pipes and equipment are marked with the same color fill or frame on the plumbing floor plan and on the riser diagram. Sanitary pipes will be modeled according the plumbing floor plan P1-3008. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Floor plans on drawing P1-3008 are correct. Refer to attached sketch of drawing P1-5030.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2329 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2469	TTC - Sanitary Vent and Gray Water Waste Vent Risers' Position is Changed	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	04/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-3002; 5/P1-3013 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: B-C/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #029 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #029 Upgoing Sanitary Vent; Gray Water Waste Vent; Sanitary Vent Riser From SAND/OIL Interceptor and Sanitary Vent From Treated Gray Water Tank pipes are shown on Train Platform Level Enlarged Plan (P1-3002) . The position of these pipes is changed on Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202). There is a contradiction between the pipe types too. It is reported in PLMBG-CR #131. (2015.01.23.) Vent pipes will be modeled according the plumbing plan P1-2202. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches for correct tags.		
T-2470	TTC - Connection Between Vent pipes is not Shown	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	04/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3002; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: C.3/5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #034 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #034 Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030) shows a connection between two Vent pipe branches (indicated with red and green fill). This connection is not shown on Train Platform Level Enlarged Plan (P1-3002). The suggested connection is indicated with red dashed line. The same pipe branches and equipment are marked with the same color fill or frame on the plumbing floor plan and on the riser diagram.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch for the vent connection.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2330 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Vent pipes will be modeled according the plumbing plan P1-3002 and the suggested pipe connection (indicated with red dashed line) will be used.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>							
T-2471	TTC - Contradiction Between Floor Plan and Detail	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	04/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: 4/P1-3006; P1-2107 Location: Zone 4, Train Platform Level Gridline: E.2/34.8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #048				This sheet was originally issued for the below grade package. We added the main package reference just below the original numbering system. No changes are required.			
See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #048							
Train Platform Level Zone 07 Plumbing Plan (P1-2107) shows a detail: 4/P1-3006. The name of the detail is contradicting with the floor plan: Lower Concourse Level Zone 07 Enlarged Floor Plan.							
Issue does not affect modeling.							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2332 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	14) Supply dimension.						
T-2472C	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/20/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2706 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridline: 5 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 768 SK1 See attached CD RFI 768 SK1 for items 1 to 8: 1) The noted dimension is missing on 2/A1-2972. Supply. 2) The noted dimension is missing on 2/A1-2972. Supply. 3) The noted dimension is missing on 2/A1-2972 but the dimension is 4'-3 3/4 per S1-2706. Please confirm. 4) Supply dimension. 5) Supply dimension. 6) Supply dimension. 7) Supply dimension. 8) Based on the edge of slab information on 2/A1-2972 and the 4" set back dimension, the W16x31 is 5'-0 south of Grid 'F' and detail 11/S1-2731 no longer applies. Please confirm.							
<hr/>							
T-2472D	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: 1/A1-2972 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 5 and D Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 769 SK1 See attached CD RFI 769 SK1: Please supply the missing dimension.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2333 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2472E	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2707 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 770 SK1							
See attached CD RFI 770 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the TOS elevations as shown are correct or supply the elevations. 2) Confirm the noted missing beam size is a W21x50 or supply the size.							
<hr/>							
T-2472F	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2706, 2/A1-2972 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridline: 5 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 771 SK1							
See attached CD RFI 771 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) It appears the edge of slab/curb information is not consistent. Please clarify where the edge of slab/curb is. 2) Depending on the response to item 1, please note the close proximity of the beams to each other and clarify their location to avoid fouling each other. 3) The W18x50 beams are shown on S1-7103 without giving their TOS Elevation and they are not shown at all on S1-2732. Confirm they are at TOS Elevation 117'-0 1/2 or clarify.							
<hr/>							
T-2472G	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: 3/S1-2731 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 772 SK1							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2472H	See attached CD RFI 772 SK1: As shown on attached SK1, detail 3/S1-2731 does not work with the beam size and given elevations. Please clarify.						
	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/20/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
	Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 1/S1-2731, 1/A1-8911, A1-2971 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 773 SK1 See attached CD RFI 773 SK1: This information does not appear to be shown on the architectural drawings (see 1/A1-8911). Please supply the location dimensions or supply the typical offset from the curb shown on A1-2971.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2335 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2472I	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: A1-2971 Location: Roof Park Level Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 774 SK1 See attached CD RFI 774 SK1 for items 1 to 10: 1) The noted dimensions add up to 42'-6 1/8 with the grid to grid dimension being 42'-6. Please advise which dimension is to be adjusted. 2) Please supply the missing dimension. 3) Please supply the missing dimension. 4) Please supply the missing dimension. 5) Please supply the missing dimension. 6) Please supply the missing dimension. 7) It is not clear what the noted dimensions are pointing to. Confirm the dimensions as indicated are correct or clarify. 8) Please supply the missing dimension. 9) Please supply the missing dimension. 10) Please supply the missing dimension.							
T-2472J	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: B/S1-2708 Location: Zone 7, Roof Park Level Gridline: E Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 775 SK1 See attached CD RFI 775 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) The noted dimensions have been adjusted to avoid fouling the base plate of the supporting column. Confirm that is acceptable. 2) The noted dimension has been adjusted to align the top of HSS10x10 with the underside of the W21x147. Confirm that is acceptable.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2336 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2472K	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 2/S1-2731 Location: Roof Park Level Gridlines: 6/ E.2-E.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 779 SK1 See attached CD RFI 779 SK1: Confirm the PJP weld as shown is acceptable for the top and bottom flanges.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-2472L	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2703 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 4 and F Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 780 SK1 See attached CD RFI 780 SK1: Please supply a connection detail for the north/south W12x19.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-2472M	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 1,2/S1-2726 ; 1A/S1-2723 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 782 SK1 See attached CD RFI 782 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the vent hole in the base plate for galvanizing the posts is acceptable as shown or supply the information. 2) Confirm the vent hole in the cap plate for galvanizing the posts is acceptable as shown or supply the information.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2337 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2472N	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2706 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 5/ D and F Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 785 SK1 See attached CD RFI 785 SK1: Confirm it is typically acceptable to substitute 1/S1-5010 with 1/S1-5011 for the beam to beam connection if 1/S15010 will extend past the edge of slab. If not, supply an alternate solution.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-2472O	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2706, 1/S1-5010, 1/S1-5011 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 5/ E.2 and E.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 786 SK1 See attached CD RFI 786 SK1: Detail 1/S1-5010 cannot be applied at the noted locations as the angles will foul each other. Confirm it is acceptable to apply connections 1 to 8 as shown.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-2472P	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2705. S1-2706 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 793 SK1 See attached CD RFI 793 SK1 for items 1 to 5: 1) Supply a connection detail for HSS beam to WF column web. 2) Confirm detail 4/S1-7600 may be applied at the noted							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>locations or supply a connection detail.</p> <p>3) Confirm detail 2/S1-2720 may be applied at the noted locations (the detail states that the connection is for HSS beam to WF column). If not, supply a detail for the noted connections.</p> <p>4) Supply a connection detail for the HSS beam to HSS post/HSS beam.</p> <p>5) Supply a connection detail for HSS beam to the HSS post at the top of the post.</p>						
T-2472Q	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From:	Webcor Construction LP	Quang Le	To:	Turner Construction Company	Phil Miliello	Answered By:	
Co-Author:	Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
REQUEST:	<p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-2705, 7/S1-2723</p> <p>Location: Roof Park Restaurant</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 795 SK1/SK2</p>	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
	<p>See attached CD RFI 795 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 7:</p> <p>1) Confirm dimensions or supply dimensions.</p> <p>2) Confirm dimensions or supply dimensions.</p> <p>3) Supply the length of the L4x4.</p> <p>4) Supply the welding for the L4x4.</p> <p>5) Supply missing dimension from Grid D & F.</p> <p>6) Supply missing dimension from Grid D & F.</p> <p>7) Supply connection information for PL1 5/8" to L4x4's.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2339 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2472R	VOID	Void	03/20/2015	03/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton			Answered By:				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 4/S1-7102 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridline: 5 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 797 SK1 See attached CD RFI 797 SK1: Confirm the top flanges of the W14x120's may be partially prepared as shown to match the thinner flange thickness of the W24x55 or supply a new detail for these CJP welds.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2473	HVC - Grease Duct at 16 and F Line Stair Conflict	Closed	03/17/2015	03/27/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: M1-2304 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Closest Column Line Intersection is 16-F Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A 24"x14" KX CFF duct is routed though FCC 01440 (stair 405) on the contact docs. The elevation of duct is driven by the steel beam at F-line pushing the duct in to the stair. Please see attached pictures extracted from the Navis model.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Duct size has been modified and reduced to 22x8 to resolve ceiling conflict over escalator. Drop in duct has been added to avoid conflict with Stair 405. Duct to be routed beneath Stair 405 and above Fire Command Center. Refer to attached SKM-RFI-T-2473-1		
T-2474	FPR - Application of Metal Lath on A1726	Closed	03/18/2015	04/20/2015	04/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Sheet A1-8662 Specification Section 05 10 00 Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Do not apply powder actuated fasteners to column. The best way to protect this column is to blast clean the primed surface and spray it with the specified fireproofing. If there is an alternate means, other than powder actuated fasteners, for attaching the metal lath and		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2340 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Add'l Doc Ref's: Email correspondence UL General Requirements</p> <p>Per the Fire Protection Matrix and Schedule/Sheet A1-8662, all structural steel columns at the Lower Concourse,</p> <p>Ground, Second, Bus Deck, and Roof Park Levels are to receive SFRM. Column A1726 is located at the Ground and Second levels and therefore requires SFRM.</p> <p>Per Specification Section 05 10 00 (3.2) P.3.b Structural Steel and fireproofing manufacture's requirements, the steel is scheduled to be unprimed and unpainted.</p> <p>As directed by TJPA (see attached email from Steve Cunningham) and agreed upon in the Structural Issues Meeting on 10/23/14, Column A1726 was painted Obstinate Orange for the Steel Erection Event.</p> <p>Coatings have not been tested for compatibility with SFRM.</p> <p>Per UL general requirements (see attached) metal lath will need to be applied over the paint, prior to the application of SFRM.</p> <p>Please confirm the use metal lath, attached with power actuated fasteners, on the painted areas of Column A1726 is acceptable in order to comply with UL and the fire rating.</p>				<p>the alternate system fully complies with a UL tested assembly that is appropriate for this location, please submit additional information for review and a shop drawing submittal.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 04/16/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 04/29/2015</p>		
T-2475	TTC - Missing Plumbing Pipes	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	04/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>Contract Doc: A1-2862; P1-2202 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: D-E/1.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #054</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #054</p> <p>The A1-2862 Slab Edge Plan shows plumbing penetration (marked with red fill), but there is no vertical plumbing pipe on the P1-2202 Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan or P1-2302 Ground Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan. The FSP system (marked with yellow) has no connection on ASI 128 floor plans only on the Fire Protection Riser Diagram P1-5040 (the connection marked with orange), although the previous ASI P1-2302 contained this connection. The P1-2202 shows a Sprinkler Drain (SPDR) (marked with purple) standpipe which does not appear on the P1-2302 only an FSP standpipe (yellow) which marked both 6 (Combination Standpipe Sprinkler Riser) and 54 (3" Sprinkler Drain). The same systems are marked with the same color. (2015.01.23.)</p> <p>Modeled the pipes according to the plumbing plan, and the slabs according to the slab edge plan.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						
T-2476	TTC - Missing Plumbing Penetrations and Plumbing Pipes	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	05/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: A1-2862; P1-2202 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: C.3-E.6/2-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #056</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #056</p> <p>The P1-2202 Plumbing Plan shows vertical plumbing pipes (marked with red fill) which hasn't got penetrations on the Slab Edge Plan A1-2862. The A1-2862 shows drain</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Refer to attached sketches SKA-4489, SKP1-2202 and SKP1-2302 for revised area drain locations at main slab.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 4/13/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/6/2015</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2342 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	(marked with orange fill), but there are no vertical plumbing pipes on the P1-2202 Plumbing Plan. (2015.01.15)						
	Modeled the pipes according to the plumbing plan, and the slabs according to the slab edge plan. Clash remains.						
	Please confirm.						
T-2477	TTC - Missing Plumbing Penetrations	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	05/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Heath						
REQUEST:	Contract Doc: A1-2864; P1-2204; P1-2304 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D-G/16-17 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #098 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #098 The Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2204) shows a standpipe (marked with red fill) which has not got penetration on the Ground Level Zone 04 Slab Edge Plan (A1-2864). The Ground Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2304) shows a Trench drain in this location with a connection of 3" diameter which requires a sleeve with 6" diameter. (2015.01.15) Modeled the pipes according to the plumbing plan, and the slabs according to the slab edge plan. Clash remains. Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Please refer to enclosed sketches SKA-4570, SKP1-2204 and SKP1-2304 indicating drain information at elevator trench drain areas. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/6/2015		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2478	TTC - Standpipe-Area Drain Annotation Error	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2205; P1-2305; A1-2865 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/21-22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #115 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #115 The Lower Concourse Level Zone 05 Plumbing Plan (P1-2205) shows three floor drains (marked with red circles) instead of three standpipes. The Area Drains are one level above, on the Ground Level Zone 05 Plumbing Plan (P1-2305). The P1-2305 shows three 2" AD fixtures but their sleeves do not appear on the Ground Level Zone 05 Slab Edge Plan (A1-2865). These Area Drains and their IW system are not shown on the Riser Diagrams. (2015.01.23.) Area Drains will be modeled of a diameter with 2". (2015.01.23.) Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKP1-2205. Architectural slab edge drawings will not be revised as openings smaller than 4" are not indicated. These drains require a 2" diameter openings and will only be indicated in the plumbing drawings. Refer also to typical detail 4/A1-7552.				
T-2479	TTC - Missing Pipes at Train Platform Level	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	05/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202, P1-2102; P1-3002 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: A-B/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #119 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #119 The P1-2202 Lower Concourse Level Plumbing Plan shows FSK-2 floor sink (marked with yellow fill), but there are no vertical plumbing pipes on the P1-2102 Train Platform Level Plumbing Plan. The FSK-2 floor sink will be modeled without any pipe connection.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches showing the drain and vent piping for SK-2 in Room B1229. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/9/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/6/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2344 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2480	TTC - Contradiction Between the Size of the Pipes	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	05/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: P1-2102; P1-2110; P1-5020		Refer to attached sketches for SAN/AD/PD pipe sizes.					
Location: Train Platform Level							
Gridline: Global							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #022		Date Answered by Design Team: 4/9/2015					
		Date Closed by WOJV: 5/6/2015					
See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #022							
On Train Platform Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2102) and on Train Platform Level Zone 10 Plumbing Plan (P1-2110) it is shown 3" Pump Discharged Sanitary pipes going down to Sump Pumps (SP). Waste Water Piping Diagram (P1-5020) shows 4" Pump Discharged Sanitary pipes going down to Sump Pumps (SP).							
Pump Discharged Sanitary pipes will be modeled with 3" diameter according to floor plan P1-2102; P1-2110.							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2345 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2481	TTC - Contradiction Between Floor Plan and Details	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	04/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/P1-2104; 2/P1-2104; P1-3001 Location: Zone 2,3, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-H/17-19 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #126 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #126 There is a contradiction between the P1-2104 and 1;2/P1-3001. The P1-2104 shows V(SAN) (marked with green fill) and V(OSI) (marked with red fill) pipes start in Mechanical Pump Room B2420 and B2442 but the details show these vent pipes in the different order than floor plan. (2015.01.20) Pipes will be modeled according to the P1-2104. (2015.01.20.) Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The previous response from the design team is correct: Floor plan P1-2104 dated 3/21/14 is correct. Details 1 and 2/P1-3001 may not show the vents in the same order.		
T-2482	TTC - Contradiction Between Floor Plan and Details	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	04/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2105; 1/P1-3006 Location: Zone 3, Train Platform Level Gridline: C-H/22-25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #128 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #128 There is a contradiction between the P1-2105 and 1/P1-3006. The P1-2105 shows V(SAN) (marked with red fill) and V(OSI) (marked with cyan fill) pipes start in Mechanical Pump Room B2540 but the detail shows these vent pipes in the different order than floor plan. (2015.01.20) Pipes will be modeled according to the P1-2105. (2015.01.20.) Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The previous response from the design team is correct: The floor plan (P1-2105 issued with ASI-128) is correct, the line noted SN #15 is a V(OSI). Detail 1/P1-3006 may not show the vents in the same order.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2346 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2483	TTC - Contradiction Between Floor Plan and Details	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2107; 4/P1-3006 Location: Zone 4, Train Platform Level Gridline: D-E/32-35 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #130 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #130 There is a contradiction between the P1-2107 and 4/P1-3006. The P1-2107 shows V(SAN) (marked with light blue fill) and V(GWW) (marked with green fill) pipes start in Mechanical Pump Room B2761 but the details show these vent pipes in the different order than floor plan. (2015.01.20) Pipes will be modeled according to the P1-2107. (2015.01.23.) Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The previous Design Team response is correct: The floor plan P1-2107 is correct. Detail 4/P1-3006 may not show the vents in the same order. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2484	TTC - Contradiction Between Floor Plans and Riser Tags	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	05/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-3002; 5/P1-3013 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: B-C/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #131 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #131 Referring to PLMBG-CR #029 issue the position of the risers are different, but the type of the pipes are different too according to the pipe tags. The P1-3002 shows a 2" vent pipe(marked with orange) but the other floor plans (5/P1-3013; P1-2202) show there is a 8" ST riser (marked with light blue). (2015.01.15) Modeled this riser as 8" ST followed the P1-2202 and 5/P1-3013 sheets. The pipe tag on P1-3002 sheet should be updated. (2015.01.15.)			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the attached sketch for corrected sheet note. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/9/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/6/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2347 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2485	TTC - Contradicting Elements	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	05/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3015; P1-2104 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level, Train Platform Level Gridline: D.4-D.8/16-16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #142 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #142 There is a contradiction between the 1/P1-3015 Partial plan and the P1-2104 Plumbing plan because the floor plan shows two pipes flipped compared to the partial plan. Pipes will be modeled according to the P1-2104 Plumbing plan. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch SKP1-2104 RFI T-2485 for revised order of vent connections. This item should be coordinated in the subcontractor 3D coordination process as part of the submittal development. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/10/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/6/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2348 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2486	TTC - Contradiction Between Plumbing Pipe Types	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2207; 1/P1-3003 Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D.4/32-32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #145 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #145 There is a contradiction on the P1-2207 Lower Concourse Level Zone 07 Plumbing Plan. It shows that the vent pipe from the Treated Grey Water Tank connect to the <35> 4" San Vent Riser from Sand/Oil Interceptor (marked with red) instead of the <36> 4" San Vent from Treated Grey Water Tank (marked with light blue). (2015.01.23.) The Vent pipe from the TGWT will be connected to the <36> marked riser (light blue). Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch SKP1-2207 RFI T-2486 for the corrected vent connection. This item should be coordinated in the subcontractor 3D coordination process as part of the submittal development. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/10/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
T-2487	TTC - GWW/PD Pipes Shown on Riser Diagrams not on Floor Plans	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3002; P1-5010; P1-2104 Location: Zone 1,2,3, Train Platform Level Gridline: C.3-D/4-5; B-C/18-19 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #153 See attached Virtual Building PLMBG-CR #153 There are four GWW/PD pipes shown on Reuse Water System Piping Diagram P1-5010 but they are not indicated on any floor plan. (2015.01.15.) Pipes will not be modeled. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches SKP1-2104, SKP1-2106, SKP1-2107, SKP1-2202, SKP1-2204, SKP1-2206, SKP1-2207, SKP1-3002, SKP1-3012. Plumbing plans show diagrammatic routing of piping. Exact pipe location and routing shall be coordinated with sub-contractor. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/27/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
T-2488	TTC - Missing Dimensions Between HSS Beams	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2349 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2489	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2402; S1-2403; S1-2404 Location: Zone 1, 2, Second Level Gridline: B-H/1.4-16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR-CR #003 See attached Virtual Building STR-CR #003 Missing dimensions on the second level framing plans S1-2402, S1-2403, S1-2404. Dimensions are not shown between the edge of slab and the HSS beams. The HSS beams will be placed 6" (to beam centerline) from the slab edge. Infill beams will be placed with equal spacing per general note GR-13 (S-0005). Please provide missing dimensions.	Julia John	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello						
	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please reject this RFI. This information has been answered before in numerous RFI's. This information has been confirmed via Shop Drawings thus, these dimensions are not missing. Many of the structural steel pieces this RFI refers to have already fabricated, Virtual Model notwithstanding.						
T-2489	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2864; 1/A1-7311 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D-D.4/15-16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR-CR #023 See attached Virtual Building STR-CR #023 There are contradictions between the marked dimensions of escalator pit on the architectural slab edge plan A1-2864 and the architectural callout plan 1/A1-7311. The sheet 1/A1-7311 shows 5' - 7/8" to width of pit slab but the sheet A1-2864 shows 5' - 7" to the same place. Followed the marked dimensions on architectural slab edge plan A1-2864. Please confirm.	Julia John	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello						
	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Please refer to SKA-4547 for clarification.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2350 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2490	TTC - Missing Sump Pit on Structural Drawings	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2302, A&B/A1-7101, 1&3/A1-8714, 1/A1-7001, S1-2302, 1/S1-7001 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: E.6-F/1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR-CR #031 See attached Virtual Building STR-CR #031 The architectural plans A1-2302, A&B/A1-7101, 1&3/A1-8714 show the sump pit in the PE201 elevator pit but the other plan (1/A1-7001) does not mark sump pit at this area. (2015.01.20.) The plans A1-2302, A&B/A1-7101, 1&3/A1-8714 will be followed to model the sump pit in the PE201 elevator pit. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. There is nothing to clarify in drawings.		

T-2491	TTC - Contradiction Between the Floor Plan and the Detail	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2302, 8/S1-3700 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: C/5-6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR-CR #033 See attached Virtual Building STR-CR #033 The structural framing plan S1-2302 shows a W40x503 steel beam on gridline C and a slab step but the lines on this plan show more slab edges (red dashed lines). The 8/S1-3700 detail (refers to S1-2302 floor plan) shows the steel beam not on the gridline and multiple steps of slab edges in the same area. In addition, the 4/S1-5022 detail shows a similar double-step, and there is a right step marker in front of that detail. Followed the structural detail 8/S1-3700 to model the slab steps and followed the structural framing plan S1-2302 to modeled the steel beam.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The previous response from the Design Team is correct: Detail 3/S1-3700 applies at this location.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2351 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2492	TTC - Contradiction Between the Framing Plan and the Slab Edge Plan	Closed	03/18/2015	03/28/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: S1-2306; A1-2866 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: E-E.2/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR-CR #035		The previous response from the Design Team is correct. Follow the Architecture Slab Edge Plan A1-2866.					
See attached Virtual Building STR-CR #035							
The structural framing plan S1-2306 shows a slab opening in the marked area, but the architectural slab edge plan A1-2866 does not show the opening. The MEP plans show the opening, but there is not any vertical MEP element shown in this opening. The exact position and dimensions are missing.							
The slab edge plan A1-2866 will be followed and the slab opening will not be modeled.							
Please confirm.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2493	TTC - Undefined Curb/Wall Alignment	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc:A1-2202-A1-2210; A1-2302-A1-2307; A1-2402-A1-2407; A1-2502-A1-2507 Location: Lower Concourse Level - Bus Deck Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #014 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #014 The architectural plans where the architectural walls are represented show dimension lines up to the edges of the walls, exterior or interior faces depending of the case. The architectural curbs below are correctly designated following the schedules but in a lot of cases the thickness of the curb doesn't belong to the wall above. We don't have any information about the alignment between the curb and the wall above when the thickness varies. These curbs will be modeled aligned to the dimensioned faces of the walls above. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Dimensions on floor plans are to the face of wall. Locate curbs so that they are centered on the metal stud wall framing per specification section 05 41 00 3.2.J. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/27/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
<hr/>							
T-2494	TTC - Contradiction Between the Slopes Based on the Elevation Points	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2962 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: C-G/12-14 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #028 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #028 The 1/A1-2962 shows the slope and the elevation points of the built up slabs. The points of the built up slabs are defined correctly but the slope where it is marked with red have +0.1% difference, the slope marked with blue has - 0.1% difference compared to the plan. Followed the elevation points and the slopes will be different.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please reject this RFI. The topic of rounded slope values has already been responded to in a number of previous RFIs. A less than 1/10th of 1 percent deviation represents a real-world deviation of less than 1/8" over 10 feet. See responses to RFIs T-2310, T-2306 and T-2296.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2353 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2495	TTC - Contradiction Between the Slopes Based on the Elevation Points	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:					
Contract Doc: 2/A1-2961							
Location: Zone1, 2, Ground Level							
Gridline: D-F/10-11							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #032							
See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #032.							
The 2/A1-2961 shows the slopes and the elevation points of the built up slabs. The points of the built up slabs are defined correctly but the slopes have +0.1% difference compared to the plan.							
Followed the elevation points and the slopes will be different.							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2354 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2496	TTC - Missing Dimension Line to the Edge of the Topping Slab	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-2961 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D-D.4/16-16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #039 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #039. There is not any dimension line for the highlighted topping slab that defines the edge of it. The edge of this topping slab will be cut without any curb (marked with red dashed line). The missing edge of the topping slab will be aligned to the right-side edge of the curb on its north side (marked with green fill). Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4655 for dimension requested.		
T-2497	TTC - Contradiction Between Slab Edge Plans and Typical Detail	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-2961; 1/S1-7302; 6/S1-7660; A1-2863 Location: Zone 1, 2, Ground Level Gridline: D-F/10-11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #040 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #040. The callout on the slab edge plan 2/A1-2961 shows the boundary and the elevation points of the built-up slabs. The callout on the framing plan 1/S1-7302 shows a typical section detail 6/S1-7660. The detail shows a 10" curb on concrete slab but the slab edge plan does not indicate any curb at the same place. The curbs may cause differences in the slope of the built-up slabs based on the slab edge plan A1-2863. Followed the slab edge plan A1-2863 and the curb won't be modeled.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Shop drawings for this area have already been reviewed and approved. Refer to TG0702-030.0 dated 11/20/2014. GC shall coordinate between sub-contractors. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/27/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2355 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2498	TTC - Contradiction Between Dimension Lines	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:					
Contract Doc: A1-3105; 1/A1-3196							
Location: Zone 2, Ground Level							
Gridline: C-D.4/14-15							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #052							
See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #052.							
There is a contradiction between the marked dimension lines. The partial plan A1-3105 refers to the detail 1/A1-3196.							
Followed the partial plan A1-3105 to model the curb and wall.							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2356 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2499	TTC - Incorrect Slope of Slab	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-3105 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D.4-G/14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #054 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #054. There are contradictions between the elevation points of the slab and the slope of the slab. If we follow the elevation points, the slope will be 3.4% instead of 1.1%. Followed the elevation points and the slope will be modeled as 3.4%. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please reject this RFI. This RFI is identical to RFI T-2238 and has already been addressed NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2500	TTC - Contradiction Between the Top Elevations of Ramp	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2963; S1-2351 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: C.3-D.4/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #056 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #056. There are contradictions between floor plans A1-2963 and S1-2351. The top of elevations of ramp are different on the plans. Followed the floor plan A1-2963 to model the ramp. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For ramp elevations, refer to sheet A1-2963 which indicates the same spot elevations as the loading dock plan, A1-3100.				
T-2501	TTC - Missing Dimensions of Penetration	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	04/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2357 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2863 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: C.3-D/11-12 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #074 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #074. The penetration marked with yellow is below a structural curb and the exact dimension of the penetration is missing. (2015.01.16.) The penetration will be modeled below the curb and the dimensions shown on the screenshot will be used. Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-2502	BGP - Lower Concourse Elevator Pit Conflict with Column	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Sylvia Hartanto							
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2207 & S1-7111 Location: Lower Concourse Level Elevator Pit Grid Line: GL 32 - 32.4 & GL E Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached See attached documents of elevator pit at grid lines 32-32.4 and cross grid line E. The current elevator pit's 10" wall encroaches columns C247 & C248 by 5". These columns have been poured to bottom of moment frame beam at 32.4. The structural details at this specific location are not provided and the current conflict is in-constructible. Please confirm that decreasing the 10" wall to a 4" wall is acceptable and provide rebar details at this location.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: It is acceptable to notch the elevator pit slab and exterior wall around the columns. The minimum pit wall thickness shall be 4" and the plan extent of the notch shall be 36" centered on each of the columns. The pit wall shall not contact the columns. THE ELEVATOR PIT INTERIOR WALL FACE SHALL REMAIN PER CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS EDGE OF SLAB PLAN. GC shall confirm pit dimensions with the elevator subcontractor. Pit Wall Reinforcing: Inside face vertical and horizontal bars are unaffected. They shall be the sole reinforcing passing through the notched wall section. Exterior face horizontal reinforcing shall terminate with a horizontal hook at each notch reentrant corner. The hook length at each notch may be reduced to 6". Exterior face vertical reinforcing shall terminate at each notch. On both sides of each notch, provide (2) additional exterior face vertical bars located within 16" of the notch reentrant corner.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2358 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2503	TTC - Contradiction Between Structural Floor Plan and Detail in Sump Pit	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2024; 2/S1-3008; A1-2814 Location: Zone 3, 4, Mat Slab Level Gridline: C.3-C/18-19 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #076 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #076. There is a contradiction in the dimensions of the sump pit. Meanwhile the S1-2024 shows a 4'-0" dimension between the 18 grid and the boundary of the pit, the S1-3008 detail restrict the highlighted dimension to 5'-0" between the deepest edge of the hole and the sloped face of the sump pit by its bottom. If we keep this 5'-0" dimension, it is impossible to keep a 4'-0" distance to the grid to the boundary and it becomes to 4'-0 3/8". At the opposite side, the deep of the hole is restricted by a 38'-6" elevation and the edge of the boundary of the pit is restricted by A1-2814 following the chain of dimension lines. In this case it is impossible to keep a 5" typical distance between the deepest edge of the hole and the sloped face of the right side of the pit and it becomes 5'-0 1/2". The dimension 4'-0 3/8" will be used from the grid 18 and 5 1/2" will be used at the sloped face. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The constructability assumption is incorrect. The 5'-0" clearance as labeled "MIN", which stands for "minimum". Follow the dimensions on the plans. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2504	TTC - Incorrect Elevation Sign	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2863 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: F-G/11-12 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #077 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #077. The elevations marked with yellow define the TOC and there is not any element which can set with the elevation marked with red. The elevation marked with red will be ignored. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The constructability assumption is incorrect. The contractor is advised to look at the latest drawing A1-2863 issued in ASI-0130. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.			
T-2505	TTC - Contradiction Between Curbs	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The previous response from the Design Team stands. Follow A1-2963. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.			
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2863; A1-2963 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: D-D.4/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #079 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #079. There is a contradiction between the curbs (marked with yellow) on the plans A1-2863 and A1-2963. The run of the curb(s) are shown differently on the plans and the thickness of the curb(s) are also missing. The plan A1-2963 shows only one start and one end point for the curb. The dimensions on the plan A1-2963 will be followed to model the curbs. Modeled the curb with 9" thickness as shown the screenshot of A1-2963. Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2360 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2506	TTC - Contradicting Dimensions of HSS Steels at Stair 202	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/S1-7004; 5/A1-7004 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: D-E/1.4-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #082 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #082. There are contradictions between the placement of the HSS steels around the stair 202. The detail 3/S1-7004 and the detail 5/A1-7004 show them with different dimensions. The detail 3/S1-7004 will be followed. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The steel locations have been approved and returned in the steel shop drawing. No actions is required. WOJV should coorinate the Virtual Building model with the completed construction and submittals. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/9/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2507	TTC - The Cricket is Inside the Built-up Slab	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2863; A1-2961 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: E-G/9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #088 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #088. The red marked part of the cricket which is shown on the plan 1/A1-2961 is in clash with the built-up slab. The elevation of the concrete cover is 19.21" based on the plan A1-2863. The lowest point of the built-up slab is 19,06" so the cricket will be under the built-up The cricket will be modeled as shown on the screenshot and the clash will remain. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Water will run around plinth. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2508	TTC - Incorrect Dimensions of the Structural Curb	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	04/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2250 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F.7-G/5-6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #098 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #098. If the radius of the curb (marked with yellow) is 52'-6" then the dimensions marked with red cannot be followed. The length of the arc need to be longer than the dimensions shown. The dimensions will be modeled as shown on the screenshot of the model. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> WOJV to respond to this RFI. The Design Team has responded and issued a revised drawing in ASI-0127. See the "Design Response" and "Resolution" on page 2 of the attached pdf.				
T-2509	TTC - Contradicting Dimensions of Plumbing Penetrations	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2863; A1-2963; P1-0051; P1-2303 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: D/6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #102 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #102. The architectural slab edge plan A1-2863 shows the pipe sleeves (diam.:10", 6" and 4"), the architectural callout plan A1-2963 shows two sleeves with 8" and 6" and one sleeve without diameter, but the plumbing floor plan P1-2303 shows a 4" SAN riser, an 8" ST riser and a 2" SAN VENT riser on the same place. Based on the pipe sleeve schedule P1-0051 the diameters of the sleeves are 10", 6" and 4". The diameters of the sleeves and the exact positions are contradicting. The PH3 - CR #089 issue includes the missing dimensions. The penetrations modeled with the diameters of 10", 6" and 4" and the PH3 - CR #089 was followed.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Design Team disagrees that the plans do not match. A1-2863 and A1-2963 are identical. Plumbing drawings do not show penetration locations. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Please confirm.						
T-2510	TTC - Contradiction Dimension Values	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-9002; 1/A1-3196 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D-D.4/14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #106 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #106. There is a contradiction between 1/A1-9002 and 1/A1-3196. The 1/A1-9002 shows a type 9 wall with a CC curb below, but the 1/A1-3196 shows a type 9 wall only.(2015.01.19.) The CC curb was modeled. (2015.01.19.) Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> OK, we understand you virtual modeled the curb. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2511	TTC - Contradiction Between the Type Mark of the Curb	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-9001; 1/A1-3195 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: E.6-F/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #112 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #112. There is a contradiction between the plans 1/A1-9001 and 1/A1-3195. The detail 1/A1-9001 shows the curb with 'CC' type, the detail 1/A1-3195 shows the same curb with 'CC1' type. The detail 1/A1-3195 will be followed and modeled the curb with 'CC1' type. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Design Team disagrees that the curbs do not match. Both curb types are labeled 'CC'. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2512	TTC - Contradiction Between Dimensions of a Stair Landing	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 5/A1-7004; A/A1-7004 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level - Ground Level Gridline: D.4-E/1.4-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #119 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #119 There is a contradiction between the stair plan 5/A1-7004 and section A/A1-7004. The stair plan shows the distance between the edge of landing and the gridline 2, it is 6'-3 3/4" (marked with red rectangle on 5/A1-7004), but the section A/A1-7004 shows the same distance with 6'-5". Followed the stair plan 5/A1-7004 when modeled the landing (marked with red fill) and the distance between the landing and the gridline 2 will be 6'-3 3/4". Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Design Team disagrees that the dimensions do not match: 0'-2 1/2" + 2'-11 3/4" + 0'-10 3/4" + 2'-3 3/4" = 6'-4 3/4". NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2364 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2513	TTC - Clash Between Curbs and Slab Penetration	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-9064; P1-3002 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level - Lower Concourse Level Gridline: B-C/5-6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #132 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #132. The marked slab penetration (6" diameter) clashes the two curbs next to it and the walls above the curbs. The penetration, the curbs and the walls were modeled according to the plan 1/A1-9064. The clash remains as shown on the attached 3D screenshot. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Design Team disagrees that there is a clash. Refer to the previous response from the Design Team, which is correct. See 2/P1-3017. The penetrating pipe is 2" diameter. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				
T-2514	TTC - Missing Dimensions of Interior Walls	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-3005; 1&3/A1-9858; S1-2202 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F-F.7/2-3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #138 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #138. The architectural floor plan A1-3005 refers to the partition detail 1/A1-9858. This plan shows the operable partition, but the structure of the operable partitions are not clear (the expandable panel nose is missing, the panel thickness is not marked, the references on plan are incorrect - marked with red fill). Some note on the plan A1-9858 refer to structural details, but the structural plans does not show anything in this area. The operable partitions are not modeled. There is a wall with the type 20D (marked with blue) above the operable partition which was modeled according to the section 3/A1-9858(the section number is incorrect - see the PH3-			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI does not ask a question. All information necessary to the construction of the operable partition is available on A1-9858 and specification 10 22 39 NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2365 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2515	CR#127 issue). The bottom elevation of 20 D wall is 5'-6" AFF which was scaled from the section 3/A1-9858. The dimensions shown on the last screenshot will be used to model the wall on the floor plan.						
	Please confirm.						
	TTC - Contradiction Between Dimensions on Train Platform Level		Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP	Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
	Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Heath					
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
	Contract Doc: 1/A1-9215; E/A1-9217 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: C.3-D/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #145 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #145. There is a contradiction between sheet A1-9215 and detail E/A1-9217. E/A1-9217 shows that the length of wall should be 8' - 2 3/4". The wall is scaled from the model and if the dimensions (marked with yellow) are hold the length of the wall will be 8'-3 3/4 as it is indicated on the 1/A1-9215 screenshot. The wall is modeled with dimension 8' - 3 3/4 according to the screenshot. The opening is positioned from the left face of the wall. Please confirm.		Locate all concrete walls according to the plans. Center the MEP work on the wall as shown on E/A1-9217. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2366 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2516	TTC - Contradiction Between Showed Openings on Train Platform Level	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-9215; D/A1-9216; B/A1-9217 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-D/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #147 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #147 There is a contradiction between section D/A1-9216 and section B/A1-9217 (the sections are marked with green on A1-9215 screenshot). The section B/A1-9217 shows other two openings (marked with red) in the concrete wall of Corridor Service [B2222] (marked with yellow) but the openings are not indicated on the section D/A1-9216. The upper opening is clashing with the perpendicular wall. The openings are modeled according to section B/A1-9217. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Design Team disagrees that there is a conflict. Sections D/A1-9216 and B/A1-9217 are located in different rooms and therefore, they correctly show different information. The upper plumbing penetration shown on B/A1-9217 does not occur at the corridor wall, it occurs at the Storage Tank wall beyond as noted in the drawing. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
T-2517	TTC - Missing Dimension of the Opening	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: B/A1-9240 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: B-C/12-13 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #148 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #148. There is a missing dimension of the electrical opening (marked with yellow) on the A1-9240. The opening is modeled as on the screenshot. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Please see attached SKA-4568 with additional dimensions at opening.		
T-2518	TTC - Missing Horizontal Dimension and Diameter of Mechanical Opening	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	04/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2367 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p>				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: B/A1-9241; M1-2202 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F/3-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #149</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #149.</p> <p>The horizontal dimension and the diameter of the mechanical opening are missing on the B/A1-9241 sheet which shows the concrete wall (marked with yellow) on the mechanical plan. The M1-2202 plan shows a duct with 6" diameter (marked with green) at the same place but the information about the mechanical opening is missing.</p> <p>The mechanical opening will be modeled as showed on the second screenshot.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This 6" supply duct will have insulation (1.5" around) so will be about 9" OD. 12" diameter opening in the concrete wall is sufficient for this duct. Confirm dimensions with the the subcontractors and submittals.</p>		
T-2519	TTC - Contradiction Between Dimensions on Train Platform Level	Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p>				Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: A/A1-9216; E/A1-9217 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: C.3-D.4/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #150</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #150.</p> <p>There is a contradiction between section A/A1-9216 and section E/A1-9217. E/A1-9217 shows that the position of opening should be 1'-0" from the grid number 5 but the detail A/A1-9216 shows that the position of opening is 2'-7" from grid number 5. If the A/A1-9216 section is followed the dimensions will be incorrect on the E/A1-9217.</p> <p>The opening is modeled according to the detail A/A1-9216.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Follow the dimensions taken orthogonal to the wall on A/A1-9216.</p> <p>NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject		Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed	
T-2520	TTC - Contradiction Between Width Dimensions		Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	04/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From:		Webcor Construction LP	Julia John	To:		Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger
Co-Author:		Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Heath						
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc:		A1-2850		Confirmed, provide 1'-0" wide opening.					
Location:		Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level							
Gridline:		V-W/3							
Add'l Doc Ref's:		Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #152							
See attached		Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #152.							
The indicated dimensions of the penetration are contradicting A1-2850 plan.									
The opening will be modeled with the width of 1'.									
Please confirm.									
T-2521	TTC - Contradicting Sheets		Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	04/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From:		Webcor Construction LP	Julia John	To:		Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger
Co-Author:		Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Heath						
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc:		3/A1-3008; A1-2842		The plumbing penetration shown on A1-2842 and 3/A1-3008 are one and the same. Follow the dimensions on A1-2842 for locating the penetration.					
Location:		Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level							
Gridline:		D/3-4							
Add'l Doc Ref's:		Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #153							
See attached		Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #153.							
There is a contradiction between the 3/A1-3008 and the A1-2842 sheet. The 3/A1-3008 plan shows a PLBG penetration but this penetration is not on the slab edge plan (A1-2842).									
The slab edge plan will be followed and the penetration is not modeled.									
Please confirm.									
T-2522	TTC - Contradiction Between Sheets		Closed	03/19/2015	03/29/2015	04/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From:		Webcor Construction LP	Julia John	To:		Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger
Co-Author:		Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Heath						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2369 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: A1-2202 ; 15/A-0035 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D.4-D/2-3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #154 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #154. The B1226A door (marked with green) is correctly placed on the A1-2202 Floor plan according to detail number 15/A-0035 but the model does not match with the section A1-9241 because the section shows the door is in the center of the wall. The door will be modeled according to the A1-2202 and A-0035 plans. Please confirm.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>The Design Team disagrees that there is a conflict. Section D/A1-9241 was revised in ASI-0128.</div>		
T-2523	TTC - 2D Analysis Problem	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	04/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John</div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</div></div>	<div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>			<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>		
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: C/A1-9242; C/A1-9242(SKA-3328); 2/A1-3009 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C.3-D/7-8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #155 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #155. There is a contradiction on the newer C/A1-9242 section and the older C/A1-9242 (SKA-3328) section. The position of the gridline D (marked with blue) is changed on the latest plan. The correct position of gridline D is scaled from the 2/A1-3009 as on the screenshot. The good position is marked with green. The older position of gridline D is followed (marked with green). Please confirm.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Confirmed, the gridline is misplaced. Follow the gridline per plan 2/A1-3009 and section D/A1-9242.</div>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2370 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2524	TTC - Contradicting Curb Types on Lower Concourse Level	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	04/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 4/A1-7844; 5/A1-7011 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: E.2-E.6/16-17 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #156 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #156. There is a contradiction between A1-7844 and A1-7011. The 4/A1-7844 detail shows CC/B/H curb (marked with yellow) but the 5/A1-7011 plan shows type CC4 to the same curb. The curb was modeled type CC4 according to the 5/A1-7011. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, curb type CC4 is correct.				
T-2525	TTC - Missing Information About the Retractable Bollards Pullbox	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2310, 1/A1-7418/1, C/A1-7419 Location: Zone 1, Ground level Gridline: V/2-3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #157 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #157. There are missing information about the depth and width from a retractable bollards pullbox . The missing elevations and width have been scaled from the 1/A1-7418 detail and C/A1-7419 ramp partial section (marked with orange). Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See previous RFI responses on electrical boxes for retractable bollards. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2371 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2526	TTC - Incorrect Dimension Values	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	04/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3002 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: B-C/12-13 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #159 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #159. There is an incorrect dimension on the plan 1/A1-3002. The plan 1/A1-3002 shows that the distance between the pier and the face of the wall is 7'-3' (marked with yellow) but the distance will be 7'-9" if the size of the pier is 1'-4"x1'-4" (marked with green). The distance will be 7'-9" face of the wall as it is shown on the screenshot from the model. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The dimension 7'-3" on 1/A1-3002 is correct. Piers at this location are 22"x16", refer to reviewed and approved submittal TG0600-363.2.		
T-2527	TTC - Contradiction Between Plumbing Penetrations	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-2204;1/A1-3008 (SKA-3169);1/A1-2844 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: B-C/13-14 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #160 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #160. There is a contradiction between the 1/A1-3008 plan and 1/A1-2844. The 1/A1-3008 plan shows a plumbing penetration (marked with red), but the A1-2844 does not show that. (2015.01.16.) The model will be followed to 1/A1-2844 and 1/A1-2204 sheet. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Follow plumbing penetration dimensioned on A1-2844. Only #46 SAN Vent pipe penetrates the lower concourse slab. The #48 3/4" CD (pumped) pipe drains to the floor sink (FS) beside it and does not penetrate the lower concourse slab. Also, please refer to reviewed and approved submittal TG0600-121.2. The design team suggests that Tim Maxwell or a similar WOJV person experienced in MEP construction and the on-going already completed submittals is involved with the Virtual Building team to assist them in reading MEP, A, and S drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2372 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2528	TTC - Contradicted Elevations	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	04/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2842; B/A1-6231 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: A-C/1-1.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #162 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #162. There is a contradiction between the slab edge plan number A1-2842 and the section number B/A1-6231. The section shows -8'-2" elevation for the top of slab but the elevation is - 5'-5" for the top of slab. This issue is based on PH3-CR #064. Followed the slab edge plans A1-2842 . Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, follow the elevations provided on the slab edge plan A1-2842. Notice that detail A/A1-6231 issued with ASI-0128 provides the corresponding top of slab elevation for "Low Concourse West".			
<hr/>							
T-2529	TTC - Reference Error	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	04/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A/A1-9235; 1/A1-3001 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: A-B/2-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #163 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #163. The openings (marked with green) are scaled from the sloped topping (marked with green arrow) but the other openings (2'-0"x4'-6") are scaled from the highest point of the room slab which is -3'-6 1/2". Dimension can not be scaled from sloped slab. The openings (marked with green)will be scaled from the highest point of the room slab (-3'- 6 1/2"). Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2373 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2530	TTC - Incorrect Elevation	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	04/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3001 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: A-C/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #164 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #164. There is an unnecessary elevation (marked with purple) because the useable and correct elevation is next to it (marked with green). The slab will be modeled with the elevation of -4'-11" Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Lower concourse slab at identified location has already been constructed at the correct elevation of -4'-11".				
T-2531	TTC - Clashing Wall and Slab on Ground Level	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-2864(SKA-3674); 1/A1-9002 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D/14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #166 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #166. There is a clash between a CMU wall (and a curb below it), a slab (marked with green) and a curb below the slab (marked with blue). There is a gap between the slab and the structural steel beam (see the 3D Model screenshot). Elements were modeled with clash according to the plans 1/A1-9002 and 1/A1-2864(SKA-3674). Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See structural drawings. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2374 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2532	TTC - Contradiction Between Framing Plan and Floor Plan	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	04/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2203, A1-2203, 3/A1-9255 Location: Zone 1, 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: H-L/7-11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #168 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #168. There is a contradiction between the floor plan (A1-2203) and the framing plan (S1-2203). The framing plan shows different wall layout from the floor plan. The walls marked with green are missing from the plan A1-2203. The beams will be modeled according to S1-2203. The ramp knee will be modeled according to A1-2203. The width of the wall is missing it is scaled from the plan and it will be modeled with 8". Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Vehicle and Bike Ramp shop drawings have been approved, and the ramps are currently under construction.		
T-2533	TTC - Contradiction Between Sheet A/A1-7233 and 4/A1-7576	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	04/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A/A1-7233; 4/A1-7576 Location: Zone 1, 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: 16-D.8 / E / E.2; 4-5/D.4-E.6; 8-9/D.8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #170 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #170. There is a contradiction between sheet A/A1-7233 and 4/A1-7576. A/A1-7233 shows that the distance between elevation of Lower Concourse West (-4'-11") and the T/O Elevator Pit (-10'-11") is 6'-0" but the detail number 4/A1-7576 shows the same distance between elevation Lower Concourse West (-4'-11") and Bottom of Elevator Pit. The A/A1-7233 will be followed. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pit depth clearly identified on A/A1-7233 and on the edge of slab drawings. Note on detail 4/A1-7576 should read "to bottom of pit".		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2375 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2534	TTC - Contradiction Between Slab Edge Plan and Floor Plan	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	04/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2842; A1-2202; 1/A1-3005; 1/A1-9804 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: E.2-F/3-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #171 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #171. There are some PLBG openings on the A1-2842 slab edge plan (marked with green) but these openings are not shown on the architectural plans. The openings will be modeled according to the A1-2842 plan. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive layout shop drawings for Lower Concourse have been reviewed and approved, and the floor slab has already been constructed. See your shop drawings for this work.				
T-2535	TTC - Contradiction Between Elevations and Slope on Ground Level	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	04/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2961 (SKA-3312) Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D/16-16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #172 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #172. There is a contradiction on 3/A1-2961 (SKA-3312). If the elevations of the slab are followed (marked with green) the 2.3% slope (marked with yellow) will be incorrect. The slab will be modeled according to the elevations. The slope will be 2.9%(see the image above) instead of 2.3%. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Follow the elevations identified in this RFI. Calculated slope actually DOES work out to 2.3%, based on (rise/run=0.05/21.5 x 100 = 2.3).				
T-2536	TTC - Contradiction Between the Position of the Piers and Size of Wall Openings	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	04/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



T-2537	SCS - DBA Steel Connections At TG 19.9 and TR 20.1	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2305, S1-3702, S1-3707 Location: Ground Level Grid Line: GL 19, 20 Add'l Doc Ref's: Attached		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Please reference Contract Drawings S1-2305, S1-3702, and S1-3707 regarding the DBA Steel Connections at TR 19.9 and TR 20.1. Also reference Structural Steel Shop Drawings E4, 609AC, E5, and 701AB.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1. On SI-2305, TR 19.9 and TR 20.1 have Detail 9/SI-3702 is cut showing top of concrete running sloped. However, by cross referencing elevations on S1-2305, the concrete is stepped, not sloped, at the concrete/TR connection. The stepped condition is closest to 6/S1-3707. Please confirm				Confirmed that the connection of the concrete beam shall be similar to Detail 6/S1-3707.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2377 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	that Detail 6/S1- 3707 should be used for the concrete/TR girder interaction at TR19.9 and 20.1 south instead of Detail 9/SI-3702.						
T-2538	SSS - Cast Node Type 16 Deviation Request	Closed	03/20/2015		03/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Stephanie Azzolino	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Bradken, Inc.		Wayne Braun					
REQUEST: Contract Doc: N/A Location: Ground Level Cast Node Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A See attached Dimensional report and numbered print. Bradken has found dimensional deviations in items 48, 49 and 50. Please confirm attached dimensions are acceptable.		SUGGESTION: Please provide disposition on out of tolerance conditions.	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. GC to coordinate the impact of this dimensional deviation with other sub-contractors and any fit up or other issues that might arise due to this condition are addressed at no cost to the owner. Reason for RFI (TT): None given. We categorize this RFI as substitution request. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2378 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2539	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015	04/09/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-7102 Location: Zone 2 Gridlines: 5 and D.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 766 SK1 See attached CD RFI 766 SK1 for items 1 to 4: 1) Please provide beam location. 2) Confirm WT flange and web thicknesses to match beam below as shown. 3) As details 4 & 5/S1-5002 cannot be applied here, provide stiffener plate thickness and weld. 4) Supply weld size.				1) The W12x19 beams are located from edge of slab on S1-7102. See enclosed SKA-4558-R1 for edge of slab locations. 2) Provide BU-WT, stiffeners and weld sizes per 5/S1-5002. 3) Refer top response to 2) above. 4) Refer top response to 2) above.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2540	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2703 Location: Roof Park Level Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 767 SK1 See attached CD RFI 767 SK1 for items 1 to 14: 1) Confirm the noted connections should be indicated as moment connections at 7 locations. 2) Confirm the cantilevered beams are the same size as the back-span beam at 7 locations or supply the missing beam sizes. 3) Confirm 90 degrees or supply the angle. 4) Supply dimension. 5) Supply dimension. 6) Clarify what is meant by the noted line. 7) Confirm 90 degrees or supply the angles. 8) Depending on the response to items 1 & 2, supply a moment connection detail for the non-aligned flanges. 9) It is not clear where the cantilevered beams terminate as a detail is not shown. Please clarify the extent of the cantilevered beams at 7 locations. 10) Confirm dimension. 11) Supply dimension. 12) Supply dimension. 13) Supply dimension. 14) Supply dimension.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Highlighted connections are not moment connections. The cantilevered member is an angle, not a WF beam. Edge of slab detail 9/S1-5000 shall apply at the 7 highlighted locations. In lieu of the backspan kicker brace per 9/S1-5000, provide bracing as follows: a) Where backspan beam is W12 and edge beam is W16, provide a plate brace similar to 6/S1-5015, except that plate thickness shall be 1/2" and fillet welds shall be 3/8". b) Where backspan beam and the edge beam are same size, provide a flange to flange moment connection between the two beams. c) Where backspan beam is W21x147 and edge beam is W21x44, provide a full depth shear plate connection per 1/S1-5013. 2) See response to 1). 3) Confirmed. 4) Highlighted dimension is 2' - 4 3/4". 5) Highlighted dimension is 15' - 0". 6) The short line is a graphical error and shall be ignored. 7) Confirmed. 8) See response to 1). 9) See response to 1). 10) Confirmed. 11) Highlighted dimension is 5' - 3 3/4". 12) Highlighted Dimension is 1'-3 1/2". The HSS5x0.375 is centered on the horizontal HSS10x6x3/8 beam shown on S1-2704. See attached sketches SKA-4550 and SKA-4551 for location of			





Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2381 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 1/A1-2972 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 5 and D Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 769 SK1 See attached CD RFI 769 SK1: Please supply the missing dimension.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4558, for requested dimension.			
T-2543	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2707 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 770 SK1 See attached CD RFI 770 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the TOS elevations as shown are correct or supply the elevations. 2) Confirm the noted missing beam size is a W21x50 or supply the size.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with the reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as called out on contract documents.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2382 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2544	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2706, 2/A1-2972 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridline: 5 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 771 SK1 See attached CD RFI 771 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) It appears the edge of slab/curb information is not consistent. Please clarify where the edge of slab/curb is. 2) Depending on the response to item 1, please note the close proximity of the beams to each other and clarify their location to avoid fouling each other. 3) The W18x50 beams are shown on S1-7103 without giving their TOS Elevation and they are not shown at all on S1-2732. Confirm they are at TOS Elevation 117'-0 1/2 or clarify.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The 2" dimension between the two steel beams as shown on SK1 in the RFI is incorrect. S1-2732 does not callout the 11' - 5 5/8" dimension as shown on SK1. Distance between the W16 and W18 beams is 8 3/4" which makes the total distance between the west edge of the elevator roof curb and GL 5 to be 12' - 0 3/8" and is consistent with A1-2972. However, with the current locations of the two W18x50 beams (centered on the guide rail HSS posts), the beam flanges project into the hoistway space. To provide required hoistway clearance move the W18x50 posts away from the hoistway space so that centerline distance the two W18x50 beams increases to 9' -9 1/2". 2) The two beams do not foul each other. See response to 1). 3) As per the Elevator consultants recommended dimension, the datum will be 116'-7". Please note that this datum is subject to change as required by the awarded Elevator Contractor's requirements. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			
T-2544.1	SSS - PE204 Missing Information	Closed	04/01/2015		04/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2706 and 2/A1-2972 Location: PE 204 and Roof Park Restaurant Gridline: 5 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 771.1 SK1 This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-2544 (SK 1051, CD 771) See attached CD RFI 771.1 SK1: The dimensions have been updated to suit the response in RFI T-2544 (SK 1051, CD 771) but the following instruction in the response "To provide required hoistway clearance move the W18x50 posts away from the		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Locate the two W18x50 beams as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0466. Note that the W18 beams are offset from the centerline of the HSS posts below. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2383 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	hoistway space so that centerline distance the two W18x50 beams increases to 9'-9 1/2" is not clear. Supply a revised plan showing the dimensions or clarify the above statement.						
T-2545	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially		
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: 3/S1-2731 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 772 SK1			Provide HSS beam to WF connection per attached sketch SKS-0462. Provide a stiffener plate in lieu of the kicker brace per 3/S1-2731 as shown in SKS-0462.				
See attached CD RFI 772 SK1: As shown on attached SK1, detail 3/S1-2731 does not work with the beam size and given elevations. Please clarify.			Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				
<hr/>							
T-2546	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially		
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: 1/S1-2731, 1/A1-8911, A1-2971 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 773 SK1			The edge beams at Terrace Level are centered on the pipe columns along the perimeter. Cladding around the perimeter can be located on architectural drawing A1-3451, and details 8/A1-8900 & 1/A1-8911. See response to RFI T-2540 for locating the horizontal HSS10x6 beam along the perimeter of the terrace level.				
See attached CD RFI 773 SK1: This information does not appear to be shown on the architectural drawings (see 1/A1-8911). Please supply the location dimensions or supply the typical offset from the curb shown on A1-2971.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2384 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2547	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: A1-2971 Location: Roof Park Level Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 774 SK1					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached CD RFI 774 SK1 for items 1 to 10: 1) The noted dimensions add up to 42'-6 1/8 with the grid to grid dimension being 42'-6. Please advise which dimension is to be adjusted. 2) Please supply the missing dimension. 3) Please supply the missing dimension. 4) Please supply the missing dimension. 5) Please supply the missing dimension. 6) Please supply the missing dimension. 7) It is not clear what the noted dimensions are pointing to. Confirm the dimensions as indicated are correct or clarify. 8) Please supply the missing dimension. 9) Please supply the missing dimension. 10) Please supply the missing dimension.					Please refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4559 for clarifications and dimensions requested.		
T-2548	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: B/S1-2708 Location: Zone 7, Roof Park Level Gridline: E Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 775 SK1					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached CD RFI 775 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) The noted dimensions have been adjusted to avoid fouling the base plate of the supporting column. Confirm that is acceptable. 2) The noted dimension has been adjusted to align the top of HSS10x10 with the underside of the W21x147. Confirm that is acceptable.					1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
T-2549	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2385 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 2/S1-2731 Location: Roof Park Level Gridlines: 6/ E.2-E.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 779 SK1 See attached CD RFI 779 SK1: Confirm the PJP weld as shown is acceptable for the top and bottom flanges.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, except, provide 1/4" fillet welds on the other side of the PJP welds at the beam flanges. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as request for substitution.				
T-2550	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015	03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2703 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 4 and F Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 780 SK1 See attached CD RFI 780 SK1: Please supply a connection detail for the north/south W12x19.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Move the north/south W12x19 beam slightly towards the HSS column face and provide shear plate connection as shown in attached sketch SKS-0461. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2551	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPQuang LeTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: 1,2/S1-2726 ; 1A/S1-2723 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 782 SK1				1) Hole size confirmed. Increase 7/8" dimension to locate the vent hole as needed to account for construction tolerances.			
See attached CD RFI 782 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) Confirm the vent hole in the base plate for galvanizing the posts is acceptable as shown or supply the information. 2) Confirm the vent hole in the cap plate for galvanizing the posts is acceptable as shown or supply the information.				2) Hole size confirmed. Increase 7/8" dimension to locate the vent hole as needed to account for construction tolerances.			
				Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as clarification on means and methods.			
T-2552	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPQuang LeTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2706 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 5/ D and F Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 785 SK1				Shear plate connections per 1/S1-5011 shall be provided in lieu of double angle connections only if the connection angle is projecting more than 1/2" beyond the edge of slab.			
See attached CD RFI 785 SK1: Confirm it is typically acceptable to substitute 1/S1-5010 with 1/S1-5011 for the beam to beam connection if 1/S15010 will extend past the edge of slab. If not, supply an alternate solution.				Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			
T-2553	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPQuang LeTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2706, 1/S1-5010, 1/S1-5011 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 5/ E.2 and E.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 786 SK1				1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. Note that this is the same connection as (2).			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2387 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	See attached CD RFI 786 SK1: Detail 1/S1-5010 cannot be applied at the noted locations as the angles will foul each other. Confirm it is acceptable to apply connections 1 to 8 as shown.			4) Confirmed. 5) Confirmed. 6) Confirmed. 7) Confirmed. 8) Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reasons for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			
T-2554	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015	04/01/2015	Potentially		<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2705. S1-2706 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 793 SK1 See attached CD RFI 793 SK1 for items 1 to 5: 1) Supply a connection detail for HSS beam to WF column web. 2) Confirm detail 4/S1-7600 may be applied at the noted locations or supply a connection detail. 3) Confirm detail 2/S1-2720 may be applied at the noted locations (the detail states that the connection is for HSS beam to WF column). If not, supply a detail for the noted connections. 4) Supply a connection detail for the HSS beam to HSS post/HSS beam. 5) Supply a connection detail for HSS beam to the HSS post at the top of the post.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Provide HSS beam to WF column connection similar to 2/S1-2720, except, L6x6 angle widths shall match HSS beam width. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. 4) Provide HSS beam to HSS post/beam connection per attached sketch SKS-0464. 5) Provide HSS beam to HSS column connection per 6/S1-7600. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2388 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2554.1	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Fouling Connection at Continuity Plates	Closed	04/16/2015		04/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2705 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 5 and F Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 793.1 SK1 The connection per 2/S1-2720 for the HSS4x4x1/2 as noted in the response in RFI T-2554 (SK 1051, CD 793) item 1 does not work as the L6x6's will foul the continuity plates per 1/S1-2724 and the stiffener plate per 7/S1-2723 as shown. Confirm it is acceptable to connect the HSS4x4x1/2 to the column per 5B/S1-2723 or supply a new detail.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification. Date answered by design team: 4/20/15 Date closed by WOJV: 4/21/15			
T-2555	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		04/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2705, 7/S1-2723 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 795 SK1/SK2 See attached CD RFI 795 SK1 & SK2 for items 1 to 7: 1) Confirm dimensions or supply dimensions. 2) Confirm dimensions or supply dimensions. 3) Supply the length of the L4x4. 4) Supply the welding for the L4x4. 5) Supply missing dimension from Grid D & F. 6) Supply missing dimension from Grid D & F. 7) Supply connection information for PL1 5/8" to L4x4's.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) 2'-0" typical spacing as highlighted in the RFI is correct. Use 2 ½" dimension (not 2 ¼" as in RFI) from centerline of support to grid line 5. 2) See item 1. 3) See sketch SKS-0465. 4) See sketch SKS-0465. 5) Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4550-R1 for dimensions. 6) Refer to enclosed sketches SKS-0465 and SKA-4550-R1. 7) See sketch SKS-0465.			
T-2556	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 4/S1-7102 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridline: 5		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2389 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 797 SK1</p> <p>See attached CD RFI 797 SK1: Confirm the top flanges of the W14x120's may be partially prepared as shown to match the thinner flange thickness of the W24x55 or supply a new detail for these CJP welds.</p>					request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.	
T-2557	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially		
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Contract Doc Ref: A/S1-2707, A/S1-2708 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: E and D.8 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 798 SK1</p> <p>See attached CD RFI 798 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) Supply a connection detail for the W12x96 column to the underside of the beam. 2) Supply a connection detail for the W12x96 column to the underside of the beam considering item 3 below. 3) Considering CD RFI 775 regarding the elevation for the HSS10x10x5/8 and item 2 above, please supply a connection detail for the HSS10x10 to the column as detail 2/S1-2720 can't be applied at this location.</p>				<p>1) Detail 2/S1-2724 is a typical detail applies at this location. As indicated in this detail, the steel column is continuous and does not terminate underside of the steel beam. Graphical representation in A/S1-2707 is not accurate and will be revised in a future ASI. Top of steel column is the same as top of steel beam.</p> <p>2) Provide connection of W12x96 column to the underside of beam per attached sketch SKS-0463.</p> <p>3) Provide connection per 2/S1-2720 except, the top angle shall be waived. Place the HSS beam edge flush with face of the WF column and provide a 5/16 fillet weld at the top edge of the HSS.</p> <p>Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification and change to be issued in future bulletin.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: C/S1-2708 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: F and E.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 802 SK1</div><div>See attached CD RFI 802 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) The noted dimensions were previously requested but the response in RFI T-1922 (SK 941, CD 698) noted that these dimensions are to be supplied by the Elevator Contractor. Please supply the dimensions on the west and east sides of the future elevator. 2) The picture seems to indicate that the elevator posts extend up above the roof steel but S1-2706 indicates that the posts terminate below the roof beams. Confirm the posts terminate below the roof beams or supply more information for the elevation at the top of posts and the top connection. 3) The elevator posts for the future elevator are HSS8x4x1/2 per S1-2701. Confirm that information remains correct.</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>	<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Response 4/2/15: The Design Team has not been officially authorized to work on this elevator by TJPA. We cannot locate elevator elements without a Elevator manufactures design input.</div><div>Revised Response 4/10/15: 1. Final dimensions locating guide rail supports shall be provided by the elevator subcontractor. The design of the elevator criteria shall be based on previously issued elevator Hoistway dimensions and meeting requirements for 4,500 lbs/200 fpm MRL elevator, with guiderail supports not exceeding vertical spacing of 13'-0". 2. Confirmed. HSS posts terminate below W18 elevator equipment beams. Structural graphics will be clarified in next ASI. 3. HSS posts remain 8x4x1/2 as currently indicated. However, elevator contractor shall confirm that HSS posts will meet requirements of elevator equipment criteria provided in part 1.</div></div>				
T-2560.1	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Void	05/20/2015	05/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Quang Le</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>	<div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div>	<div><div>Answered By:</div></div>				
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: C/S1-2708 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: F and E.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 802 SK1</div><div>This is a follow up RFI to T-2560 as the previous response did not answer the question posed.</div><div>1) The noted dimensions were previously requested but the response in RFI T-1922 (SK 941, CD 698) noted that these dimensions are to be supplied by the Elevator Contractor. Please supply the dimensions on the west and east sides of the future elevator. 2) The picture seems to indicate that the elevator posts extend up above the roof steel but S1-2706 indicates that</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>	<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div></div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2392 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the posts terminate below the roof beams. Confirm the posts terminate below the roof beams or supply more information for the elevation at the top of posts and the top connection.</p> <p>3) The elevator posts for the future elevator are HSS8x4x1/2 per S1-2701. Confirm that information remains correct.</p> <p>4) Please include specifications for restaurant elevator.</p>						
T-2561	TTC - Clash Between the Telecommunications Openings and the Moment Frame	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	Contract Doc: A1-2843; S1-2203 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: A-B/8-9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #175		There is no clash between the Telcom conduits and the spandrel beams (not moment frame as noted on the RFI) at the lower concourse level. The telcom conduits penetrate the spandrel beams as shown on detail 6/TE1-8014. Refer also to reviewed and approved submittal TG0600-128.0.				
	See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #175.		Date Answered by Design Team: 4/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
	There is a clash between telecommunications opening and moment frame on the Lower Concourse Level. The sheet A1-2843 shows that the distance is 0'-7" between the telecommunications openings and the grid line A but the sheet S1-2203 shows a moment frame at the same place.						
	The clash remains until further qualification.						
	Please confirm.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2562	TTC - Contradiction Between Plumbing Penetrations Marking	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2204; A1-2844 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F.7-G/14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #177 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #177. There is a contradiction between the Lower Concourse Level slab edge plan (A1-2844) and floor plan (1/A1-2204). The A1-2204 shows that the penetrations are future penetrations but the A1-2844 does not show the same. The penetrations will be modeled according to A1-2844. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The penetrations shown on A1-2204 and A1-2844 are one and the same. Follow dimensions on A1-2844 for locations of plumbing penetrations. WOJV shall coordinate the Virtual Building modeling process with the subcontractor submittal and MEP 3D coordination process Date Answered by Design Team: 4/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2563	TTC - Incorrect Annotation	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2865 Location: Zone 3, Ground level Gridline: F.7-G/19-20 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #179 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #179. The architectural slab edge plan A1-2865 shows a '4" SL' label but the penetration is missing from the plan in this location. The annotation error will be ignored. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> All sleeves provided are per P1-2205, so there are no missing sleeves. Ignore 4" SL annotation. WOJV shall coordinate plumbing locations with subcontractor submittal and 3D modeling coordination process. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2564	TTC - Clash Between the Floor Drain and Structural Steel Beam	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2394 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2865; S1-2305 Location: Zone 3, Ground level Gridline: C.3-D/19-20 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #180 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #180. The architectural slab edge plan A1-2865 shows a floor drain in the area marked with red fill but the structural framing plan S1-2305 shows a W44x230 steel beam below the floor drain. There is a clash between the marked floor drain and the structural steel. (2015.01.19.) The floor drain was placed based on the slab edge plan A1-2865. The steel beams were placed according to the structural framing plan S1-2305. The clash remains. Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4609 for revised floor drain locations. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
T-2565	TTC - Incorrect Wall Dimension	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Heath						
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-7023 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: V-W/3-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #181 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #181. There is an incorrect dimension. The dimension (marked with red) is 10'-10" as shown on the plan (1/A1-7023), but the remaining distance is only 3'-8 3/8" not 3'-9 1/2". It was modeled with distance 3'-8 3/8". Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no dimension 10'-10" shown on 1/A1-7023 as mentioned on this RFI. For dimensions of walls at Stair 901 (B1901), refer to reviewed and approved submittal TG0600-129.1. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/9/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2566	TTC - Contradiction Between the Position of Architectural Curb	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-7010/8; A1-2305; 4&6/A1-7830 Location: Zone 3, Ground level Gridline: C.3-D/19.9-20 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #182 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #182. The architectural callout plan 8/A1-7010 (reference on architectural floor plan A1-2305) shows a 'CC2' architectural curb and refer to architectural detail 4/A1-7830. This detail shows the walls on different position and the architectural details 4 & 6/A1-7830 do not shown the 'CC2' architectural curb. The 'CC2' curb was placed based on the architectural callout plan 8/A1-7010 and follow the 1' - 6" wall dimension on the architectural detail 4/A1-7830. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Enlarged architectural detail 4/A1-7830 is rotated in orientation in the drawing, but shows the correct condition. It is the correct detail reference - no concrete curb is required. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/27/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
T-2567	TTC - Missing Dimension	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A/A1-9235; A/A1-9236 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: A-B/2-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #184 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #184. The dimensions of housekeeping pads are missing on the A1-9235 plan. The A1-9236 plan shows a similar area and the dimensions are indicated (marked with green)on the plan. The elements will be modeled according to A/A1-9236 plan. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to SKA-4593, SKA-4596, and SKA-4597 for the TOFF of the transformer housekeeping pads. Please note that the vertical dimension shown on A/A1-9236 have been removed, refer to SKA-4592. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2396 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2568	TTC - There is a Clash Between Structural Steels on Ground Level	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 4/S1-5002; 6/S1-5002 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D.4-F.7/12-13 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #185 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #185. There is a clash between a BU-WT beam and a WT beam on S1-5002 plan. If the beams were modeled to the bottom of the slabs with the right type per details, the WT10.5X22(marked with yellow) and the WF beam(marked with green) are in clash. (2015.01.19.) Steel beams were modeled in clash. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail 4/S1-5002 WT callout reads: "Trim web to fit". Steel shop drawings have already been reviewed. WOJV shall coordinate the Virtual Building modeling with completed submittals and construction. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/10/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2569	TTC - Contradiction Between Plans	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3001; B/A1-9235; 4/A1-8717; 1/A1-8718; S1-2302; 1/S1-2350; 2/S1-3412 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: A-B/2-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #186 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #186. The 4/A1-8718 detail shows an element (marked with green) which refers to structure but this element is not on the structure plans. The 4/A1-8718 detail is on the 1/A1-8717 callout. The 1/S1-3412 typ. section shows the same area as the 4/A1-8718. The element will not be modeled. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to sketch SKS-0474 for the curb detail at the Transformer Vault Room manhole cover with concrete ring. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/25/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2397 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2570	TTC - Contradiction Between the Elevation Tags for the Ramp	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2310; 1/A1-7418; C/A1-7419 Location: Zone 1, Ground level Gridline: L/2-3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #189 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #189. On the A1-2310 the elevation tags (marked with red) show that the ramp do not slope on the elevation 24.50" (24'-6"), but an other plan about this area (1/A1-7418) shows that this area is sloped because the elevation is 24'-6" and 24'-4 1/2". The slope of the ramp will be modeled according to 1/A1-7418 and C/A1-7419. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The vehicle ramp elevations shown on 1/A1-7418 and C/A1-7419 are correct as coordinated with civil drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/13/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				

T-2571	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015	04/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton						
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: C/S1-2707, D/S1-2707 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 803 SK1 See attached CD RFI 803 SK1 for items 1 to 8: 1) The elevator posts cannot be connected to the underside of the beam at EL 105'-3 as the connection will foul with the steel shown in 6/S1-2724. Please clarify the intent and supply connection details for the top of elevator posts as required. 2) Confirm the elevator post connection is per 1/S1-7600 without the kicker brace as there is not steel/slab at the outside of the elevator. 3) Confirm the elevator posts are HSS10x4x5/8 per A/S1-7130 or supply the sizes. 4) The elevator posts are shown extending down to the top of steel but 2/S1-7102 indicates detail 9/S1-7631, which shows the posts connection to the top of concrete wall. Please clarify the intent and supply the top of concrete			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Attached sketch SKS-0470 provides applicable details for different conditions regarding elevator guide rail termination locations. Please verify elevator guide rail post extents with the elevator manufacturer and submit applicable detail from SKS-0470. 2) Confirmed, except provide stiffener plate per 1/S1-7600 and as shown in the attached sketch. 3) Confirmed. 4) Posts connect to top of concrete wall per 9/S1-7631. T/wall elevation is 86' - 6 1/2". 5) Elevator posts will be shown on D/S1-2707 in the next ASI. 6) See response to 1).			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2398 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	wall elevation if the posts terminate at the top of concrete wall. 5) Elevator posts are shown on S1-2702, S1-2703, S1-2704 & 3,4/S1-7102 but they are not shown here. Please clarify. 6) Depending on the response to item 5: The elevator posts cannot be connected to the underside of the beam at EL 105'-3 as the connection will foul with the steel shown in 6/S1-2724. Please clarify the intent and supply connection details for the top of elevator posts as required 7) Depending on the response to item 5: The elevator posts are shown extending down to the top of steel but 2/S1-7102 indicates detail 8/S1-7631, which shows the posts connection to the top of concrete wall. Please clarify the intent and supply the top of concrete wall elevation if the posts terminate at the top of concrete wall. 8) Final elevator post locations to be supplied by OTIS.			7) Posts connect to top of concrete wall per 9/S1-7631. T/wall elevation is 86' - 6 1/2". 8) We assume that nothing is requested from the design team in this item.			
T-2572	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially		
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Contract Doc Ref: 1 and 8/ S1-2724 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 804 SK1				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached CD RFI 804 SK1: Please clarify what is meant by the 5/16 dimension and confirm the CJP weld as shown is acceptable.				5/16 is a typo and can be ignored. Contractor proposed CJP weld detail is acceptable.			
				Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as request for substitution.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2399 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2573	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015	04/09/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2706, 2/A1-2972 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 806 SK1 See attached CD RFI 806 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) With the edge of slab extending 5'-3 1/2' north of Grid D, the beam flange will extend 1/4" outside (north) of the edge of slab. Confirm that is the intent or supply a solution. 2) Supply a slab edge detail across the noted unsupported span.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Provide edge of slab detail per 8/S1-5000, except, the edge bent plate shall be welded to the W16x31 and W12x19 beam flanges. Bent plate shall span from edge of slab on the north side to the centerline of the W12 beam on the south side. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				

T-2574	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2703 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 5/ D and F Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 807 SK1 See attached CD RFI 807 SK1 for items 1 to 5: 1) Supply edge of slab support detail at the noted end of slab opening. 2) Supply edge of slab support detail at the noted end of slab opening. 3) Supply edge of slab support detail at the noted end of slab opening. 4) Confirm the 1/4" bent edge plate may be cantilevered as shown or supply alternate solution. 5) As there is no beam on the end of the slab opening, confirm it is acceptable to span a 1/4" bent plate as shown or supply an alternate solution.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Per typical detail 12/S1-5003, C-channel supports along the north, south and east un-supported edges shall be provided. Edge bent plate per 8/S1-5000 shall be welded to the c-channels along these edges. 2) See response to 1). 3) See response to 1). 4) Confirmed. Provide a vertical 1/4" fillet weld at the corner between the cantilevered bent plate and the bent plate on the south edge. 5) See response to 1). Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2574.1	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Fouling Connection Detail at Slab Openings	Closed	04/01/2015		04/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2703, 12/S1-5003, 6/S1-5011 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: D and 5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Cd RFI 807.1 SK1, SK2 This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-2574 (SK 1053, CD 807) With the C8x11.5 located 1" from the edge of opening per 12/S1-5003, the connection per 6/S1-5011 will foul the beam connections as shown at 7 locations. Provide a solution at 7 locations.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Cope the C-channel top flanges and provide welds at the supporting beam subject to the following conditions: a) Where weld access is available from both sides, provide WELD "A" as shown in attached sketch SKS-0468. b) Where weld access is available only on one side, provide welds "A" and "B", except that weld "A" shall be one-sided. c) Where channel web cannot be extended to the web of the supporting beam web due to presence of connection bolts, stop the channel web short of the bolts and provide welds "B" and "C". Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as clarification on means and methods.	
<hr/>							
T-2575	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2703, A1-2971 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 5 and D.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Cd RFI 809 SK1 See attached CD RFI 809 SK1: Drawing A1-2971 does not locate the slab opening in the north/south direction. Confirm the dimension shown on S12703 locates the south side of the slab opening and the center of the W12x19 beams.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Dimension indicated and highlighted on RFI locates the south side of the slab opening to grid line D.4.	
<hr/>							
T-2576	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information and Clarifications	Closed	03/20/2015		03/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2701			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Connection detail per SKS-0434 provided in response	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2577	<div><div>SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Edge of Slab Clarifications</div><div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Quang Le</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div><div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California Dis</div><div>Ryan Clayton</div></div></div></div> <div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: A1-2971, S1-2701 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: D and 4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 811</div><div>See attached CD RFI 811 SK1 for items 1 & 2: 1) The edge of slab extends 3 3/8" north of the center of beam per the post locations on S1-2701 and the edge of slab information on A1-2971 but S1-2703 indicates 4". Confirm 3 3/8" is acceptable. 2) The beam flange will extend 1" past the edge of slab with the information shown on A1-2971. Confirm that is the intent or provide a solution.</div></div>	Closed	03/20/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially		
			<div>to RFI T-1923 shall be provided at the post locations highlighted in the RFI.</div> <div>Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with Reason for Request Insufficient Information and Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as previously answered.</div>				
			<div>ANSWER:</div> <div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed.</div>				
			<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2402 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2578	HVC - Conflict for Rod Hangers in Detail and Spec	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: M1-5000-Detail 6 / Spec 23-05 29-3 Location: Zone: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection is: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A There is a conflict between spec. 23 05 29-3 and drawing detail 6/M1-5000. The detail shows 2 rod roller hanger for pipe sizes 6" and a larger. Spec calls for 2 rod roller hanger for 8" and above. Although specifications trump drawing details please confirm that rollers for 8" mechanical pipe and larger is acceptable.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specifications do not trump the drawings. When there is a conflict in the Contract Documents, the Design Team/TJPA Representative will determine the correct item. Drawings and specs are both Contract Documents and "where requirements differ, apply the more stringent" (per Mechanical General Provisions 23 05 01-1.2D), unless otherwise approved by the TJPA Representative. In this specific case only, rollers for 8 inch and larger pipe are acceptable.				
T-2579	TTC - Missing Information About the Position of a Concrete Curb on Ground Level Closed		03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-2864; 1/A1-7205 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: C.3-D/15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #190 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #190. There is a missing information on the sheet A1-2864 about the position of a concrete curb(marked with yellow). If the curb was modeled aligned to the well dimensioned curb (rounded with red on A1-2864), the dimension on 1/A1-7205 is 12'-1 3/4" instead 12'-1". The curb will be modeled aligned to the well dimensioned curb. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive layout submittal of this area has been reviewed and returned. WOJV shall coordinate Virtual Building process with completed submittals. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2403 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2580	TTC - Contradicting Size of the Stair Shaft	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2302; A1-2862 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: C-C.3/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #191 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #191. There is a contradiction between S1-2302 and A1-2862. A1-2862 shows a stair shaft with dimensions but the S1-2302 shows the same stair shaft with different size. The overlaid screenshot shows the contradiction. The architectural plan will be followed and the W16x26 steel is modeled 6" from the edge of the larger shaft. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive layout submittal has already been reviewed and approved by WOJV and Design Team. WOJV shall coordinate Virtual Building modeling process with submittals. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2581	TTC - Wall Layout Dimension Error	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2870; A1-2310; 1/A1-7402 Location: Zone 1, Ground level Gridline: L/2-3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #193 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #193. There is a difference in a dimension between the model and the plan A1-2870. If we follow the distance according to A1-2870 and the radius according to A1-7402 the 19'-8 7/8" distance will be 19'-8". Please clarify.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the wall layout at the ramp, refer to reviewed and approved submittal TG0600-956.0. WOJV shall coordinate Virtual Building modeling process with completed construction and submittals. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2582	TTC - Missing Information on Ground Level	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2404 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-8720 Location: Zone 1, 2, Ground Level Gridline: J-K/10.1-11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #194 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #194. There is a missing information about the position of the penetrations(marked with yellow). The distance is scaled from the plan. The distances are 9'-4" of left penetration and 8'-9" of the right penetration. Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The bollard location is noted in the detail. WOJV to coordinate the final location of the drain penetration per details on A1-8721. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/10/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/8/2015		
T-2583	TTC - Clash Between Floor Drain and Concrete Beam	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company	Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Heath						
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2862 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: C.3-C.4/1.-1.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #197 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #197. There are some clashes between the floor drains and the CBM concrete beam. If the dimensions on A1-2862 are followed the drains (marked with red) will be above the beams. The floor drains will be modeled as on the screenshots. The clashes remain. Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketches SKA-4640 and SKLA-405 for revised locations of area drains. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2405 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2584	TTC - Clash Between Opening and Beam	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2302; A1-2862 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: B/5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #198 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #198. There is a clash between MFB1 beam and 2" sleeve on the Ground Floor. The sheet A1-2862 shows the position of the opening but the sheet S1-2302 shows a beam below the opening. (2015.01.20.) The elements will be modeled according to the plans. The clash remains. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 2" sleeve is relocated per enclosed sketch SKA-4610 to clear beam below. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
T-2585	TTC - Sleeve & Concrete Beam Conflict	Closed	03/23/2015	04/02/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2867; S1-2207 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: F.7-G/33-33.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #535 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #535. Clash between the sleeve and the structural beam. The A1-2867 Ground Level Zone 07 Slab Edge Plan shows the sleeve (marked yellow) directly above a structural beam (marked green). The structural beam was modeled according to drawing S1-2207 and the sleeve was placed per drawing A1-2867. The clash remains. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TR33.2 transfer beam is 4' wide and does not clash with sleeve location noted in this RFI. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2406 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2586	TTC - Missing Information about the CMU Wall Locations	Open	03/23/2015	04/02/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2206; A1-3009 Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: G-H/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #536 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #536. The Lower Concourse Level Zone 06 Floor Plan (A1-2206) and the Plan at South UPS Room B1642 (4/A1-3009) do not show the exact location of the structural CMU walls. The CMU walls will be modeled at 6'-1" from the edge of the Concrete wall, 5'-11 1/8" from the gridline 31 and 4'-2" from the gridline H. The resulting dimensions see on screenshot above. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-2587	TTC - EJB & CMU Wall Conflict	Closed	03/24/2015	04/03/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2845; A1-2205 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C.3-D/21-22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #537 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #537. There is a clash between the EJB (marked with orange) and the CMU wall (marked with yellow). The Lower Concourse Level Zone 05 Slab Edge Plan (A1-2845) shows the EJB directly below the CMU wall. The CMU wall was modeled according to the Lower Concourse Level Zone 05 Floor Plan (A1-2205) and the EJB was placed per drawing A1-2845. The clash remains. Please clarify.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no clash between the EJB and wall as noted on the RFI. The EJB on A1-2845 is cast in the lower concourse slab soffit and the CMU wall on A1-2205 are above the slab of the lower concourse. Refer also to reviewed and approved submittals TG0600-129.1, TG0600-128.0, TG0600-121.2, and TG0600-122.0, TG0600-123.1, and TG0600-931.2. It is recommended that WOJV involve more senior staff members in the Virtual Modeling Process to flush out these issues and to coordinate with already completed submittals. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2407 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2588	TTC - Missing Beam Dimension	Closed	03/24/2015	04/03/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2307; S1-2253; S1-5033; S1-5033 Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D/33-33.5; F/33-33.5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #538 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #538. The Lower Concourse Level - Partial Plan (S1-2253) and the Steel Sections and Details plan (S1-5033) do not show the length of the WT 40x503 beam (marked yellow). The beam was modeled with 5' length. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See steel shop drawings. NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.		
<hr/>							
T-2589	TTC - Missing Information about Concrete Wall	Closed	03/24/2015	04/03/2015	04/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2126; S1-2056; A-0015 Location: Zone 4, Mat Slab Level Gridline: G-H/26-27 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #541 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #541. The Mat Slab Level Zone 06 Wall Plan (A1-2126) and the Mat Top Reinforcement - Zone 06 Plan (S1-2056) do not show the exact thickness of these concrete walls. (marked yellow). These concrete wall will be modeled with 14" thickness. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the thickness of the RCW walls, refer to reviewed and approved Mat Slab comprehensive layouts on submittals TG0600-102, TG0600-103, and TG0600-104. Refer also to Train platform level knee wall submittal TG0600-961.1. WOJV should coordinate completed construction and submittals with the Virtual Building process. Date Answered by Design Team: 04/08/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 04/15/2015		
<hr/>							
T-2590	TTC - Detail Reference Error on Architectural Section	Closed	03/24/2015	04/03/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2408 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-6006; 2/A1-8162 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: 27-27.1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #542</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #542.</p> <p>The A1-6006 (Building Section at Grid Line E Zone 06) referring to 2/A1-8162 detail, but the 2/A1-8162 shows an enlarged floor plan.</p> <p>This area will be modeled according to the A1-6006 (Building Section at Grid Line E Zone 06) until the further information.</p> <p>Please clarify.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Sheet A1-6006 has a typo in the referenced section detail 2/A1-8162 SIM, the correct reference should be 2/A1-8160 SIM.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 4/28/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015</p>		
T-2591	TTC - Contradiction between Structural Plans	Closed	03/24/2015	04/03/2015	03/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Heath						
	<p>REQUEST: Contract Doc: B/S1-4305; 4/S1-5052 Location: Zone 1, 2, 3, Ground Level Gridline: C-G/1.4-24.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #516</p> <p>See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #516</p> <p>There is a contradiction between the B/S1-4305 Transfer Girder Elevations and the 4/S1-5052 Transfer Girder Details. According to the 4/S1-5052 detail the steel plate (marked with yellow) is 8'-8" long but the B/S1-4305 elevation shows it is 8'-8 1/2" long.</p> <p>The steel plate will be modeled according to the 4/S1-5052 detail with 8'-8" long.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>See steel shop drawings.</p> <p>NOTE: Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI.</p>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2592	TTC - Missing Wall Sleeve Elevation	Closed	03/24/2015	04/03/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-9237; E1-3210 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: H/21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #529 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #529 The C/A1-9237 Lower Concourse Level Transformer Vault Rooms Concrete Wall Elevation shows the distance between the pulling eyes and the wall sleeves, but the exact elevation of pulling eyes are not shown on plans so the exact elevation of the wall sleeves are missing. The E1-3210 enlarged electrical plans do not show the elevation of these conduits. (2015.01.16.) The missing dimensions were scaled from the wall elevation (C/A1-9237) - see resulting dimensions in the screenshots above. (2015.01.16.) Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to attached sketches SKA 4585 to SKA-4587 for wall sleeve and pulling eye locations at Transformer Vault Rooms B1561 and B1562 on C/A1-9237 other Transformer Vault Rooms at the Lower Concourse Level. Please note that the elevations for the sleeves shown on the SKAs are based on SFPUC ES drawings sent to WOJV and issued for bid last 04/24/2014. WOJV to coordinate Virtual Building modeling with other project documents.\		
			Date Answered by Design Team: 4/13/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
<hr/>							
T-2593	TTC - Contradiction Between Architectural and Electrical Elevation	Closed	03/24/2015	04/03/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-9237; E1-3210 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: H/21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #530 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #530 There are some contradiction between the C/A1-9237 Lower Concourse Level Transformer Vault Rooms Concrete Wall Elevation and A/E1-3210 Lower Concourse Level Enlarged Plans. The location of marked sleeves are different. The sleeves will be modeled according to the architectural drawings. Clashes remain.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The service conduits sleeves configuration highlighted on C/A1-9237 are correct as coordinated with SFPUC drawing sheet ES-2111. Refer to SKA-4585R1 for sleeve locations. Please note that these service conduit sleeves should be within the beam pockets. Please note that SKA-4585 issued with the response to RFI-2592 is superseded by SKA-4585R1. WSP-Electrical Response: For service conduit sleeves on E1-3210, refer to SKE-RFI-T-2593-1 and SKE-RFI-T-2593-2. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/16/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2410 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2594	TTC - Contradiction Between the Pier Dimensions	Closed	03/24/2015	04/03/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: A1-2205; A1-7010; S1-9050 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C.3-D/21-22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3-CR #534 See attached Virtual Building PH3-CR #534 Contradiction between the Lower Concourse Level Zone 05 Floor Plan (A1-2205) and the 9/S1-9050 Wall pier detail. According to the schedule on 9/S1-9050 the pier should be 1'-4" width but in this case the edge of the pier is 10'-8 1/8" distance from the gridline 21 or the edge of the pier will not be aligned to the edge of the wall. Followed the 9/S1-9050 Wall Pier Detail these piers are modeled 1'-4" width. Please confirm.				The dimension 10'-5 5/8" is correct. The CMU piers at these locations are 1'-6 3/8" as reviewed and approved on submittal TG0600-931.2. WOJV to coordinate the Virtual Building modeling with completed submittals and construction. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/13/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2411 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2595	TTC - Missing Information about the Locations of the Type 31 Walls.	Closed	03/24/2015	04/03/2015	04/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3021 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: G-H/23-24 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #544 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #544 The Lower Concourse Level South Passageway Plan (A1-3021) does not show the exact location of these type 31 walls. The walls were modeled at 10'-8 1/2" from the grid line 23, 21'-11" from the grid line 24 and 3'-10 1/2" from the grid line H. The resulting dimensions see on screenshot above. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to SKA-4582, for dimensions of the type 31 walls at the Lower Concourse exit passageway.		
T-2596	TTC - Detail Reference Error on Architectural Callout	Closed	03/24/2015	04/03/2015	04/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-3009; 1/A1-3021; A/A1-3021 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: G/23 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #545 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #545 The A1-3021 Architectural Lower Concourse Level South Passageway Plan and section contains a callout with 3/A1-3009 reference number but the 3/A1-3009 enlarged plan shows a different level than the 1/A1-3021. This callout may not necessary for this plan. The 3/A1-3009 callout is originated by A1-2225. The A1-3021 Plan had been created without 3/A1-3009 callout. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail reference on 1/A1-3021 is removed. Please refer to SKA-4853.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2412 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2597	TTC - Contradictions Between Type of Walls and the Type of Curbs	Closed	03/24/2015	04/03/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3404; 1/A1-9034 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Gridline: E.6/24.9-25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #549 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #549 There are two contradictions between the 1/A1-3404 - Service Building at GL25 roof Park Level Plans and the 1/A1-9034 - Public Restrooms - Roof Park Level Plans. The 1/A1-3404 shows the type of yellow marked wall is '17', the type of green marked wall is '8' and the type of curbs are 'CC1' but the 1/A1-9034 shows the type of yellow marked wall is '8', the type of green marked wall is '18' and the type of curbs are 'CC'. These walls and curbs will be modeled according to 1/A1-9034 plan. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to sheet A1-9034 for restroom wall types. Wall tags related to restrooms on A1-3404 will be removed in future ASI. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
T-2598	TTC - Contradictions Between Type of Walls and the Type of Curbs	Open	03/24/2015	04/03/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3404; 1/A1-9034 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Gridline: E.6-F/25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #550 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #550 There are two contradictions between the 1/A1-3404 - Service Building at GL25 roof Park Level Plans and the 1/A1-9034 - Public Restrooms - Roof Park Level Plans. The 1/A1-3404 shows the type of yellow marked wall is '11' but the 1/A1-9034 shows the type of yellow marked wall is '14' and the location of wall is not the same. These walls will be modeled according to 1/A1-9034 plan with type 14.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2413 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Please confirm.						
T-2599	TTC - Contradiction Between Location of Walls and Missing Type of Wall and Curb Closed		03/24/2015	04/03/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: A1-3404; A1-9034 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Gridline: E.6-F/25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #551				Refer to enclosed sketches SKA-4613 and 4614 for wall types and curb locations. Also, please refer to sketch SKA-4612 (issued with RFI T-2598). Zone plans and restrooms plans do not have duplicate tags			
See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #551				Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015			
There is a contradiction between the 1/A1-3404 - Service Building at GL25 roof Park Level Plans and the 1/A1-9034 - Public Restrooms - Roof Park Level Plans. The plans show different location of yellow marked wall and curb. The 1/A1-9034 plan does not show type of this wall and curb.							
The location of this wall and curb will be modeled according to 1/A1-9034 plan with type '11-CC4'.							
Please confirm.							



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2600	TTC - Contradictions Between Type of Curbs	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3404; 1/A1-9034 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Gridline: E.6-F/25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #522 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #522 There are contradictions between the 1/A1-3404 - Service Building at GL25 roof Park Level Plans and the 1/A1-9034 - Public Restrooms - Roof Park Level Plans. The 1/A1-3404 shows the type of yellow marked curb is 'CC4' and the type of green marked curb is 'CC1' but the 1/A1-9034 shows the type of yellow marked curb is 'CC' and the type of green marked curb is 'CC'. Modeled the green marked curb with type 'CC' according to 1/A1-9034 and modeled the yellow marked curb with type 'CC4' according to 1/A1-3404 plan. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please follow the curb types provided on the 1/A1-3404 plan. Refer to response to RFI T-2599. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/29/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
<hr/>							
T-2601	SSS - Roof Drag Plate Deck Closure Detail GL 14	Closed	03/23/2015		04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2604, 7 & 8/ S1-5020 Location: Zone 4, Roof Level Gridline: 14 Add'l Doc Ref's: LS-RFI 37 Sketch #1 and #2 Please reference the Roof Park Level sheet S1-2604. At grid 14/F is the call out for a 3"x18"x53' drag plate. The plate is shown butting into the flange of the column. With a 53' length the plate would extend all the way to perimeter gridline H. The metal decking abuts to each side of the plate per detail 7/S1-5020. The drag plate is installed over the column per detail 8/S1-5020. With the 53' length the end of the drag plate stops 3' short of the perimeter beam and terminates over the row of W24 beams. This is typical at all drag plate ends.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reason for request Verification. We categorize this RFI as clarification on means and methods.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2415 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	In that 3' region there is an approximate 19" square hole between the deck, the drag plate, and the beams. Please confirm it is acceptable to close the hole by adding a 12 gauge flat plate as per the attached details or supply an alternate solution.						
T-2602	TTC - Contradiction Between Type of Curbs	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3404; 1/A1-9034 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Gridline: E.6-F/25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #533 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #533 There is a contradiction between the 1/A1-3404 - Service Building at GL25 roof Park Level Plans and the 1/A1-9034 - Public Restrooms - Roof Park Level Plans. The 1/A1-3404 shows the type of yellow marked curb is 'CC5' but the 1/A1-9034 shows the type of yellow marked curb is 'CC' . This curb will be modeled according to 1/A1-3404 plan with type 'CC5'. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Follow the curb type provided on 1/A1-3404 Date Answered by Design Team: 4/29/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2416 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2603	TTC - Contradiction Between Type of Curbs	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3404; 1/A1-9034 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Gridline: E.6-F/24-24.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #554 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #554 There is a contradiction between the 1/A1-3404 - Service Building at GL25 roof Park Level Plans and the 1/A1-9034 - Public Restrooms - Roof Park Level Plans. The 1/A1-3404 shows the type of yellow marked curb is 'CC1' but the 1/A1-9034 shows the type of yellow marked curb is 'CC' . This curb will be modeled according to 1/A1-9034 plan with type 'CC'. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Follow the curb types provided on 1/A1-3404. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/29/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
T-2604	TTC - Contradiction Between Dimension Lines	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-9004 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: C3-D/16-16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #556 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #556 There is a contradiction between the dimensions on 1/A1-9004 architectural plan. The green marked dimension line shows the inner edge of the type 18 wall (marked with red) is 5'-9 1/8" distance from the edge of type 3 wall (marked with yellow) but according to the red marked dimension line this distance is 5'-8 1/2". The green marked dimension lines will be followed. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. 5'-9 1/8" is the correct dimension. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2417 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2605	TTC - Interior Wall Contradiction	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2404; 2/A1-9355; A-0021 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: C.3-D/15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #557 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #557 There is a contradiction between the Plan Detail (2/A1-9355) and the Second Level Zone 04 Floor Plan (A1-2404). The Second Level Zone 04 Floor Plan (A1-2404) shows the inner edge of this wall is 2'-1" from the gridline 16 but according to the detail (2/A1-9355) this distance is 2'-0 1/2". Modeled wall at 2'-0 1/2" from gridline 16 according to The Plan Detail (2/A1-9355). Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Dimension 2'-1" in A1-2404 is correct. The Dimension on 2/A1-9355 previously shown as 1'-1" is 1'-1 1/2". Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015			

T-2606	TTC - Interior Wall Contradiction	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-3220; 6/A1-9352, A1-2884 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: C-C.3/16-17 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #558 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #558 There is a contradiction between the Partial Plan - Emergency Generator Room (2/A1-3220) and the Plan Detail (6/A1-9352). The Partial Plan Emergency Generator Room (2/A1-3220) shows the outer edge of this wall is 1'-9 3/4" from the gridline C.3 but according to the detail (6/A1-9352) this distance is 1'-10". Modeled this wall at 1'-10" from gridline C.3 according to the Plan Detail (6/A1-9352). Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to sketches SKA-4616 & SKA-4617 for clarification for the requested dimensions. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2418 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2607	TTC - Interior Wall Contradiction	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-3220; 3/A1-9352 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: D/16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #559 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #559 There is a contradiction between the Partial Plan - Emergency Generator Room (2/A1-3220) and the Plan Detail (3/A1-9352). The 2/A1-3220 shows the outer edge of these walls are 2'-8" and 6'-1" from the gridline D but according to the 3/A1-9353 these distances are 2'-7" and 6'-0". Modeled wall at 2'-7" and 6'-0" from gridline D according to the Plan Detail (3/A1-9353). Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to sketches SKA-4618 & SKA-4619 for clarification of the dimensions. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		

T-2608	TTC - Interior Wall Contradiction	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-3220; 3/A1-9352 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: D/16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #560 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #560 There is a contradiction between the Partial Plan - Emergency Generator Room (2/A1-3220) and the Plan Detail (6/A1-9352). The Partial Plan Emergency Generator Room (2/A1-3220) shows the outer edge of this wall is 2'-0" from the gridline 16.9 but according to the detail (3/A1-9353) this distance is 1'-10". Modeled wall at 1'-10"from gridline 16.9 according to the Plan Detail (2/A1-3220). Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, the correct dimension is 1'-10". Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2609	TTC - Interior Wall Clashes with Structural Column	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	04/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A-0021; 2/A1-3220 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: D/16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #561 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #561 There is a clash between the steel column and the interior wall. The wall should be type 40 according to the wall type tag on 2/A1-3220 but the floor plan shows only two layers of the type 40 wall. Wall thickness was modeled with type 40 (11 1/2" width) according to the schedule (A-0021). Modeled this wall in clash with structural steel column. Please clarify.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to response for RFI T-2294 and refer to detail 1/A1-9355 indicating that wall type 40 is split on either side of the column. There is no clash with the column. WOJV shall coordinate the Virtual Building modeling process with existing RFI and Submittal responses.				
T-2610	TTC - Wall Type Contradiction	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-7311; 2/A1-3220 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: D-D.4/15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #562 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #562 There is a contradiction between the Escalator E409 - Plan at Second Level (2/A1-7311) and the Partial Plan - Emergency Generator Room (2/A1-3220). The 2/A1-7311 shows the type of the yellow marked wall is 3 but the 2/A1-3220 shows this wall with type 8. Modeled this wall with type 3. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch SKA-4620 for clarification on partition type. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2420 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2611	TTC - Concrete Curb and Wall Misalignment	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2894; 1/A1-9024 Location: Zone 2, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.4-D.8/14 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #563 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #563 There is a misalignment between wall (marked yellow) and concrete curb (marked green). The A1-2894 - Bus Deck Level Zone 04 Slab Edge Plan shows the edge of the curb is 7" distance from the gridline D.8 and the 1/A1-9024 - Public Restrooms- Bus Deck Level- Plans shows the edge of the wall is 9 7/8" from the gridline D.8. (2015.01.21.) Modeled the curb according to the slab edge plan and the wall according to the green marked dimension line on the enlarged floor plan. They are not aligned. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to SKA-4622 for dimension clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/5/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
T-2612	TTC - Wall Location Discrepancy	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2504; 1/A1-9024 Location: Zone 2, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D4.-F/14 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #564 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #564 There is a contradiction between the dimension lines on A1-2504 Bus Deck Level Zone 04 Floor Plan and on the 1/A1-9024 Bus Deck Level enlarged floor plan. The A1-2504 floor plan shows the outer edge of this wall is 1'-2 1/2" from the gridline D.4 but according to the 1/A1-9024 this distance is 1'-2". Modeled the wall at 1'-2 1/2" from the gridline D.4 followed the A1-2504 floor plan.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The dimension 25'-5" on A1-2504 is correct. The dimension 1'-2" on 1/A1-9024 is incorrect; it should be 1'-2 1/2". Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2421 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2613	TTC - Wall Type Contradiction	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Julia John		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc: A1-3105; 1/A1-9002; A1-2304				Wall type listed 1/A1-9002 should be type 6 HD.			
Location: Zone 2, Ground Level				Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015			
Gridline: C.3-D.4/14-15				Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015			
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #565							
See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #565							
There is a contradiction between the wall types on the following architectural plans: A1-3105 Natoma Street Loading Dock Partial Plan, A1-2304 Ground Level Zone 04 Floor Plan and A1-9002 Enlarged Loading Dock Floor Plan. The A1-3105 and A1-2304 show the yellow marked wall should be type 6 but the A1-9002 shows this wall with type 10.							
Modeled the wall with type 6 followed the A1-3105 and A1-2304 Architectural plans.							
Please confirm.							



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2614	TTC - Missing Information About Compound Ceilings	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Julia John To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4304 Location: Zone 2, Ground level Gridline: C.3-G/15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #567 See attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #567 There are no dimensions about the compound ceilings (marked with yellow fill) on the A1-4304 Ground level zone 04 reflected ceiling plan. The missing dimensions are scaled from the reflected ceiling plan. See resulting dimensions on the screenshots above. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor to coordinate final duct routing pathway. Provide fire-rated duct enclosure per typical detail 1/A-0024 of a suitable length, width and depth to fully enclose the duct. Refer to mechanical drawings for duct size and approximate location. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2615	TTC - Missing wall type from wall schedule	Closed	03/31/2015	04/28/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Stephanie Azzolino To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2304; A-0021 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D/16-17 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #568 Please see attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #568. The A-0021 gypsum partition schedule does not contain wall type 60. Modeled the type 60 walls with 8 7/8" thickness. Please confirm wall type.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to SSI sheet A-0023 for partition type 60. This sheet has been issued for construction on 05/30/2014 and again was included in ASI 0128 without any changes. This is a unnecessary RFI. WOJV shall provide all CDs to the VB modeling team. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2616	TTC - Contradiction between architectural and detail plans	Closed	03/31/2015	04/28/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2424 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
Please confirm use of the green marked dimensions.							
T-2618	TTC - Wall type contradiction	Closed	03/31/2015	04/28/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: A-0021; 1/A1-1014; A1-3105		Please refer to SSI sheet A-0023 for partition type 60.					
Location: Zone 2, Ground Level		This sheet has been issued for construction on					
Gridline: F-F.7/16		05/30/2014 and again was included in ASI-0128					
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #571		without any changes. This is an unnecessary RFI.					
Please see attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #571.		WOJV shall provide all the CDs to the VB modeling team.					
The 1/A1-7014 architectural partial plan shows wall with type 64 (marked with yellow) but the A1-3105 partial plan shows this wall with type 10. The gypsum partition schedule plan (A-0021) does not contain type 64.		Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015					
Modeled the wall with type 10 according to A1-3105 partial plan.		Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015					
Please confirm wall type.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2425 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2619	TTC - Contradiction between the dimensions	Closed	03/31/2015	04/28/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2865; 1/A1-8211; Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Gridline: G-F.7/20.1-21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #573 Please see attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #573. There is a contradiction between Steel - Supported Glazed Curtain wall - Grand Hall (w-3) Details Plan (A1-8211) and Ground Level Zone 05 Slab Edge Plan. (A1-2865). The 1/A18211 shows 1' -10" and 6'-9 3/8" distance between the curbs and walls. The 1/A1-2865 shows 1'- 10" and 6'-9" distance between the walls and concrete curb. Modeled this wall according to the 1/A1-8211 Architectural plan. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Dimension 6'-9 3/8" in 1/A1-8211 is correct. Please see revised dimension in attached sketch SKA-4621. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2620	TTC - Wall type and location contradiction	Closed	03/31/2015	04/28/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2303; A1-9351 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: G/11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #575 Please see attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #575. There is a contradiction between the 5/A1-9351 detail plan and A1-2303 Ground Level Zone 03 Floor Plan. The 5/A1-9351 plan shows there is a type 1 wall (marked with yellow) at 11 3/4" distance from the gridline 11 but the A1-2303 plan shows the type of this wall is 14 and the distance of this is 10 1/2" from the gridline 11. Modeled this wall with type 14 and 10 1/2" distance from the gridline 11 followed the A1-2303 plan. Please confirm wall type and location.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See the attached SKA-4649 for wall type and dimension clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/5/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2426 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2621	TTC - Wall type contradiction	Closed	03/31/2015	04/28/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-7203; A1-7825 Location: Zone 3, Second Level Gridline: D.4-D.8/24-24.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #576 Please see attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #576. There is a contradiction between the Elevator PE502 & PE503 Partial Plans (2/A1-7203) and the Aluminium Panel Cladding (W-16A) & Stair/Elevator Shaft Wall Details (1/A17825). The 2/A1-7203 shows the type of the red marked wall is 21 but the 1/A1-7825 shows this wall with type 11. (2015.01.19.) Modeled this wall with type 21 A,H. Please confirm wall type.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. The wall type is 21 A1, H. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/5/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015			
<hr/>							
T-2622	TTC - Dimension contradiction and bad door position	Closed	03/31/2015	04/28/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-7012; 3/A1-9355; 4/A1-7835 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: F/16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #577 Please see attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #577. There is a contradiction between the Stair 401, PE 403 & PE 404 at Second Level (2/A1-7012); Plan Detail (3/A1-9355) and Plan Detail - Second Level (4/A1-7835). The 2/A1-7012 stair plan and the 4/A1-7835 detail show that the distance between the edges of walls is 5'-3" but according to the 4/A1-7835 detail this distance is 5'-5". There is a difference between the horizontal dimension lines too. The incorrect dimensions are marked with red fill. The 3/A1-9355 detail shows a door (marked with yellow) but the 2/A1-7012 stair plan does not show this. (2015.01.22.)		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See the attached sketches SKA-4650 & SKA-4651 for clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/5/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015			
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2427 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>These walls will be modeled in accordance with the 3/A1-9355 (green marks) and the door will not be modeled. (2015.01.22.)</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>							
T-2623	TTC - Wall type contradiction	Closed	03/31/2015	04/28/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-9002; 1/A1-3196 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D-D.4/14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #578 Please see attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #578. There is a contradiction between the 1/A1-9002 Loading Dock Floor Plan and the 1/A1-3196 East Loading Dock Master Plan. The 1/A1-9002 shows the yellow marked wall with type 18 but the 1/A1-3196 shows this wall with type 8. Modeled this wall with type 18 followed the 1/A1-9002 sheet. Please confirm wall type.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4652 for revised wall tags at Driver's Unisex Restroom. Tag on 1/A1-9002 is correct as noted. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/14/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2428 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2624	TTC - Missing information about the location and size of the structural curb	Closed	03/31/2015	04/28/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-2966; 1/A1-9034 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Gridline: E.6-F/25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #579 Please see attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #579. The 1/A1-2966 Roof Park Level Partial Slab Edge Plans does not show the location and the width of the curb. The curb was scaled from 1/A1-2966 and modeled with 11" width at 5'-9 1/2" from the gridline 25. See resulting dimensions on attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #579. Please confirm location and size of structural curb.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to previous RFI T-2598 with sketch SKA-4614 for curb width and location. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2625	TTC - Contradicting dimensions	Closed	03/31/2015	04/28/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2304; 1/A1-9002; 1/A1-3196 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D-D.4/14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #580 Please see attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #580. There is a contradiction between Facilities Restroom Ground Level - Plans & Elevations (A1-9002); Ground Level Zone 04 Floor Plan (A1-2304); East Loading Dock Master (1/A13196). The A1-2304 shows the inner edge of the partition wall is 8' -7 5/8" distance from the gridline 14 (marked with yellow), but the A1-9002 Plan shows this distance is 9'-6 1/8". The 1/A1-3196 shows the inner edge of partition wall is 25' 6 1/2" distance from the gridline 15 but the 1/A1-9002 Architectural plan shows 24' -7 7/8". These walls will be modeled following the dimensions which are marked with yellow fill on attached Virtual Building PH3(ASI)-CR #580.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4674 for updated Facilities Restroom dimensions to grid lines. Location is consistent with floor plan and dock detail sheets referenced in the RFI. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/11/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
Please confirm.							
T-2626	T-2626 FSP - Semi-Recessed Sprinkler Product Data	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	04/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Transbay Fire Protection Kevin Malone							
REQUEST: Ref: 21 13 19 Section 2.8 (B.6) Location: Bus Deck Level Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A A semi-recessed type sprinkler "TYCO TY-6, 8.0k factor" has been specified for the Bus Deck Level Ceilings. We have not been able to find product data on this sprinkler. Could the Engineer's provide Product Data on this sprinkler head?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The correct designation is Tyco TY-B, 8.0 k factor.				
T-2627	Manlift Opening Curb Dimension	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	03/25/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang To: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Spencer Sayles		Answered By: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Spencer Sayles					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached email correspondence from WOJV stating that decks will be left out around man-lifts and that curbs are to follow the perimeter of the deck opening. SCCI requires the dimensions for these curbs in order to pour decks with man-lift openings. Please provide dimensions for the curb along the perimeter of man-lift openings.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to the attached sketches for opening dimensions.				
T-2628	SSS - Train Box Column Web Splices	Closed	03/25/2015	04/09/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2202 Location: Zone 2 Gridline: 5/ E and H Add'l Doc Ref: Shop drawing 417, 419 Confirm the web shop splices shown in the attached sketches are acceptable.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed splice locations are acceptable. Submit the proposed shop splice detail for design team review. TT: We agree with reason for request Verification. We categorize this RFI as request for substitution.		
T-2629	GCW - Structural Glass Doors	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	04/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming Co-Author: Crown Corr, Inc. Tom Niepokoj	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Specification 08 12 50 Add'l Doc Ref's: A1-8158, Specification 08 80 03 Specification 08 12 50 section 2.4.F.1: Provide glass with line of white, opaque ceramic frit dots at eye level on the number 4 surface; dot size and spacing are subject to TJPA Representative's approval conflicts with Architectural Drawings (Re: A1-8158) which requires glass type GL-1 for doors typically. Per Specification 08 80 03 section 2.7.A glass type GL-1 does not require ceramic frit. Please advise if white, opaque ceramic frit dots are required for doors indicated to be provided with GL-1. Please clarify what glass infill is required for Structural Glass Doors.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification 08 12 50 section 2.4.F.1 that states: Provide glass with line of white, opaque ceramic frit dots at eye level on the number 4 surface is deleted. There is no requirement for white, opaque ceramic frit dots on any glass door. RFI Answered by the Design Team: 04/09/2015 RFI Closed by WOJV: 04/28/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2431 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2630	SCS - Notch in Fin Walls at GL's 9, 13, 17, 25, & 29	Closed	03/25/2015	04/04/2015	04/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2603, S1-2604, S1-2605, S1-2606 Location: Roof Level, Zones 2-5 Gridline: GL 9, 13, 17, 25, 29 Add'l Doc Ref: TG0702-106.1 Per the response to Submittal TG0702-1 06.1. On sheet 2, drawing No. MD-R 1 OG, AAI reviewer noted to notch fin walls at GL's 9, 13, 17, 25 and 29. Please provide dimensions for the above referenced notches.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketches SKA-4571 to 4574 for dimensions and locations for the notched fin walls.		
T-2631	SSS - SE201 and SE202 Missing Connection Details	Closed	03/27/2015		04/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 4/S1-7102 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 5 and D.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI #812 SK1 See attached CD RFI 812 SK1 for items 1 to 4: 1) Supply a connection detail for the WT to the beam. 2) Supply a connection detail for the WT to WT at each corner. 3) Supply a connection detail for the WT to the column web. 4) The flange of the WT extends past the edge of slab. Please provide a solution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) WT need not connect to the perpendicular WF beam and shall be stopped short at the top flange of the WF beam below. 2) WT need not connect to the perpendicular WT and shall be stopped short at the top flange of the WF beam below. 3) WT need not connect to the column web and shall be stopped short at the top flange of the WF beam below. 4) Stop the WT short as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0469. Revise edge of slab and deck orientation, add BU-WT and provide welds at the deck support angles as shown in the sketch. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request: Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		
T-2632	T-2632 ELV - Electrical Room 01324 Building Steel Conflict	Closed	03/26/2015	04/05/2015	03/31/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2432 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 0128/E1-2303,2/E1-3301] Location: Zone[03], Level [Ground] Closest Column Line Intersection is [D,11] Add'l Doc's Ref's: SK# FEC0022</div><div>Per the response given in RFI T-2216 , the electrical room layout was revised. This includes the addition of a new partition wall. However, the dimensional layout for these changes were not provided. Please provide a dimensional layout of electrical room 01324.</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4447 for new partition type and location within Electrical Room 01324. Also, refer to response to RFI T-2216.</div></div>		
T-2633	T-2633 ELV - Buy America for Conduit Fittings	Closed	03/27/2015	04/06/2015	05/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From:</div>Webcor Construction LP</div> <div><div>Co-Author:</div>Fisk Electric Company</div>		<div><div>Aseem Goyal</div><div>Orvil Anthony</div></div>	<div><div>To:</div>Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div>		<div><div>Answered By:</div>Transbay PMPC</div> <div>Ray Quesada</div>		
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128/ Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A</div><div>Per specification section 250500 Paragraph 2.9 "conduit and fittings" subparagraph C 1, 3, 5, D1, all relate to fittings by manufacturers and model number. Paragraph G.2 Rigid Steel and Intermediate Metal Conduit Fittings list the following acceptable fittings manufacturers: Appleton, Crouse-Hinds, Efcor, Midwest, O.Z/Gedney, Raco, Spring City and Thomas and Betts.In carefully reviewing the specification for the Buy America requirements, none of the above listed manufacturers comply with the Buy America. Therefore, Fisk has carefully reviewed the Buy America requirements, and wishes to identify that this is a sub-component of a larger system. The fittings are a small and minor sub-component of larger systems consisting of: Switchgear, Electrical Panels, Fire Alarm System, Intrusion System, Conduit, Wire, Cable, and Lighting System. The sub-components include, clamps, conduit fittings, connectors, junction boxes, anchors, clamps, washers, screws, nuts, bolts, fire seal, and concrete pads just to name a few.The complete manufacturing end products, including all components and sub-components, systems will take place in the United</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>The TJPA does not approve compliance with the Buy America provisions of the contract. The Prime Contractor is responsible for ensuring that lower tier subcontractors are in compliance. The TJPA has requested that the contractor provide information to be submitted to file on the attached memo for future records/use. Please provide the requested information and return to PMPC.</div><div>Answered by Design Team: 5/11/2015 Closed by Webcor: 05/12/2015</div></div>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2433 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>States, in the City of San Francisco, California, by Local International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW).Fisk Electric has reviewed three (3) FTA ruling regarding sub-components: one for the Charlotte Area Transit System, one for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, and the last one for the Southern California Edison.</p> <p>Fisk Electric is following the FTA's conclusions in preparing this RFI. Enclosed please find copies of all three (3) FTA rulings outlined above. Please note that Fisk Electric intends to utilize fittings manufactured by the O.Z./Gedney Company, one of the acceptable manufacturers specified in the contract specifications. Please review and approve our use of the O.Z. Gedney fittings for various conduit systems requirements.</p>						
T-2634	FSP - PRV Locations	Closed	03/27/2015	04/06/2015	04/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal</p> <p>Co-Author: Transbay Fire Protection Kevin Malone</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>	<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Ref: 21 13 19 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : Fire Sprinkler Permit Submission Meeting #1 ı Item 1.05</p> <p>Low Rise buildings in San Francisco are normally provided with Manual Wet Class 1 Standpipe systems which are pressurized by Fire Trucks through the FDCs. SFFD confirmed this is the approach they expect and would prefer not to have to deal with PRVs. Since we have combined standpipe/sprinkler systems under pump pressure, PRVs will be required where pressures exceed 150 psi. This occurs only in the below grade levels of the building. TFP requests acknowledgement that PRVs will only be provided on levels where pressures require them.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>As discussed in the meeting with the SFFD, the pressure reducing type fire hose valves will be used for levels B2 and B1 only. Level 1 through 4 will have standard fire hose valves. Fire Sprinkler Subcontractor is the engineer of record for this system and shall be responsible for confirming all final Regulatory Agency requirements for the system.</p>				
<hr/>							
T-2635	FSP - Cross Connections all Levels	Closed	03/27/2015	04/06/2015	04/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>	<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>Co-Author: Transbay Fire ProtectionKevin Malone</div> <div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Ref: 21 13 19 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : Fire Sprinkler Permit Submission Meeting #1 - Item 1.07 Cross connection supply to each Sprinkler Zone has been added to the Transit Center as an enhancement. Unlike a high rise the additional supply is considered a secondary supply. TFP intends to include the secondary supply into our hydraulic calculations which we believe is necessary to provide the large volume of water required at the Bus Deck level. This approach is acceptable to the SFFD but we want the Design team to confirm that it's acceptable to them</div></div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div><div>ANSWER: No, this is not acceptable. The second supply to the sprinkler zones was added as a building system increased reliability feature. The system is hydraulically calculated to be supplied from one riser in the event that the other riser is not operational. For the bus deck some of the risers at the east end could be 8" in size, if necessary</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div></div></div>							
T-2636	DLV - Slab Edge Plans in Conflict with Detail	Closed	03/31/2015	04/10/2015	04/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LPAndrew KitchenTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div> <div>Co-Author:</div> <div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: A1-2862, A1-2863, A1-3191 Location: GL 5-6 See attached marked up drawings. A1-2862 and A1-2863 show the Top of Wall elevation surrounding the Dock Leveler Pits as 22.88 ft. and the elevation of the pits as 21.35 ft. and 21.33 ft. 4/A1-3191 shows the top of wall elevation as 23.5 ft. and the elevation of the pits as 21.83 ft.</div></div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div><div>ANSWER: A1-2862 and 2863 will not be updated as the information indicated is correct. Please refer to enlarged plan A1-2963, which is referenced in the two drawings above that indicates top of leveler pit slab at 21.83', which matches the detail. Note that top of wall elevations are taken from the underside of slab and the detail is only calling out top of slab values.</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div></div><div>Please advise.</div></div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2435 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2637	SSS - Field Order#34 Fire-Trol Column Shell Extent and Primer	Closed	03/31/2015		04/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 1/S1-2720 Location: Typical HSS Column to WF BM Connection Gridlines: n/a Add'l Doc Ref's: n/a For the Fire-Trol columns, please advise on questions 1 and 2 below: 1. Detail 1 / S1-2720 shows that the FIRE-TROL shell extends near the base plate around EL: 80'-7", but the architectural drawings show the shell starting at EL: 86'-9". Please verify that the FIRE-TROL shell is only required between EL: 86'-9" and EL: 98'-0" and that the spray-on fireproofing (Not in Skanska's scope of work) will be used to fire rate the columns below and above those elevations? 2. Please confirm the shell primer finish for the column shells.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Follow attached SKA-4550-R2, for elevations of start and stop of the FIRE-TROL shell. Structural detail will be adjusted accordingly. 2. Shell primer shall be manufacturer's standard product to accept interior paint finish.		
T-2638	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Brace Bevel Clarifications	Closed	04/01/2015		04/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2703, 9/S1-5000 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 767.1 SK1 and SK2 See attached CD RFI 767.1 SK1 for items 1 to 3: 1) 9/S1-5000 indicates a 1/1 bevel. Confirm the noted bevel is acceptable. 2) 9/S1-5000 indicates a 1/1 bevel. Confirm the noted bevel is acceptable. 3) 9/S1-5000 indicates a 1/1 bevel. Confirm the noted bevel is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Confirmed. 2) Confirmed. 3) Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2436 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2639	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Dimension at Continuity Plates	Closed	04/01/2015		04/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPQuang Le</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: 8/S1-2724, 5/S1-4202 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 814 SK1, SK2 See attached CD RFI 814 SK1: Confirm the corner cuts on the continuity plates are 2" x 2" per 5/S1-4202 or provide the missing dimensions.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Continuity plate corner clips indicated in the RFI shall be detailed per AWS D1.8, Section 4.1. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request insufficient information. We categorize this RFI as clarification on means and methods.		
T-2640	FSP - Sprinkler Heads in Shaw Alley Ceiling	Closed	04/02/2015	04/12/2015	04/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPAseem Goyal</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Transbay Fire ProtectionKevin Malone</div></div>							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: Fire Sprinkler Permit Submission Meeting #1 - Item 1.11 (A1-4403) Location: Shaw Alley Reflected Ceiling Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A Sprinkler heads running East to West are spaced less than 6 feet apart. To prevent cold soldering, NFPA #13 requires baffles between heads spaced less than 6 feet apart. Two of NFPA #13's conditions for baffles (non-combustibility and an 8 inch minimum width) don't seem to be met by the light fixtures that separate the sprinklers. Please have the design team advise on this issue.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Sprinkler locations were revised so that they are not less than 6 feet apart. Please refer to the two enclosed sketches; SKA-4591 and SKA-4594. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/13/2015 Date closed in CMIC: 4/20/15		
T-2641	TTC - Missing dimension of the door	Closed	04/02/2015	04/30/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPMichelle Collanton</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LPJeff Heath</div></div>							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc: A1-2304; 1/A1-7014 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: 15-16/F-F.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #001 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #001.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4654 of revised door 01405A location. Partition and door location have been re-configured to avoid accessibility standards and code related conflicts. Note that concrete curb layout is also revised and requires coordination with shop drawings previously		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>There are missing dimensions of the highlighted door number 01405A (marked with green).</p> <p>The position of door was scaled from the plan as it is on the sceenshot.</p> <p>Please provide missing dimensions.</p>				<p>reviewed. Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4673 with slab edge plan revision of concrete curb.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 5/11/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015</p>		
T-2642	TTC - Missing dimension of the door	Closed	04/02/2015	04/30/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: A1-2305; 1/A1-7009 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Gridline: 19.1-20/F-F.7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #002</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #002.</p> <p>There is missing dimension of the highlighted door number 01520S(marked with green).</p> <p>The position of door was scaled from the plan as it is on the sceenshot.</p> <p>Please provide missing dimensions.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4655 for location of door within wall. Read in conjunction with door schedule.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2643	TTC - Missing dimensions about an interior door	Closed	04/02/2015	04/30/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #003 There is a missing dimension about an interior door (marked with yellow fill). The A1-2403, the 3/A1-7301 and the 2/A1-7006 plans show the door, but none of these plans show the position of this 02301A door. In addition, the A1-2883 plan shows the curb (marked with green fill) under the door, but the dimension of the curb is also missing. The dimension of the door was scaled from plan. The door should be 3'-5 3/8" from GL 6 according to the A1-2403. Please provide missing dimensions.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to SKA-4660 & SKA-4661 for curb and door location clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2644	TTC - Missing information about an interior door	Closed	04/02/2015	04/30/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2404; A1-9704 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: F-F.7/16-16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #004 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #004. The A1-2404 plan shows the 02405A door (marked with green fill), but the schedule do not show that. The schedule does not contain the 02405A door. Please provide missing information.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4653 with revised door schedule. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2645	TTC - Detail reference error	Closed	04/02/2015	04/30/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2439 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: 4/A1-7005; 9/A1-9207 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: B-C/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #005 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #005. There is a wrong detail reference on 4/A1-7005 plan. This plan shows the 9/A1-9207 detail, but the 9/A1-9207 plan shows a totally different area. The reference on 4/A1-7005 plan should be changed. Please provide correct reference.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to A1-7005 issued with ASI-0130 for revised detail reference on 4/A1-7005. WOJV to confirm the VB modeling team and all sub-contractors have the current CDs. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/5/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
T-2646	TTC - Missing dimensions about doors	Closed	04/02/2015	04/30/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2404; 2/A1-7205; 2/A1-3220 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: C.3-D/14-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #006 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #006. There are some missing dimensions about doors (marked with yellow fill). The 02323B and 02420A doors (marked with green fill) have dimensions from the same wall, but there is no information about the position of that interior wall (marked with red fill). After scaling the plans, the screenshot in attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #006 shows the dimensions of the doors. Please provide missing dimensions.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to SKA-4690 & SKA-4691 for dimensional clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2440 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2647	TTC - Contradiction between plans	Closed	04/02/2015	04/30/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2404; A1-2884 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: C-C.3/14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #007 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #007. There is a contradiction between Second Level Floor Plan (A1-2404) and Second Level Slab Edge Plan (A1-2884). The floor plan shows a floor drain (marked with red) in the room, but the Slab Edge Plan does not show this floor drain. The floor drain should be visible on the slab edge plan. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The floor drain is noted and located on the edge of slab drawing as FKS-2. Refer to plumbing drawings P1-0051 & P1-2404 for additional information. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2648	TTC - Missing information about doors	Closed	04/02/2015	04/30/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2602; A1-9706; 1/A1-3450; 1/A1-9030; 1/A19031 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: C-E/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #008 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #008. There are missing information about doors. The A1-2602 shows doors (marked with yellow) that the door schedule do not contains. In addition, there are some missing dimensions about these doors (marked with red). After scaling the plans, the screenshot in attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #008 shows the dimensions of the doors. Please provide missing information.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For Roof Park Restaurant door schedule, refer to A1-9710 not A1-9706. Additional dimensions provided in the enclosed sketch SKA-4682. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2649	TTC - Missing dimension about the door(marked with green)	Closed	04/02/2015	04/30/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-3404;A1-2606 Location: Zone 4, Roof Park Level Gridline: 25-26/E.2-E.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #009 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #009. There is a missing dimension about the door(marked with green) with the number PK523A. The 3 1/2" distance was scaled from the plan as it is on the screenshot. Please provide missing dimension.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4683 for dimensions to locate door. Read in conjunction with door schedule. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2650	TTC - Contradiction between plans	Closed	04/02/2015	04/30/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-9603;A1-4302 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: 4-6/C-E.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #010 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #010. The room finish schedule A1-9603 shows that the lower dock room has got IS/GB ceiling material but the ceiling plan does not show any ceiling in the room. The schedule should be corrected. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A1-9603 is correct and will not be updated. Ceiling material IS/GB** noted in the room finish schedule is correct. "IS" abbreviation noted in the Abbreviation table on A1-9603. GB** refer to 'comments' column in the schedule. Fire rated duct west of Gridline 5 and north of Gridline D adjacent to stair 203; the "GB-FR" tags the gypsum ceiling in the Lower Loading Dock 01222. A1-4302 is correct and will not be updated. Also, please refer to M1-2302 for corresponded duct in this area. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2651	RFI T-2651 FSP - Cold Shell Sprinkler Protection for Roof Park Restaurant	Closed	04/02/2015	04/12/2015	04/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				





Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2443 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2653	TTC - Missing reference	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-7001 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: F/1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #011 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #011. There is a missing reference on a callout (marked with green fill) on the 1/A1-7001 plan. The callout should be deleted. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The callout reference is labeled "extent of site mockup". This is not a detail callout, but only denotes the cladding area extents for the mock-up of W-16A on site. No callout reference will be provided and A1-7001 will not be revised. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2654	TTC - Missing callout	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2303; 3/A1-8152 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: G/9-10 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #012 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #012. There is a missing callout on A1-2303 plan. The plan shows the 3/A1-8152 callout (marked with green), but at the GL 10 this similar callout is missing (marked with yellow). The A1-2303 should show the 3/A1-8152 callout to the place marked with yellow on the screenshot. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The reference "3/A1-8152 SIM" is correct as is. The suggestion from the reviewer to move the callout is incorrect. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2444 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2655	TTC - Wrong detail reference	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2403; A/A1-8156; 1/A1-8156 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: F-F.7/8-9.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #013; 1/A1-8156 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #013. There is a wrong callout reference on A1-2403 plan. The callout (marked with green) references to section A/A1-8156. The reference on A1-2403 should be corrected to 1/A1-8156. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4694 with revised reference callout to Shaw Alley Bridge. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2656	TTC - Missing dimensions about walls	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2504; 4/A1-7012; 1/A1-7013 Location: Zone 2, Bus Deck Level Gridline: E/16-16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #014 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #014. There are missing dimensions about walls (marked with green fill) on A1-2504 plan. The 4/A1-7012 and 1/A1-7013 details also show these walls, but there are not any dimension. After scaling the plans, the screenshot shows the dimensions of the walls. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4692 for clarification of dimensions of generator exhaust flue enclosure. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2445 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2657	TTC - Gap between the walls	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2206; 1/A1-3009 Location: Zone 4, Lower Level Gridline: G-H/27-29 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #015 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #015. There are gaps between the type 9. CMU walls and RC wall on plans A1-2206 and 1/A1-3009. The plans and callout should be corrected. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There are no gaps between type 9 CMU walls and RC walls in plans as stated in this RFI. Please refer to A1-2206 and 1/A1-3009 issued with ASI-130. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		

T-2658	TTC - Missing types of the walls	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2206; A1-2207 Location: Zone 4, Lower Level Gridline: C-B/31-32 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #016 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #016. There is a missing type of a wall between gridline 31 and 31.7 on A1-2206 and A1-2207 plans. The A1-2206 plan shows the wall without any type and the A1-2207 plan shows the wall types but the marked wall do not shown on this plan. The wall should be mark on the floor plan. Please provide missing wall types.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no wall here as stated in the RFI. This is the continuation of the concrete pad at the Reclaimed Water Pump Room B1621. Please refer to SKA-4671 for graphics clarification in sheet A1-2206. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2446 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2659	TTC - Contradicting floor plans and callout	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2306; 3/A1-8275 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: C-C.3; F.7-G/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #017 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #017. The A1-2306 floor plan refers to the 3/A1-8275 callout plan but the callout shows different wall layouts and wall types are missing. Wall layout should be changed on callout 3/A1-8275 or floor plan A1-2306 to avoid the discrepancy. The walls should be mark on the plans. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> SFMTA Booths in the Muni Bus Plaza are Prefabricated units per RFI response P1-0197 dated 6/21/2014 and drawings and Specification Section 13 34 24 issued in ASI 127 on 9/12/2014. Wall types and final layout are by the selected Booth manufacturer. WOJV to ensure the Virtual Building team has the current CDs and past RFIs. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/14/2015				
T-2660	TTC - Contradicting slab openings	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2302 to A1-2307; A1-2862 to A1-2867; S12302 to S1-2307; 2; 3 & 5/A1-9317 Location: Zones 1-4, Ground Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #018 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #018. The architectural floor plans (A1-2302 to A1-2307) refers to a typical detail (2/A1-9317 TYP). This shows slab openings around the steel columns but the structural plans (S1-2302 to S1-2307 and references) and the architectural slab edge plans (A1-2862 to A1-2867) do not shows this openings. The slab edge plans should be corrected. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to "NOTE" legend box on sheets A1-2862 to A1-2867, slab edge zone plans for ground level. This general note refers to slab block out typical details at all column locations. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/21/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2661	TTC - Missing elevation about the built up topping	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2404;A1-9530; A1-9604 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: 13-15/C-F Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #019 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #019. The plan A1-9604 shows a concrete/floor tile built up topping on the Janitor's room with number 02484 and on the Electrical room with number 02465 but on the plan A1-2404 the elevation is missing. The elevations should be added to the plan A1-2404. Please provide missing elevations.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4693 for TOFF elevations noted. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2662	TTC - Wrong reference	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-7006; 4/A1-7833 Location: Zone 1, Bus deck level Gridline: E-F/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #020 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #020. The architectural callout plan 3/A1-7006 refers to 4/A1-7833 detail, but this detail shows to another place. The reference should be corrected. Please provide correct reference.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The correct detail reference is 3/A1-7837 (not 4/A1-7833). Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2663	SSS - OCS Vertical Plate Missing Dimensions	Closed	04/03/2015		04/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
--------	---------	--------	--------------	---------------	---------------	-------------	---------

Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton

REQUEST:

Contract Doc Ref: A1-8550 through A1-8532
Location: Zone 4
Gridlines: 27-28/D-C.3
Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 815 SK1

See attached CD RFI 815 SK1:
The referenced RFI's and drawings do not show sufficient information for the vertical plates. Supply a revised structural drawing or sketch showing the information and dimensions required for the vertical plates.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: ☐

The 3D computer model is part of the construction documents for this part of the project.
Please refer to 3D model as noted on detail 2/A1-8552 for information regarding vertical plate dimensions.
Vertical plates and horizontal plate form one assembly; see detail 2/A1-8551.

T-2663.1	SSS - OCS Vertical Plate Missing Dimensions	Closed	04/17/2015	04/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Quang Le	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	

Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton

REQUEST:

Contract Doc Ref: A1-8550 through A1-8532
Location: Zone 4, Second Level
Gridlines: 27 and C.3
Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1, SK2, SK3, SK4

The response to RFI T-2663, refers us to a 3D model file provided to Webcor. From this we have taken rough dimensions for the vertical sides of the OCS plate. The model does not provide sufficient information for steel detailing.

- Please confirm dimensions taken from the 3D model (Ref SK RFI 1075.1 SK01).
- Please provide vertical plate thickness and grade (Ref SK RFI 1075.1 SK02).
- Please provide vertical plate to horizontal plate weld detail (Ref SK RFI 1075.1 SK03).
- What is plate configuration at corners (Ref SK RFI 1075.1 SK04).

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: ☐

It appears that the image in red is the rhino model (outside surface model) which a part of the construction documents. The blue plate appears to be offset from the red image and might be a result of the 2D shop drawing mis-coordination. The design intent is to have the 1/2" vertical plates (same thickness as horizontal plate) flush at the end of the horizontal plate on three sides. It is acceptable to have small tolerance of geometrical difference on the north and south sides. However, the east and west sides must match the rhino 3D model. The plate vertical walls per the 3D model shall be 1'-1" in height. 12'-9 1/2" for the lower dimension is confirmed. Upper dimension of walls to match the plate edge is confirmed. The vertical plates shall be welded to the horizontal plate with a 3" long, 1/4" fillet weld spaced at 12" on center on both sides.

We suggest that the DB Ceiling contractor be copied on RFI's such as this for future coordination.

Date Answered by Design Team: 4/27/15
Date closed by WOJV: 4/27/15



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2664	TTC - Wrong reference	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/A1-7006; B/A1-7106 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.8-E/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #021 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #021. The architectural callout plan 3/A1-7006 refers to B/A1-7106 section, but this section do not shows the levels above the Bus Deck Level. The section should be corrected. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Detail B on A1-7106 does show a small section above the Bus Deck finish floor elevation. The drawing and reference is correct and there is justification in showing the section reference on the Bus Deck Level finished floor. This is not a constructability or construction issue or question and the architectural drawings do show the correct information. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2665	TTC - Missing concrete curb	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2303; A1-2863; 1/A1-3195 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: E.6-F/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #022 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #022. The A1-2303 Ground Level Floor Plan and the 1/A1-3195 detail plan shows a structural concrete curb (marked with purple) with 'CC' tag, but this curb is not existing on the A1-2863 Slab Edge Plan. The A1-2863 Slab Edge Plan should be corrected. Please confirm and correct.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4685 for wall tag revision that clarifies curb type. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2450 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2666	TTC - Contradicting wall types	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-7203; A1-7204; A1-7843 Location: Zones 3 & 4, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/24-24.9; D.4-E.6/32-32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #023 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #023. On the Lower Concourse Level the 1/A1-7203 Elevator Partial Plan shows walls with "1 CC4/E" and "1 CC4/E,K" but the 1/A1-7204 Elevator Partial Plan shows the same walls with "1 CC4" and "1 CC4/K" type and also the 3/A1-7843 detail plan marks these walls with simple "1" tags. The wall types should be corrected. Please confirm and correct.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4684. A general note was added for typical details and enlarged plans regarding additional wall type qualifiers. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2667	TTC - Contradicting wall types	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-3450; A1-9030; A1-9031; A1-8906 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: C-C.3/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #024 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #024. There are contradictions between 1/A1-9030, 1/A1-9031 floor plans and callouts and 1/A1-8906 detail. There are different wall types on each 3 plans. The wall types should be corrected. Please confirm and correct.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4687 for curb type revisions to wall tag qualifiers. The detail is coordinated with the restroom plans as well as the slab edge plan A1-2902. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2668	TTC - Contradicting wall types	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2451 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-3404; A1-9033; 1/A1-2966 Location: Zone 3-4, Roof Park Level Gridline: D-E/24-26 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #025 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #025. There are contradictions between 1/A1-3404 and 1/A1-9033 floor plan call out. There are different wall types on the plans for the same wall. The 1/A1-2966 Slab Edge Plan shows these curbs, so these curbs should be tagged with right type. The wall and curb types should be corrected on the plans. Please confirm and correct.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to responses for RFI T-2598 and T-2599 with sketches for wall type information and corresponding curbs on the slab edge plans. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2669	TTC - Missing Detail	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-7204; A1-7840 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.8-E/32-32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #026 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #026. The 4/A1-7204 Partial Floor Plan refers to 3/A1-7840 detail plan. The A1-7840 sheet does not contain detail number 3 but it shows 2 pieces of detail number 4. The A1-7840 sheet should be corrected. Please confirm and correct.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4686. A general note was added for typical details and enlarged plans regarding additional wall type qualifiers. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2452 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-267	BSE - DI Installation at First Street	Closed	11/29/2011	12/09/2011	12/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch Co-Author: Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
REQUEST: Reference RFI U-101, Sheet U-3021 The RFI response U-101 dated 02-28-2011 eliminates the CB #501 from the RUP contractor's scope of work. However there has been no replacement or adequate surface water control system neither suggested nor installed to replace the CB # 501. BBII recommends that this catch basin # 501, be installed per the original design to control surface water. Please confirm it will installed.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> CB#501 was deleted from RUP due to unforeseen field conditions. For RUP, runoff from adjacent area to drain south to existing CB at STA 4+20. Existing CB at STA 4+20 to remain in place and active at completion of RUP. BSE Contractor to provide stormwater control on site accordance with BSE documents.				
T-2670	TTC - Missing dimensions and elevation	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2863 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: D.4/8-9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #027 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #027. There are missing dimensions and elevation of a floor drain (marked with red fill) in escalator pit. After scaling the plan, the screenshot in attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #027 shows the dimensions of the floor drain. Please provide missing dimensions and elevation.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive layout shop drawing submittals have already been reviewed and approved for this area. (Ref: TG0702-029.1) Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2671	TTC - Missing dimensions of floor drain	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Contract Doc: A/A1-9250; B/A1-9250; A1-2867; A1-9251 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: F.7/34 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #028</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #028.</p> <p>There are missing dimensions about a floor drain (marked with red fill) at south pull box.</p> <p>After scaling the plans, the screenshots in attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #028 show the dimensions of the floor drain.</p> <p>Please confirm or provide dimensions.</p>				<p>Please refer to attached sketch SKA-4672 for floor drain dimension clarification at the Beale Street north and south pull boxes on A1-2867.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 5/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015</p>		
T-2672	TTC - Missing dimensions of floor drain	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p> <p>REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2862; A1-2922; A/A1-7310; 1/A1-7310; A12302 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: D-D.4/3-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #029</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #029.</p> <p>There are missing dimensions about a floor drain (marked with red fill) in escalator pit.</p> <p>After scaling the plans, the screenshot in attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #029 shows the dimensions of the floor drain.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Refer to attached sketch SKA-4672 for floor drain dimension clarification at the Beale Street north and south pull boxes on A1-2867.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 5/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2456 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2457 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2678	TTC - Contradictions between type of curbs	Closed	04/03/2015	05/01/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/A1-3220; A1-2884; A1-2404; 2&3/A1-9355 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: D-F/16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #035 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #035. There are contradictions between type of curbs around structural column at D/16 and F/16 grids. 2/A1-3220 floor detail drawing shows CC5 curb at D/16 grid, but A1-2884 slab edge plan shows CC2 type to the same curb. The 3/A1-9355 detail drawing shows differences at grid F/16 because this drawing shows CC curb type, but this type is CC3 and CC2 on the slab edge plan A1-2884. Curb types should be corrected. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Shop drawings for this area have already been reviewed and approved. Refer to TG0702-048.0 dated 2/13/2015. WOJV shall coordinate the work developed in submittals between the trade subcontractors on their team including the Virtual Building modeling team. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015		
T-2679	TTC - Contradiction between wall types	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2502; 1/A1-7002; 2/A1-7001 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D-F/1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #036 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #036. There are contradictions between the type of walls (marked with yellow) on 1/A1-7002 typical stair drawing and 2/A1-7001 landing drawing. The A1-2502 floor plan shows these callouts to the same place. The 1/A1-7002 shows 11E;7 C,Z;11 A,C wall types around the stair at D-F/1 grids, but 2/A1-7001 shows these walls with different types.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Part of this RFI question was included in previous RFI T-2675. Refer to sketches on RFI T-2675 for response. Additionally, refer to the attached sketch SKA-4645 for additional clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2458 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>Wall types should be corrected.</div> <div>Please confirm.</div>							
T-268	BSE - Rebar in Secondary Shafts	Closed	12/08/2011	12/18/2011	12/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Arup	
Co-Author:				Kevin Clinch			
REQUEST: Reference GT-2201, Installation Sequence Note 5 Please confirm the reinforcement in the secondary shafts should be installed in the last buttress shaft of each row.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		As described in Note 5 on sheet GT-2201, since the cost-add option has been excercised, the reinforcement shall be installed in the secondary shafts along rows 15 and 16.5.	
T-2680	TTC - Reference Error	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2505 Location: Zone 3, Bus Deck Level Gridline: E.2/22-23 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #037 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #037. There is a not recognizable reference mark at E.2/22-23 grids on A1-2505 plan. The probable mark is B/XA1-5615. Incorrect reference should be corrected. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		The reference tag was corrected and issued in ASI-0130. WOJV shall coordinate the current CDs with the Virtual Building team to confirm they have all the current documents. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2459 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2681	TTC - Contradiction between wall types	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/A1-7121; 1/A1-7021; A1-2506 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.4-E/31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #038 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #038. There is a contradiction between 1/A1-7021 detail and 1/A1-7121 section drawing. 1/A1-7021 shows 18 A1 wall type around driver restroom, but 1/A1-7121 shows these walls without A1 comment. Wall type should be corrected. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no contradiction between sheets. The north and south walls to the Driver Restroom are wall type 18 CC/A1, while the west wall is only type 18. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2682	TTC - Wrong detail reference on the sheet	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-8641 Location: Zone 3, Roof Park Level Gridline: G/21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #039 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #039. On the sheet 1/A1-8641 there is a section reference A/A1-8630A, but this section is on this (A1-8641) sheet below (marked with red). There are 3 more details on this sheet and these details also reference to A1-8630A, but in the ASI 128 drawings there is no A1-8630A sheet. The reference names on the A1-8641 should be checked. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This reference is incorrect. The correct reference is A/A1-8641. The sheet back reference in the detail titles are incorrect. The correct back reference in the detail titles will be A1-8641. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2460 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2683	TTC - Detail reference error	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Michelle Collanton</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div></div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
<div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jeff Heath</div></div>							
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: A/A1-6102 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: F-D/2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #040 Please see attached Virtual Building ARCH (ASI 128)-CR #040. The A/A1-6102 section shows a callout with B/A1-8168 reference (marked with green), but in the ASI 128 drawings we did not get the A1-8168 plan. The latest version of sheet A1-8168 should be sent. Please confirm.</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Sheet A1-8168 was issued in ASI-0130. If you can't find this sheet, check with WOJV document control. Reference to B/A1-8168 is incorrect, it should be 5/A1-8168. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/30/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015</div></div>	
T-2684	RFI T-2684 ELV - Prefabricated Unit Connection Point Clarification	Closed	04/03/2015	04/03/2015	04/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Aseem Goyal</div></div> <div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div>			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
<div><div>Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company</div><div>Orvil Anthony</div></div>							
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref:[ASI 130/E1-2306, 2310, 2502] Location: Zone[06,10], Level [Ground], Zone[02], Level [Bus Deck] Closest Column Line Intersection is [GND,Zone 06: 30,C; 30,F,7; GND,Zone 10: 3,V; Bus Deck,Zone 02: 2,D] Add'l Doc's Ref's: 13 34 24 Per ASI 130 the "NIC" was removed for prefabricated booths which now means providing Line and Low voltage to each Pre-fab booth. Per the response to RFI T-2049.1, it states to provide toggle handle disconnect switches within each booth to terminate prewired booth circuits for connection by others. How many electrical point connections(i.e. conduit) are required for each prefabricated booth and where are the required rough-in locations at deck level at each booth for future connection?</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Exact rough-in locations shall be coordinated with prefabricated booth shop drawings. WOJV to obtain the prefabricated booth shop drawings and coordinate with the electrical subcOntractor.</div></div>	
T-2685	Rebar Clearance to Reglet at Scallop/perimeter Walls	Closed	04/06/2015	04/16/2015	04/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2461 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Charlie Marrow			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-3282 Location: Roof Level Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: Attached A 1" deep continuous reglet is shown at the inside face of the wall at the top per details 2,4, & 5 on S1-3282. In order to achieve a minimum of 1-1/2" rebar clearance, is it acceptable to provide a 2-1/2" clearance at the inside face of the wall in lieu of 2"?			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable. Note that where details 4 and 5/S1-3282 apply, only the top U bars shall have a clear cover of 2 ½" on the inside face. The #6 vertical bars shall have 2" clear as called out in 4 and 5/S1-3282.				
T-2686	SCS - Reinforcing details at Walls around PE403 & PE404	Closed	04/06/2015	04/16/2015	04/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2604 & S1-7107 Location: Roof Park Level Gridline: 16 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached Please reference detail 1/S1-7107 for wall plan around PE403 & PE404 - Roof Park Level. Please provide reinforcement details and configuration for these walls.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide rebar details in the concrete walls at PE403/404 per comments in the attached sketch SKS-0467. Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2462 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2687	TTC - Two different tags for one system	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: E-0011 Location: Global Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #001 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #001. The Electrical Legend Plan (E-0011) shows two different tags (LSI and LCI) for the Life Safety Interface To PA System. The LCI should means an another system. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no piece of equipment with acronym 'LCI'. Refer to attached sketch SKE-RFI-T-2687-1 for clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2688	TTC - Contradiction between the geometry of type F15 lighting fixture	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: E1-0062; E1-4102 Location: Global Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #002 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #002. There is a contradiction between the Schedules-Lighting Fixture plan (E1-0062) and Train Platform Level Zone 02 Lighting Plan (E1-4102). The Schedules-Lighting Fixture plan shows the type F15 lighting fixture has a round geometry, but the Train Platform Level Zone 02 Lighting Plan shows the type F15 is rectangular. The manufacturer website (http://www.visual-3d.com/tools/photometricviewer/default.aspx?id=53790) shows the IBL 24L SD125 LP740 lighting fixture is rectangular so the Schedule should show rectangular geometry as same as the Train Platform Level Zone 02 Lighting Plan (E1-4102).			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Symbol shape shown on drawings is not representative of actual fixture shape. All F15 fixtures per light fixture schedule on Sheet E1-0062 are rectangular. WOJV Virtual Modeling team should also be aware that the light fixture housing above the ceiling finish will not be the same size as the fixture opening in the ceiling finish. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2463 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2689	TTC - Missing lighting fixtures from electrical lighting plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: A1-4506; E1-4506 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #003				Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4639 with Bus Deck lighting clarification at zone 06.			
Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #003.				Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015			
There is a contradiction between the E1-4506 Bus Deck Level Zone 06 lighting Plan and the A1-4506 Zone 06 Reflected Ceiling Plan. The electrical lighting plan shows 2 extra lighting fixtures, compared to the architectural plan.							
The two plans should match.							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2464 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2690	TTC - Missing lighting fixture from Lighting Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4203; E1-4203 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: K/7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #004 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #004. There is a missing lighting fixture in Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Lighting Plan (E1-4203). The Lighting Plan (E1-4203) shows three lighting fixtures but the Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4203) shows only two of them. The A1-4203 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4203 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no missing lighting fixture as stated on the RFI. There are 4 light fixtures for IDF Room B1360. The other light fixture highlighted in yellow in the RFI is included in the continuation of the plan in sheet E1-4211. Also, please refer to Note A on drawings E1-4203 and E1-4211. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/19/2015 (revised response received 5/13/2015) Date Closed by WOJV: 5/14/2015				
T-2691	TTC - Contradiction between Lighting Plan and Reflected Ceiling Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4203; E1-4203 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C.3/7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #005 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #005. There is contradiction between the Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Lighting Plan (E1-4203) and the Lower Concourse Level 03 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4203). The position of the lightings are different. The A1-4203 Reflected Ceiling Plan and E1-4203 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to SKA-4624 for updated light fixture location at Water Heater closet B1391. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2692	TTC - Missing lighting fixture from Reflected Ceiling Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4203; E1-4203 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C.3/6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #006 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #006. There is a missing lighting fixture on Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4203). The Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Lighting Plan (E1-4203) shows four lighting fixtures but the Ceiling Plan (A1-4203) shows only three of them. The A1-4203 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4203 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide light fixture quantity per electrical drawings. Refer to attached SKA-4625 for revised light fixture spacing. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				
T-2693	TTC - Contradiction between Lighting Plan and Reflected Ceiling Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4203; E1-4203 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C.3/6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #007 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #007. There is contradiction between the Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Lighting Plan (E1-4203) and the Lower Concourse Level 03 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4203). The position of the lightings are different (marked with yellow). The A1-4203 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4203 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to SKA-4626 for revised light fixture location at Lock Shop B1388. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2466 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2694	TTC - Missing lighting fixture from Reflected Ceiling Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4204; E1-4204 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: H/15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #008 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #008. There is a missing lighting fixture on Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4204). The Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Lighting Plan (E1-4204) shows four lighting fixtures (marked with yellow) but the Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4204) shows only three of them. The A1-4204 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4204 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to SKA-4627 for revised light fixture layout at the South Electrical Room B1441. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015		
T-2695	TTC - Contradiction between Lighting Plan and Reflected Ceiling Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4204; E1-4204 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: H/14 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #009 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #009. There is contradiction between the Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Lighting Plan (E1-4204) and the Lower Concourse Level 04 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4204). The position of the lightings are different (marked with yellow). The A1-4204 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4204 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the attached sketch SKA-4656 for the updated orientation of lighting fixture at IDF Room B1462. Orient fixtures as shown on E1-4204. Locate fixtures within room as shown on architectural drawings per Sheet Note A, E1-4204. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2468 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2699	ASI # 131 - Phase 2 Train Platform Track Clearance Requirements	Closed	04/06/2015	04/16/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: Field Order T-00036 (ASI # 131) Phase 2 Documents Location: Train Platform Level					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
During ongoing MEPS coordination with ASI # 131 (Field Order # T-00036) Phase 2 documents an issue arose involving required ceiling clearances above the actual track areas in the Train Platform level. It was mentioned in weekly BIM coordination meetings that there exist a Dynamic Vehicle Envelope requirement reflecting future track clearances in the Train Platform Level for each track. Please provide required track clearances for continued Phase 2 MEPS coordination.					Refer to enclosed sketches SKA-2456, SKA-2457, SKA-2458, SKA-2459, SKA-2461 and SKA-2473 for the required Dynamic Vehicle Envelope clearances.		
					Answered by Design Team: 04/10/2015 Closed by Webcor: 05/14/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject		Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2702	TTC - Missing lighting fixtures from Reflected Ceiling Plan		Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath						
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc: A1-4210; E1-4210				Refer to SKA-4628 for revised light fixture layout at Stair 901 B1901.				
Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level								
Gridline: V/3								
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #013				Date Answered by Design Team: 5/1/2015				
Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #013.				Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				
The Lower Concourse Level Zone 10 Lighting Plan (E1-4210) shows two lighting fixtures at this location but the Lower Concourse Level Zone 10 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4210) do not show it.								
The A1-4210 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4210 Lighting Plan should match.								
Please confirm.								

T-2703	TTC - Different position of lighting fixtures		Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath						
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc: A1-4504; E1-4504				See the attached sketch SKA-4646 for revised light fixture layout.				
Location: Zone 2, Bus Deck Level								
Gridline: D.8-E.2/17-18								
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #014				Date Answered by Design Team: 5/5/2015				
Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #014.				Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				
There is a contradiction between the E1-4504 Bus Deck Level Zone 04 Lighting Plan and the A1-4504 Zone 04 Reflected Ceiling Plan. The Architectural plan shows 3 piece of lighting fixtures, but the Electrical plan shows 4 piece of lighting fixtures and they are rotated by 90 degrees compared to the Architectural plan.								
The two plans should match.								
Please confirm.								



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2471 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2704	TTC - Different geometry of lighting fixtures	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4502; E1-4502 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D-E.6/3-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #015 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #015. There is a contradiction between the E1-4502 Bus Deck Level Zone 02 lighting Plan and the A1-4502 Zone 02 Reflected Ceiling Plan. The Architectural plan shows 8 pieces of ceiling mounted square shaped lighting fixtures, but the Electrical plan shows 4 pieces of round shaped lighting fixtures. The two plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the attached sketch SKA-4662 for clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2705	TTC - Missing lighting fixture from Lighting Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4303; E1-4303 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: C-C.3/6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #016 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #016. The Ground Level Zone 02 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4303) shows a lighting fixture at this location but the Ground Level Zone 02 Lighting Plan (E1-4303) does not show it. The A1-4303 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4303 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The light fixture in question should not be shown on the architectural drawings. The electrical drawing is correct. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2472 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2706	TTC - Contradiction between Lighting Plan and Reflected Ceiling Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4303; E1-4303 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: E-F/7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #017 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #017. There is a contradiction between the Ground Level Zone 03 Lighting Plan (E1-4303) and the Ground Level Zone 03 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4303). The position of the lighting fixtures are different (marked with red). Furthermore there are missing lightings on E1-4303 sheet (marked with yellow). The A1-4303 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4303 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to SKE-RFI-T-2706 and SKA-4688 for clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/14/2015				
T-2707	TTC - Contradiction between Lighting Plan and Reflected Ceiling Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4303; E1-4303 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: C-C.3/11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #018 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #018. There is a contradiction between the Ground Level Zone 03 Lighting Plan (E1-4303) and the Ground Level 03 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4303). The position of the lighting fixtures are different (marked with yellow). The A1-4303 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4303 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Do not dimension light fixtures or locate light fixtures per electrical drawings. Location and orientation of light fixtures is governed by architectural drawings as indicated in electrical general note on A/E1-4303 & E-0005. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2473 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2708	TTC - Missing lighting fixture on Lighting Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4304; E1-4304 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: D-D.4/15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #019 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #019. The Ground Level Zone 04 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4304) shows four lighting fixtures at this location but the Ground Level Zone 04 Lighting Plan (E1-4304) shows only three of them. The A1-4304 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4304 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch SKA-4663 for lighting layout clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2709	TTC - Missing lighting fixture on Lighting Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4306; E1-4306 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: F/31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #020 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #020. The Ground Level Zone 06 Lighting Plan (E1-4306) shows a lighting fixture at this location but the Ground Level Zone 06 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4306) does not show it. The A1-4306 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4306 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Locate light fixtures per architectural drawings as indicated in General Note A in drawing E-0005. There is no light fixture at this location per A1-4306. This is the location of the future OCS trough. Do not locate light fixtures per electrical drawings. Refer to SKE-T-RFI-2709 for revised Lighting Plans. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/15/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2474 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2710	TTC - Missing lighting fixture from the Lighting Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4306; E1-4306 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: E.6-F/28 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #021 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #021. The Ground Level Zone 06 Lighting Plan (E1-4306) shows a lighting fixture at this location but the Ground Level Zone 06 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4306) does not show it. The A1-4306 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4306 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Locate light fixtures per architectural drawings as indicated in General Note A in drawing E-0005. There is no light fixture at this location per A1-4306. This is the location of the future OCS trough. Do not locate light fixtures per electrical drawings. Refer to SKE-T-RFI-2709 and SKE-T-RFI-2710 for revised Lighting Plans. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				
T-2711	TTC - Contradiction between Lighting Plan and Reflected Ceiling Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: E1-4105; A1-4105 Location: Zone 3, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-C.3/22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #022 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #022. There is a contradiction between the Train Platform Level Zone 05 Lighting Plan (E1-4105) and the Train Platform Level Zone 05 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4105). The position of the lighting fixtures are different (marked with yellow). The A1-4105 Reflected Ceiling Plan and the E1-4105 Lighting Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch SKA-4669 for updated light fixture locations for IDF Room B2520. Locate fixtures as shown on architectural drawings per Sheet Note A, E1-4204. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2476 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Plan should match.						
	Please confirm.						
T-2714	TTC - Contradiction between Lighting Plan and Reflected Ceiling Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Contract Doc: A1-4206; E1-4206				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level				Refer to SKA-4658 for the updated location of lighting fixture at IDF Room B1680.			
Gridline: B/27-27.1							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #025				Orient and locate fixtures within room as shown on architectural drawings per Sheet Note A, E1-4206.			
Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #025.				Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015			
There is a contradiction between the Lower Concourse Level Zone 06 Lighting Plan (E1-4206) and the Lower Concourse Level 06 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4206). The position of the lightings are different (marked with yellow).				Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015			
The A1-4206 Reflected Ceiling Plan And the E1-4206 Lighting Plan should match.							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2477 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2715	TTC - Missing lighting fixture from the Lighting Plan	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4402; E1-4402 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D-E/1-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #026 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #026. There is a missing lighting fixture from E1-4402 Second Level Zone 02 Lighting Plan. The A1-4402 Zone 02 Reflected Ceiling Plan indicate a lighting fixture, but the Electrical Lighting Plan does not contain any information about the exact type of the lighting fixture. The Electrical Lighting Plan should contain the exact type of the lighting fixture. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Light fixture described in this RFI on the architectural drawings is not required and shall be deleted. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2716	TTC - Missing lighting fixture	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4502; E1-4402 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: E-F.7/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #027 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #027. There is a missing lighting fixture from E1-4402 Second Level Zone 02 lighting Plan. The A1-4502 Zone 02 Architectural Plan indicate 3 lighting fixtures, but the Electrical Lighting Plan shows information about only 2 lighting fixtures. The two plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to SKA-4696 for clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2478 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>NOTE: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #027 has typos in the Detail Reference, Sheet Approval Date, and Description sections specifying A1-4402 instead of A1-4502.</p>							
T-2717	TTC - Different mounting of lighting fixtures	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc: A1-4403; E1-4403			Refer to attached sketch SKA-4664 for lighting layout clarification.				
Location: Zone 1, Second Level							
Gridline: C.3-D/7-8							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #028			Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015				
Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #028.			Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
There is a contradiction between the E1-4403 Second Level Zone 03 Lighting Plan and the A1-4403 Zone 03 Architectural Plan. The Architectural plan shows wall mounted lighting fixtures, but the Electrical plan shows ceiling mounted lighting fixtures.							
The two plans should match.							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2479 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2718	TTC - Missing lighting fixture	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4403; E1-4403 Location: Zone 1-2, Second Level Gridline: C.3-D/10-11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #029 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #029. There is a missing lighting fixture from E1-4403 Second Level Zone 03 Lighting Plan. The A1-4403 Zone 03 Reflected Ceiling Plan indicate a lighting fixture, but the Electrical Lighting Plan does not contain any information about the exact type of the lighting fixture. The two plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Light fixture described in this RFI on the architectural drawings is not required and shall be deleted. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2719	TTC - Different mounting of lighting fixtures	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4406; E1-4406 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: E-F/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #030 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #030. There is a contradiction between the E1-4406 Second Level Zone 06 lighting Plan and the A1-4406 Zone 06 Architectural Plan. The Architectural plan shows there is a wall mounted lighting fixture, but the Electrical plan shows it is a ceiling mounted lighting fixture. The two plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to sketch SKA-4665 for clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/11/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2480 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2720	TTC - Missing lighting fixtures in the superintendent station	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4502; E1-4502 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D-F/1.4-3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #031 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #031. There is a contradiction between the E1-4502 Bus Deck Level Zone 02 lighting Plan and the A1-4502 Zone 02 Reflected Ceiling Plan. The Architectural plan shows there are 12 pieces of ceiling mounted lighting fixtures, but the Electrical plan does not show any lighting fixtures in this room. The two plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Delete lighting configuration shown on Architectural Drawings. Lighting shall be supplied as part of the Manufacturer's prefabricated booth. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2721	TTC - Different position of lighting fixtures	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-4502; E1-4502 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.8-E.2/3-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #032 Please see attached Virtual Building EL (ASI 128)-CR #032. There is a contradiction between the E1-4502 Bus Deck Level Zone 02 Lighting Plan and the A1-4502 Zone 02 Reflected Ceiling Plan. The lighting fixture on the Architectural plan is rotated by 90 degrees, compared to the Electrical plan. The two plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches SKA-4666 & SKA-4667 for clarification. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2481 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2722	TTC - Missing pipe and equipment	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3002; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-C/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #001 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #001. The Riser Diagram (P1-5040) shows an equipment with a connecting pipe which are not shown on the Enlarged Plan (P1-3002). In accordance with the P1-5040 these elements should appear on the P1-2102. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to T-2723, T-2724, T-2725, T-2728 attached sketch SKP1-3002. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2723	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plan and the riser diagram	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3002; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-C/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #002 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #002. There is a contradiction between the Enlarged Floor Plan (P1-3002) and the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040). The P1-2101 shows two vertical pipes but the P1-5040 shows only one vertical pipe here(marked with red). The P1-3002 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to T-2722, T-2724, T-2725, T-2728 attached sketch SKP1-3002. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2724	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plan and the riser diagram	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3002; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-C/3-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #003 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #003. There is a contradiction between the Enlarged floor Plan (P1-3002) and the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040). The P1-3002 shows one equipment (marked with red arrows) instead of two like the P1-5040. Pipe tracing is different too (marked with red). The P1-3002 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to sketch T-2722, T-2723, T-2725, T-2728 and attached sketch SKP1-3002. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2725	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plan and the riser diagram	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3002; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-C/3-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #004 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #004. There is a contradiction between the Enlarged Floor Plan (P1-3002) and the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040). The P1-3002 shows three capped future connection but the P1-5040 shows only two. The P1-3002 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to T-2722, T-2723, T-2724, T-2728 and attached sketch SKP1-3002. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2483 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2726	TTC - Missing information	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-0051; P1-2202; A1-2202; A1-3010 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: A/1.4-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #005 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #005. There is no information on Architectural plans about the position of sleeve for the 8" diam. fire protection supplier pipe (marked with red). There is no callout or view on the following drawings: Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Floor Plan (A1-2202); Lower Concourse Level Concrete Wall Partial Plans (A1-3010). The 8" diameter fire protection pipe requires a 12" sleeve in accordance with the Pipe Sleeve Schedule for Perimeter Foundation Wall Penetration (P1-0051) and it should be shown on the drawings. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See A1-2862 for the location of the fire protection supply pipe penetration requested. GC note: the architectural plan locates this pipe by providing the horizontal dimension to the grid and should be read in conjunction with other information in the plumbing plans (invert elevation, pipe size and pipe sleeve size). Date Answered by Design Team: 5/5/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				
T-2727	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and riser diagram	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-5040; P1-0010 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: A/1.4-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #006 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #006. There is a contradiction between the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040) and the Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Floor Plan (A1-2202). The P1-5040 shows that the fire protection supplier pipe comes down to the equipment but the P1-2202 shows that this pipe comes up to this equipment.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This discrepancy will be corrected in the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2484 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	In accordance with the P1-2202 the supplier pipe should look like the green dashed line on P1-5040.						
	Please confirm.						
T-2728	TTC - Missing vent pipe	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3002; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-C/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #007 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #007. On the Riser Diagram (P1-5040) shows a vent pipe (marked with red) from the Fire Protection Water Storage Tank which is not indicated on the Train Platform Level Zone 02 Enlarged Plan (P1-3002). The vent pipe should be shown on the P1-3002 enlarged floor plan. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to T-2722, T-2723, T-2724, T-2725, and attached sketch SKP1-3002. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2729	TTC - Contradiction between tags	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5040; A1-9601 Location: Global Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #008 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #008. The Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040) shows that the number of Mech Pump Room is B2230 and the Room Finish Schedule Train Platform Level & Lower Concourse Level shows that the B2230 room number belongs to the Sewage Ejector Room. The P1-5040 and the A1-9601 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The room numbers match, the room names will be shall be shown correctly on the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				
T-2730	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and riser diagram	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: E.2/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #009 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #009. The Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202) shows a valve which does not appear on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040). The P1-2202 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The valve is shown on the floor plan. An updated riser diagram will be coordinated in the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2731	TTC - Missing pipe branch equipment from the riser diagram	Closed	04/06/2015	05/04/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2486 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2732	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #010 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #010. The Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202) shows a pipe branch and an equipment (marked with red) which are not indicated on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram. The P1-2202 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.	Michelle Collanton Jeff Heath	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 08 88 53 Location: Zone 3 Ground Level and Roof Park Level Specification Section 088853, article 2.3.K provides some guidance on the temperature design criteria. However, we need more accurate temperatures for the interior and exterior surfaces of W-12 and W-13 skylight glazing. Due to limitations on the fire-rated glass provided by manufacturer VETROTECH, the maximum in-service temperature of the fire rated glazing cannot exceed 122 degrees Fahrenheit (F) (50 degrees Celsius). We have methods to control the temperature include adding various solar control low-e layers to the laminated glazing or adding some limited air conditioning to the interiors (under-side of fire rated glazing). However we have run initial modeling and the current design temperatures are	Jonathan Flaming Erik Bryant	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The branch and the equipment are shown on the floor plan. An updated riser diagram will be coordinated in the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015			
T-2732	GCW - Ambient Temperatures for the Glass Floors	Closed	04/07/2015	04/17/2015	04/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Co-Author: Crown Corr, Inc.		Jonathan Flaming Erik Bryant	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We cannot provide exterior and interior glass surface temperatures as requested. The surface temperature of the cladding material is a result of sun exposure, duration, and ambient temperature on the specific properties of the material, material temperature absorption and retention properties, mass of the material, etc., which are not fully known by the design team and can vary and spike with natural climate conditions. We can provide guidance from thermal comfort analysis conducted for the natural ventilation and radiant floor system performance in the Grand Hall during the design phase. The results of the computer modeling predicted a maximum interior air temperature of 92.5 degrees F at the ground floor when the outdoor air temperature is 95 degrees F. We expect to see higher temperatures (3-5degF) at the underside of the W-12 system as the heat rises through the space to the exhaust discharge points in the glass box and light column skylight. If exterior air temperatures exceed 100 degrees F then interior air				

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2488 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2733	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and riser diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2102; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: C-F/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #011 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #011. The Train Platform Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2102) shows an FSP branch (marked with red dashed line) which appears on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram as a capped future connection. The P1-2102 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The red dashed line is not the same with the capped line in Room B2230. The dashed red line goes to a fire hose valve at grid lines 4/F. The capped line will serve equipment to be installed in Phase 2. Floor plan will be coordinated in the shop drawing. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2734	TTC - Contradiction between floor plans and riser diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2102; P1-2202; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: D.4-D.8/2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #012 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #012. There is a contradiction between the Train Platform Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2102), the Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202) and the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040). The P1-2102 shows different branch lines like the P1-2202 and the P1-5040. The P1-2102, P1-2202 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The discrepancy has been addressed in ASI-0130. WOJV to confirm Virtual Building team and all trade subcontractors have the current CDs. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2490 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	(green). The P1-2203 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.						
T-2737	TTC - Missing element from piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C.3/7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #015 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #015. The Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203) shows a pipe branch (marked with red) which is not indicated on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040). The P1-2203 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The branch and the equipment are shown on the floor plan. An updated riser diagram will be coordinated in the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2491 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2738	TTC - Missing elements from the piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F-F.7/6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #016 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #016. The Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203) shows a pipe branch and an equipment (marked with red) which does not indicated on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040) The P1-2203 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The branch and the fire hose valve are shown on the floor plan. An updated riser diagram will be coordinated in the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				
T-2739	TTC - Missing elements from piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2303; P1-2403 P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level; Second Level Gridline: D.4-F.7/6-8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #017 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #017. The Ground Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2303) and the Second Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2403) show a pipe branch and an equipment (marked with red) which does not indicated on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040). The P1-2303; P1-2403 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The branch feeds a fire hose valve on the second level, the floor plans are correct. An updated riser diagram will be coordinated in the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2740	TTC - Contradiction between floor plans and the piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2503; P1-2603 P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level; Park Level Gridline: D.8-E.6/7-8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #018 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #018. The Bus Deck Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2503) and the Fire Protection Riser Diagram (P1-5040) show a Fire Hose Valve (FHV) on the FSP A4 riser (marked with green) but the Park Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2603) shows that the FHV is on the FSP A3. The P1-2503; P1-2603 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch SKP1-2603. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				
T-2741	TTC - Contradiction between floor plans and piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2402; P1-2403; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D.8-E/1.4-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #019 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #019. The Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040) shows that the fire protection supplement of the Stair 201A and B is served by the FSP A3 riser (marked with green) but the floor plans (P1-2402 and P1-2403) show that the supplier pipe (marked with red) comes from the FSP A5 riser (marked with light blue). The P1-2402; P1-2403 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The riser diagram has been revised in ASI-0130. WOJV to confirm Virtual Building team and all trade subcontractors have all current CDs. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2493 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2742	TTC - Annotation error on the floor plan	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2502 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: F-F.7/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #020 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #020. The Bus Deck Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan shows a Fire Sprinkler and Standpipe in the FSP A3 riser which is tagged with <27> but in the Sheet notes the <27> is a 1" CW (cold water pipe). Tag should be revised. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch SKP1-2502. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				
T-2743	TTC - Missing branch on floor plan	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-5041 Location: Zone 1-2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C/10.1-11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #021 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #021. The Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203) shows a fire protection branch (marked with red) which is not indicated on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P15041). The P1-2203 and the P1-5041 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Floor plan is correct. For revised riser diagram, see T-2744, T-2745, T-2750 and attached sketch SKP1-5041. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				
T-2744	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2494 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-5040; P1-5041 Location: Zone 1-2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F-J/9-12 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #022 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #022. The Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203) shows that the order of the riser on the supplier pipe (green) from the fire pump (P1-5040) is the following: FSP B1 (yellow); FSP B3 (light blue); FSP B4 (orange); FSP B8 (red) but the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5041) shows the following order: FSP B8; FSP B1; FSP B3; FSP B4. The P1-2203 and the P1-5041 should match. Please confirm.	Michelle Collanton Jeff Heath	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello SUGGESTION:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to T-2743, T-2745, T-2750 attached sketch SKP1-5041. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015		
T-2745	TTC - Missing Fire protection branch	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-5041 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: G/11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #023 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #023. The Fire Protection Piping Diagram shows a pipe branch (marked with red) which is not indicated on the Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203). The P1-2203 and the P1-5041 should match. Please confirm.	Michelle Collanton Jeff Heath	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello SUGGESTION:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Floor plan is correct. For revised riser diagram see T-2743, T-2744, T-2750, and attached sketch SKP1-5041. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2495 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2746	TTC - Missing pipe branch	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-2303; P1-2403; P1-5041 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F/9.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #024 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #024. The Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203); the Ground Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2303) and Second Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan show a pipe branch (marked with red) which does not indicated on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5041). The P1-2203; P1-2303; P1-2403 and the P1-5041 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This branch supplies a fire hose valve on the second level. The fire protection riser diagram will be coordinated in shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/23/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015		
<hr/>							
T-2747	VOID	Open	03/18/2015	03/28/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:			Answered By:				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-2748	test	Void	03/31/2015	04/10/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:			Answered By:				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-2749	TTC - Missing pipe branch	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2496 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-2210; P1-2211; P1-5041 Location: Zone 1-2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F/3-11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #025</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #025.</p> <p>The Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203); the Lower Concourse Level Zone 10 Plumbing Plan (P1-2210) and the Lower Concourse Level Zone 11 Plumbing Plan (P1-2211) show a pipe branch which does not indicated on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5041).</p> <p>The P1-2203; P1-2210; P1-2211 and the P1-5041 should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					
T-2750	TTC - Contradiction between floor plans and piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>		<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>			
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-2303; P1-5041 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: G/12 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #026</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #026.</p> <p>The Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203) and Ground Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2303) show a vertical pipe and an equipment but the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5041) does not show them.</p> <p>The P1-2203; P1-2303 and the P1-5041 should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					
				<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Refer to T-2743, T-2744, T-2745, and attached sketch SKP1-5041.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 5/17/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2751	TTC - Missing pipe branch	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2104; P1-5041 Location: Zone 2, Train Platform Level Gridline: E/16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #027 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #027. The Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5041) shows a pipe branch (marked with red) which is not indicated on the Train Platform Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2104). The P1-2103 and the P1-5041 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This branch is provided for Phase 2. It will be shown on the contractor's shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/21/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015				
T-2752	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plans and the piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-2204; P1-5041 Location: Zone 2, Train Platform Level Gridline: E/16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #028 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #028. There is a Preaction Fire Protection System on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5041) between the FSP B4 (marked with orange) and the FSP B6 (marked with blue) risers. There is no Preaction Fire Protection System on the Floor Plans (P1-2203; P1-2204) between the FSP B4 and the FSP B6 risers. The P1-2203; P1-2204 and the P1-5041 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Preaction system has been deleted. See attached sketch number T-2752,T-2754.T-2755 SKP1-5041. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/19/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2498 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2753	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plans	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2404; P1-2504 Location: Zone 2, Second Level; Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #029 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #029. There is a contradiction between Floor Plans (P1-2404; P1-2504). They show the FSP B2 riser the opposite ends of the Stair 401 (marked with red arrows) without any connection. The P1-2404 and the P1-2504 should match Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The offset on drawing P1-2404 has been deleted. Refer to attached sketch T-2753_SKP1-2404. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/21/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015				
T-2754	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plans and piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2205; P1-2305; P1-5041 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Gridline: G/22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #030 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #030. There is a contradiction between the Floor Plans (P1-2205; P1-2305) and the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5041). The P1-5041 shows that the Fire Department Connection (FDC) (marked with red) is at the gridline G/20.1 but the Floor Plans show that this equipment is at gridline G/22. Furthermore the connection of FDC is incorrect. The P1-5041 shows it is connected to the FSP C4 riser (marked with blue) but the floor plans show it is connected to FSP C1 (marked with purple). The P1-2205; P1-2305 and the P1-5041 should match.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Floor plan P1-2205 (dated 2/12/15) is correct. Floor plan P1-2305 is correct. Refer to attached sketch number T-2752,T-2754.T-2755_SKP1-5041 Date Answered by Design Team: 5/19/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2499 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2755	TTC - Contradiction between floor plans and piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Contract Doc: P1-2304; P1-2404; P1-5041				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Location: Zone 2, Second Level; Bus Deck Level				Refer to attached sketch T-2755-SKP1-5041			
Gridline: D.4-E.6/15-16				Date Answered by Design Team: 5/19/2015			
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #031				Date Closed by WOJV: 5/28/2015			
Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #031.							
There is a contradiction between the Floor Plans (P1-2304; P1-2404) and the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5041). The P1-5041 shows only one Sprinkler Drain Pipe (SPDR) (marked with red) but the Floor Plans show two.							
The P1-2304; P1-2404 and the P1-5041 should match.							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2500 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2756	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plan and piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2206; P1-5042 Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: E.6-H/27.1-28 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #032 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #032. The Floor Plan (P1-2206) shows a pipe branch (marked with red) which is not indicated on the Piping Diagram (P1-5042). The P1-2206 and the P1-5042 should match Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This branch serves a fire hose valve and will be shown in the updated riser diagram included in the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/21/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015				
T-2757	FPR - Use of Pre-Cast Bolt Covers	Closed	04/07/2015	04/07/2015	04/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Specification Section 07 81 23 Details 1, A, & B/A1-8662 Sheet S1-2505 Detail 5/S1-5017 Detail 1/S1-6008 Detail 1/S1-4206 Location: Light Column and Bus Deck Level Closest Column Line Intersection: Bus Deck Level GL 21 & GL 22 GL D.4/28 to GL D.4/38 Add'l Doc Ref's: Letter from International Paint Specification Section 07 81 23 Intumescent Fire Resistive Material has the following IFRM-1 and IFRM-2			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The design intent is to not install IFRM-2 at any connections or areas with bolts; thus neither bolts, nor pins require fireproof bolt covers. Detail 5/S1-5017 does not require IFRM-2, thus it does not need bolt covers. At detail 1/S1-6008 there are not fireproof bolt covers, they are bolt protection caps, apply IFRM-1 at this location. At the braced frame details referred to in this RFI, install IFRM-2 only on straight pipe runs and install IFRM-1 elsewhere. Submit shop drawing to confirm all demarcation lines between the two fireproofing types. Date Answered by Design Team: 04/24/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 04/24/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page:2501 of 3091

Date:06/17/2015

Time:02:27 PM

Job:30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>performance requirements: (2.3) A.1 - Listed by UL, ITS/WH, FM Global, or ICC-ES, and bearing their label. (2.3) A.2 - Formulated and applied the achieve required UL fire resistive ratings. (2.3) A.3 - The use of factory precast components with precast bolt heads.</p> <p>Per Detail 1/A1-8662 IFRM-1 is to be applied to the beams on the Bus Deck Level at GL 21 and GL 22. Sheet S1-2505 calls for a Type 2 (P) Drag Connection. Detail 5/S1-5017 depicts a Type 2 (P) Drag Connection and connection pins requiring pre-cast bolt covers.</p> <p>Per Detail A/A1-8662 IFRM-2 is to be applied at the base of the light column and references the structural drawings. Detail 1/S1-6008 depicts bolts and protection caps at the base of the light column.</p> <p>Per Detail B/A1-8662 IFRM-2 is to be applied on the brace frame at GL D.4/28 to GL D.4/38 and references structural drawings. Detail 1/S1-4206 depicts Typ. Brace Conn. at MF Col. at Ground Floor and connection pins at the BRB plates requiring pre-cast bolt covers.</p> <p>Per the attached letter from International Paint, UL does not have a specific listing for the Interchar (Basis of Design Material) Bolt Caps.</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable to furnish and install the Interchar (Basis of Design Material) Bolt Caps without the product having a specific UL, ITS/WH, FM Global, or ICC-ES listing or provide direction as to the desired installation of IFRM where precast bolt covers were intended to be installed.</p>						
T-2758	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plans and piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc: P1-2206; P1-2306; P1-5042			Refer to attached sketch RFI_T-2758,T-2759,T-				

[illegible]



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2503 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2760	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plans and piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2206; P1-2207; P1-5042 Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D.4-D.8/31-31.7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #035 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #035. The Floor Plan (P1-2206) shows a pipe branch (marked with red) which is indicated neither on the next floor plan (P1-2207) nor on the Piping Diagram (P1-5042). The P1-2206; P1-2207 and the P1-5042 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This piece of pipe has been removed. Refer to attached sketch RFI_T-2760_SKP1-2206.pdf. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/23/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015				
T-2761	TTC - Missing part of a riser	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2306; P1-2307; P1-5042 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: D.4-F/30-31.7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #036 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #036. The FSP D6 riser (marked with blue) is interrupted on Floor Plans (P1-2306; P1-2307). The floor plans should show the whole FSP D6 riser. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> FSP routing has been corrected. Refer to sketch RFI_T-2761,T-2768_SKP1-2306.pdf. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/23/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015				
T-2762	TTC - Missing sprinkler	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2405; P1-2505; P1-5041 Location: Zone 3, Second Level; Bus Deck Level Gridline: F/20.1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #039 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #039. The Floor Plan (P1-2405) shows a pipe branch (marked with red) which connects to the FSP D1 riser on Second Level. The Piping Diagram (P1-5042) shows that this branch connects to the FSP C1 on the Bus Deck Level instead of the Second Level. The P1-2405; P1-2505 and the P1-5041 should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no discrepancy in the connection to the correct FSP riser (FSP-C1). The actual connection comes from the second level ceiling up to the bus deck level. The updated fire protection riser diagram will be included in the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/23/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015			
T-2765	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plans and piping diagram		Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch RFI_T-2758,T-2759,T-2762,T-2763,T-2768_SKP1-5042.pdf. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/23/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015			
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2306; P1-2307; P1-5042 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: D.4-D.8/31-31.7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #040 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #040. The Piping Diagram (P1-5042) shows a Fire Hose Valve (FHV) and a Sprinkler Assembly on the FSP D3 but the Floor Plans (P1-2306; P1-2307) do not show them. The P1-2306; P1-2307 and the P1-5042 should match. Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2766	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plan and the piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc: P1-2506; P1-2606; P1-5042			This is the dedicated sprinkler control assembly for the				
Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level			exposure protection sprinkler zone. This will be				
Gridline: D.8-E.6/31			coordinated in the fire protection riser diagram				
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #041			included with the shop drawings.				
Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #041.			Date Answered by Design Team: 5/23/2015				
			Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015				
The Floor Plan (P1-2506) shows a Sprinkler Assembly (marked with red) which does not appear on the Piping Diagram (P1-5042).							
The P1-2506 and the P1-5042 should match.							
Please confirm.							
T-2767	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc: P1-2506; P1-2606; P1-5042			This connection has been removed. Refer to attached				
Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level			sketch RFI_T-2767_SKP1-2506.pdf				
Gridline: E-F/30-31							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #042			Date Answered by Design Team: 5/23/2015				
Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #042.			Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015				
The Floor Plan (P1-2506) shows a Sprinkler Pipe (SP) branch (marked with red) on FSP D2 riser (marked with orange) which connects directly to FSP D6 riser (marked with blue) but the Piping Diagram (P1-5042) does not show any connection between these two risers.							
The P1-2506 and the P1-5042 should match.							
Please confirm.							
T-2768	TTC - Contradiction between floor plans and piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2206; P1-2306; P1-5042 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: D.4-D.8/31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #043 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #043. The Floor Plan (P1-2206) and the Piping Diagram (P1-5042) show a Sprinkler Drain (SPDR) branch (marked with green) which is not indicated on the Floor Plan (P1-2306) (marked with red). The P1-2206; P1-2306 and the P1-5042 should match. Please confirm.	Michelle Collanton Jeff Heath	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Sprinkler drain is now indicated on sheet P1-2306. Refer to attached sketch RFI_T-2761,T-2768_SKP1-2306. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/23/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger
T-2769	TTC - Contradiction between floor plans and piping diagram	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2106; P1-2107; P1-5042 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: C-G/28-31.7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #044 Please see attached Virtual Building FP (ASI 128)-CR #044. The Floor Plans (P1-2106; P1-2107) show three FSP branches (marked with red) which are not indicated on the Piping Diagram (P1-5042) (the missing branches are marked with red dashed line). The P1-2106; P1-2107 and the P1-5042 should match. Please confirm.	Michelle Collanton Jeff Heath	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: All these branches supply fire hose valves. The fire protection piping diagram will be coordinated in the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/23/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2770	TTC - Missing information about mark	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: C-0010;C1-4001;C1-4002;C1-4003;C1-4004; C14006;C1-4007;C1-4008;C1-4009 Location: Global, Ground Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building L (ASI 128)-CR #001 Please see attached Virtual Building L (ASI 128)-CR #001. There is missing information about mark on the civil drawings. C-0010 sheet shows CS characters for the proposed combined sewer manhole (marked with yellow), but C1-4001 - C1-4009 drawings show this type with only S character. The C1-0010 sheet does not contain the "S" mark. Proposed combined sewer manhole should be corrected on C1-4001 - C1-4009 sheets. C-0010 should give information about "S" mark. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No revision is necessary. The symbol shown on C1-0010 is for "PROPOSED combined sewer manhole". The word "PROPOSED" indicates NEW work. The callout on sheet C1-4001 states "(E) CS MH". "(E)" indicates it is an EXISTING utility. Refer to General Note 2 on C-0005 regarding existing utilities. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/5/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				
T-2771	TTC - Reference Error	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/L1-2333;1/L1-7340 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: E.6/8-9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building L (ASI 128)-CR #002 Please see attached Virtual Building L (ASI 128)-CR #002. There is a not incorrect reference mark (marked with green) at E.6/8-9 grids on 1/A1-7340 plan. The probable mark is 2/L1-7340. Incorrect reference should be corrected. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. The correct reference is 2/L1-7340. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/5/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/7/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2509 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2772	TTC - Contradiction between type of Combination Fire/Smoke Dampers	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2102; 4/M1-3103 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: C-D/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #001 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #001. There is a contradiction between type of Combination Fire/Smoke Dampers. The Train Platform Level Zone 02 Mechanical Plan (M1-2102) shows B2-A-18 (marked yellow), B2-A16 (marked pink) and B2-A-15 (marked green) dampers but the Mechanical Sections (4/M1-3103) shows other type there. The two plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is unclear what is meant by "other type". The symbols for all three of these FSDs (FSD-B2-15, 16, 18) on M1-2102 and 4/M1-3103 are all the same and consistent with the legend for fire-smoke dampers. FSD-B2-15 (30x18) is on the return duct from the IDF Room. FSD-B2-16 (8x8) is on the supply duct going into the IDF Room. FSD-B2-18 (8x8) is directly above the supply duct and is an inlet for transfer air. Refer to schedule note 1 on M1-0053. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2773	TTC - Contradiction between the size of Condenser Water Return duct	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2203; A/M1-3101 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C-D/9.9-10.1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #002 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #002. There is a contradicting dimension between condenser water return duct (CWR; marked green). The Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Mechanical Plan (M1-2203) shows 10" diam. CWR duct but the Sections (A/M1-3101) shows this CWR duct with 12" diam. The two plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> CWR pipe size on A/M1-3103 has been corrected to 10". Refer to attached SKM-RFI-T-2773. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2510 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2774	TTC - Missing elbows from water pipes	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2204; B/M1-3101 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C-C.3/13 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #003 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #003. Missing elbows from ground loop heat exchanger pipes. The B/M1-3101 Section shows an elevation change in the green marked GLS/R pipe but the M1-2204 floor plan does not show these elbows (marked with red frame). The M1-2204 floor plan shows there is a step in the yellow marked GLS/R pipe, but the section does not show these elbows (marked with red frame). The two plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Elbows have been added to B/M1-3101. See attached SKM-RFI-T-2774. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2775	TTC - Contradiction between size of ducts	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1/2402; A/M1-3102 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: E.6-F.7/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #004 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #004. There is a contradiction between the size of rectangular supply ducts. The Second Level Zone 02 Mechanical Plan (M1-2402) shows 36x18 duct (marked yellow) but the Shafts A & B Sections (A/M1-3102) plan shows 18x30 OA duct (marked yellow). The two plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Duct size has been corrected to 18x36 on A/M1-3102. See attached SKM-RFI-T-2775. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2511 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2776	TTC - Misaligned pipe tags on the mechanical floor plan	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2205 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D-F/21-22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #005 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #005. There are some misaligned tags on Lower Concourse Level Zone 05 Mechanical Plan (M1-2205) which are not show any pipes or ducts. Tags should be revised. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pipe size tags and flow arrows have been corrected. Refer to attached SKM-RFI-T-2776. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2777	TTC - Missing duct	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 4/M1-3001; A/M1-3102 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: E.2-F/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #006 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #006. The Enlarged Plans Shaft A plan (4/M1-3001) shows a 12x12 EA duct (marked with red) but the Shafts A & B Sections (A/M1-3102) does not show this duct. The three plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 12x12 EA duct was intentionally not shown for clarity of this drawing. A note and small section of duct has been added to A/M1-3102, refer to attached SKM-RFI-T-2777. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2778	TTC - Missing horizontal pipes	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2512 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc: A/M1-3102; B/M1-3102; 2/M1-3001; 3/M1-3001; 4/M1-3001; 5/M1-3001 Location: Zone 1, Global Gridline: E.2-F/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #007 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #007. The Shafts A & B Sections (A/M1-3102) plan and Enlarged Plans Shaft A (2/M1-3001, 3/M1-3001, 4/M1-3001, 5/M1-3001) show horizontal condenser water pipes (CWR, CWS; marked with red) but the Shafts A & B Sections (B/M1-3102) does not show them. These plans should match. Please confirm.			CWS/R branches have been added to Section B on M1-3102. Note that horizontal pipes sizes can be found on the floor plans. Refer to attached SKM-RFI-T-2778. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/11/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015				
T-2779	TTC - Missing duct	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc: 5/M1-3001; A/M1-3102; B/M1-3102 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: E.2-F/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #008 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #008. The Park Level - Shaft A Enlarged Plan (5/M1-3001) and Section (Shaft A) (B/M1-3102) plan show 12x12 EA duct (marked with red) but Section (Shaft A) (A/M1-3102) does not show this. These plans should match. Please confirm.			12x12 EA duct has been added to A/M1-3102 near the top of the shaft. It is intentionally not shown behind the future (F) KX ducts for clarity of the drawing. Refer to attached SKM-RFI-T-2779. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/14/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2513 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2780	TTC - Wrong section representation	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2202; 2/M1-3103 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #009 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #009. There is a contradiction between Mechanical Floor Plan (M1-2202) and Mechanical Section (2/M1-3103). The section pass through two 4" diam. CWS pipes (marked yellow and orange) the plan shown these pipes are close to each other. This plan contain an another 8" diam. CWS pipe, but this pipe position is farther. The section contains these pipes, but these are not on the same location than the floorplan shows. The two plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Pipes have been corrected in section 2/M1-3103. Refer to attached SKM-RFI-T-2780. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				
T-2781	TTC - Missing information about pipe size and type	Closed	04/07/2015	05/05/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2406 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: E/30 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #010 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #010. The Zone 06 Mechanical Plan (M1-2406) shows a pipe system (marked with green) but this plan do not contain any information about the size and type of these pipes. The floor plan should define the size and type of these pipes. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is a duct system, not a pipe system. Size of each branch is 10" diameter, to match CD-A diffuser, per Air Inlets and Outlets schedule note 1 on M1-0050. Combined duct, on both sides of fan SF-2-D-2, shall be 12" diameter. Refer to attached SKM-RFI-T-2781 Date Answered by Design Team: 5/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/14/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2514 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2782	BGP - C19 Frame into B118 on West Throat Slab	Closed	04/07/2015	04/17/2015	04/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2250, S1-3301, S1-3303					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: West Throat Slab					1. Confirmed.		
Gridline: 1-4					2. Confirmed.		
Add'l Doc Ref: Attached					3. Confirmed.		
Please refer to SI-2250, S1-3301, and S1-3303.					4. Confirmed.		
Columns C19 that frame into beams B118 on the west throat slab shown on SI-2250 are shown in section as having 1-1/2" clear cover to the ties. Detail 5/S 1-3301 indicates the same amount of cover for beam ties. The applicable column elevation, Detail 3/S 1-3303 indicates that the column cage is to nest within the beam support below as well as above. C19 columns cannot nest within intersecting beams at the clear cover given without reinforcing clashing. Further, the tie configuration indicated for Type 020 column on S1-3306 presents constructability and congestion issues given the tie size (#6's) at 4" spacing. Please confirm the following or provide another solution:					5. Confirmed		
1. Per the attached sketch, confirm the proposed tie layout is an acceptable alternative. Note that (1) cross tie has been omitted in the north-south direction.					Due to a difference in calendar month between date answered and date received, there was a delay in posting this RFI		
2. Per the attached sketch, confirm that the clear cover to the column tie may be increased to 2-5/8" so that the column cage may nest within the intersection framing.							
3. Within the beam-column joint, confirm that the interior beam stirrup/tie may be omitted. The exterior stirrup will remain.							
4. It will not be possible to fill all beam reinforcing bars in the same layer and pass through the column cage. Please confirm that bars that cannot pass may be layered vertically.							
5. Confirm that the exterior (2) beam bars may pass outside of the nested column cage. Such bars will be contained with beam exterior stirrups through the joint.							
T-2783	TTC - Incorrect detail reference on Mechanical floor plan	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc: M1-2204; 1/M1-5002					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					The detail references on M1-2204 should be A/M1-		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2515 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>Location: Global, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #011</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #011.</p> <p>The mechanical floor plan (M1-2204) referring to 1/M1-5002 detail, but the M1-5002 sheet does not contain detail 1, it contains only A;2;3;4;5;6 details. The floor plan shows there is a TG06 SOW so the correct detail is A/M1-5002.</p> <p>The two plans should match</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						
T-2784	TTC - Different duct dimensions	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p> <p>REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/M1-3103; M1-2202 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F/5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #012</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #012.</p> <p>There is a contradiction between Mechanical Floor Plan (M1-2202) and Mechanical Section (3/M1-3103 marked red line). The Floor Plan shows there are a 28x22 EA duct (marked yellow) and a 22x28 QA duct (marked green). The Mechanical Section (3/M1-3103) shows both ducts with 22x28 size.</p> <p>The two plans should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Both drawings (M1-2202 and 3/M1-3103) are correct. There are (3) ducts here: 28x22 EA, 22x28 OA and 10x10 UPS exhaust (in 2HR rating). The duct highlighted in green is 10x10. Coordinate all duct elevations with MEP Shop Drawings.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2785	TTC - Different Equalizer Line dimension	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/M1-3004; A/M1-3004; B/M1-3004; Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: L/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #013 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #013. There is a contradiction between the 1/M1-3004 Enlarged Mechanical Plan; B/M1-3004 Mechanical section and A/M1-3003. The cooling Tower Plant Enlarged Plan (1/M1-3004)(and (A/M1-3004)(these marked green)Plan section shows one Equalizer Line with 10" but the but the other Plant Section (B-/M13004) (marked orange) shows this Equalizer Line with 8" size. These plans should contain a same size. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The equalizer line size has been corrected to 10" in B/M1-3004. Refer to attached SKM-RFI-T-2785. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015		
T-2786	TTC - Contradiction between damper types	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2202; 1/M1-3103 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: E-F/1-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #014 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #014. There is a contradiction between Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Mechanical Plan (M1-2202) and Mechanical Sections (1/M1-3103) plans. The M1-2202 shows B1-A-1 damper (marked green) but the 1/M1-3103 shows B1-A-34 damper (marked green) at the same place. The B1-A-34 tag shows other damper (marked yellow). The 1/M1-3103 plan shows possible location of this damper. (marked yellow frame). 2015.02.09			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Damper tags have been updated on 1/M1-3103. Refer to SKM-RFI-T-2786 attached. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/14/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2787	These plans should match	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Please confirm.						
	TTC - Missing (F) 96x30 duct from section						
	From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	Contract Doc: M1-2204; B/M1-3101		(F) 96x30 branch smoke exhaust duct will route up off the top of the main duct, south through the Emergency Electrical Room, under the gridline C beam and out into the ceiling plenum of the Lower Concourse.				
	Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level						
	Gridline: A-C/13						
	Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #015						
	Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #015.		Date Answered by Design Team: 5/21/2015				
			Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015				
	The Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Mechanical Plan (M1-2204) shows an (F) 96x30 duct (marked pink) but the B/M1-3101 Section does not show it.						
	These plans should match.						
	Please confirm.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2788	TTC - Incorrect location of duct connection	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 5/M1-3002; C/M1-3102; D/M1-3102 Location: Zone 2, Bus Deck Level, Park Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #016 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #016. The (F) 36x28 KX duct connection (marked yellow) and (F) 18x36 duct connection (marked pink) are on wrong level. The Park Level - Shaft B Enlarged Plan (5/M1-3002) shows this duct connection on the park level but the Section (SHAFT B) (C/M1-3102) shows them on the bus deck level. These plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Correct, KX offsets occur below Roof Park Level. Coordinate with MEP Shop Drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015		
T-2789	TTC - Missing detail drawing and contradicting detail number	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1/2652; 6/M1-3001 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: E.2-F/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #017 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #017. The 6/M1-3001 Roof Level Shaft A Enlarged Plan does not show any mechanical elements. Furthermore there is a contradiction between detail references. The M1-2652 refers to 6/M1-3001 (marked green) but the 6/M1-3001 detail refers back to M1-2702 (marked green) however the M1-2702 does not refer to 6/M1-3001. The 6/M1-3001 Roof Level Shaft A Enlarged Plan and the detail references should be revised.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2519 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2790	TTC - Contradictions between types and sizes of ducts	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: 1/M1-3004; A/M1-3004 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: L/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #018				Plan layout shown in 1/M1-3004 should be followed. Pipe sizes on A/M1-3004 section are incorrect. Coordinate with MEP Shop Drawings.			
Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #018.				Date Answered by Design Team: 5/27/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/28/2015			
There are some contradictions between types and sizes of ducts on 1/M1-3004 Enlarged Mechanical Plan and A/M1-3004 Section. The 1/M1-3004 plan shows CWS pipes with the following sizes: 8" diam. (marked purple), 14" diam. (marked yellow), 8" diam. (marked green) and 10" diam (marked blue) but the A/M1-3004 plan shows the purple marked is 8" CWR, the yellow marked is 14" CWR, the green marked is 10" CWR and the blue marked is 14" CWS.							
The 1/M1-3004 and A/M1-3004 plans should match.							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2520 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2791	TTC - Missing duct and valve	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/M1-3004; A/M1-3004 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: L/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #019 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #019. Missing Calibrated Balance Valve (marked blue) and 14" diam. CWS pipe (marked red) from Lower Concourse - Cooling Tower Plant Section (A/M1-3004) but the Lower Concourse - Cooling Tower Plant Enlarged Plan (1/M1-3004) show them. The 1/M1-3004 and A/M1-3004 plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Correct, valve and pipe should show in the section. Coordinate with MEP Shop Drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015		
<hr/>							
T-2792	TTC - Contradicting duct size tags	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2210 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: L/1.4-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #020 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #020. The duct size tags on the Lower Concourse Level Zone 10 Mechanical Plan (M1-2210) shows that the size of green marked duct changes (10" to 12") at this line, but does not show any reducer between the two different tag. The sizes should match with each other. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Correct, increaser fitting is required. Coordinate with MEP Shop Drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2521 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2793	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information	Closed	04/08/2015		04/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2705 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridline: 5 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 816 SK1 See attached CD RFI 816 SK1 for items 1 to 8: 1) Supply missing dimension. 2) Supply missing dimension. 3) Supply missing dimension. 4) Supply missing T/STEEL elevation. 5) Supply missing dimension 6) Supply missing dimension. 7) Depending on the responses to items 2, 3, 5 & 6, the connection per 2 & 4/S1-2723 may not work as the plate members are too close to the HSS column. Supply an alternate connection detail. 8) Depending on the responses to items 2, 3, 5 & 6, these plate members appear to be beyond the steel framing above and have no support. Please review and advise.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			1. See attached sketch SKA-4588				
			2. See attached sketch SKA-4588				
			3. See attached sketch SKA-4588				
			4. Horizontal leg of the 1 ¾" plate is centered on the 2"x 6" tube of the trellis system as shown in 2A/S1-2723 . Please refer to architectural drawings A1-5850 and A1-5851 for trellis tube elevations.				
			5. See attached sketch SKA-4588				
			6. See attached sketch SKA-4588				
			7. Connect the 1 ¾" plate to the HSS beam per attached sketch SKS-0472 at north and south edges of the building.				
			8. Add a HSS4x4x1/4 post between the HSS10x2 beams at trellis level and the W16 beam at the roof as shown in the attached sketch SKS-0471. Connect the 1 ¾" plate highlighted to the added post as shown in the sketch. On the north side, provide connection as shown in attached sketch SKS-0473.				
			Answered by design team: 4/22/15 Closed by WOJV: 4/23/15				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2793.1	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information	Closed	05/08/2015		05/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPQuang LeTo: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2705, RFI T-2555, T-2793				1. Confirmed.			
Location: Roof Park Restaurant							
Gridlines: 4-5							
Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 816.1 SK1, SK2, SK3, SKS-0471, SKS-0472				2. T/O Steel is 114'- 0 1/2" per 6/A1-8901.			
This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-2793 (SK 1077, CD 816)				3a. Refer to attached sketch SKS-0472A. For information not shown, refer to sketch SKS-0472.			
See attached CD RFI 816.1 SK1 to SK3 for items 1 to 4:				3b. Refer to attached sketch SKS-0472A, connection similar. For information not shown, refer to sketch SKS-0472.			
1) RFI T-2555 does not provide this information. This dimension is 4'-5 on the south side. Confirm this dimension is also 4'-5 or supply the dimension.				3c. Refer to attached sketch SKS-0472A, connection similar. For information not shown, refer to sketch SKS-0472.			
2) The response in RFI T-2793 (SK 1077, CD 816) item 4 including the referenced architectural drawings do not provide the T/STEEL elevation. The elevation on the south side is T/STEEL 114'-5 3/4. Confirm this elevation is also 114'5 3/4 or supply the elevation.				4. Refer to attached sketch SKS-0471A. For information not shown, refer to sketch SKS-0471.			
3) The connections provided for the PL 1 5/8 & PL 1 3/4 will not work. See SK2 for items 3a, 3b & 3c:				Date answered by design team: 5/7/15 at 5:54 pm			
a) The connection on SKS-0472 does not work because the underside of PL 1 5/8 is not at top of HSS10x6. Supply a new detail.				Date closed by WOJV: 5/8/15 at 7:13 am			
b) Supply a connection detail for PL 1 5/8 to underside of HSS8x6.							
c) The same occurs on the south side except the HSS10x6 is a W12x19. Supply connection details for top and bottom of PL 1 3/4.							
4) The connections provided on SKS-0471 for the PL 1 5/8 will not work. See SK3: The steel framing per contract drawings and as shown in the model does not match the information shown on SKS0471. Please clarify and supply connection details for the PL 1 5/8 at top and bottom.							
T-2793.2	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information	Closed	05/11/2015	05/21/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPQuang LeTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: T-2793.1				2) Top of Steel is 114'-5 3/4" for both, north side and the south side.			
Location: Roof Park Restaurant				3a) This is an erection bolt. Erection is means and methods.			
Gridlines: 4-5				3b) See response to 3a.			
Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 816.1 SK2, SK3							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2523 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-2793.1 (SK 1077.1, CD 816.1) Please review the questions and previous sketches listed below for the responses in RFI T-2793.1. Item 2 - We are requesting the T/STEEL elevation for the L shaped PL 1 3/4 on the north side. Please review this with the information supplied on the south side on S1-2705 and supply a detail as the galvanized HSS10x2's are at the elevation of 114'-01 ½. Item 3a - The connection supplied on SKS-0472A with the field welded PL 1/2 will foul the bolt for the connection for the HSS10x6 below as shown on the sketch. Please supply a new connection detail. Item 3b - Review the condition on the previous sketch and supply a connection detail. Item 3c - Please see items 3a & 3b above and supply the requested connection details. Item 4 - Please review and clarify the white-lined information on SKS-0471A as it is not clear.</p>				<p>3c) See response to 3a 4) It seems that the graphics were distorted for the B-B section. Refer to Sketch SKS-0471A with revised graphics, attached. The white rectangle at the bottom represents the post (beyond) introduced in .0 version of the RFI.</p> <p>Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request, insufficient information and engineering conflict. We categorize this RFI as previously answered and clarification on means and methods and.</p> <p>Answered by design team: 5/26/15 at 9:18 pm Closed by WOJV: 5/27/15</p>		
T-2793.3	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Connection Clarification	Open	06/17/2015	06/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: 4/S1-2723 Location: Roof Park Restaurant, Zone 1 Gridlines: 5 and D.3 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1							
This is a follow-up RFI to RFI T-2793 (SK 1077, CD 816): The connection as shown on SKS-0473 does not work. Confirm the connection as shown in the 2 snapshots from the model is acceptable or supply an alternate connection.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2524 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2794	TTC - Contradicting between size of same duct	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2404; C/M1-3102 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: D-E.2/16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #021 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #021. There is a contradiction between the Second Level Zone 04 Mechanical Plan (M1-2404) and Section (Shaft B) (C/M1-3102). The M1-2404 shows 36x28 KX CFF duct (marked pink and red arrow) but the C/M1-3102 shows (F) 24x40 KX (marked pink) at the same duct. The M1-2404 and C/M1-3102 plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Text callout on C/M1-3102 should be 36x28. The duct is drawn correctly. Coordinate with MEP Shop Drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				
T-2795	TTC - Contradiction between size on the same water pipes	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2203; M1-2204 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C.3-D/12; C-D/13 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #022 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #022. There is a contradiction between two size tags on the same pipes. The Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Mechanical Plan (M1-2203) shows CWR (marked green) and CWS (marked yellow) with 1-1/2" but the Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Mechanical Plan (M1-2204) shows these are 1-1/4". The M1-2203 and M1-2204 plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The pipe in question, downstream of HP-B1-B-6, shall be 1-1/4" CWS/R. Coordinate with MEP Shop Drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2525 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2796	TTC - Missing grille from ceiling	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2404; A1-4404 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: C.3-D/15-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #023 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #023. Missing Return/exhaust register or grille with flexible duct (marked red cloud and arrow) from Second Level Zone 04 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4404) but the Second Level Zone 04 Mechanical Plan (M1-2404) shows it (marked yellow). The M1-2404 and A1-4404 should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Correct. Grille to be added to A1-4404 RCP. Coordinate with MEP and RCP Shop Drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/21/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
<hr/>							
T-2797	TTC - Missing grille from ceiling	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2502; A1-4502 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D-D.4/2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #024 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #024. Missing Ceiling diffuser with flexible duct connection (marked red cloud and arrow) from Bus Deck Level Zone 02 Reflected Ceiling Plan (A1-4502) but the Bus Deck Level Zone 02 Mechanical Plan (M1-2502) shows it (marked yellow). The M1-2502 and A1-4502 should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: 			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2526 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2798	TTC - Incorrect detail reference on mechanical floor plan	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-2206; 2/M1-3007; M1-2207 Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: G/31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #025 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #025. The M1-2206 Lower Concourse Level Zone 06 Mechanical Plan refers to 3/M1-3007 enlarged floor plan, but the M1-3007 does not contains only '1' '2' 'A' and 'B' drawings. The M12207 Lower Concourse Level Zone 07 Mechanical Plan refers to 2/M1-3007 on this location so it seems this is the correct reference. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Reference to "3/M1-3007" should be "2/M1-3007". Coordinate with MEP Shop Drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/19/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				
T-2799	TTC - Contradiction between Condenser Water Riser signification	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: M1-4004; M1-2202; M1-2302 Location: Zone 1 Gridline: C/8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #026 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #026. There is a contradiction between M1-4004 (Condenser Water Riser Diagram) and Mechanical Zone 03 Plans (M1-2303; M1-2404). The Riser Diagram (M1-4004) Shows a CW A2 riser (marked green) next to gridline 2, and a CW A-3 riser (marked yellow) next to gridline 8. The M1-2303 floor plan contains a CW-A-2 Riser on the ground level but the second level floor plan (M1-2303) shows a CW A-3 riser at that location. These plans should contain a same Riser sign. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> CW Riser tag on M1-2303 should read CW-A-3. Coordinate with MEP Shop Drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/19/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/19/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2527 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2800	TTC - Missing wall openings	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2202; M1-2202 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/3-4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #027 Please see attached Virtual Building MECH (ASI 128)-CR #027. There are some missing wall openings from A1-2202 Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Floor Plan. The M1-2202 Zone 02 Mechanical Plan indicate some mechanical ducts (marked pink, purple, olive, green, orange, blue and light green) but the Architectural Floor Plan does not contain any enlarged plan or wall elevation witch shows the exact position of the wall openings. The architectural wall plan should contain the exact position of these wall openings. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For the exact positions of mechanical duct openings that go through the concrete walls at the Security Operations Suite, refer to detail references on A1-2202 and A1-3005 which in turn reference 3/A1-3008 and 1/A1-9804 (both enlarged plans). The enlarged plans have section references to A1-9241 showing concrete wall openings with dimensions including the mechanical openings highlighted on the RFI. These architectural drawings were issued with ASI-130. Also, please refer also to RFI T-2518 response for additional information. WOJV to confirm the Virtual Building modeling team and all subcontractors have the current CDs. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/14/2015				
T-2801	PLG - Vent line conflict with Future Grease Duct	Closed	04/08/2015	04/18/2015	04/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: P1-2303, & P1-2304 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Closest Column Line Intersection is 15-D Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A On P1-2303 and P1-2304 (see attached vent #1 and #2), the vent line is in conflict with the future grease duct. To avoid the clash the vent pipe is forced to run below the grease duct which further creates conflicts with the future TI spaces and the walk way (See attached vent #3, #4, #5). Please confirm it is acceptable to break the vent into segments and re-route to level 2 through the column enclosures.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The plumbing vents will run flat with no slope. This way there is more flexibility in routing the vents away from the grease duct. Answered by Design Team: 4/23/2015 Closed by Webcor: 4/27/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2528 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2802	TTC - Missing tags on Enlarged Floor Plan	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc: 2/P1-3007; P1-5060 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: D/1.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #001 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #001. There are missing tags on the Train Platform Level Zone 02 Enlarged Floor Plan (P1-3007). On the Diesel Fuel Piping Diagram (P1-5060) the FOS and FOR tags are shown (marked with green) but on the Enlarged Floor Plan the tags are missing (marked with red). The FOS and FOR tags should be shown on both plans. Please confirm.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2803	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and the rise diagram	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-5010 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: B-C/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #002 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #002. There is a contradiction between the Reuse Water System Piping Diagram (P1-5010) and the Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202). The order of the connections are not the same on the plans. The same systems are marked with the same colors. The order of the connections should be the same on both plans.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2804	TTC - Contradiction between tags	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc: 2/P1-3007; P1-5060; P1-0050					Refer to attached sketch T-2804_SKP1-5060.		
Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level					Date Answered by Design Team: 6/6/2015		
Gridline: D-D.4/1.4					Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015		
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #003							
Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #003.							
There is a contradiction between the Diesel Fuel Piping Diagram (P1-5060) and the Train Platform Level Zone 02 Enlarged Floor Plan (P1-3007). On the Enlarged Floor Plan the Diesel Fuel Filtration System has a DFF/B2-A-1 tag (marked with green), but on the Piping Diagram it has a DFF/B2--1 tag (marked with red).							
It seems an annotation error on P1-5060 Riser Diagram. The two drawings should show the same tag (DFF/B2-A-1).							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2530 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2805	TTC - Contradiction between Piping Diagram and Plumbing Plan	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5010; P1-2702 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: D.8-E/5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #004 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #004. There is a contradiction between the Reuse Water System Piping Diagram (P1-5010) and the Roof Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2702). The Piping Diagram shows RD and OFD tags (marked with green), but on the Plumbing Plan the tag is a 2" Diesel Fuel Vent Riser (marked with red). The tags should be OFD and RD on the floor plan too. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2805_SKP1-2702. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015				
T-2806	TTC - Annotation error on Train Platform Level Zone 02 Enlarged Plan	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3002 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: C-C.3/5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #005 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #005. There is an annotation error on the Train Platform Level Zone 02 Enlarged Plan (P1-3002). The storm drain piping has incorrect tag (marked with red), because tag 18 is a 2" vent. The tag should be 8" ST riser (tag 5). Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				




Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2531 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2807	TTC - Contradiction between enlarged plan and riser diagram	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc: P1-5031; 2/P1-3010 Location: Zone 2, Second Level; Bus Deck Level Gridline: E-F/14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #006 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #006. There are contradictions between the riser diagram P1-5031 and the enlarged plan 2/P1-3010. Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5031) shows WCO (Marked with red square) which is not indicated on Enlarged Restroom Plans (2/P1-3010). 2/P1-3010 shows 4" San Waste vertical pipe (Marked with red fill) connected at the last WC, while P1-5031 shows connection at the middle WC. Floor plan and riser diagram should match. Please confirm.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2808	TTC - Missing information on enlarged plan	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc: 4/P1-3010 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: E-F/14-15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #007 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #007. There is a missing tag from Enlarged Restroom Plan - Level 2 (4/P1-3010). SAN pipe indicated with purple has a connection without a tag. Connection without tag is shown with red fill. Tag should be shown on enlarged plan.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2533 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2810	TTC - Contradiction between the Piping Diagram and the Plumbing Floor Plan	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2505; P1-5070 Location: Zone 3, Bus Deck Level Gridline: E.2-G/19.9-21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #009 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #009. There is a contradiction between the Natural Gas Piping Diagram (P1-5070) and the Bus Deck Level Zone 5 Plumbing Plan (P1-2505). The 30 PK560 pipe (marked green) has horizontal section on The Bus Deck Level Zone 5 Plumbing Plan, but the Natural Gas Piping Diagram does not show this. The floor plan and riser diagram should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The natural gas piping diagram is just that, it shows where the piping goes, it does not show all offsets. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/6/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015				
T-2811	TTC - Missing 4" RW/CW pipe	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3002; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: A-C/3-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #010 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #010. The Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050) shows 4" RW/CW pipe (marked with yellow), but this diagram does not show any information about the connection of the pipe, furthermore the Enlarged Plans (P1-3002) does not show this pipe. The Water Piping Diagram and the Enlarged Plans should match.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2535 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2813	TTC - Contradiction between enlarged plan and riser diagram	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5031; 2/P1-3010; 4/P1-3010 Location: Zone 2, Second Level; Bus Deck Level Gridline: E-F/15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #012 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #012. There is a missing FCO from P1-5031 Waste And Vent Piping Diagram, which is shown on 2/P1-3010 Enlarged Restroom Plan. Missing FCO is shown with red frame both on floor plan and has been added to riser diagram. Also connection of FD (green frame) is not at the same spot. According to 2/P1-3010, FD should be connected between SS (green frame) and FCO (red frame). P1-5031 and P1-3010 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2814	TTC - Unnecessary pipes on riser diagram	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5050; P1-5010; P1-3002; P1-2202 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level; Lower Concourse Level Gridline: B-D/2-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #013 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #013. There is a GWT pipe on P1-5010 piping diagram (marked with red) which is not shown on P1-3002 enlarged plan and P1-5050 piping diagram. P1-3002 enlarged plan and P1-5050 piping diagram show one GWT system starting from B2226 room (marked with green). This branch continues on P1-2202. P1-3002, P1-2202 and P1-5050			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2536 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2815	TTC - Annotation error on Plumbing Plan	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2304; P1-5011 Location: Global Gridline: D/16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #014 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #014. There is an annotation error in Ground Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2304). The tag (marked with red) should be UP/DN not only DN because it is an 8" ST Riser. Tag 12 should be UP/DN ST/B4. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2816	TTC - Missing cold water pipes	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2102; P1-3002; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-D/2-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #015 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #015. The Enlarged Plans (P1-3002) and the Train Platform Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2102) show cold water pipes (marked with red line), which are not shown on the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050). The Water Piping Diagram, the Enlarged Plans and the Train Platform Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-2817	TTC - Missing two cold water pipes	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: B-G/8-9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #016 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #016. The Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050) shows two branches (marked with red line) which connect to 1-1/2" cold water pipe (marked with yellow line), but the Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203) does not show these red marked cold water pipes. The Water Piping Diagram and the Train Platform Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan should match.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2539 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2819	TTC - Missing a cold water pipe	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Contract Doc: P1-2210; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: L/3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #018</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #018.</p> <p>The Lower Concourse Level Zone 10 Plumbing Plan (P1-2210) shows a 3/4" cold water pipe (marked with red line) branch which connects to 1-1/2" cold water pipe (marked with orange line), but the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050) does not show this pipe.</p> <p>The Water Piping Diagram and the Train Platform Level Zone 10 Plumbing Plan should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>							

T-2820	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and riser diagram	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Contract Doc: P1-3009; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D/3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #019</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #019.</p> <p>There is a contradiction between the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050) and the Enlarged Restroom Plans Level 02, B1 and B2 (P1-3009). The piping diagram shows 1-1/2" cold water pipe, but the enlarged plan shows 1" cold water.</p> <p>The Water Piping Diagram and the Train Platform Level Zone 10 Plumbing Plan should match.</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2540 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2821	TTC - Missing cold water pipe	Closed	04/08/2015	05/06/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: B/1.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #020 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #020. Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202) shows a 3/4" cold water pipe (marked with red line) branch which connects to 3/4" cold water pipe (marked with green line), but the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050) does not show this 3/4" cold water pipe. The Water Piping Diagram and the Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is a sheet note on drawings P1-5050 through P1-5053, which states that not all piping connections to trap primers are shown on riser diagrams. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/21/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/27/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2541 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2822	TTC - Missing cold water pipe	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: G/3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #021 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #021. Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202) shows a 3/4" cold water pipe (marked with red line) branch which connects to 1" cold water pipe (marked with purple line),but the The Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050) does not show this 3/4" cold water pipe. The Water Piping Diagram and the Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		

T-2823	TTC - Missing cold water pipe	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C/5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #023 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #023. Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202) shows a 3/4" cold water pipe (marked with yellow rectangle on floor plan) branch which connects to 3" cold water pipe (marked with purple line; clouded with red on riser diagram), but the The Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050) does not show this 3/4" cold water pipe. The Water Piping Diagram and the Lower Concourse		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2824	TTC - Missing cold water pipe	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #024 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #024. Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202) shows a 2" cold water pipe branch (marked with red fill) which connects to 3" cold water pipe (marked with purple line),but according to the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050) the size of this cold water pipe branch is 1". The Water Piping Diagram and the Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2825	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and piping diagram	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D-F/2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #025 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #025. There is a contradiction between the Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202) and the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050). The riser diagram shows that there are 2 branches connecting to yellow branch (which is part of CW A5 riser) the branch marked with, blue and green. Floor plan shows that only blue line connects to yellow branch (CW A5), and green branch connects to blue. The Water Piping Diagram and the Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2826	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and riser diagram	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2304; P1-5031 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: C-D/14-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #026 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #026. There are contradictions between P1-5031 piping diagram and P1-2304 plumbing floor plan. SAN branch coming from EW (gray) connects to other branch coming from FSK (yellow) on riser diagram, but it connects directly to main branch (red) on floor plan.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2545 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2828	TTC - Annotation tag has a slight offset from pipe	Open	04/08/2015	05/06/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Contract Doc: P1-2202 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #028</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #028.</p> <p>There is an annotation tag (red frame) with an arrowhead which does not point to the correct upgoing pipe. Arrowhead is marked with red, upgoing pipe is green.</p> <p>Arrowhead should be adjusted to upgoing pipe.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>							
T-2829	TTC - Contradiction between floor plans and details	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Contract Doc: P1-2302; P1-2402; 3/P1-3014; 6/P1-3014 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level; Second Level Gridline: F/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #029</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #029.</p> <p>There are contradictions between plumbing floor plans and detail plans. There is a vent pipe missing from 3/P1-3014. Missing vent pipe is indicated with green on 6/P1-3014, P12302,P1-2402. Position of upgoing pipes are different on floor plans and details.</p> <p>Floor plans and details should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2546 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2830	TTC - There are annotation errors on floor plan	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2302; P1-2402 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level; Second Level Gridline: F/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #030 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #030. There are some annotation errors on P1-2302 plumbing floor plan. A SAN A8 tag appear twice at gridline F/4 (indicated with red). Tags are missing from pipes marked with green. Tags should be revised at gridline F/4. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2831	ELV - Riser Sleeves at GL D&13 Drawing conflict	Closed	04/08/2015	04/18/2015	04/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128/TE1-4204/TE1-4504] Location: Zone [04], Level [Lower Concourse/Bus Deck] Closest Column Line Intersection is [D,13] Add'l Doc's Ref's: [ASI 128/TE1-2304/TE1-2404/TE1-2504/A1-2864/A1-2884/A1-2894/TE1-4304/TE1-4404] At Column Line [D,13] there are (4)-4" conduits rising from Lower Concourse to Bus Deck level along the column. These conduits require 5" sleeves in slabs of Ground Level, Second Level, and Bus Deck Level. The only sleeves indicated on the Contract Documents are 4" sleeves in the Bus Deck level slab. Please confirm that 5" sleeves are required for these (3) slabs.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> If the sleeve is for a 4" conduit to pass through, then yes a 5" sleeve would be a minimum allowable size. WOJV to coordinate between subcontractors. Note that a 4" EMT outside diameter is approximately 4.5". Date Answered by Design Team: 4/13/15 Date Closed by WOJV: 4/17/15		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5010; P1-2503 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: D-F/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #032</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #032.</p> <p>There is an unnecessary storm drain pipe coming from the ST/A2 riser (marked with red) without any OFD and RD connection.</p> <p>The Piping Diagram should be revised.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			
T-2835	TTC - Missing branch on Piping Diagram	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>	<p>Answered By:</p>				
	<p>REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5012; P1-2205 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: H-J/20-21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #033</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #033.</p> <p>There is a missing storm piping branch (marked with red) on Reuse Water System Piping Plan (P1-5012) which is indicated on the Lower Concourse Level Zone 05 Plumbing Plan (P1-2205).</p> <p>Piping Diagram and Floor Plan should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2549 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2836	TTC - Annotation Error on Piping Diagram	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5012; P1-2505 Location: Zone 3, Bus Deck Level Gridline: F/21-22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #034 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #034. There is a contradiction between the Reuse Water System Piping Diagram (P1-5012) and Bus Deck Level Zone 05 Plumbing Plan (P1-2505). On the Piping Diagram the ST and OST piping is connected to the ST/C2 system but on the Floor Plan it is connected to the ST/C3 system (marked with red dashed line). The Piping diagram should match with the Plumbing Plan. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2837	TTC - Contradiction between Piping Diagram and Plumbing Plan	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5012; P1-2706 Location: Zone 4, Roof Level Gridline: D.4-E.2/26 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #035 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #035. There is a contradiction between the Reuse Water System Piping Diagram (P1-5012) and the Roof Level Zone 06 Plumbing Plan (P1-2706). On the Piping Plan the OFD and RD has a 300 SQ FT tag but the Floor Plan shows 600 SQ FT (marked with red). The plans should match with each other.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2839	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and riser diagram	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2204; P1-5031; 10/P1-3008 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level; Second Level Gridline: C-F/14-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #037 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #037. There are contradictions between P1-2204 floor plan, P1-3008 enlarged plan and P1-5031 piping diagram. Floor plan shows branch with future cap at gridline F/16 (blue) connects to other branch (green). P1-3008 shows that red branch also connects to green. Green connects to purple branch as well as the orange. However riser diagram shows that the blue pipe is the main branch and both purple and green connects to it. Riser diagram, floor plan and enlarged plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2840	TTC - Contradiction between enlarged plan, plumbing floor plan and the water pipi	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5053; P1-3008; P1-2206 Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C-G/30 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #038 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #038. There is a contradiction between P1-2206, P1-3008 and P1-5053.The water piping diagram (P1-5053) shows pipes (the CW pipe marked with orange and the GWT pipe marked with cyan) which have a capped future connection above Ground Level. But the plumbing floor plan (P1-2206) and enlarged plan (P1-5/3008; P1-9/3008) shows			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2552 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2841	these pipes with cap for future connection on the Lower Concourse Level. Furthermore, position of future caps relative to CW riser (marked with pink, in blue frame) is different. P1-2206 shows that the riser is between two future caps, but riser diagram indicates two capped connection on a different branch.						
	The enlarged plan (P1-3008), the plumbing floor plan (P1-2206) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053) should match.						
	Please confirm.						
	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and piping diagram	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
T-2842	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:			
	Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: E.2/2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #039						
	Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #039.						
	There is a contradiction between the Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202) and the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050). Floor plan shows that yellow, purple and orange branches have a tee connection, while riser diagram shows two connections at different locations.						
	The Water Piping Diagram and the Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan should match.						
Please confirm.							
T-2842	TTC - Contradiction between enlarged plan, Plumbing Plan and the water piping di	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:				

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jeff Heath</div></div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: P1-3008; P1-5053; P1-2406 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/30 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #040 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #040. There is a contradiction between the enlarged plan (P1-3008), the Second Level Zone 06 Plumbing Plan (P1-2406) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053). According to the riser diagram (P1-5053) the CW D3 riser (pipe marked with pink) has to continue straight up to Bus Deck Level (pipe marked with green) but the symbol at CW D3 (yellow rectangle) on floor plan (P1-2406) indicates that the riser does not go up to Bus Deck Level. Enlarged plan (P1-3008) shows a downgoing pipe from Bus Deck Level (red rectangle), but no continuation is shown on P1-2406. Position of this downgoing pipe has an offset from CW D3. (marked with red and yellow rectangle). The enlarged plan (P1-3008), the plumbing floor plan (P1-2406) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053) should match. Please confirm.</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div></div></div>							
T-2843	TTC - Contradiction between enlarged plan and the water piping diagram	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Michelle Collanton</div></div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company</div><div>Phil Militello</div></div></div> <div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Jeff Heath</div></div> <div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: P1-3018; P1-5053 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: E.6/30 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #041 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #041.</div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div> <div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div></div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2554 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>There is a contradiction between the enlarged plan (P1-3018) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053). According to the enlarged plan (P1-3018) the purple marked CW pipe has to connect to the pink marked CW pipe. But according to the riser diagram the purple marked CW pipe connects to the riser (marked with green, shown with red arrow).</p> <p>The enlarged plan (P1-3018) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053) should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						
T-2844	TTC - Missing pipe on floor plan (P1-2206)	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2206; P1-5053 Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C-C.3/30 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #042 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #042. The Lower Concourse Level Zone 06 Plumbing Plan (P1-2206) shows a pipe (marked with red) which does not indicated on the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5053)(pipe marked with orange and clouded). The plumbing plan (P1-2206) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053) should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2555 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2845	TTC - Contradiction between plumbing floor plans	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2102, P1-2202 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C.3-D/2-3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #043 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #043. P1-2102 indicates that GWW A1, A2, A3 (yellow) is the closest riser to gridline C. In the middle there is a SAN/AD (pink) pipe with a riser tag SAN A1, and the farthest upgoing pipe is a SAN (marked with green). On P1-2202, the green SAN pipe is in the middle and it has the SAN A1 riser tag. Floor plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2846	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plans and the piping diagram	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-2302; P1-2402; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridline: D.8-E/1.4-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #044 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #044. The Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040) shows a connection (marked with red) which is not indicated on the Ground Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2302). On the P1-2302 the sprinklers and the hose valve (marked with orange) have no supply even from the ground below (P1-2202) or above (P1-2402).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	The P1-2202; P1-2302; P1-2402 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.						
T-2847	TTC - Missing elements from the riser diagram	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath		Answered By:				
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2102; P1-2110; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: D.4-L/2-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #045 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #045. The Train Platform Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2102) and the Train Platform Level Zone 10 Plumbing Plan (P1-2110) show a fire protection branch (marked with red) which is not indicated on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040). The P1-2102, P1-2110 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2848	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plan and the riser diagram	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2203; P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F/6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #046 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #046. There is a contradiction between the Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203) and the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040). The P1-2203 shows that the FSP A5 riser (marked with orange) is the first one, the next one is the FSP A4. The P1-5040 shows that they are in reverse order. Furthermore the FSP A1 connects to another branch (marked with red). The P1-2203 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2849	TTC - Contradiction between the floor plans and the piping diagram	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-2302 P1-5040 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level; Ground Level Gridline: D.8-E/1.4-2 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #047 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #047. The Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202) shows a Sprinkler Drain branch (SPDR) (marked with red) which is not indicated on the Fire Protection Piping Diagram (P1-5040) and on the Ground Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2302) only a tag refer to that there should be an SPDR but it is not shown just a Fire Protection Sprinkler pipe.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	The P1-2203; P1-2302 and the P1-5040 should match. Please confirm.						
T-2850	TTC - Missing information about the size and type of the pipes	Open	04/09/2015	05/07/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP	Michelle Collanton Jeff Heath	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Miliitello	Answered By:			
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2403 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: E/6-7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #048 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #048. Missing information about the size and type of the green marked pipe. The <48> sheet note is missing from the Second Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2403). The sheet notes on the P1-2403 should be revised. Please confirm.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2559 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2851	TTC - Missing pipe system	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2102; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Train Platform Level Gridline: D-F.7/5-6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #049 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #049. There is a missing pipe system from P1-5030 Waste Water System Piping Diagram. The blue clouded system on P1-2102 Train Platform Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan can not be found on P1-5020 riser diagram. Red frame shows the required location of the missing branch on P1-5030. Piping diagram and floor plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> All the drainage piping serving the engineering equipment storage B1246 is shown on floor plan P1-2102. The riser diagram will be coordinated with shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/28/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				
T-2852	TTC - Missing pipeline on riser diagram	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2402, P1-5020 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: E.6-F/2-3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #050 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #050. There is a missing pipe branch on P1-5020 riser diagram. P1-2402 plan shows an additional branch to AD (clouded with blue) but it is not shown on piping diagram. Plumbing floor plan and riser diagram should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The SAN/AD branch from an area drain on bus deck level is shown on the floor plan. The riser diagram will be coordinated with the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/28/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2560 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2853	DAT - Second Level Slab Opening Conflict	Closed	04/09/2015	04/19/2015	05/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128/TE1-4403/TE1-4303] Location: Zone [03], Level [Second Level] Closest Column Line Intersection is [C,11] Add'l Doc's Ref's: [ASI 128/TE1-2303/TE1-2403/A1-2883] The Telecom RCP (TE1-4403/TE1-4303) calls out for a riser near column line C & 11, but neither the Architectural Slab Edge Plan (A1-2883) nor Telecom Floor Plans (TE1-2303/TE1-2403) depicts the same. If the intent is to continue the conduit riser through the second floor level please provide block out location and size.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The information in the referenced TE-series RCP (TE1-4403 and TE1-4303) drawings and Floor Plan TE1-2303, is correct. The riser extends through the deck between Ground Level and Second Level, as the drawings indicate. Please refer to enclosed sketches SKA-4605, SKA-4606 and SKA-4607 for locations and sizes on the slab edge plans. Exact location and routing of risers at Ground and Second Level are indicated in architectural slab edge plans. Please refer to enclosed markups. Answered by Design Team : 4/28/2015 Closed by Webcor: 5/04/2015		
<hr/>							
T-2854	TTC - Missing pipe connection on plumbing floor plan	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-3009 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C.3-E/2-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #051 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #051. There are missing pipe connections on P1-2202 floor plan. Enlarged plan 1/P1-3009 shows "Refer to dwg P1-2202 for continuation" for HWT and CW pipes coming from room B1225 (green arrow on P1-3009) but there is not any connection shown on P1-2202. Pipes with missing connection are in yellow frame. Floor plan and enlarged plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2854_SKP1-2202. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/28/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015		
<hr/>							
T-2855	TTC - Contradiction between enlarged plan, plumbing floor plan and the water pipi	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2561 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2856	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5053; P1-3008; P1-2506 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level; Park Level Gridline: D.4-E.6/30 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #052 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #052. There is a contradiction between the plumbing floor plan (P1-2506), the enlarged plan (P1-3008) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053). Riser diagram (P1-5053) shows vertical pipe (marked with red cloud) which is not shown on to the plumbing floor plan. But according to the plumbing floor plan the cyan marked pipes should connect to the dark green marked pipes (see red dashed line). The enlarged plan (P1-3008), the plumbing floor plan (P1-2506) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053) should match. Please confirm.	Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
T-2856	TTC - Contradiction between enlarged plan, riser bank details and the water piping Closed						
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5053; P1-3008; P1-3016; P1-2406; P1-2507 Location: Global, Bus Deck Level; Park Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #053 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #053. According to Bus Deck Level Plumbing Floor plans (P1-3016; P1-3008; P1-2507) the EWH 3-D-1, EWH 3-D-2 and EWH 3-D-4 equipments are connected to a downgoing pipe which does not appear on the Second Level Floor	Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
T-2856							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2562 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>plan and the piping diagram. The horizontal pipeline is marked with green dashed line on riser diagram and the vertical pipe is marked with blue cloud. The piping diagram shows an another connection path (mark with red) which does not exist according to the floor plan. Refer to PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #052 issue.</p> <p>The enlarged plan (P1-3008), the riser bank details plan (P1-3016) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053) should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						
T-2857	TTC - Missing connection	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p>		<p>ANSWERED By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>					
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: P1-5053; P1-3008; P1-2406; Location: Global, Bus Deck Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #054</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #054.</p> <p>Refer to the PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #053 issue, there is a downgoing pipe on the enlarged plan (P1-3008) which is not indicated on the plumbing floor plan (P1-2406) (marked with purple rectangle). But it should connect to the main line (marked with green) as it is marked on the water piping diagram with purple dashed line.</p> <p>The enlarged plan (P1-3008), the plumbing floor plan (P1-2406) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053) should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Riser diagram is correct. Refer to attached sketches T-2855, T-2856, T-2857_SKP1-3008 and T-2855, T-2856, T-2857, T-2859_SKP1-3018.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 5/29/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2563 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2858	TTC - Missing Pipe on Floor Plan	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5053; P1-2207 Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: A-B/32-34 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #055 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #055. The Water Piping Diagram (P1-5053) (pipe marked with red and clouded) shows pipes (marked with red) which are not indicated on the Lower Concourse Level Zone 07 Plumbing Plan (P1-2206). The plumbing floor plan (P1-2207) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053) should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2858, T-2880_SKP1-2207. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/15/2015				
T-2859	TTC - Contradiction between the enlarged plan, the plumbing floor plan and the water piping diagram	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5053; P1-3018; P1-2406 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level Gridline: E.2-E.6/30 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #056 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #056. There is a contradiction between the enlarged plan (P1-3018), the plumbing floor plan (P1-2406) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053). The tags of the pipes are different (marked with red rectangle). The GWT/D1 (pipe marked with cyan) shown on the enlarged plan as GWT/D3. The GWT/D2 (pipe marked with yellow) shown on the enlarged plan as GWT/D5. The GWT/D3 (pipe marked with green) shown on the enlarged plan as GWT/D4. Furthermore the GWT/D4 and the GWT/D5 tags			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Riser diagram and floor plan is correct. Refer to attached Sketch T-2855, T-2856, T-2857, T-2859_SKP1-3018. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/29/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2564 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	do not exist on other plans.						
	The enlarged plan (P1-3018), the plumbing floor plan (P1-2406) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053) should match.						
	Please confirm.						
T-2860	TTC - Contradiction between enlarged plan and the water piping diagram	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath						
	REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5053; P1-3018; Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: E.2-F/30 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #057	SUGGESTION:				ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #057.					Floor plan is correct. Refer to attached sketch T-2860_SKP1-5053.	
	There is a contradiction between the enlarged plan (P1-3018) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053). According to the enlarged plan (P1-3018) the red marked pipe (clouded) has a connection to the green marked pipe but the water piping diagram shows this red marked pipe connected to another pipe (marked with brown).					Date Answered by Design Team: 5/29/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015	
	The enlarged plan (P1-3018) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053) should match.						
	Please confirm.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2565 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2861	TTC - Missing pipe on plumbing floor plan (P1-2205) and enlarged plan (P1-3003)	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5052; P1-3003; P1-2205; Location: Lower Concourse Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #058 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #058. The water piping diagram (P1-5052) shows some pipes (marked with red and clouded) which are not indicated on the plumbing floor plan (P1-2205) and enlarged plan (P1-3003). According to the water piping diagram there are two pipes which connected to the orange marked pipe but it does not indicated on the enlarged plan and plumbing floor plan. The enlarged plan (P1-3003), the plumbing floor plan (P1-2205) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052) should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> All hose bibbs water supply lines (6) are accounted for in the riser diagram P1-5052 for Sector C. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/28/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015		
T-2862	TTC - Contradiction between plumbing floor plan and the water piping diagram	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5052; P1-2305 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Gridline: C.3/20 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #059 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #059. There is a contradiction between the plumbing floor plan (P1-2305) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052). According to the plumbing floor plan (P1-2305) the pipe (marked with cyan) has a connection to an SS-1 mop sink but the water piping diagram shows this pipe connected to			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Revised fixture tags. See attached sketch T-2862, T-2865, T-2867, T-2869_SKP1-5052. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/31/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>a lavatory.</p> <p>The plumbing floor plan (P1-2305) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052) should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						
T-2863	TTC - Contradiction between the water piping diagram and the enlarged plan	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Riser diagram has been corrected. Refer to attached sketch T-2882, T-2877, T-2863, T-2881_SKP1-5052.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015</p>					
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: P1-5052; P1-3003 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: 24.9/C Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #060</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #060.</p> <p>There is a contradiction between the water piping diagram (P1-5052) and the enlarged plan. The water piping diagram (P1-5052) shows that the pipe which go to the ESEW (marked with purple) is connected to the cyan marked pipe but according to the enlarged plan (P1-3003) this pipe is connected to the orange marked pipe (shows with red dashed line on riser diagram).</p> <p>The enlarged plan (P1-3003), and the water piping diagram (P1-5052) should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2567 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2864	TTC - Missing pipe on water piping diagram (P1-5052)	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5052; P1-3003 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C-C.3/24.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #061 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #061. The water piping diagram (P1-5052) shows a pipe (marked with red and clouded) which is not indicated on the enlarged plan (P1-3003) (the lack of connection marked with red cloud). The enlarged plan (P1-3003) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052) should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches T-2864, T-2866, T-2889_SKP1-2205, T-2864_SKP1-5051 and T-2864, T-2866_SKP1-5052. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/15/2015				
T-2865	TTC - Contradiction between plumbing floor plan and the water piping diagram	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5052; P1-2305; P1-2205 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Gridline: C.3/19.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #062 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #062. There is a contradiction between the plumbing floor plans (P1-2305; P1-2205) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052). According to the Ground Level Plumbing Plan (P1-2305) there is a 3/4" diam CW pipe which turns down, but the Lower Concourse Level Plumbing Plan (P1-2205) does not show this pipe. Furthermore this pipe position according to the plumbing floor plan should be between the two HB pipe (marked with red dashed line and clouded) but the water piping diagram shows different			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches T-2685_SKP1-2205 and T-2862, T-2865, T-2867, T-2869_SKP1-5052. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/31/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2568 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	(marked with red fill). The plumbing floor plan (P1-2305) (P1.2205) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052) should match. Please confirm.						
T-2866	TTC - Missing pipe on the plumbing floor plan (P1-2205)	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5052; P1-2205 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level Gridline: C/21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #063 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #063. There is a contradiction between the plumbing floor plan (P1-2205) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052). According to the water piping diagram (P1-5052) there are pipes which had capped future connection (marked with red) connected to the CW pipe (marked with cyan). But there are no pipes connected to the CW pipe (marked with cyan and clouded) on the plumbing floor plan (P1-2205). The plumbing floor plan (P1-2205) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052) should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches T-2864, T-2866, T-2889_SKP1-2205 and T-2864, T-2866_SKP1-5052. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/15/2015				

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Date Answered by Design Team: 5/31/2015
Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2571 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2870	TTC - Annotation Error on Plumbing Plan	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPMichelle Collanton</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LPJeff Heath</div></div>			<div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: P1-2502; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D-D.4/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #067 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #067. There is an Annotation Error on the Bus Deck Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2502). The plumbing floor plan shows that the CW and GWT pipes are connected to the wrong risers. According to the Piping Diagram (P1-5050) the GWT should be connected to the GWT/A1 (marked with red) and the CW should be connected to the CW/A4 (marked with green). The Plumbing Plan and Piping Diagram should match. Please confirm.</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>The riser designations and locations are correct. Refer also to detail 3/P1-3013. The correct piping connections, refer to attached sketch T-2870_SKP1-2502. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/31/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015</div></div>				
T-2871	TTC - Contradiction between Piping Diagram and Enlarged Plan	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPMichelle Collanton</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LPJeff Heath</div></div>			<div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: P1-3010; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D.8/3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #068 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #068. There is a contradiction between the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050) and the Enlarged Restroom Plan Level 03 (P1-3010). There is a hose bib (HB) (marked with red fill) on the Piping Diagram which is connected to a CW pipe (marked with green) but on the Enlarged Plan it is not indicated.</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>The branch piping and the hose bibb have been removed from the riser diagram. Refer to attached sketch T-2871_SKP1-5050. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/31/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015</div></div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2572 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2573 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2873	TTC - Annotation error on Plumbing Floor Plan	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2403; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: F/8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #070 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #070. There is an annotation error on Second Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2403). The CW/A1 tag is pointing at the wrong riser (marked with red). According to the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050) the tag should point at the riser marked with green. Water Piping Diagram and Plumbing Floor Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2873_SKP1-2403. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				
T-2874	SSS - Stud Location on Web TR 19.9, 20.1, 22, and 24	Closed	04/09/2015	04/23/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2305, 3/S1-3705, 6/S1-3707, 9/S1-3702 Location: Ground Level, Zone 3 Gridlines: 19.1, 20.1, 22, and 24. Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1 and 2 This is a follow up RFI to T-2433 and T-2637. 1) Per RFI T-2433 response, please confirm Skanska is to implement detail 3/S1-3705 in lieu of 6/S1-3707. Please note that TR 22 and 24 are in fabrication. Please confirm if an alternate detail could be proposed to Shimmick that does not alter stud locations in 6/S1-3707. 2) Pending on response to #1, there are no dimension from bottom of flange to studs located on the web. Please provide dimensions to locate studs on web or revised detail.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The Design Team is open to an alternate detail that mitigate the impact to TR22 and TR23 that are in fabrication. W/O to facilitate a coordination meeting with Shimmick. 2) The Design Team is open to an alternate detail that mitigate the impact to TR19.1 & TR20.1 that are in fabrication. W/O to facilitate a coordination meeting with Shimmick. Reason for RFI (TT): Not noted by Skanska. TT categorizes this as "Change to be issued in future ASI" Answered by Design team: 4/22/15 Closed by WOJV: 4/23/15				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2574 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	3) Per RFI T-2537 response, please confirm Skanska is to implement detail 6/S1-3707 in lieu of 9/S1-3702. Please note that TR 19.1 and 20.1 are in fabrication. Please confirm if an alternate detail could be proposed to Shimmick that does not alter stud locations in 9/S1-3702.						
T-2875	TTC - Annotation error on Piping Diagram, Plumbing Plan and on Riser Bank Detai Closed		04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5050; P1-2602; P1-3013 Location: Zone 1, Park Level Gridline: C.3-D/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #071 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #071. There is an annotation error on Water Piping Diagram (P1-5050), Park Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2602) and on Riser Bank Detail (P1-3013). The Piping Diagram shows that the riser has a GWT/A1 tag (marked with green) but on the Plumbing Plan and on the Riser Bank Detail the riser has a GWT/A4 tag (marked with red). Water Piping Diagram, Park Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan and Riser Bank Detail should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches T-2875_SKP1-2602 and T-2875_SKP1_3013. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2876	TTC - Contradiction between Piping Diagram and Enlarged Plan	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3012; P1-5050 Location: Zone 1, Park Level Gridline: D/5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #072 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #072. There is a contradiction between Piping Diagram (P1-5050) and Enlarged Plan (P1-3012). Enlarged Plan shows cross connection of CW pipe branches (shown with red and blue). Piping Diagram shows two tee connections (marked with arrows). Connection matching floor plan is shown with blue dashed line on piping diagram. Piping Diagram and Floor Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Floor plan and riser diagram are both correct. The riser diagram is drawn like this for clarity. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/31/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				
T-2877	TTC - Contradiction between plumbing floor plan and the water piping diagram	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5052; P1-2505 Location: Zone 3, Bus Deck Level Gridline: F-/22-24.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #073 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #073. There is a contradiction between the plumbing floor plan (P1-2505) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052). The order of the pipe connections are different on the two sheets, and according to the plumbing floor plan (P1-2505) the pipe (maked with 3.) should connect to the pipe as on the water piping diagram (P1-5052)(marked with red dashed line).			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Riser diagram has been corrected. Refer to attached sketch T-2882, T-2877, T-2863, T-2881_SKP1-5052. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2576 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2878	The plumbing floor plan (P1-2505) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052) should match.						
	Please confirm.						
	TTC - Missing element on Plumbing Plan		Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/15/2015	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP	Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
	Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Heath					
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	Contract Doc: P1-5051; P1-2203		Refer to attached sketch T-2878_SKP1-2203.				
	Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level						
	Gridline: F-H/11						
	Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #074		Date Answered by Design Team: 6/12/2015				
			Date Closed by WOJV: 6/15/2015				
	Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #074.						
	There is a missing element on Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203). The Water Piping Diagram (P1-5051) shows a pipe branch (marked with red) which is not indicated on the Plumbing Plan. Missing branch is marked with red dashed line.						
	Water Piping Diagram and Plumbing Plan should match.						
	Please confirm.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2879	TTC - Annotation error on Plumbing Plan	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5051; P1-2203 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D/12 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #075 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #075. There is an annotation error on Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203). The CW/B6 tag is pointing to the wrong riser (marked with red). Correct riser marked with blue. The CW/B6 tag should point to the blue marked riser. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Both floor plan and riser diagram are correct. One arrow points to two risers SAN/B5 and CW/B6. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/31/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				
T-2880	TTC - Missing elements on floor plan (P1-2207)	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2207; P1-5053 Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C-C.3/33-33.5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #076 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #076. The Water Piping Diagram (P1-5053) shows pipes and caps (marked with red) which are not indicated on the Lower Concourse Level Zone 07 Plumbing Plan (P1-2207)(pipe marked with purple and clouded). The plumbing plan (P1-2207) and the water piping diagram (P1-5053) should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2858, T-2880_SKP1-2207. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/15/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2578 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2881	TTC - Contradiction between plumbing floor plan and the water piping diagrams	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5051; P1-5052; P1-2505; P1-2504 Location: Zone 3, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D-F.7/19.1 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #077 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #077. There is a contradiction between the plumbing floor plans (P1-2505; P1-2504) and the water piping diagrams (P1-5051; P1-5052). According to the water piping diagram (P1-5052) there are two hose bib (HB) fixtures (clouded) which are not connected to the CW/C1 riser. According to the water piping diagram (P1-5051) and the plumbing floor plans (P1-2505; P1-2504) these two pipe connected to the CW/B1 riser. The plumbing floor plan (P1-2505) and the water piping diagrams (P1-5051; P1-5052) should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2882, T-2877, T-2863, T-2881_SKP1-5052. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				
T-2882	TTC - Missing lavatory on the enlarged plan (P1-3012)	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5052; P1-3012 Location: Zone 3, Park Level Gridline: D/25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #078 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #078. The water piping diagram (P1-5052) shows a lavatory (marked with red line) which is not indicated on the enlarged plan (P1-2/3012) (clouded). The enlarged plan (P1-3012) and the water piping diagram			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Riser diagram has been corrected. Refer to attached sketch T-2882, T-2877, T-2863, T-2881_SKP1-5052. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2579 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	(P1-5052) should match.						
	Please confirm.						
T-2883	TTC - Contradiction between plumbing floor plan and the water piping diagram	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: P1-5052; P1-2505		Sheet notes call-outs have been revised. Sheet P1-					
Location: Zone 3, Park Level		5052 is correct. Refer to attached sketch T-					
Gridline: E.6-F/24.9		2883_SKP1-2505.					
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR							
#079							
Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-		Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015					
CR #079.		Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015					
There is a contradiction between the plumbing floor plan							
(P1-2505) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052).							
According to the water piping diagram (P1-5052) the pipe							
(marked with yellow line) is a 1" diam. CW riser but the							
plumbing floor plan (P1-2505) shows it is a 3" diam. CW							
riser.							
The plumbing floor plan (P1-2505) and the water piping							
diagram (P1-5052) should match.							
Please confirm.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2884	TTC - Contradiction between plumbing floor plan, the water piping diagram and the enlarged plan (P1-2/3003). According to the enlarged plan (P12/3003) the pipe (marked with green line) has a tee connection (shown with red arrow) but the plumbing floor plan (P1-2205) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052) show only an elbow connection (marked with red arrow).	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5052; P1-2205; P1-3003 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: A-B/24-25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #080 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #080. There is a contradiction between the plumbing floor plan (P1-2205), the water piping diagram (P1-5052) and the enlarged plan (P1-2/3003). According to the enlarged plan (P12/3003) the pipe (marked with green line) has a tee connection (shown with red arrow) but the plumbing floor plan (P1-2205) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052) show only an elbow connection (marked with red arrow). The plumbing floor plan (P1-2505); the enlarged plan (P1-2/3003) and the water piping diagram (P1-5052) should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The "GWT" piping has been deleted on sheet P1-3003. Refer to attached sketch T-2884_SKP1-3003. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015				
T-2885	DAT - Telecom RCP and Floor Plan Inconsistency	Closed	04/09/2015	04/19/2015	04/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128/TE1-4304] Location: Zone [04], Level [Ground Level] Closest Column Line Intersection is [C.3,16] Add'l Doc's Ref's: [ASI 128/TE1-2404/A1-2884/TE1-4404/TE1-4504] There is a discrepancy between the Telecom Reflected Ceiling Plans for Ground Level and Second Level. Please refer to the clouded regions in the attached drawings and confirm there is a riser, and Second Level TE-RCP [TE1-4404] contains an opening instead of a Pull Box.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The information in the referenced TE-series drawing is accurate. The riser only extends through 1 floor just as the drawings indicate. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/13/15 Date closed in CMIC: 4/20/15				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2581 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2886	TTC - Contradiction between Piping Diagram and Plumbing Plan	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2204; P1-5051 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: G/17 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #081 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #081. There is a contradiction between the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5051) and the Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2204). The Plumbing Plan shows a pipe (marked with green) which ends with a 3/4" CW UP but on the Piping Diagram this pipe ends with a future Cap (marked with red). The Piping Diagram and the Plumbing Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2886, T-2906_SKP1-2204. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/15/2015				
T-2887	TTC - Missing element on Water Piping Diagram	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5051; P1-2203 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F-H/11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #082 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #082. There is a missing element on Water Piping Diagram (P1-5051). The Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203) shows a pipe branch going to a Drain box (marked with red) which is not indicated on the Piping Diagram. Missing branch is marked with red dashed line. Water Piping Diagram and Plumbing Plan should match			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This CW line goes to the drain box trap primer. According to the general notes on sheet P1-5051 not all trap primer lines are shown. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2582 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2888	TTC - Annotation error on Plumbing Plan	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Contract Doc: P1-2204; P1-5051 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D/14 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #083 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #083. There is an annotation error on Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2204). The CW/B4 tag (marked with red) is pointing to a horizontal pipe (marked with green line) instead of the riser. The correct riser marked with blue. The CW/B4 tag should point to the correct riser. Please confirm.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The arrow from the risers SAN/B7 and CW/B4 points in the general direction of the riser locations. The drawing is too crowded as it is, the arrow cannot be more precise Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2583 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2889	TTC - Missing elements on Plumbing Plan	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2205; P1-5052; A1-9602 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: E.6-G/20-21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #084 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #084. There is a missing system on the Lower Concourse Level Zone 05 Plumbing Plan (P1-2205). The Water Piping Diagram shows a pipe system (marked with red cloud) coming from the CW and GWT but on the Plumbing Floor Plan it is not indicated Water Piping Diagram and Plumbing Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2864, T-2866, T-2889_SKP1-2205. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/15/2015				
T-2890	TTC - Annotation error on Piping Diagram	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2205; P1-5052; A1-9602 Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F-G/21-22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #085 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #085. There is an annotation error on Water Piping Diagram (P1-5052). The Piping diagram shows that the B1560 room (marked with red cloud) has the JANITOR'S CLOSET tag but on Lower Concourse Level Zone 05 Plumbing Plan (P1-2205) the tag is MAIN SWITCHGEAR ROOM. According to the A1-9602 Room Schedule the Plumbing Plan is correct. Water Piping Diagram should be revised.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Both Janitor Closets 01560 and 01580 are located at the ground level. Room tags have been revised previously. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2584 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2891	TTC - The plumbing partial plan shows incorrect underlay drawing	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc: A1-7005; 5/P1-3013 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: B/4-5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #086 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #086. There is a contradiction between Architectural Stair 203 at Lower Concourse Level (A1-7005) and Plumbing Partial Plan at gridlines 5/B (5/P1-3013). The plumbing partial plan shows incorrect underlay drawing. The slab penetration is different on plumbing plan than the architecture plan shows. The underlay of the plumbing partial plan should follow the architectural plans. Please confirm.				The plumbing plans are diagrammatic and the discrepancy in the backgrounds shown on 5/P1-3013 is not relevant in locating plumbing penetrations on the slab. The architectural edge of slab drawings locates these penetrations. Please read in conjunction with the plumbing plans (for pipe sizes) and plumbing pipe sleeve schedule (for sleeve sizes). Refer to reviewed and approved submittal TG0600-129.1 for slab penetrations near Stair 203. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2892	TTC - Missing pipe from piping diagram	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: A/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #087 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #087. There is a missing pipe from the Waste and Vent piping Diagram (P1-5030). The piping diagram does not show the pipeline what is on Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 plumbing plan (P1-2202) at gridline A/4. The upturn pipeline should be drawn on Waste and Vent piping Diagram (P1-5030). Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> These lines are vent lines from house traps and they are not supposed to be shown on the riser diagrams. Refer to detail 6/P1-6001. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				
T-2893	TTC - Missing tag	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2202 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: F/4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #088 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #088. There is a missing tag about upturn Sanitary waste pipe at gridline F/4 on Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202). The upturn Sanitary Waste pipe should be tagged at gridline F/4 on Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2202). Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There are tags with an arrow pointing to this general direction, SAN/A8 and CW/A3. The drawing is very crowded for the arrow to be more precise. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/1/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/4/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2894	TTC - Contradiction between plans	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5031; P1-2103; P1-2104 Location: Zone 2, Train Platform Level Gridline: F.7-H/12-13 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #089 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #089. There are contradictions between Train Platform Level Zone 03-04 Plumbing Plans (P1-2103; P1-2104) and Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5031). The Waste and Vent diagram shows a cap for future pipe connection to the yellow highlighted sanitary pipe run. This future connection is missing from the zone 03 and zone 04 plumbing plan. The future connection with cap should be marked on Train Platform Level zone 03-04 plumbing plans (P1-2103; P1-2104). Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketches T-2894_SKP1-2104 and T-2894_SKP1-5031. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/10/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/12/2015				
T-2895	TTC - Contradiction between plumbing plans	Closed	04/09/2015	05/07/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5031; 4/P1-3015; P1-2504 Location: Zone 2, Bus Deck Level Gridline: E/16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #090 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #090. There is a contradiction between Plumbing Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5031) and Plumbing Riser Bank Details (4/P1-3015). The Waste and Vent diagram shows connection from Drinking Fountain (DF) to Gray Water Waste Vent Riser. This connection is missing from the			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The extraneous 2" vent line has been deleted from drawing P1-5031. Drawings P1-3016, P1-2504 and P1-3010 are correct. Refer to attached sketch T-2895_SKP1-5031. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2587 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Riser Bank details and Bus Deck Level zone 04 plumbing plan.</p> <p>The connection should be marked on Plumbing Riser Bank details (P1-3015) and on Bus Deck Level zone 04 plumbing plan (P1-2504).</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						
T-2896	HVC - NEC Classification of AST Tank Rooms	Closed	04/09/2015	04/19/2015	04/29/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: E1-2102 and E12204 Location: Zone 2&4 Level B1&B2 Closest Column Line Intersection is GL2-D and GL15-C Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A				Liquid is Class 2 flammable, but the room is NEC 500 Class 1, Division 2. Sheet E1-2102 is correct as is. Refer to attached sketch, SKE-RFI-T-2896-1, for correction.			
Drawing E1-2102, Note 6 classifies the electrical race ways and equipment in Room B2261 (aboveground storage tank room) as NEC Division1, Class 1 and that all electrical race ways and equipment should be installed per this Classification. Similarly drawing E1-2204, Note 5 classifies the electrical race ways and Equipment in Room B1485 (aboveground storage tank room) as NEC Division 2, Class 2 and that all electrical race ways and equipment should be installed per this classification. Both storage tanks will contain Diesel No. 2. Diesel No. 2 is classified as a Class II combustible by the NFPA having a flash point higher than 100 degrees F. Per the NEC the proper classification of the electrical installation in these two rooms is "non-hazardous" since Diesel No. 2 is a not a flammable liquid. Please revise these notes to reflect the correct NEC classification for these two tank rooms as "non-hazardous". There is no cost impact to the project, since Becker Electric priced the electrical installation for this portion of the install based on a non-hazardous classification.				Answered by Design Team : 04/27/2015 Closed by Webcor: 04/28/2015			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2897	TTC - Contradiction between plumbing plans	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5031; 1/P1-3001 Location: Zone 2, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-C/18-19 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #091 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #091. There is a contradiction between Plumbing Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5031) and Plumbing enlarged plans (1/P1-3001). According to Plumbing Waste and Vent Piping Diagram there are two Sanitary Waste pipe runs from the Mechanical pump room (B2420), but the enlarged plan shows one from there. The Sanitary Waste pipe run should be marked on Plumbing enlarged plans (1/P1-3001). Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Sheet P1-3001 is correct. The riser diagram is also correct. Refer to attached sketch T-2897_SKP1-2105 and T-2897_SKP1-2104. This information could have been reasonably found by reviewing the Contract Documents and therefore this RFI is deemed a Frivolous RFI. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/10/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/12/2015				
T-2898	TTC - Contradiction between plumbing plans	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5031; P1-2504 Location: Zone 2, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D-D.4/14-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #092 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #092. There is a contradiction between Plumbing Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5031) and Bus Deck Level zone 04 plumbing plan (P1-2504). The Waste and Vent Piping Diagram shows 3" diameter for Sanitary Waste Vent, but the zone 04 plumbing plan shows 4" diameter of this vent instead of 3".			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The vent pipe size on riser diagram P1-5031 has been revised. Refer to attached sketch T-2895, T-2898_SKP1-5031. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	The diameter of Sanitary Waste Vent should be same on plumbing plans.						
	Please confirm.						
T-2899	TTC - Annotation Error on plumbing floor plan	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2105 Location: Zone 3, Train Platform Level Gridline: D-F/24 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #093 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #093. There is an annotation error on the plumbing floor plan (P1-2105). The SAN pipes (marked with green) are connected to the SAN/AD pipe (marked with red rectangle and arrow). The SAN pipe should connect to the SAN pipe (marked with green) instead of SAN/AD pipe (marked with orange). Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2899_SKP1-2105 Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2590 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2900	TTC - Missing area drain and the connection pipe of that on the water piping diagr	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2405; P1-5021; Location: Zone 3, Second Level Gridline: C.3-D/21-22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #094 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #094. The plumbing floor plan (P1-2405) shows a pipe (marked with red and arrow) which is not indicated on the water piping diagram (P1-5021) (marked with red dashed line and arrow). The plumbing floor plan (P1-2405) and the water piping diagram (P1-5021) should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2900, T-2901, T-2902_SKP1-5021. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015		
T-2901	TTC - Missing area drain and connection pipe	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2405; P1-5021; Location: Zone 3, Second Level Gridline: F/21 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #095 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #095. The plumbing floor plan (P1-2405) shows two area drain and the connection pipe of that (marked with red and arrow) which are not indicated on the water piping diagram (P1-5021) (marked with red dashed line and arrow). The plumbing floor plan (P1-2405) and the water piping diagram (P1-5021) should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2900, T-2901, T-2902_SKP1-5021. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2902	TTC - Missing area drain and connection pipe	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2405; P1-5021; Location: Zone 3, Second Level Gridline: D-F/24 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #096 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #096. The plumbing floor plan (P1-2405) shows two area drain and the connection pipe of that (marked with red and arrow) which are not indicated on the water piping diagram (P1-5021) (marked with red dashed line and arrow). The plumbing floor plan (P1-2405) and the water piping diagram (P1-5021) should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2900, T-2901, T-2902_SKP1-5021. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015				
T-2903	TTC - Missing pipes on water piping diagram	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2205; P1-5021; 2/P1-3003; Location: Zone 3, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C-F.7/22-25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #097 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #097. The plumbing floor plan (P1-2205) and the enlarged plan (2/P1-3003) shows a pipe with 4 piece of 2" down going vent pipes (marked with red and arrow) which are not indicated on the water piping diagram (P1-5021) (marked with red cloud and arrow). The plumbing floor plan (P1-2205), the enlarged plan (P1-3003) and the water piping diagram (P1-5021) should match.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> These vents are not part of the systems shown on P1-5021, they are sanitary vents and as such will be shown on the updated riser diagram P1-5032 to be included with the shop drawings. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/8/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2905	TTC - Missing element on Plumbing Plan	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5051; P1-2203; P1-2303 Location: Zone 1-2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D/10-12 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #099 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #099. There is a missing element on Lower Concourse Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2203). The Water Piping Diagram (P1-5051) shows a pipe branch with a Hose Bib (marked with red) which are not indicated on the Plumbing Plans. P1-2203 does not show the missing pipe branch marked with red cloud and the P1-2303 Plumbing Plan does not indicate the Hose Bib marked with red rectangle. Water Piping Diagram and Plumbing Plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The hose bibb has been deleted on sheet P1-5051. Sheets P1-2203 and P1-2303 are correct. Refer to attached sketch T-2905_SKP1-5051. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/8/2015				
T-2906	TTC - Missing Element on Plumbing Plan	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2204; P1-5051 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D-G/14-16 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #100 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #0100. There is a missing element on the Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2204). The Water Piping Diagram (P1-5051) shows a 1" CW pipe coming from the CW/B3 riser (marked with red cloud) that should come out from the section marked with blue cloud on the Plumbing Plan. The floor plan shows a 3/4" CW pipe marked with green but it is a different branch and it is not shown on the			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2886, T-2906_SKP1-2204. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/15/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2594 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2595 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2908	TTC - Missing element and connection	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/P1-3011; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: C.3/7 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #102 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #0102. The Enlarged Restroom Plan - Level 02 (1/P1-3011) shows 4 piece of water closets (WC marked red frame) but the Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030) shows only three of them. The P1-5030 plan should show four water closets. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The enlarged floor plan P1-3011 is correct. Refer to attached sketch T-2908_SKP1-5030. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/8/2015		

T-2909	TTC - Missing Fan Rooms	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5033; A1-9602 Location: Lower Concourse Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #103 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #0103. There are two Fan Room tag (B1624; B1647) on the Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5033) (marked with red rectangles) which are not indicated on the Room Finish Schedule Lower Concourse Level (A1-9602). The piping diagram and the room schedule plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The two Fan Rooms (B1624 and B1647) mentioned on the RFI are not indicated on the Room Finish Schedule Lower Concourse Level (A1-9602) because they are to be built in Phase 2 and are not part of the current scope. Refer to Phase 2 drawing A2-2206 for these rooms. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/11/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2597 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	red. Floor plan does not show any branch connecting to light blue branch.						
	The piping diagram and the floor plan should match.						
	Please confirm.						
T-2912	TTC - Missing Area Drain	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2206; P1-2306 Location: Zone 4, Lower Concourse Level; Ground Level Gridline: C-F/30 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #106 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #106. There is a missing area drain on the Ground Level Zone 06 Plumbing Plan (P1-2306). Connecting sanitary pipe is show with red rectangle on P1-2206. Location of the missing area drain is indicated in red frame on P1-2306. The floor plans should be revised. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to sheets P1-2206 and P1-2306 issued for ASI 0132. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/4/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/8/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2598 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2913	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and piping diagram	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-3018; 8/P1-3008; P1-5033 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level; Second Level Gridline: D-F/30-31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #107 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #107. There is a contradiction between the Enlarged Restroom Plans Level 02 and 01 and B1 (P1-3018), the Enlarged Restroom Plans Level 03, 02, 01, and B1 Plumbing (P1-3008) and the Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5033). The riser diagram shows that there are 3 branches connecting to dark blue branch (which is part of SAN D4 riser) the branch marked with orange, green and yellow. Floor plan shows 4 branch connecting to dark blue branch. The riser diagram shows that there are one floor drain and one floor sink connect to the orange sanitary pipe, but the floor plans shows that one floor sink connect to the orange sanitary pipe and the floor drain connect to the dark blue SAN D4 riser. The piping diagram and the floor plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2910, T-2913_SKP1-5033. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/16/2015				
T-2914	TTC - Annotation Error on Plumbing Plan	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 4/P1-3016 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level Gridline: E/32.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #108 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #108. There is an annotation error on the Riser Bank Details			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2914_SKP1-3016. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/16/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2599 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	(4/P1-3016). The SS-1 tag is not pointing to the mop sink. The floor plans should be revised. Please confirm.						
T-2915	TTC - Missing pipe connection on plumbing floor plan	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/P1-3018; P1-2406 Location: Zone 4, Second Level Gridline: D-E/30 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #109 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #109. There are missing pipe connections on Second Level zone 06 Plumbing Plan (P1-2206). Enlarged plan 1/P1-3018 shows "Refer to dwg P1-2406 for continuation" for vent pipes coming from room 02649, but there is no connection shown on P1-2406. Floor plan and enlarged plan should match. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2915_SKP1-2406. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/16/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2600 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2916	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and piping diagram	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2105; P1-5032 Location: Zone 3, Train Platform Level Gridline: F.7/22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #110 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #110. There is a contradiction between the Train Platform Level Zone 05 Plumbing Plan (P1-2105) and the Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5032). The riser diagram does not show the sanitary pipes which are marked with red arrows on the floor plan. Red clouds indicates the position of missing pipe branches. The piping diagram and the floor plan should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2916-SKP1-5032. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/10/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/12/2015		
T-2917	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and piping diagram	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2105; P1-5032 Location: Zone 3, Train Platform Level Gridline: F.7/22 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #111 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #111. There is a contradiction between the Train Platform Level Zone 05 Plumbing Plan (P1-2105) and the Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5032). The floor plan does not show the sanitary pipes which are marked with red arrows on the riser diagram. The piping diagram and the floor plan should match.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch T-2917_SKP1-2105. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/16/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2601 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm.							
T-2918	TTC - Annotation Error on Plumbing Plan	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	06/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP		Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Contract Doc: P1-2505				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Location: Zone 3, Bus Deck Level				The tag call-out has been removed and replaced with a note. Refer to attached sketch T-2918_SKP1-2505.			
Gridline: D.8/25							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #112				Date Answered by Design Team: 6/15/2015			
Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #112.				Date Closed by WOJV: 6/16/2015			
There is an annotation error on the Bus Deck Level Zone 05 Plumbing Plan (P1-2505). The Sheet Notes shows that 45 tag 3" sanitary vent down, but the D.8/25 area shows 45 tag 3" sanitary vent up.							
The floor plans should be revised.							
Please confirm.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2919	TTC - Contradiction connections of pipes	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 3/P1-3010; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D.8-E/3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #113 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #113. There is a contradiction between order of connections. First connection is FD (marked red) on the Enlarged Underfloor Restroom Plan - Level 2 (3/P1-3010) plan but it is second connection on the Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030) plan. Second connection is SS (marked blue) on the 3/P1-3010 but it is first connection on the P1-5030 plan The 3/P1-3010 and P1-5030 plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2920	TTC - Contradiction between Water Piping Diagram and Plumbing floor plan	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5051; P1-2403 Location: Zone 1-2, Second Level Gridline: D-F/10-11 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #114 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #114. There is a contradiction between the Water Piping Diagram (P1-5051) and Second Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2403). The plumbing floor plans shows that there is a horizontal branch (marked with green) coming from the CW/B9 riser (marked with purple) but the Piping Diagram shows that branch (marked with red) is coming from the CW/B7 riser (marked with light blue).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



T-2921	TTC - Contradiction between Piping Diagram and Plumbing Plan	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Michelle Collanton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP	Jeff Heath					
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>Contract Doc: P1-5020; P1-2403; P1-2404 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: D-F/11-14 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #115</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #115.</p> <p>There is a contradiction between the Waste Water System Piping Diagram (P1-5020), Second Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2403) and the Second Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2404). The P1-2403 and P1-2404 Plumbing Plans show seven 4" SAN/AD but the Piping Diagram show only six of them (marked with red).</p> <p>Piping Diagram and Plumbing Plans should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2604 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2922	TTC - Contradiction between Plumbing Plan and Drains and Cleanout Schedule	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-0051; P1-2204 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D-F/17 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #116 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #116. There is contradiction between the Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2204) and Drains and Cleanout Schedule (P1-0051). On the Plumbing Plan the tag 45 shows that the Trench Drain has a 3" connection but the Drains and Cleanout Schedule shows TD-2 requires 4" connections. The Plumbing Plan and Drains and Cleanout Schedule should match Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2923	TTC - Contradiction between Plumbing Plans and Piping Diagram	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2204; P1-2304; P1-5020 Location: Zone 2, Lower Concourse Level, Ground Level Gridline: D-F/16-17 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #117 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #117. There is a contradiction between the Lower Concourse Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2204) and the Ground Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2304). The P1-2204 plan shows four 3" UP to TD-2 (marked with red) but the P1-2304 plan shows only one Trench Drain. The others are indicated as Area Drain AD-4 (marked with green). Furthermore the P15020 Piping Diagram shows only one			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>Trench Drain (marked with red). Area Drains are missing (marked with green cloud).</p> <p>Piping Diagram and Plumbing Plans should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						
T-2924	TTC - Annotation error on Piping Diagram	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath</p>		Answered By:				
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: P1-2104; P1-5020; A1-9601 Location: Zone 2, Train Platform Level Gridline: B-G/16-18 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #118</p> <p>Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #118.</p> <p>There is an annotation error on Waste Water System Piping Diagram (P1-5020). The Piping diagram shows that the B2420 and the B2442 room (marked with red cloud) has the SEWAGE EJECTOR ROOM tag but on Train Platform Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2104) the tag is MECHANICAL PUMP ROOM (marked with green cloud). According to the A1-9601 Room Schedule the Plumbing Plan is correct.</p> <p>Water Piping Diagram should be revised.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2925	TTC - Contradiction between Piping Diagram, Plumbing Floor Plan and Enlarged F Open		04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc: P1-2104; P1-5020; 1/P1-3001							
Location: Zone 2, Train Platform Level							
Gridline: B-C/17-18							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #119							
Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #119.							
There is a contradiction between the Train Platform Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2104), Waste Water System Piping Diagram (P1-5020) and the Train Platform Level Zone 04 Enlarged Floor Plan (1/P1-3001). The Piping Diagram shows two Sanitary risers (marked with green) coming from the Sewage Ejector Room B2420 but the Plumbing Floor Plan and the Enlarged Floor Plan shows only one (marked with red).							
Piping Diagram; Plumbing Floor Plan and Enlarged Floor Plan should match.							
Please confirm.							
<hr/>							
T-2926	TTC - Contradiction between Piping Diagram, Plumbing Floor Plan and Enlarged F Open		04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc: P1-2104; P1-5020; 2/P1-3001							
Location: Zone 2, Train Platform Level							
Gridline: G-H/16-17							
Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #120							
Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #120.							
There is a contradiction between the Train Platform Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2104), Waste Water System Piping Diagram (P1-5020) and the Train Platform Level Zone 04 Enlarged Floor Plan (2/P1-3001). The Piping							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2607 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Diagram shows a Sanitary Riser (marked with green) which is not indicated on the Plumbing Floor Plan and on the Enlarged Floor Plan (marked with red dashed line).</p> <p>Piping Diagram; Plumbing Floor Plan and Enlarged Floor Plan should match.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						
T-2927	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Shim Plate Details	Closed	04/10/2015	04/16/2015	Potentially		
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: 7/S1-2724 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 805 SK1			Shim plates can be used to achieve satisfactory bearing between the column base plate and beam below, where sufficient contact area does not exist. If sufficient contact area exists between the base plate and the beam below, shim plates are not required. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for request Insufficient Information. We categorize this RFI as no cost clarification.				
See attached CD RFI 805 SK1: Please give direction as to why the detail indicates shim plates as required.			Date Answered by Design Team: 4/14/15 Date Closed by WOJV: 4/16/15				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2608 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2928	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Erectability Clarification	Closed	04/10/2015		04/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2705, S1-2723 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridline: 5 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 792 SK1 See attached CD RFI 792 SK1 for item 1: 1) Confirm the connections as shown on S1-2723 will be applied as shown or supply an alternative (details 1 & 3/S1-2723make the member un-erectable).							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Erection is a means and methods issue. Reason for RFI (TT): We disagree with reason for RFI Engineering Conflict. We categorize this RFI as clarification on means and methods. Date answered by design team: 4/19/15 Date closed by WOJV: 4/20/15				
T-2929	TTC - Contradiction between Piping Diagram, Plumbing Floor Plan and Enlarged F Open		04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2104; P1-5020; 1/P1-3001 Location: Zone 2, Train Platform Level Gridline: A-C/18-19 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #121 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #121. There is a contradiction between the Train Platform Level Zone 04 Plumbing Plan (P1-2104), Waste Water System Piping Diagram (P1-5020) and the Train Platform Level Zone 04 Enlarged Floor Plan (1/P1-3001). The Piping Diagram shows two Vents (marked with green) coming from the Sewage Ejector Room B2420 but the Plumbing Floor Plan and the Enlarged Floor Plans show 3 of them (marked with red). Piping Diagram; Plumbing Floor Plan and Enlarged Floor Plan should match. Please confirm.							
SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2930	TTC - Contradiction between plumbing floor plan and the enlarged plan	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPMichelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LPJeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2105; 1/P1-3006 Location: Zone 3, Train Platform Level Gridline: F.7-G/23-24 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #122 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #122. There is a contradiction between the plumbing floor plan (P1-2105) and the enlarged plan (1/P1-3006). The position of two pipes (SAN and OSI marked with orange and green) are different on the sheets. The plumbing floor plan (P1-2105) and the enlarged plan (1/P1-3006) should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2931	TTC - Missing area drain and connection pipe	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LPMichelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LPJeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2405; P1-2404; P1-5021; Location: Zone 3, Second Level Gridline: D-F.7/18-19.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #123 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #123. The plumbing floor plan (P1-2404) shows pipes (marked with red and arrow) which is not indicated on the water piping diagram (P1-5021) (marked with red dashed line and arrow). The plumbing floor plan (P1-2404) and the water piping diagram (P1-5021) should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2932	TTC - Annotation error on plumbing floor plan	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2505 Location: Zone 3, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D-E.2/22-24.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #124 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #124. Missing information about the size and type of the purple marked riser. The plumbing floor plan (P1-2505) shows a pipe (marked with purple) with the tag of 23 which is not indicated on the sheet notes. Furthermore the tag of 23 and the tag of 26 are reversed and point on the wrong pipes. Pipe tags should be revised. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2933	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and piping diagram	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5033; P1-2406 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: E/30 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #125 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #125. There is a contradiction between the Ground Level Zone 06 Plumbing Plan (P1-2306) and the Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5033). The riser diagram shows that there are 2 branches connecting to dark blue branch, the connecting branches are marked with orange and green. The Floor Plan shows that the green branch connects into the orange branch and then the orange connects to the blue.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2611 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2612 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2935	TTC - Different room tag appellation	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 2/P1-3017; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: C/6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #127 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #127. There is a contradiction between Piping Diagram (P1-5030) and Enlarged Restroom Plan (P1-3017). The Piping Diagram (P1-5030) shows one Women's Restrooms and Locker Room B1240 room tag (marked red), but the Enlarged Restroom Plan (2/3017) shows this room tag with B1243 number (marked blue).The B1240 room number associated to the Men's Restrooms and Locker Room (marked green). The piping diagram should contain Women's Restrooms and Locker Room with B1243 room tag. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
T-2936	TTC - Different room tag appellation	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5030; A1-2202 ;1/P1-3009; Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D/3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #128 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #128. There is a contradiction between Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030) and Lower Concourse Level Zone 02 Floor Plan (A1-2202). The Piping Diagram (P1-5030) shows a Janitor Room B11277 (marked yellow) between.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2613 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>The Enlarged Restroom Plan (1/P1-3009) shows this Janitor Room without any room tag. The floor plan shows these a Janitorial Closet with B1291 room number. The B1277 Room number is associated to the Women's Locker Room (marked brown).</p> <p>The Piping Diagram (P1-5030) should contain the same room numbers than the floor plans.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>						
T-2937	TTC - Missing WC pipes	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5030; 1/P1-3009; Location: Zone 1, Lower Concourse Level Gridline: D/3 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #129 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #129. There is a missing WC pipes from the Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030). The Enlarged Restroom Plans (1/P1-3009) shows 2 WC in the Men's Restroom & Locker Room B1125. The WC-2 (marked red) is not indicated on Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030). The same equipments are marked with the same color fill on the Enlarged Restroom Plan and on the Waste And Vent Piping Diagram. Furthermore there are some unnecessary Floor Drain marks (marked red circle). These marks point at the Shower. The Waste And Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030) should contain the missing element. Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2938	TTC - Contradiction between two systems	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5030; 1/P1-3012 Location: Zone 1, Roof Park Level Gridline: D/5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #130 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #130. There is a contradiction between Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030) and Enlarged Level 04 (1/P1-3012) plans. The order of branch pipe connections to main SAN pipe is different. According to P1-5030 plan the yellow marked branch (with WCs and FD) is the first and the red marked branch (with the FT and SS) is the second one but P1-3012 shows red branch connecting as first and yellow as second. The P1-5030 and 1/P1-3012 plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2939	TTC - Contradiction between pipe connections	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-5030; 2/P1-3011 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: C.3/8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #131 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #131. There is a contradiction between pipe connections on Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030) and Enlarged Underfloor Restroom Plan - Level 01 (2/P1-3011). The piping diagram (P1-5030) shows the yellow marked branch is connected to the red marked branch but according to the floor plan the yellow marked branch is			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2941	TTC - Contradiction between floor plan and riser diagram	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: 1/P1-3011; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: C.3/8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #133 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #133. There is a contradiction between Enlarged Restroom Plan - Level 02 (1/P1-3011) and Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030). The 1/P1-3011 plan shows a SAN Waste pipe with 2" (marked red frame) but the P1-5030 riser diagram does not show it. This pipe is not shown on Second Level Zone 03 Plumbing Plan (P1-2403). The P1-5030 riser diagram and floor plans should match. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-2942	TTC - Contradiction between pipe connections	Open	04/10/2015	05/08/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: P1-2402; P1-5030 Location: Zone 1, Second Level Gridline: D-F/5 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #134 Please see attached Virtual Building PLMBG (ASI 128)-CR #134. There is a contradiction between pipe connections on Second Level Zone 02 Plumbing Plan (P1-2402) and Waste and Vent Piping Diagram (P1-5030). The P1-2402 plan shows yellow marked Vent pipe which connects into orange marked Vent pipe but the P1-5030 plan shows these pipes are connected to the blue marked separately. The connections should match on P1-2402 and P1-5030			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2617 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2618 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2944	TTC - Missing dimension about the curb	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2864 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level Gridline: 15-16/F-F.6 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #001 Please see attached Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #001. There are missing dimensions about the curbs (marked with green). The position of the curb was scaled from the plan as it is on the screenshot. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to response and sketches (SKA-4654 and SKA-4673) included with RFI T-2641 for dimensions and location of these curbs. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				
T-2945	TTC - Contradiction between plans	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	05/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2884; S1-2404 Location: Zone 2, Second Level Gridline: C.3-D/16-16.9 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #002 Please see attached Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #002. There is a contradiction between Second Level Framing Plan (S1-2404) and Second Level Slab Edge Plan (A1-2884). The opening (marked with red) should be at the same position on both plans. One of the plans should be corrected. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Opening is located per A1-2884 issued with ASI-0128. This information has been noted in approved and returned submittals already. (Ref: TG0702-092.1) Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/15/2015				



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2946	TTC - Missing elevation of elements	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A&B/S1-7137; A&B&C/S1-7136; 2/S1-7108; S12305 Location: Zone 3, Ground Level, Second Level Gridline: D-F/24-25 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #003 Please see attached Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #003. At the walls (marked with yellow fill) of the elevator PE502 & PE503 there are missing elevations for the secondary wall support framings (marked with red). These wall support framings should be placed with equal distances in the height of the elevator. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> These beams have already been reviewed and approved in shop drawings. See steel shop drawing submittals TG0701-130.0 (dated 11/19/2014) and TG0701-130.1 (dated 03/02/2015). WOJV shall coordinate submittals with the VB modeling team as well as other trade subcontractors. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015		
<hr/>							
T-2947	TTC - Contradicting floor plans in terms of curbs	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	05/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2862 - A1-2871; S1-2302 - S1-2311 Location: Ground Level Gridline: Global Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #004 Please see attached Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #004. There is a contradiction between Ground Level slab edge plans (A1-2862 - A1-2871) and Ground Level framing plans (S1-2302 - S1-2311). The slab edge plans show some curbs (marked with yellow fill) and these curbs are not indicated on the framing plans. S1-2303 should contain the missing curbs to avoid the discrepancy. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Structural zone plans do not indicate curbs below walls that are shown on architectural plans. These are located and dimensioned in the architectural edge of slab drawings and to be read in conjunction with the architectural zone plans. Refer to A-0020 to A-0022 under Gypsum Board Partition Symbol for note about 'cc'. The typical 'cc' structural detail is 6/S1-5003 for these architectural curbs. The WOJV team should already have this understanding of the CDs without asking this question. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/15/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2620 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2948	TTC - Missing position of elements	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2203; S1-2303; S1-2403; S1-2503; S1-7104; S1-7132 Location: Zone 1, Global Gridline: E/8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #005 Please see attached Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #005. There are missing dimensions about the horizontal position of the 6 marked HSS12X6X5/8 columns at the elevator PE301 & PE302. These dimensions are missing from the Lower Concourse Level, Ground Level, Second Level and Bus Deck Level. The dimensions were scaled from the PDF. See the screenshot above. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> These beams have already been reviewed and approved in shop drawings. See steel shop drawing submittal TG0701-83.0 (dated 07/07/2014). WOJV shall coordinate submittals with the VB modeling team as well as other trade subcontractors. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				
T-2949	TTC - Missing position of elements	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2304; S1-2404; S1-2504; S1-7113 Location: Zone 2, Ground Level, Second Level, Bus Deck Level Gridline: D/15 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #006 Please see attached Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #006. There are missing dimensions about the horizontal position of the 4 marked HSS12X6X5/8 columns at the elevator SE401. The missing dimensions were scaled from the sheet. See the screenshot above. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> These beams have already been reviewed and approved in shop drawings. See steel submittal TG0701-78.0 (dated 04/16/2014). Final location of elevator rail HSS supports is to be determined by Elevator manufacture/installer. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2621 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2950	TTC - Missing position of elements	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: S1-2207; S1-2307; S1-2407; S1-2507; S1-7111 Location: Zone 4, Global Gridline: E/32 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #007 Please see attached Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #007. There are missing dimensions about the horizontal position of the 4 marked HSS12X6X5/8 columns at the elevator PE704 & PE705. The missing dimensions were scaled from the sheet. See the screenshot. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> These columns have already been reviewed in shop drawings. See steel submittal TG0701-139.1 (dated 01/26/2015). WOJV shall coordinate submittals with the VB modeling team as well as other trade subcontractors. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/11/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/13/2015		
<hr/>							
T-2951	TTC - Contradicting curb layout	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath							
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2867;S1-2307 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridline: D-F/32.4-33 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #008 Please see attached Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #008. The structural framing plan S1-2307 shows the permanent curb layout but the architectural slab edge plan A1-2867 shows this curb (marked with yellow) with pause or opening. The curb layout should be corrected on structural framing plan. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide the curbs following the Architectural Slab Edge Plan. A revised structural plan will not be provided. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2622 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2952	TTC - Contradicting opening	Closed	04/10/2015	05/08/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc: A1-2896; S1-2506 Location: Zone 4, Bus Deck Level Gridline: E.6-F/31 Add'l Doc Ref's: Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #009 Please see attached Virtual Building STR (ASI 128)-CR #009. There is a contradiction between Bus Deck Level Framing Plan (S1-2506) and Bus Deck Level Slab Edge Plan (A1-2896). The opening on the framing plan (marked with blue fill) should be visible on the slab edge plan as well. The slab edge plan should be corrected. Please confirm.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A1-2896 is correct as shown. This opening is no longer required. Please refer also to TE1-2506 for corresponding information (size and location of this riser revised with ASI-0128). WOJV to confirm Virtual Building team has current CDs. Date Answered by Design Team: 5/14/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/18/2015				
T-2953	SCS - Ground Level GL 11 Architectural Wall Details	Closed	04/12/2015	04/22/2015	04/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-7303, SKS 0315 Location: Ground Level Gridline: 11 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached Please reference SKS 0315 taken from RFI T -0951 and A 1-7303 regarding the Ground Level GL 11 Architectural Wall. SKS 0315 is a cut section showing an architectural wall on the west side of TR 11, taken somewhere between GL D & F (section not yet in contract drawings). The sketch does not provide the material type. Also, the connection at top/bottom of the architectural wall is not shown, and is expected to change when the supporting slab is either permanent or a knockout slab. The extent along TR 11 where this detail is applicable is also not available. Note that this wall is indicated on A 1-7303 as concrete. No mention of CIP AC is made on the drawings. 1. Please confirm it is acceptable for this wall to be the			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Yes. 2) Refer to typical detail 6/S1-5003 (a) Tall Curb for rebar information. 3) No top connection required for upper slab. 4) Confirmed - refer also to enclosed sketch SKA-4601. 5) Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4601 for dimensions between knock out panels. Date answered by Design Team: 4/25/15 Date Closed by WOJV: 4/28/15 6) Pour curbs separately - refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4601. Separate rebar in curbs that are noted for demolition in phase 2.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>same concrete mix forming the S1 slab on metal deck.</p> <p>2. Please provide a sketch or contract detail applicable for the rebar connection detail. Please note any intended rebar connection or jointing occurring in the support slab below.</p> <p>3. Please provide a connection detail for the top of architectural wall to the top bent plate. Please note any connection change when the wall is supported by (1) a knockout slab or (2) a permanent slab.</p> <p>4. Please confirm that SKS 0315 correctly dimensions the east edge of the support slab below. SKS 0315 and A1-7303 (in contract set) show different slab extents.</p> <p>5. Please confirm the north/south ends of the architectural wall are the northernmost and southernmost edges of both knockout panels. If this is the case, please provide the total dimension between knockout panels.</p> <p>6. Please confirm that the wall may be poured continuous with the curbs north and south of the knockout panels as shown in sketch, is the rebar connected in these areas?</p>						
T-2954	SCS - Ground Level MFB Spacing per TG0702-027	Closed	04/12/2015	04/22/2015	04/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:Turner Construction Comç Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Contract Doc Ref: N/A				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Location: Ground Level				Confirmed, it is acceptable to shift the centerline of highlighted MFB to be 7'-6 3/4" to achieve total dimension of 38'-6" between GL 10.1 and 11.			
Gridline: 10.1-11							
Add'l Doc Ref: TG0702-027 & TG0702-030				Answered by Design Team: 4/20/15			
				Closed by WOJV: 4/27/15			
<p>On sheet 1.3.0 of TG0702-027 SCS-RESPONSE it is noted to "refer to dimensions on submittal TG0702-030" for the moment frame concrete beam spacing (South of GL G, between GL 10.1 & 11). The dimensions provided for the moment frame concrete beams between GL 10.1 & 11 do not add up to the total dimension between gridlines (38'-6"). Please confirm it is acceptable to shift CL of the clouded beam to be 7'6 3/4" to achieve the total dimension between gridlines (38'-6").</p>							



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2955	SCS - Ground Level Air Vent - Moment Frame Beam Conflict #2	Closed	04/12/2015	04/22/2015	04/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-2864 Location: Ground Level Gridline: GL G @ GL 22 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
On architectural plan sheet AI -2864, the air vent slab opening (South of GL G, at GL 22) interferes with the moment frame concrete beam. Reference RFI T-1010.1 for concrete beam spacing & RFI T-2103 for direction to center air vent slab opening location between beams. The opening cannot be centered similar to RFI T-2103's direction due to a small span between beams. Please revise contract documents to resolve this conflict by either adjusting air vent slab opening location or moment frame concrete beam location.					Adjusting the location of the MFB to 7'-1" west of GL 22 is acceptable structurally.		
					Answered By Design Team: 4/25/15 Closed by WOJV: 4/28/15		
T-2956	SCS - Ground Level Vault Openings - Moment Frame Beam Conflict	Closed	04/12/2015	04/22/2015	04/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-2865 Location: Ground Level Gridline: GL 21 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
On architectural plan sheet AI-2865, the (2) 7'x10' slab openings directly to the East and West of GL 21 interfere with the moment frame concrete beams. Reference RFI T-1010.1 for concrete beam spacing. Please confirm it is acceptable to adjust the slab opening location to have one edge of block-out flush with beam face.					Refer to enclosed sketch SKA-4602 for transformer vault openings with moment frame beam information superimposed. 7' wide openings east and west of GL 21 do not conflict with moment frame beam locations. No changes are required and A1-2865 will not be revised.		
					Date answered by Design Team: 4/22/15 Date Closed By WOJV: 4/28/15		
T-2957	SCS - Ground Level Circular Slab Opening Radius	Closed	04/12/2015	04/22/2015	04/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2625 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-2865 Location: Ground Level Gridline: 21 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached On architectural plan sheet A1-2865, the circular slab opening to the east of GL 21 indicates a radius of 2'-6 1/4" which varies from the other circular slab openings. Please verify that this dimension callout refers to the outside edge of curb and not the slab opening radius.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed, the radius of 2'-6 1/4" indicated on A1-2865 refers to the outer edge of the curb and not the slab opening. Date Answered By Design Team: 4/19/15 Date Closed by WOJV: 4/20/15			
T-2958	SCS - Ground Level Plenum - Missing Dimension	Closed	04/12/2015	04/22/2015	04/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2305 Location: Ground Level Gridline: G & 22 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached On structural plan sheet SI-2305, sections 5/S1-3708 & 6/S1-3708, a depressed slab & set of hanging walls (South of GL G, at GL 22) are shown. Please provide the dimensions referenced in the sketch to detail to these walls.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to attached sketch SKA-4608 for dimensions and section references of the air intake plenums (depressed slab and hanging walls) at GL 22/G. Answered by Design Team: 4/28/15 Closed by WOJV: 4/30/15			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2626 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2959	SCS - Moment Frane Beam Spacing at GL 1.1-1.4	Closed	04/12/2015	04/12/2015	04/20/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2302 Location: Ground Level Gridline: 1.1-1.4 Add'l Doc Ref: RFI-1010.1					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
On structural plan sheet S 1-2302, what is the moment frame concrete beam spacing between GL 1.1 & 1.4, North of GL C? RFI T-1010.1 does not relate this information. Is it equal spacing between centerline of foundation wall & GL 1.4 or between GL 1.1 & 1.4?					Provide equal spacing between the centerline of the foundation wall and GL 1.4 to locate the MFB1 north of GL C. Date Answered By Design Team: 4/19/15 Date Closed by WOJV: 4/20/15		
<hr/>							
T-2960	SCS - Moment Frame Beam Spacing in Zone 4	Closed	04/12/2015	04/22/2015	04/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2306 & S1-2307 Location: Ground Level Gridline: 27-34 Add'l Doc Ref: RFI-1010.1					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
On structural plan sheet S1-2306 & S1-2307, what is the moment frame concrete beam spacing between GL 27-34, North of GL C & South of GL G? RFI T-1010.1 does not relate this information. Please advise whether it is acceptable to refer to note GR -13 on structural drawing sheet S-005 for the spacing or instruct otherwise.					Confirmed. Moment frame beams (MFB) between GL 27-34 North of GL C and South of GL G can be located based on equal spacing, as specified on General Note GR-13 on sheet S-0005. Answered by Design Team: 4/25/15 Closed by WOJV: 4/28/15		
<hr/>							
T-2961	GCW - Glass Floors Shear Keys	Pending	04/13/2015	04/23/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Crown Corr, Inc. Erik Bryant							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: 08 88 53 Add'l Doc Ref's: 3/S1-6020					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Provide specifics on shear key provided for embed support of glass wall W-12. We need confirmation on the							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2627 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>location of shear keys and specifics of what the shear key is and how we can secure the embed plate to it. We would anticipate a steel shear key allowing us to weld or mechanically attach the embed. It is our assumption that the shear key will be provided for steel embed attachments, and will NOT be by GREENLITE. Reactions can be provided. It is our assumption that the shear key will allow for the transfer of lateral and transverse shear forces into the structure, and NOT transferring the shear forces directly into the concrete through the embedded threaded rods. Please confirm.</p>							
T-2962	GCW - Glass Floor Tension Rods	Open	04/13/2015	04/23/2015	04/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Crown Corr, Inc. Erik Bryant							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 08 88 53 1.Specification 08 88 53 Section 1.2.A.1: This section describes basic system configuration calling for primary girders (trusses) with a tension rod suspension system. What does the design team expect from the tension rods in a fire condition? ie (A) Do we ignore the tension rods when designing the primary steel members which traverse the opening for dead load and applied design live load? - in which case the truss becomes irrelevant in a fire condition. But we may have larger truss members to span the opening. Or (B) is the design intent to design for the tension rods to assist the primary steel members and assist with carrying the dead load and applied design live load? - in which case the performance of the composite structure in fire conditions is a much more complicated issue and probably impossible to test for in the furnace to ASTM-E119. Please note: Even if a portion of the truss structure was to be replicated inside the furnace under the primary steel members, testing this would not replicate the performance		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> To RFI question 1: We had assumed 'B' as it had led to a more slender and efficient design of the glass floors. However, as the design of the glass floors changes, we would not be opposed to option 'A'. We are not attached to the trusses and from a structural point of view, both options can be made work. However, the trusses without the tension rods will most likely become heavier. Regarding the testing, is the intent to fire-test the entire assembly of one truss with glass and tension rods? Or, is the test only for glass and directly supporting steel beams? If second, then the test assembly would be much smaller. Answered by Design Team: 04/30/2015 Closed by WOJV: 05/04/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2628 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>of a full truss span... Design Option A (W-12) preferred</p> <p>- Design main beam to span opening without relying on the tension rod suspension system as a structural support member or fire-rated member. Resulting in larger primary truss members. Design Option B (W-12)</p> <p>- Design main beam to utilize the tension rod suspension system as a structural support system to assist in transferring the applied live, wind, seismic, and blast loading (exterior loading). Which would then have complications for the fire-testing. Design Option (W-13) Preferred</p> <p>- Design circular frame system assuming the tension rod is an architectural feature and not a structural element. Please confirm the original design intent of the tension rod suspension system of W-12 and W-13.</p>						
T-2963	GCW - Glass Floor Seismic Analysis	Closed	04/13/2015	04/23/2015	04/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Crown Corr, Inc. Erik Bryant							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Contract Doc Ref: 08 88 53 Add'l Doc Ref's: S-0005 1. Specification 08 88 53 Section 2.3.D.6: This section is providing criteria for seismic loading. Section is calling for system to meet the performance requirements of AAMA 501.4 and 501.6 and submit test reports of similar assemblies demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>W-12 & W-13 are unique framing systems that will NOT have initial test reports to demonstrate compliance. Design intent is to prove framing systems can resist seismic loading though analysis as opposed to testing. Please confirm if acceptable.</p>				<p>1. The testing reports were requested to determine the viability of a similar system that has been tested. Since no specific testing for these systems is required as a value engineering measure, TJPA should be clearly informed that W-12 & W-13 are unique framing systems that will NOT have initial test reports to demonstrate compliance and that the Design Build Contractor will prove that the proposed framing system can resist the required seismic loading through analysis as opposed to testing.</p> <p>2. The Design Team does not take exception to the DB Contractor's interpretation of the seismic loading. It should be noted that concurrence from the SSRC</p>			





<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2966	BGP - CDSM Demo for Vehicle/Bike Ramp Corbels	Open	04/14/2015	04/24/2015	04/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Webcor Construction LP Spencer Sayles			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell							
REQUEST: In order to install the corbels on the south face of the Foundation Wall below the Bike and Vehicle Ramp, SCCI is going to have to cut and remove a section of the CDSM Wall. The elevation to cut the CDSM piles is not specified in the contract drawings. Please confirm it is acceptable to cut the CDSM piles shown on the attached drawing to the specified elevation. Additionally per conversation with WOJV, please confirm it is WOJV's intent for TG06 to notch the CDSM Piles 758-761 and 766-772 at EL +8' -6" for future CDSM demolition for the various foundation wall penetrations.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. SCCI to perform the notching of CDSM piles. Piles 762-765 to be cut down 12" below the slab. Refer to 5/A1-7413 (approximately at 14' 6")		
T-2967	SSS - PE 204 Conflicting Edge of Slab Location	Closed	04/14/2015	04/24/2015	04/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-7103 and 2/A1-2972 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: F and 5 Add'l Doc Ref's: CD RFI 816 SK1 See attached CD RFI 817 SK1: 2/A1-2972 indicates the noted edge of slab to be 11'-8 3/8 west of Grid 5 and 1/S1-7103 shows the edge of slab aligned with the upper edge of slab at 12'-0 3/8 west of Grid 5. Confirm A1-2972 is correct as shown.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please use location in S1-7103 and refer to SKA-4604 for clarification. Answered by design team: 4/27/15 Closed by WOJV: 4/27/15		
T-2968	SST - Shop Primer Requirement	Closed	04/15/2015	04/25/2015	04/22/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Specification Sections 05 51 00, 05 50 00, 05 05 12 and 09 97 15 Specification Section 05 51 00 (Steel Stairs & Railings) states to: "Galvanize stair assemblies. Comply with the requirements of Section 05 50 00, then clean and shop			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/22/15 Date Closed by WOJV: 4/27/15		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>prime stair assemblies as specified in Section 05 50 00 and Section 05 05 12." Specification section 05 50 00-2.8 Cleaning and Shop Painting states "Shop prime steel, including galvanized steel, with one coat of primer to dry film thickness of one mil for a single coat." Shop primer as indicated per the specification 05 05 00 is Tnemec 90-97, however per attached letter from Tnemec, 90-97 is not recommended to be used as a primer coat over galvanized metal, as it is to be used in lieu of galvanizing or to touch up galvanizing. It is not used as a full coat over galvanized metal. Tnemec recommends using Tnemec series 69 expoxoline as a full coating over the galvanized metal, however this material is already specified to be used as an intermediate coat per 09 97 15 - High Performance Coatings Galvanized Metal, and should be applied immediately prior the finish coat per manufacture suggestions.</p> <p>As the permanent steel stairs will be used for an extended period of time as construction stairs, and per conversation with AAI, please confirm it is acceptable to field install the galvanized stairs, spot prime any exposed surfaces with Tnemec 90-97 and allow the stairs to be used for construction activities. Once the schedule permits the final painting to commence, TG7.05 contractor will clean the stairs and spot prime any damaged locations immediately prior handing over the stairs to the painting contractor, whom will place the intermediate coat of Series 69 expoxoline and then the finish coat of paint.</p>						



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2968.1	SST - Shop Primer Requirement	Closed	04/30/2015	05/10/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Contract Doc Ref: Spec 05 51 00, 05 50 00, 05 05 12, and 09 97 15 Location: All stairs Gridlines: n/a Add'l Doc Ref's: Letter from Tnemec</p> <p>This is a follow up RFI to T-2968.</p> <p>Per construction issues meeting on 4.15.15 and RFI T-2968, it was confirmed that the galvanized stairs did not require shop priming. Only touch-up would be immediately applied on the field if any specific areas were damaged.</p> <p>Please confirm that the field installed galvanized stairs will not require shop priming.</p> <p>For reference only: -05 51 00 Steel Stairs & Railings: "Galvanize stair assemblies. Comply with the requirements of Section 05 50 00, then clean and shop prime stair assemblies as specified in Section 05 50 00 and Section 05 05 12." -05 50 00-2.8 Cleaning and Shop Painting: "Shop prime steel, including galvanized steel, with one coat of primer to dry film thickness of one mil for a single coat." -05 05 00 calls out shop primer is Tnemec 90-97. -Letter from Tnemec: 90-97 is not recommended to be used as a primer coat over galvanized metal, as it is to be used in lieu of galvanizing or to touch up galvanizing. It is not used as a full coat over galvanized metal. Tnemec recommends using Tnemec series 69 expoxoline as a full coating over the galvanized metal, however this material is already specified to be used as an intermediate coat per 09 97 15 - High Performance Coatings Galvanized Metal, and should be applied immediately prior the finish coat per manufacture suggestions.</p>				<p>Confirmed. Galvanized stairs will not require primer. Use the specified TNEMEC 90-97 for touch-up of galvanizing damaged areas. Prep galvanized elements for painting per 05 51 00 2.6.</p> <p>Finish stairs per 09 91 00 3.7 and 09 97 15 2.7.</p> <p>Answered by Design Team: 5/3/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/11/15</p>			
<hr/>							
T-2969	HVC - Grease Duct Elevation Issues	Closed	04/15/2015	04/25/2015	04/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Reference: ASI 128/M1-2304				48x18 KX duct to be re-sized to 48x10. Slope duct so			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2634 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Location: Level 01, Zone 02 Closest column line Intersection: D/11-15 Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A</p> <p>The grease duct (kitchen exhaust duct) on Grid intersection D/11-15 (screen shot attached), this duct is located in the finish ceiling. DMI has pushed the duct as high as it could but they are still hitting the finish ceiling. Please advise on a solution with the elevation of the ceiling or relocation/re-routing of the duct. Additionally, this duct is atop a vent line that is within 9'-6" of FF in the TI space. Please confirm if this would be acceptable?</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2635 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	PE704/705: -See questions 21 thru 24 attached on WOJV 6. SE401: -See questions 25 thru 28 attached on WOJV 7. Notes: -Elevator SE202 is not included in this Elevator Group RFI. -Otis Rail Force Detail Sheet Dated 3/31/15 will also be included in Otis's Technical Shop Drawing Submittal Package.				2.Car Rail (CAR) supports shall follow structural design and shall match the quantities shown in the contract documents. Paired vertical guiderail supports shall be centered on the elevator guiderails. The center to center spacing of the guiderail supports is dependent on the selection of the ANGLE BY MFR indicated in Detail 9/S1-7630. Alternatively, the ANGLE BY MFR can be designed (sized, spaced, or both) by the elevator manufacturer to accommodate an arbitrary fixed spacing. This latter scenario is more likely to occur, given the required coordination with the structural steel bracing indicated in Detail 1/S1-7600, which has either been erected or indicated in the structural steel submittals. GC shall coordinate the final location of the paired guiderail supports with Detail 1/S1-7600 and relevant RFI's including RFI T-2390..		
T-2970.1	SSS - HSS Guide Rail Support	Closed	05/07/2015	05/15/2015	Potentially		
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-7101, S1-7104, S1-7132, S1-7106, S1-7134, S1-7108, S1-7136, S1-7111, S1-7139, S1-7113 Location: All elevator locations Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1 through 11 This is a follow up RFI to T-2970. 1) Please confirm the proposed detail sketch on 5/16" fillet weld between plate and HSS for elevator guiderail attachment as shown in WOJV 1 through 10. Otis confirms detail is acceptable, pending structural engineer review. 2) Please confirm the proposed 9' elevation attachment as shown in WOJV 1 through 10. 3) Please confirm the proposed HSS location.				1. Confirmed. Otis is responsible for the design of the plate between the tubes to meet the strength and stiffness requirements. 2. 9'-0" spacing for the rail support attachment is to be approved by Otis. Add additional support at 8/WOJV7 as needed. 3. Confirmed.			
Notes: -Erector to choose between field or shop weld.				Answered by design team: 5/14/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/15/15			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2636 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>-PE201 no vertical HSS is required. Otis will attach to horizontal members.</p> <p>-SE201 scope was deleted from project</p> <p>-SE202 will be clarified by Otis within 2-3 weeks.</p> <p>-Rail forces on WOJV 11</p>						
T-2971	SCS - Embeds at West Throat Slab and East Ramp Wall Interface	Closed	04/15/2015	04/25/2015	04/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell</p>		<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>					
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-3203, S1-3204, S1-3210</p> <p>Location: West throat Slab, Vehicle/Bike Ramp</p> <p>Gridline: N/A</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref: TG0600-702.1</p> <p> Please reference plan sheets SI-3203, S1-3204 & SI-3210 and Submittal TG0600-702.1- Misc. Metal Fabrication- Vehicle/Bike Ramp & Walls.</p> <p> Please confirm per field discussions with the SEOR:</p> <p>1) Detail 4 on Plan Sheet S1-3203 shows the typical ledger angle connection between the West Throat Slab and the East Ramp Wall. Please confirm the L6x6x3/4 can be lowered up to 2 inches to facilitate the top fillet weld shown in Detail4. A shim plate will be tack welded to the top of the plate to ensure the bearing pad assembly is in the correct position.</p> <p>2) Detail 6 on Plan Sheet S1-3204 shows the ledger angle connection between the West Throat Slab and the East Ramp Wall above the South corridor. Please confirm the L6x6x3/4 is to be installed per plan, however an additional 1" of Foam can be installed above the L6x6x3/4 to facilitate the top fillet weld from above.</p> <p>3) Detail 3 on Plan Sheet S1-3210 shows the embeds at the connection between the West Throat Slab B 118 Beams and the East Ramp Wall. Submittal TG0600-702.1 (sheet 6) replaces the L8x8x 1 with a 1" Ledger Plate with stiffeners. Please confirm that the 1" Ledger Plate can be</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1. Confirmed.</p> <p>2. Confirmed.</p> <p>3. Confirmed.</p> <p> Galvanize shim plates.</p> <p> Answered by Design Team: 4/27/15</p> <p>Closed by WOJV: 4/30/15</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2637 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	lowered up to 2" to facilitate the top fillet weld shown in Detail 3. A shim plate will be tack welded to the top of the plate to ensure the bearing pad assembly is in the correct position.						
T-2972	SSS - Continuity Plate & Girder Flange Offsets	Closed	04/16/2015	04/26/2015	04/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 6/S1-5012, FCR#1085 Location: Bus Deck Level Gridlines: See SK2. Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1, SK2 Due to fabrication tolerances, Skanska has encountered several locations of beam to moment column connections where the flanges of the girders do not line up with both of the continuity plates welded into the BU columns. In most instances, the deviation is less than ½ inch. Skanska requests permission to proceed with installation of girders where the difference is ½ inch or less between the flanges and continuity plates, and we will add additional tapered welds on both sides of the joint, at a 2.5:1 taper to transition between the members. See attached sketch. If any connections are found to be greater than a ½" deviation, we request permission to handle these on a case-by-case basis. A list of encountered connection deviations is attached.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Where deviation is 1/2" or less, it is acceptable to proceed without using the tapered welds per SK1 of the RFI. Note that the reinforcing fillets per contract drawings shall still be used as specified. Where deviations are larger than 1/2", deviations will be reviewed on a case by case basis. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with the reason for request Alternate Proposal. We categorize this RFI as request for substation. Date Answered by design team: 4/20/15 Date closed by WOJV: 4/21/15			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-2973	MME - Fencing for IDF and MDF Rooms	Closed	04/20/2015		05/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: A1-2203					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: MDF & IDF Rooms					1. Confirmed. Furnish and install standard product fencing (as shown on attached SK-1 and as noted on item #3 of the VE correspondence between WOJV and TJPA) at IDF and MDF Rooms.		
Closest Column Line Intersection: n/a					2. Installation shall be based on dimensions provided on the contract documents and other requirements stated on specification 05 50 00.		
Add'l Doc Ref's: Sketch SK-1 E-mail Correspondence							
Contract documents call for custom "Security Screen w/ Gate" at IDF and MDF rooms (see Sheet A1-2203 for example).							
Per negotiations with TJPA (see attached e-mail correspondence), TG07.3 shall furnish and install standard product fencing in lieu of custom fencing at locations called out in the contract documents.							
Please confirm the following for IDF and MDF rooms: 1. Where custom fencing is specified by the contract documents, standard product fencing (see attached sketch SK-1 for agreed upon materials and details) shall be furnished and installed.							
2. Fence dimensions and other requirements within the contract documents will remain unchanged.							
T-2974	MME - Aluminum Column Cover Confirmation	Closed	04/20/2015		05/06/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: Sheets A1-9205 through A1-9207 A1-9209 Sheets A1-2202 through A1-2207 A1-2210 A1-2211 A1-2250					Confirmed. Please furnish and install 1/4" thick Checker plate aluminum column covers (as shown on attached SK-2 and as noted on item #4 of the bid negotiation correspondence between WOJV and TJPA) on steel columns at Lower Concourse Level based on dimensions provided in the contract documents and requirements stated in specification		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2639 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Location: N/A</p> <p>Closest Column Line Intersection:</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: Sketch SK-2 E-mail Correspondence</p> <p>Sheets A1-9205 through A1-9207 and A1-9209 detail finished aluminum column covers to be installed at locations called out on Sheets A1-2202 through A1-2207, A1-2210, A1-2211, and A1-2250.</p> <p>Per negotiations with TJPA (see attached e-mail correspondence), 1/4" thick checkered aluminum column covers similar to Sketch SK-2 (see attached) shall be furnished and installed.</p> <p>Please confirm 1/4" thick checkered aluminum column covers similar to Sketch SK-2 shall be furnished and installed in lieu of finished aluminum column covers as detailed by the contract documents at locations identified on Sheets A1-2202 through A1-2207, A1-2210, A1-2211, and A1-2250.</p>			05 75 00 - 2.6.			
				Answered by design team: 5/1/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/6/15			
T-2975	ELV - Roof Park Level MNS System connection to Beacons	Closed	04/20/2015	04/30/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:			
	Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 TE1-4602 - 4607; SE1-2602-2607; Specification: 12 93 10; 26 50 02; 26 50 01 Location: Zone [02 - 07], Level [Park] Closest Column Line: [Park Perimeter] Add'l Doc's Ref's: RFI T-2414, L1-9632-9634; Detail 4, SE1-4001			Power requirements of beacons vary by model. Model will be selected by Landscape Consultant via shop drawing and mock up. Power requirements will be addressed at that time.			
	With regards to response RFI T-2414 ELV- E-2 Light Pole Park Level, it stated that the MNS system will activate the rooftop park beacons through a connection from the fire alarm system. However, it does not state or answer how			Answered by Design Team : 05/06/2015 Submitted by Webcor: 05/07/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2640 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>these beacons are powered? This should be clarified since they are stating connection to the MNS system, the power for these beacons need to meet the requirements of Chapter 24 of NFPA 72 - 2013 edition. Please advise.</p>							
T-2976	GCW - Temporary Retail Facade	Pending	04/20/2015	04/30/2015	04/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Crown Corr, Inc. Erik Bryant							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: A1-8151 Add'l Doc Ref: 08 44 25				Yes. The Retail Facades are required to meet blast and balanced design requirements, as they are part of the overall W-2 system.			
Are the temporary retail facades required to meet blast and balanced design requirements?				Answered by Design Team: 04/28/2015 Closed by WOJV: 05/04/2015			
T-2977	BOL - Vertical Bollard Penetration Sleeve	Closed	04/21/2015	05/01/2015	04/29/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Andrew Kitchen			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ryan Brekke							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: A1-7430 Location: Typical Detail				Schedule 80 pipe is acceptable for SS Sleeve.			
Detail 5 on plan sheet A1-7430 specifically states that the SS pipe sleeve be 1/4" thick. Schedule 80 SS pipe has a standard thickness of 0.218".				Date closed in Constructware: 4/28/2015 Date closed by WOJV: 4/29/2015			
Please confirm Schedule 80 pipe is acceptable for the SS pipe sleeve.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2641 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2978	SCS - Roof Park Level Perimeter Concrete Wall Mockup	Closed	04/21/2015	05/01/2015	04/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Spec 033002 dated 12/6/2014 Location: Roof Park Level Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: N/A Please provide a sketch describing the extent of the mockup required for the roof park perimeter concrete wall and scallop as referenced under section 3.6/H/2/e in the Cast-in place Concrete spec - 033002 (page 24.)			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to attached sketch SKA-4603_roof park concrete wall mockup.pdf for information and extent of the Roof Park perimeter concrete wall mock-up. Note that the fin walls are not required for visual mockup. Date Answered by Design Team: 4/25/15 Date Closed by WOJV: 4/27/15		
T-2979	GCW - Welded Studs to Cruciform Column	Open	04/21/2015	05/01/2015	04/28/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-2863 Location: Ground level curbs at Cruciform Columns The curbs that support the W-2 curtain wall currently do not connect to the cruciform column. In the TG08.11R Glass Curtain Walls and Skylights Design Meeting on 4/16/2015 it was discussed that welding studs to the base of the cruciform column would help support the curbs. Provide typical detail to support the W-2 curb at the cruciform columns.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See the attached SSK-0475 for headed studs where the concrete curb terminated at the cruciform columns. Reason for RFI (TT): Not provided by W/O. TT categorize this as changes to be issued in future ASI. Answered by Design Team: 04/28/2015 Closed by WOJV: 05/04/2015		
T-2980	SCS - Alternate for Steel Plate for High Curbs on Metal Deck	Closed	04/22/2015	05/02/2015	04/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 6/S1-5003 Location: N/A Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: Attached			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed detail is not acceptable. The bent bars cannot be developed in the slab as shown in the proposed detail.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2642 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<p>Please reference Detail 6/S 1-5003 regarding the plate supporting the deformed bar anchors for high curbs on metal deck. Harris Rebar would like to propose an alternate to detail 6/S 1-5003. The original detail calls for welded DBA's attaching to a plate screwed into the metal deck. We would like to propose to replace the DBA bars and supporting plate with a rebar hat bar. This bar would be at the same size and spacing as the DBA bars, matching the schedule. The difference is that the bar would tie into the deck reinforcing rather than being welded to a deck plate. The bars would be supplied in sections with the ties fusion welded with bracing wire to the project site. Please confirm if this is acceptable.</p>				Answered by Design Team: 4/28/15 Closed by WOJV: 4/30/15		
T-2981	<p>SSS - PQRs for Light Column Casting Material</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-6005 to S1-6007 Location: Light columns at all levels. Gridlines: 22-24 Add'l Doc Ref: n/a</p> <p>To maintain project schedule requirements, our subcontractor Oregon Iron Works (OIW) will be taking back a portion of the light column fabrication scope from their subcontractor, XKT Engineering. The scope of this work will involve welding API 5L Gr. X52 pipe and A572 Gr. 50 plate to ASTM A958 castings. In accordance with the project specifications, XKT performed the required Procedure Qualification Record (PQR) testing for casting to pipe and for casting to plate material welds. The tests were witnessed and the mechanical testing was performed by the TJPA's third party inspection firm (ISI). The PQR documentation was submitted and approved as Submittal TG0701-105B. Skanska is requesting that OIW be allowed to utilize the PQR tests and data performed by XKT to develop their own Welding Procedure Specifications (WPSs) for their use in welding light column components</p>	Closed	04/23/2015	04/29/2015	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>				<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>TT and sbp have no objections to this alternate proposal.</p> <p>Date answered by design team: 4/28/15 Dated closed by WOJV: 4/29/15</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2643 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2982	SCS - Transformer Vault Room B1324 CJ Relocation	Closed	04/23/2015	05/03/2015	05/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1/9236 Location: Vault Room B1324 Gridline: 11-12 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached Refer to transformer vault room B1324, on the south wall, detail A/A1-9236, there is a Construction Joint 3" away from the edge of the beam. In order to accommodate the trim bars around the beam block-out, please confirm that is acceptable to move the Construction Joint to the West 1' 3". Please provide acceptable offset to relocate Construction Joints in similar scenarios.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AAI Response: Confirmed. The control joint can be moved 1'-3" to the west as indicated on the RFI. Please note that for transformer vault rooms, the vertical wall control joints start 30" above structural slab. Refer to general note on transformer vault enlarged plans (A1-3001 to A1-3003). TT Response: The control joint indicated in the RFI may be relocated as proposed. SCCI has received, on comprehensive layout submittals, the locations and sizes of control joints and movement joints. Joint labeled as control joints, in general, can be moved; however, design team would need to review all proposed relocations. Please incorporate the locations and sizes of control and movement joints shown on the comprehensive layouts and any reviewed changes to control joint locations on partition wall comprehensive layout submittals and partition wall bracing submittals. Answered by Design Team: 5/1/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/4/15				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2644 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2983	SCS - Partition Walls Dimensions - Room B1323 & B1324	Closed	04/24/2015	05/04/2015	05/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1/3002 Location: Lower Concourse Gridline: GL 12/B and 10.2/B Add'l Doc Ref: Sketch Attached For the partition walls on the westernmost and easternmost sides of the rooms B1323 and B1324 (Lower Concourse Level, GL 12/B and 10.2/B,) please provide the length required for the walls (see drawing attached for clarification.)			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached sketch SKA-4611 for lengths of walls on the westernmost and easternmost sides of Transformer Vault rooms B1323 and B1324 at the Lower Concourse Level. Answered by Design Team: 4/29/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/1/15		
T-2984	SCS - Partition Wall Opening Elevation	Closed	04/24/2015	05/04/2015	05/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-9236 Location: Lower Concourse Gridline: GL 12/B and 10.2/B Add'l Doc Ref: Sketch attached Please refer to rooms B1323 and B1324 at the Lower Concourse Level (GL 12/B and 10.2/B). Regarding the openings shown on details D/A1-9236 and F/A1-9236, please provide the elevation required for the lowest wall opening (see drawing attached for clarification.)			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Typically, the transformer vault room wearing slabs slope down (1/8" per foot) to the sump pit area through the opening in the wall (for high point (HP) and low point (LP) of the wearing slab, refer to drawings A1-3001 to A1-3003). The bottom elevation of the opening can be derived by deducting the thickness of 3-1/2" (consisting of floor coating, wearing slab, drainage composite, protection board, and WPM-5) to the low point elevations on plan. For the typical detail at the wall opening, refer to SKA-4623 Answered by Design Team: 5/6/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/8/15		
T-2985	RFI T-2985 ELV - Powered Network Equipment	Closed	04/24/2015	05/04/2015	04/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref:[Div 25 BMCS, 275116 - Public Addressing and Paging, 281300 - Access Control, 282300 - Video			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The controlling organization is WSP/SM&W and the network equipment referred to in this RFI questions is part of the upcoming Phase 1.5 scope of work. To		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Surveillance, 283002 - Fire Management System Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A</p> <p>Fisk's low voltage subcontractor will be providing edge devices and cabling for the building control management system (Division 25), public addressing and paging (Division 27), access control (Division 28), video surveillance (Division 28) and fire management system (Division 28), as well as the network backbone and horizontal cabling (Division 27). In order to prevent compatibility issues between these devices and the powered network equipment, we are requesting a contact with the controlling organization responsible for network equipment procurement and installation, as well as a list of the selected equipment that will populate the IDF and MDF rooms.Please advise.</p>						
T-2986	RFI T-2986 ELV - Contact Information for Electrical Door	Closed	04/24/2015	04/24/2015			
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony</p>							
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128,Div 08] Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A</p> <p>We would like the contract information of the company that will be providing the electrified door hardware and frame for the Transbay project. We have some design coordination efforts that need to take place soon.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>					
			<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The Door Trade Subcontractor is under the TG16 package which is currently out to bid for a May 2015 bid date. If everything goes as planned the Bid will be approved in June and the awarded bidder under contract in either late June or early July.</p>			
						Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2646 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2987	DAT- IT Provider Contact Information	Closed	04/24/2015	05/04/2015	04/24/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A Please provide the contact information for the IT provider for the SF Transbay project. We would like to start dialog with them to determine the type of equipment they plan on using and configuring for the project. Please advise.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The IT provider for TJPA is not determined yet and there is no known ETA. TJPA is in negotiations but that's all that is known as of this writing.				
T-2988	FSP - Sleeve Product Data for Slab on Metal Deck	Closed	04/24/2015	05/04/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: Specification 22 05 29 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A In the ongoing effort of MEPS activity catching up with concrete deck pours please review the attached Sleeve product data and advise if acceptable for Fire Sprinkler sleeving. It's been internally reviewed and is compliant with specifications. Be advised that what is ultimately approved in this RFI will be included in the Transbay Fire Protection official product data submittal as well to maintain continuity of material data.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
T-2989	SCS - CDSM Cut Elevation	Open	04/27/2015	05/07/2015	04/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Webcor Construction LP Spencer Sayles		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal					
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Response to RFI T-1892 noted that the south west walls to be coordinated with TG06. Piles 762 to 765 (in between the ramps) are to remain per submittal TG0600-048. See attached.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Piles 762-765 are to be cut 1' below the bottom of the slab (~13'6".) 2. Please see updated sketch attached.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2647 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2990	SSS - Decking Clarifications at Exit Mezzanine From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 1/S1-2252, 4/S1-5032, and 10/S1-9001 Location: North Mezzanine Exit Gridlines: 21-22 Add'l Doc Ref: SK1, SK2, and SK3 1) Please confirm the rebar dowels tying into the slab wall shown in SK3 will be placed after the deck as the deck cannot be installed after the dowels. A similar condition occurs at the South Exit Mezzanine. 2) To the north-west of grid 22/C a S11 slab is shown. The deck for the S11 slab spans between two W12x40 beams and rests on the top side of the bottom flange. To clear the top flange the deck must be shortened by about 5". The net result is 1½" of bearing at each end of the sheet. The minimum requirement for bearing is 2". Furthermore, the maximum un-shored span for this deck is 10'-0". The beam to beam dimension is 10'-8 1/16" with a clear dimension of 10'-0 1/16". The max un-shored span is based on 2" of bearing. With the reduced bearing and maximum span reached we recommend the deck be shored prior to placing concrete. Please confirm 1 ½" of bearing is acceptable and shoring will be required.	Closed	04/27/2015	05/04/2015	Potentially		<input type="checkbox"/>
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1- This is a means and methods issue. Couplers at the CMU wall face as recommended by W/O would be an acceptable approach. 2) 1 1/2" bearing is acceptable. Shoring is a means and methods issue. Contractor is responsible for the stability of the structure in the temporary condition as indicated in General Notes Section GR-5 of Sheet S-0005. Reason for RFI (TT): We categorize this RFI as clarification on means and methods. Date answered by design team: 5/1/15 Date closed by WOJV: 5/4/15				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2648 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2991	SSS - Voids Around Columns at Ground Level GL 10-14	Closed	04/28/2015		04/30/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Quang Le	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: TG0701-92A Sht. 2, S1-2303 Location: Ground Level, Zone 2 Gridlines: 10-14 Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1, 2, and 3 There are voids around the columns at the ground level with no detail. Highlighted are the locations with similar shape and size openings. Please provide a response that could be implemented in zones 1, 3, and 4. 1) Please provide a general detail to close the L-shaped openings. 2) Please confirm sheet metal gauge size is to remain the same as deck per spec 05 30 00 (2.3A, 2.4C, and 2.4D) if opening is larger than 3"x3". 3) Please provide a general detail to close the line gap openings between top of flange to TR. 4) Please confirm sheet metal gauge size is to remain the same as deck per spec 05 30 00 (2.3A, 2.4C, and 2.4D) if gap is larger than 2". 5) Please provide a general detail to close the square opening. 6) Please confirm sheet metal gauge size is to remain the same as deck per spec 05 30 00 (2.3A, 2.4C, and 2.4D) if opening is larger than 3"x3". For Reference only: Spec 05 30 00- Steel Deck 2.3A) Galvanized Steel: roof steel deck, floor galvanized steel deck and all closures and flashing shall be formed from steel sheets conforming to ASTM A653, SS Grade 33 (min) with minimum yield strength of 38ksi. Before forming, steel sheet shall be coated with a zinc coating conforming to ASTM A653 Zinc coated per ASTM A653 G90. 2.4C) Pour Stops and Girder Fillers: Steel sheet, of same material as deck panels, and of thickness and profile indicated, but not less than deck gauge. 2.4D) Column Closures, End Closures, Z-Closures, and Cover Plates: Steel sheet, of same material and thickness as deck panels, unless otherwise indicated.				Areas to receive concrete must be formed and the forms must be wet concrete tight. Method of forming is within the contractor's means-and-methods. Formwork shall conform to either Specification 05 30 00 or 03 10 01. Reason for RFI (TT): "clarification for issues on means and methods" and "called out in contract documents"			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-2991.1	SSS - Voids Around Columns at Ground Level GL 10-14	Closed	05/01/2015		05/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2303, TG0701-92A Sht.2			Design team does not object to the contractor's means and methods selected.				
Location: Ground Level, Zone 2			Reason for RFI (TT): " clarification for issues on means and methods "				
Gridlines: 10-14							
Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1, 2, and 3							
This is a follow up RFI to T-2991 to confirm Webcor's proposed details for the various openings around the columns that must be closed to hold concrete.			Date answered by design team: 5/7/15 at 3:33pm				
			Date closed by WOJV: 5/8/15 7:47 am				
Please confirm the following proposed details for the various openings in WOJV 1 through 3. Please note that the sheet metal gauge thickness will follow 05 30 00 Steel Deck. Perimeter of flashing will receive 3" stitch weld 2" o.c where applicable in order to hold concrete.							
For Reference only: Spec 05 30 00- Steel Deck							
2.3A) Galvanized Steel: roof steel deck, floor galvanized steel deck and all closures and flashing shall be formed from steel sheets conforming to ASTM A653, SS Grade 33 (min) with minimum yield strength of 38ksi. Before forming, steel sheet shall be coated with a zinc coating conforming to ASTM A653 Zinc coated per ASTM A653 G90.							
2.4C) Pour Stops and Girder Fillers: Steel sheet, of same material as deck panels, and of thickness and profile indicated, but not less than deck gauge.							
2.4D) Column Closures, End Closures, Z-Closures, and Cover Plates: Steel sheet, of same material and thickness as deck panels, unless otherwise indicated.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2651 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>support the concrete beams, or (2) frame in at the B100 and B101 angles. The second option requires 45 degree coupler supports. Couplers with custom-angle bottom supports are not readily available.</p> <p>1. Please confirm it is acceptable to build up a welded support for the base of these Lenton couplers shown at the TR 2/B100 and TR 3/B101 connection in order to support any couplers on the TR girder.</p> <p>2. Please confirm it is acceptable to change the coupler spacing along the south and east edges of the TR in order to fit the (9) couplers within the concrete beam. Coupler layout to be provided in submittal TG0702-073 for Ground Level GL 1-6.</p> <p>3. If neither option is acceptable, please provide direction on the placement of the couplers for the TR 2/B100 and TR 3/B101 connection. A currently laid out, this detail cannot be constructed.</p>				Answered by Design Team: 5/7/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/8/15		
T-2995	<p>PLG - 18 Gauge Steel for Sleeves below 4 inch</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: Specification section 22 05 29 Location: NA Closest Column Line Intersection is NA Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>According to contract specifications, all sleeves are to be constructed of 18-Gauge Galvanized steel. DMI has approached all listed and a couple local MFGs and all are unable to provide 18-Gauge sleeves for sizes 4" and below. DMI can provide galvanized 20-gauge steel for sleeve sizes 2.5" up to 3.5", and galvanized 24-Gauge steel for Sleeve sizes below 2.5". This is due to manufacturing limitations. Please confirm that this is acceptable.</p>	Closed	04/29/2015	05/09/2015	05/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Confirmed. Sleeving solutions proposed in this RFI are acceptable.</p> <p>Answered by Design Team : 05/09/2015 Closed by Webcor: 05/12/2015</p>				
T-2996	<p>HVC - Grease Duct Conflict with Shaft Wall</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>	Closed	04/29/2015	05/09/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div><div><div><div><div></div><div>Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc.</div></div></div><div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: M1-2304 Location: Ground Level Closest Column Line Intersection is 15-D Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</div><div>On column lines 15& D.4 the 36x24 KX duct turns up into the shaft on the floor above. The shaft wall on the ground level does not incorporate the grease duct. See attached. Please Advise.</div></div></div><div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div></div><div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>KX duct up can be decreased in size to 24x22 and moved north to not conflict with IT/Telecom riser enclosure. 22x24 size to continue up and south horizontally (within Level 2 shaft enclosure) and transition back to 36" wide duct before going out the south wall in the Level 2 ceiling. Refer to attached SKM--RFI -T-2996--1 (M1-2304) and SKM--RFI--T-2996--2 (M1-2404).</div><div>Answered by design team : 05/07/2015 Closed by Webcor: 05/11/2015</div></div></div></div></div></div>							
T-2997	HVC - Duct Conflict with Ceiling and Wall at GL16.9 & D	Closed	04/29/2015	04/29/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div><div><div><div><div></div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div></div></div><div><div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div></div><div><div><div>Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc.</div></div></div><div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: M1-2304 Location: Ground Level Closest Column Line Intersection is 16.9-D Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</div><div>On the column lines 16.9 & D the 30x18 EX duct is in conflict with the ceiling and the wall. The duct is 3' from the steel and 13" too low in to the W-2 system (See attached). Please Advise.</div></div></div><div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div></div><div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Horizontal duct shall be re-seized from 30x18 to 30x8. Insulation is required around this duct, per 23 07 00-2.5B, but can be terminated outside the retail space, before running between the bottom of beam (with fireproofing) and top mullion of curtain wall. See attached SKA-4697 for clarification of duct penetration at W-2 system curtain wall.</div><div>Answered by Design Team : 05/21/2015 Closed by Webcor: 05/27/2015</div></div></div></div></div></div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2653 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-2998	PLG-3 in CHW Supply & Return Feed Locations	Open	04/29/2015	05/09/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: M1-2107, M1-3007 (Detail 2), M1-2107, M1-2206 Location: Lower Concourse and Train Platform Closest Column Line Intersection is 31.7/G Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A The 3in CHWS/CHWR mechanical piping is shown to feed from the mechanical mains on the lower concourse (AC-B1-D-1, 2, 3) and also shows it being feed from the train platform (ACC-B2-D-1 dry cooler). Which one is correct? Please advice.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-2999	DAT - Confirmation on Communication System conduit labelling	Closed	04/29/2015	05/09/2015	05/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 Specifications: 260503, 270533 Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A Per specification 26 05 03.3.11-B.6, it states the conduit permanent markings shall be spaced at minimum fifty (50) feet intervals, within ten (10) feet of every floor or wall penetration visible from either side. The requirement for the communication system conduit specification section 270533.3.1.G, states "Conduits shall be clearly labeled at both ends designating the opposite locations(s) served." Please confirm communication conduit should only be labeled at the ends only.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Requirements of Specification 27 05 33 are in addition to and do not eliminate the requirements to label conduits as stated in 26 05 03. Answered by Design Team: 05/01/2015 Closed by Webcor: 05/04/2015		
<hr/>							
T-3000	SSS - Bus Deck Perimeter W40 Beam Size GL 30-31	Closed	04/29/2015		05/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2506		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed at the location indicated in the RFI.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2654 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<div><div>Location: Bus Deck Level, Zone 4 Gridlines 31/ B & H Add'l Doc Ref: OIW NCR 2771-15-09, Shop Drawings 1072 & 1079</div><div>Reference attached OIW transmittal for NCR 2771-15-09. During fabrication of Drag beams A1072 and A1079, it was noted that the Beams were processed from W40x277 as opposed to the specified W40x297 per approved drawings. The actual yield strength of the W40x277(HT#411818) noted on the mill test report is 55KSI. Please confirm if assemblies A1072 and A1079 can be supplied from the noted W40x277.</div></div>						
T-3001	ELV - Electrical Room Gear Relocation	Closed	05/01/2015	05/11/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony</div></div>		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128/E1-2106, E1-3102, M1-2106] Location: Zone[06], Level [Train Platform] Closest Column Line Intersection is [30,C; 30,E] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A</div><div>1. In the Train Platform, the Electrical Room B2620, the electrical panel is in conflict with the low register. Please confirm it is acceptable to relocate the gear within the room to the new proposed locations. These revisions take care of any existing/potential conflicts. 2. In the Train Platform, the Electrical Room B2623, the electrical panel is in conflict with the low register. Please confirm it is acceptable to relocate the gear within the room to the new proposed locations. These revisions take care of any existing/potential conflicts.</div></div>		<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>1) WSP takes no exceptions to proposed layout. 2) WSP takes no exceptions to proposed layout. Refer to attached sketches, SKE-RFI-T-3001-1 & SKE -RFI-T-3001-2, for incorporation into electrical drawing</div><div>Answered by Design Team: 05/07/2015 Closed by Webcor: 05/11/2015</div></div>					
T-3002	SSS - Weld Issues at Corner Cast Nodes 16-01 and 19-01	Closed	05/01/2015		05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div><div>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</div></div>		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2655 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-4353, 5c/S1-4352 Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridlines: 1.4 & C; 1.4 & G Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1, SK2, SK3, and SK4</p> <p>1.) To provide code compliant CJP weld terminations at cast nodes 16-01 and 19-01 (girder top flange and continuity plate welds - see attached sketches) and eliminate weld dam conditions up against the casting, we must remove material from cast nodes 16-01 and 19-01 as shown in attached sketch. This will allow proper termination of CJP welds</p> <p>2.) Please also confirm that a 3/4" vertical fillet weld is required between continuity plates (above and below girder top flange) as none is shown on S1-4353 but shown on 5c/S1-4352.</p> <p>Please confirm this is acceptable, that architectural requirements are maintained and that there are no other feasible options as removal of cast node material will have time and cost impacts to our fabricator.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Items 1) and 2) are confirmed. It is not correct that there are no other options available. The proposed strategy is preferred, as it salvages work already completed before the issue was brought to the attention of Design Team.</p>		
T-3003	BGP - Knee Wall Formsaver Location GL13/G	Closed	05/01/2015	05/11/2015	05/19/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell</p>			<p>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: A1-2124 Location: Mat Slab Area 7 & 8 Gridline: GL 13/G Add'l Doc Ref: Attached</p> <p>Please reference attached comprehensive layout drawings for Area 7 & 8 Mat Slab. Following the Area 7 Mat Slab pour, Area 8 comprehensive layout drawings were returned with changes to the location of B2463 IDF Room at GL13/G. As a result, the eastern half of platform formsavers were installed 2" north of those previously installed on the western half. Please confirm:</p> <p>1. The eastern half of platform wall dimensions are correct.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1. Confirmed; as marked-up on the RFI, from gridline G to the north wall, the dimension is 2'-10 3/8". For all other dimensions for the knee walls at IDF Room B2462 and Electrical Room B2461, please refer to reviewed and approved submittal TG0600-961.1 (sheet KW1.02). Please note that there can be no deviation from the dimensions on the submittal for the knee walls and walls above them to ensure Train Platform Clearance minimum requirements are maintained.</p> <p>2. Confirmed; the exterior formsavers placed outside of the submittal location/dimensions shall be abandoned and replaced by drill and bond # 6 dowels is acceptable.</p> <p>3. Confirmed; additional cover to exterior formsavers</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2656 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>2. It is acceptable to abandon exterior formsavers placed outside of S108.0 location and replace with drill and bond #6 dowels.</div> <div>3. It is acceptable to pour a thickened wall at locations where exterior formsavers were placed inside of S108.0 locations.</div>						
T-3004	voided	Closed	05/01/2015	05/11/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div> <div>Aseem Goyal</div> <div>Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company</div> <div>Orvil Anthony</div>	<div>To: Turner Construction Company</div> <div>Phil Militello</div>	Answered By:				
	<div>REQUEST:</div> <div>Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 Specification 26 05 3</div> <div>Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A]</div> <div>Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A]</div> <div>Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A</div> <div>Embedded supports are required for raceways installed under concrete deck areas but Specification section 26 05 3.11 A does not specify any support materials to be used for the same. In the continuous MEPS activity catching up with the concrete deck pours please approve the use of ISAT SDI-HB inserts to be installed per attached ISAT submittal for Concrete Deck Inserts. Be advised that what is ultimately approved in this RFI will be included in the Fisk Electric official product data submittal as well to maintain continuity of material data.</div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2657 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3005	Voided	Closed	05/01/2015	05/11/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Aseem Goyal	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:		
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company		Orvil Anthony					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 078413 Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A</p> <p>Specification section 07 84 13 2.4 B 6 calls for "steel sleeves of G-90 galvanized steel minimum 14 gauge thick and as required for UL assembly". No further material specification are given for the same .In the continuous MEPS activity catching up with the concrete deck pours please approve use of sleeve inserts per attached 2", 3", 4", and 5" sleeve details, using RMC sleeve material and 3M rated assemblies (C-AJ-1427 & 1552). Be advised that what is ultimately approved in this RFI will be included in the Fisk Electric official product data submittal as well to maintain continuity of material data.</p>							

T-3006	BGP - Vehcle & Bike Ramp Beam End Support	Closed	05/01/2015	05/11/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Kamran Azarbal	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-3411 Location: Vehicle/Bike Ramp Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: N/A</p> <p>Detail 1 on Plan Sheet S1-3411 shows a 1" Seismic Joint between the support beam and the foundation wall. Detail 1 also shows the L8x8x1 1/8" welded on 3 sides to a plate embedded in the foundation wall.</p> <p>Please confirm per field conversation with the SEOR that embed is to be welded as shown and the support beam can be poured directly against the foundation wall without the 1" Seismic Joint.</p>				<p>The L8x8 in Detail 1/S1-3411 is in contact with, and welded to, the foundation wall embed plate. Provide 1" joint between beam concrete face and wall. Same applies for Detail 10/S1-3411. Concrete may not be poured directly against the foundation wall.</p> <p>Date Answered by Design Team: 5/7/15 Date Closed by WOJV: 5/11/15</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2658 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3007	SCS - Sleeve Relocation at 4th Lift of Wall	Closed	05/15/2015	05/15/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-2862, A1-2863, A1-2865, A1-2866, A1-2867 Location: Foundation Wall Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: Attached Please refer to the attached Mark-ups. Please confirm whether it would be acceptable to relocate the sleeves shown up to 12" east or west in order to avoid conflict with the existing CDSM piles.			SUGGESTION: Please refer to SKA-4698 to SKA-4702 for the relocated sleeves mentioned on the RFI. Also, see MDS relocation comments in the attached 28110 TTC RFI T-3007. Answered by Design Team: 5/29 Closed by WOJV: 6/2		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
T-3008	BGP - Trestle Pile Concrete	Closed	05/05/2015	05/05/2015	05/22/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell							
REQUEST: Please reference the following documents: TG03 S1-3003 Detail2 Submittal TG03-0280 SH-0200 & SH-5201 Detail 11 TG06 A1-8711 TG06 QBD-111 Per Notes 1-3 of Detail 2 on TG03 Sheet S1-3003, the trestle contractor (TG03) shall: 1. Design the trestle pile. 2. Trestle pile shall allow for vertical movement of mat slab and accommodate waterproofing details. Submit the proposed design for review. 3. The detail provided is an example detail to illustrate design intent and performance criteria. The TG03 contractor, which is the designer of the trestle pile that is to allow for movement and accommodate waterproofing, submitted TG03-0280-Access Trestle. Note 2.1.C.4 on Sheet SH-0200 states, "Place concrete by tremie method from tip elevation to bottom of excavation elevation . . .". Detail11 on Sheet SH-5201 also depicts concrete elevation to bottom of excavation. Per QBD 111 (Q-1 & Q-2), a TG06 bidder asks, "We			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As discussed in the construction meeting on 5/6/2015, the void shall be filled with lean concrete to the level of the compressible material, as shown in the contract document. Answered by Design Team: 5/21/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/22/15		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>believe the concrete in the trestle piles is approximately the same elevation as the bottom of the mud slab. Please confirm TG06 fills the inside of the piles to the bottom of the compressible material". The response to the question states, "Refer to TG03 reference documents. TG06 trade sub is responsible for completing all details as shown on A1-8711".</p> <p>It is clear the TG03 contractor, which is once again the designer of the trestle and pile, does not require the concrete inside the pile above the excavation elevation as set forth in the above paragraphs. SCCI fully understands it is responsible for the waterproofing details depicted in the Architectural drawing A 1-8711 per contract and as stated in the response to QBD 111. Furthermore, see highlighted AI-8711 (Titled as "Train Box Waterproofing Details") stating "Piles for shoring, bracing, and trestle columns (not in package) penetrations thru WPM to be sleeved, waterproofed, and sealed". Additionally, see highlighted notes on Detail 2 of TG03 Sheet S1-3003 stating, "See architectural documents for waterproofing details". It is very apparent SCCI (TG06) is responsible for the waterproofing details depicted in the architectural drawings and more specifically A1-8711 titled "Train Box Waterproofmg Details."</p> <p>In conclusion, it is evident the TG03 contractor (trestle pile designer) does not require concrete inside the piles above the excavation elevation and the TG06 contractor is responsible for waterproofing the trestle pile.</p> <p>Please confirm the concrete inside the trestle piles above the excavation elevation is not required. If not, are there any specific structural requirements for this fill? Could it be gravel or a lean slurry grout?</p>						
T-3009	SSS - Fire Trol Column QC Requirements	Closed	05/05/2015	05/15/2015	05/07/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3010	DAT - Low Voltage Riser Shaft Conflict	Closed	05/05/2015	05/15/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128/TE1-4204, TE1-4304, TE1-4404, TE1-4504] Location: Zone [02], Level [Ground Level to Bus Deck Level] Closest Column Line Intersection is [E,15] Add'l Doc's Ref's: [N/A] Per ASI 128, we are to provide (10) 4" Conduits through our riser at Grids E-15 from Lower Concourse: (4) 4" conduits exit at Ground Level, (4) 4" conduits exit at Second Level, and (2) 2" conduits exit at Bus Deck Level. As a result, we are currently clashing with Mechanical future grease duct at the Ground Level and Second Level overhead. Please advise.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Kitchen exhaust grease duct has been modified and no longer blocks off IT/Telecom riser at Level 2 ceiling. Refer to RFI-T-2996 response and associated sketches (SKM-RFI-T-2996-1 and SKM-RFI-T-2996-2 are also attached to this RFI for reference). Answered by Design Team: 05/07/2015 Closed by Webcor : 05/11/2015				
T-3011	ELV - Electrical Routing for Phase 2 Lighting for Light Column	Closed	05/05/2015	05/15/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: A/A1-4650 , 7/A1-4650 Location: Light Column Lighting, Lower Concourse Closest Column Line: 23 & E Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A A/A1-4650 calls out for electrical routing for phase 2 lighting at the lower concourse level, since it will be unfeasible to run a conduit through the light column once its welded and grouted in place. Please confirm the following; 1) The intent is to drill 2 holes through horizontally and completely through the light column and stub a conduit through the column for future use. 2) Is there a home-run location for the Phase 2 conduit or is the conduit to remain stubbed and cap somewhere near the light column for future use. 3) Is Detail 7/A1-4650 is to be followed for where the conduit stubs into the center of the column.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No, the design intent for the Phase II does not require a conduit to go through the light column vertical members. The conduit can be routed through the Lower Concourse plenum space and through a soffit at the glass floor circular opening and be stubbed-out and capped to feed the future Phase II lighting. 2. Conduit is to remain stubbed just to the inside boundary of the future phase 2 ceiling soffit. 3. See item 1 above. Answered by Design Team : 5/15/2015 Closed by Webcor: 5/18/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2663 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3012	ELV - Electrical Routing for Skylight Support Ring for Light Column	Closed	05/05/2015	05/15/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: A/A1-4650 , B/A1-4650 Location: Light Column Lighting, Roof Park Level Closest Column Line: 23 & E Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A Please confirm if the electrical routing of the light column lighting depicted in the skylight support ring (see attached) is to be surface mounted or runs through the tube steel.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As show in CDs, conduit should run directly underneath lower concourse slab and in between vertical column members and terminate below the ring; stub and cap conduit for future phase 2 wiring. Run the conduit in plan directly adjacent the column at a 45 or 90 degree plan location in a straight run between the column and floor slab. Answer by Design Team: 5/21/15 Closed by Webcor: 5/27/15				
T-3013	ELV - Second Level Conduit Callout	Closed	05/06/2015	05/16/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128, E1-2404 Location: Zone[04], Level [Second] Closest Column Line Intersection is [(16,C) & (15,C.3)] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A On sheet E1-2404, the callout for FE089, FE096 is currently pointing towards the clearance zone for panel EDSH-CTR-GEN. Please confirm that the callout FE089, FE096 should be point to the conduits from the 14"x6" opening to the Electrical Room 02422 instead (see attached markup of E1-2404).			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Correct. Refer to SKE-RFI-T-3013-1 attached. Answered by design team: 05/07/2015 Closed by Webcor: 05/11/2015				
T-3014	DAT - Re-routing LV Lower Concourse Conduit	Closed	05/06/2015	05/16/2015	05/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128, TE-4204 Location: Zone[04], Level [Lower Concourse] Closest Column Line Intersection is [14,D] Add'l Doc's Ref's: BIM Screenshots Due to limited space and clashes with the structural steel			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Revised Response: AA Response: The relocation of the (10) 4" conduits running to the riser at GL E/15, as proposed in this RFI is				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2664 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3015	column at gridlines E-15 on sheet TE-4204, we were forced to re-route the (10) 4" conduits shown routed to the riser from the west side. As a result, we relocated our conduit run so that it comes from the north side of the riser. This method not only allows us to avoid the Structural Column identified in the attachment, but also avoid the Mechanical pipe within the vicinity shown on the renders. Please confirm this relocation of conduit is acceptable.						
	DAT- Fire Alarm Communication Requirement	Closed	05/06/2015	05/16/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By:	Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger
	Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony						
	REQUEST: This question contains Sensitive Security Information and is available only to individuals who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question.	SUGGESTION:				ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
							The response to this question contains Sensitive Security Information and is available only to individuals who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question.
							Answered by Design Team: 5/23/2015 Closed by Webcor: 5/27/2015



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2665 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3016	SSS - TR 33.2 Splice Location	Closed	05/06/2015		05/13/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Shop Drawing A724 Location: Ground Level Gridlines: 32.2 Add'l Doc Ref's: n/a Girder A724 gridline 33.2 currently has (4) transverse top flange splices. Due to our material usage on this project we have been able to cut many smaller parts from remnant. We now have stock plate remaining that we can use to eliminate (3) top flange splices by cutting this flange from (2) plates and adding a new splice to the center of the top flange. See marked up drawing 724AC attached. All other Geometry would be maintained only the original splices would be removed. Please confirm the center top flange splice is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with reasons for request, alternate proposal and verification. We categorize this RFI as substitution request. Answered by design team: 5/12/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/13/15			
<hr/>							
T-3017	SSS - Roof Park Trellis HSS Post	Closed	05/06/2015		05/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2723, A1-8917 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 4-6/C.3-G Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1, 2, and 3 The trellis HSS post at the roof park restaurant is designated as galvanized in S1-2723 while A1-8917 calls out a paint finish. Please confirm the trellis HSS post will receive a galvanized finish.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The trellis HSS post shall be hot dip galvanized and shall receive specified paint finish. Answered by the design team: 5/8/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/8/15			
<hr/>							
T-3018	ELV MS-B1-C Feeder Clarification	Closed	05/07/2015	05/17/2015	05/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2666 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref:[ASI 128/E1-2205, E1-3202, E1-5010/26 24 12] Location: Zone[05], Level [Lower Concourse] Closest Column Line Intersection is [F.7,19.9] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A The clouded feeders on drawing E1-5010 are shown as being fed from both MS-B1-C and MS-B1-D. Please confirm DPH-B1-C-12 and DPH-B1-C-13 should be fed from MS-B1-C only.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Correct. DPH-B1-C-12 and DPH-B1-C-13 should be fed from MS-B1-C only. Refer to attached sketch for clarification, SKE-RFI-T-3018-1. Answered by design team : 05/11/2015 Closed by Webcor: 5/11/2015		
T-3019	DAT - Riser Sleeves and Conduit at D-13 Column Discrepancies	Closed	05/07/2015	05/17/2015	05/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128: TE1-2304/TE1-2404/TE1-2504/TE1-4204/TE1-4304/TE1-4404/TE1-4504] Location: Zone [04], Level [Lower Concourse/Ground level/level 2/Bus Deck] Closest Column Line Intersection is [D,13] Add'l Doc's Ref's: [ASI 128: A1-2864/A1-2884/A1-2894] At Column Line [D,13] there are (4)4" conduits rising from Lower Concourse to Bus Deck level along the interior of the column. Due to the design of the structural steel on the Ground Level Deck, Fisk had to manipulate their conduit runs and wrap them as close to steel as possible so they can continue on through the riser. As a result, there are 2 conflicts with Fisk's conduits protruding through the columns because there is not enough space once they clear the steel to keep them on the interior of the column. On the second level, the rectangular column encasement does not permit the same type of space thus resulting in 4 conflicts with the column encasement. On the Bus Deck, Fisk was able to avoid the same type of conflicts as the levels below but Fisk is required to revise the sleeves in order to avoid clashes with the exterior of the columns. See attached images for clarification and please advise .	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Revised Response : AAI Response: Refer to SKA-4678, SKA-4679, and SKA-4680 for the adjusted (4) 4" conduit runs with 5" sleeves rising from the Lower Concourse Level to the Bus Deck Level. SMW Response: Our conduits layouts are diagrammatic only to show intent, exact routing is done in the field as you have proposed, SM&W does not need to review every deviation unless it reduces separation of the redundant and diverse pathways layout and it appears this does not. Answered by Design Team: 05/11/2015 Closed by Webcor: 06/02/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2667 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3020	ELV - Electrical Conduit Routing through IDF Room	Closed	05/07/2015	05/17/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128/E1-2106] Location: Zone[06], Level [Train Platform] Closest Column Line Intersection is [(30,E), (30,G)] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A Please confirm that the electrical routing of the conduit is accurate and acceptable to pass through IDF Rooms B2622 and B2641. Typically the feeders should maintain a distance of 1' from all Low Voltage Systems in order to avoid any potential disruptions with low voltage distribution.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Correct and confirmed by SM&W. Maintain a 1'-0" distance as mentioned. Answered by Design Team: 5/15/2015 Closed by Webcor: 5/18/2015		
T-3021	PLG - Water Feature Piping Material	Closed	05/07/2015	05/17/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Specification section 13 12 00 Location: NA Closest Column Line Intersection is NA Additional Document References: Drawings L1-7017 & L1-7069 Contract specifications 13 12 00, Items 3.4 B. 1. notes grooves for mechanical coupling shall be cut which would indicate a heavier (schedule 40S) pipe schedule versus a roll groove system (schedule 10S) which also meets the temperature & pressure requirements for the water feature system. Contract drawing L1-7017 (which was not updated in the latest drawing release for the water feature) indicates that the piping material is to be "Type 304 Stainless Steel"; Detail 1 on drawing L1-7069 notes that the piping is type 316L. Please clarify material type (304 or 316L), pipe schedule (schedule 40S or schedule 10S) and groove type (cut or rolled).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> S.S. Type 304 is acceptable, schedule 40S, cut grooved. Answered by Design Team: 06/02/2015 Closed by Webcor: 06/04/2015		
T-3022	ELV - Fire Resistive Requirement Clarification	Closed	05/07/2015	05/17/2015	05/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3024	RFI T-3024 PLG- PLG- Hanging Piping from Catwalk on Level 02	Closed	05/08/2015	05/18/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Casey Condron							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc: M1-2404 and P1-2404			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Location: Level 02			This is acceptable. WOJV shall coordinate the structural loads imposed on the catwalk and attachment method with the sub-contractor providing that work.				
Gridlines: E.2/16							
Add'l Doc Ref's: See attached model screenshots							
Please see attached screenshots of piping layout on Level 02, Zone 02 (Gridlines E.2/16). Due to space limitations in the cat walk area on Level 02 (Gridlines E.2/16), there is conflict with the 6in. storm drain, 4in. sewer line, and 4in. vent conflicting with the duct located in the same area. The attached screenshots show the proposed routing of the storm drain, sewer line, and vent line in this area to avoid clashes with the duct. Please confirm it is acceptable to hang the storm drain, sewer line, and vent line from the catwalk as shown in photo 1 thru 3.			Answered by Design Team: 5/21/15 Closed by Webcor: 5/27/15				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2670 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3025	SSS- W1 Detail Revision for Corner Plate	Closed	05/08/2015	05/08/2015	05/23/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: 11/S1-8005 Location: Roof Park Level, Zone 1 and 4 Gridlines: 1/ B and H; 33.5/ B and H Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1, 2, 3, and 4 1) Per 11/S1-8005, the corner plates extending to the edge of flange conflicts with the installation of the W1 system at the roof park level. Per construction issues meeting on 5/6/15, please provide a revised detail for the corner plates called out in WOJV 2 and 3.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See the attached sketch for conceptual detail for the revised corner connection. See below proposed actions to be taken before final direction for constructions is provided: 1. CCI must confirm with Larsen that the proposed detail is OK with them. 2. WOJV is to discuss with Skanska to determine potential impact to cost and schedule and report back to TJP A and the Design Team for direction. 3. Once we receive the cost/schedule input, the overall team (with Owner's confirmation) will either accept or reject the modification. a. If the new detail is accepted, a formal sketch will be issued to track the change. b. If the new detail is rejected, WOJV is to proceed as-is with the W-1 and the structural steel. Under separate follow up RFI, some minor modifications need to be made to the W-16 metal panel fascia profile to coordinate with W-1. Answered by design team: 5/23/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/26/15		
T-3026	RFI T-3026 PLG - Water Feature Piping within Geosynthetic Fill	Closed	05/11/2015	05/21/2015	06/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: Drawing L1-7034 Location: Roof Park Level Closest Column Line Intersection is NA Additional Document References: N/A Drawing Detail 1/L1-7034 and Detail 3/L1-7034 indicate coupled pipe with in the geosynthetic fill material. This install detail poses constructability and maintenance issues. Please confirm that inaccessible coupled fittings are acceptable.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> VICTAULIC COUPLINGS ARE ACCEPTABLE FOR BURIED SYSTEMS. VIC COUPLINGS PROVIDE BETTER EXPANSION, CONTRACTION AND DEFLECTION CAPABILITIES THAN THREADED OR WELDED PIPE. Answered by Design Team : 06/01/2015 Closed by Webcor: 06/02/2015		
T-3027	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Missing Information	Closed	05/11/2015		05/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2671 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Quang Le	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2702, A1-3450 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: 4-6 Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV1 and 2 Please refer to the attached WOJV 1 and 2 for the following questions below: 1) Provide deck support detail. 2) Provide deck support detail. 3) Provide deck support detail. If ledger angle is required, please clarify its conditions at the curved wall areas. 4) Please confirm no metal deck in this area and advise "future deck" installation timing. 5) Please confirm no guardrails are required at the doors between room PK220 and the Roof Park Level. There is an approx. 6'-0" drop between the Roof Park Level and Room PK220 structural slab (no elevated slab is currently required at this location). No guardrails are shown between the doors leading to Room PK220 and the Roof Park Level. The doors within the W-2 system leading into Room PK220 (in the open position) do not meet the strength and attachment requirements for guardrails. Please refer to CBC 2007 1013.1 on guardrails. Per CBC 2007 1013.1: Guards shall be located along open-sided walking surfaces, mezzanines, industrial equipment platforms, stairways, ramps and landings that are located more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor or grade below. Guards shall be adequate in strength and attachment in accordance with Section 1607.7. Where glass is used to provide a guard or as a portion of the guard system, the guard shall also comply with Section 2407. Guards shall also be located along glazed sides of stairways, ramps and landings that are located more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor or grade below where the glazing provided does not meet the strength and attachment requirements in Section 1607.7. Exception: Guards are not required for the following locations: 1. On the loading side of loading docks or piers. 2. On the audience side of stages and raised platforms, including steps leading up to the stage and raised		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Per typical masonry details, refer to Detail 10/S1-9001. 2) See response to question 1. 3) Deck to concrete wall detail is per 7/S1-2731 as called out on the plan (see Sheet S1-2702). 4) As shown in Detail 2/S1-2730, the deck in this area is to be designed and installed by others. The extent of future deck area is called out on the plan (see S1-2702). Discuss the installation timing of the deck directly with TJPA. 5) Temporary fall protection and construction access are contractor's means and methods. Reason for RFI (TT): Not provided. We categorize this RFI as called out on contract documents.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2672 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	platforms. 3. On raised stage and platform floor areas, such as runways, ramps and side stages used for entertainment or presentations. 4. At vertical openings in the performance area of stages and platforms. 5. At elevated walking surfaces appurtenant to stages and platforms for access to and utilization of special lighting or equipment. 6. Along vehicle service pits not accessible to the public. 7. In assembly seating where guards in accordance with Section 1025.14 are permitted and provided.						
T-3028	SCS - Roof Park Level Play Structure Mast FTG	Closed	05/11/2015	05/21/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-2904, L1-2639 Location: Roof Level Gridline: GL 16-18 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached Drawing A1-2904 and L1-2639 shows a sequence of mast footings for the play structure at equal spacing. The drawings do not provide a starting location for these footings. Please provide East/West offset from gridline 16 or 18 to center of one of the footings.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Sheet A1-2904 issued with ASI-0130 ties the footings for the play structure to gridlines F.7 and 17. WOJV to ensure the Virtual Building team has the current CDs. Answered by Design Team: 5/12/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/14/15			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2673 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-3029	SCS - Embedded Concrete Inserts Termination Elevation	Closed	05/11/2015	05/21/2015	05/14/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: A1-2842 & A1-6231 Location: Lower Concourse Gridline: GL D-G / Along West Foundation Wall Add'l Doc Ref: N/A Drawings A1-2842 calls out vertical continuous concrete inserts in the 4th lift foundation walls. This callout also references detail C on sheet A1-6231. Detail C shows the concrete inserts terminating at the bottom elevation of the ground level moment frame beams. The ground level slab along the west wall does not have moment frame beams from gridline A to G. Sheet A1-2842 calls out the concrete inserts be embedded from grid D to K. Please provide a termination elevation for the embedded concrete inserts in the foundation walls from gridline D to G.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The vertical concrete inserts at the west foundation wall from gridline D to G are to be terminated at ELEV +15'-3". In cases where concrete beams for Stair 201 are located, the inserts terminate below the beams. Answered by Design Team: 5/12/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/14/15		
T-3030	SCS - Rebar Conflict with Nelson Studs and Anchors	Closed	05/13/2015	05/25/2015	05/29/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Phil Militello				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S-0008, 6/S1-5000, 2/S1-5000 Location: N/A Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: Sketches Attached Slab rebar is shown in the middle of the bottom flute per typical detail 6/S1-5000, and it will need to remain in the center due to the location of Nelson shear head studs, (2) per flute in various conditions. 1. Per PA-6/ S-0008, there is a 1" max dimension allowed between the centerline of flute and drilled anchors. Since the size of rebar varies from #4-#7 per the metal deck schedule on 2/S1-5000, please confirm that it is acceptable to increase the clearance between the centerline of flute and drilled anchors to 1 1/2" in order to avoid possible conflicts between the anchor and larger			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) The 1" dimension limit is based on ICC Research report ESR-1917, which cannot be increased. 2) It is not acceptable to bend the stud 45 deg. Studs may be bent to 15 deg (toward the beam support only) to clear rebars. Alternately, the rebar may be placed off center from the center of the deck to clear the studs. The rebar may be in contact with the studs without 1/2" separation.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2674 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100


<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	size rebar (#7's.)						
	2. Please confirm that it is acceptable to bend any existing Nelson studs in conflict with the rebar running along the centerline of the bottom metal decking flutes 45 degrees as needed in order to provide a 1/2" clearance between the stud and rebar (see sketch attached.) Any such conflicts will be discussed with the SEOR in the field before proceeding.						
T-3031	SCS - Rebar distance at Metal Decking Low Flute	Closed	05/13/2015	05/25/2015	05/29/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: 6/S1-5000 Location: N/A Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: Sketch Attached					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm that the low flute rebar shown in detail 6/S1-5000 is to be placed 2" above the bottom of the flute, or advise otherwise.					The cover for bottom bar shall be 3/4" per Typical Concrete Clear Covers Detail 5/S-3001. To facilitate future shot pins, the clear covers may be increased to 1".		



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>					
Contract Doc Ref: TG0701-87.1 Sht.2532AB (page 207) Location: Zone 1 Gridlines: 1/D.4 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1 and 2 W14x311 column at ST 201 had to increase in length from original MTO and mill order following the response to RFI T-1531. Herrick propose making up the required length with a shop splice weld as detailed in attached sketches. Please confirm if this is acceptable.		A CJP welded shop splice is acceptable. The splice detail shall be per the typical column splice details in the drawings, Detail 1/S1-5050. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with the reason for request "Alternate Proposal". Answered by design team: 5/14/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/15/15					
T-3038	SSS - Steel Deck Specification Clarification	Closed	05/13/2015	05/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>					
Contract Doc Ref: Spec 05 30 00 Location: Zone 1-4 at all steel decks Gridlines: n/a Add'l Doc Ref: AWS D1.3 Table 1.2 The Contract Specifications "Section 05 30 00" Steel Deck, Para 2.6 MISCELLANEOUS MATERIALS reads as follows: A. Arc-Welding Electrodes: AWS A5.1 E70XX Series, as required for the conditions of use. The AWS D1.3:2008 Structural Welding Code-Sheet Steel contains the following : Clause 1.4 Weld Metal Requirements 1.4.1 Matching Filler Metals. When using the indicated weld process, the filler metals listed in Table 1.2 provide a weld joint with strengths matching that of the base metal. Per Table 1.2 (attached), the use of the ASTM A653SS Gr33 Deck material, as specified by the Contract specifications (specification 2.3 Materials, para A), may be welded with the SMAW process utilizing electrodes that meet either the AWS A5.1 or the AWS A5.5 weld electrode filler metal classification.		Confirmed that AWS A5.5 SMAW E70XX-XX electrode is acceptable for use for welding of the steel deck. Reason for RFI (TT): Skanska noted the reason is Insufficient Information. TT categorize this as request for substitution. Answered by design team: 5/14/15 Closed by WOJV: 5/15/15					



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Skanska believes that the specification inadvertently omitted the allowance for A5.5 filler metal classification in addition to the stated AWS A5.1 for use in welding of the steel deck. Does the SEOR confirm that the use of an AWS A5.5 SMAW E70XX-XX electrode that conforms to the requirements of the AWS D1.3 Code, including the requirements of Table 1.2, note a, is acceptable for use for welding of the steel deck for this project?</p>						
T-3039	ELV- Future Phase 1.5 Permanent Power Clarification	Closed	05/13/2015	05/23/2015	06/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>		<p>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal</p>					
<p>Co-Author:</p>							
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Ref: 26 05 08, 26 07 00, 26 24 12, 26 24 13 & TTC Schedule Risk List - Issue # 2 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>RFI is voided.</p>			
<p>In past discussions with the Design Team (WSP) regarding installation of equipment and distribution in the MDF and IDF rooms for Phase 1.5 scope it was determined that Phase 1.5 will require clean, permanent building power. Due to the nature of this future equipment relative to overall building operations and the systems involved, it is necessary to energize the MDF/IDF rooms early and before most other systems and equipment are energized on permanent power. Realizing this requirement leads to several items that need clarification as follows:</p> <p>1.) Will permanent power for Phase 1.5 be subject to any early commissioning or acceptance testing and sign-off of power distribution, panel and switchgear?</p> <p>2.) Is emergency power required for Phase 1.5 initial installation and startup? If so, will the ATS, UPS and Generator systems need to be fully functional and, if so, will any of these systems require any level of commissioning and/or acceptance testing and sign-off prior to use?</p> <p>3.) Will CRAC units will need to be fully functional for head-in equipment install. If so, are they subject to any commissioning and/or acceptance testing and sign-off</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2680 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	prior to use? 4.) Will there be any level of BMCS functionality required (i.e., notifications, alarms, etc.)? 5.) Is there any level of Fire Alarm or Fire Protection require during Phase 1.5 install? 6.) Confirm that permanent lighting is required for MDF/IDF rooms. If so, do they need to be fully integrated with lighting control prior Phase 1.5 use? 7.) Will MDF room access control be required early for Phase 1.5 installation, or can it wait on overall access control installation, start-up and commissioning? 8.) Will Level of TJPA acceptance of MDF/IDF Rooms is required (i.e., level of finishes, etc.)?						
T-3040	DAT - ELD Relocation in the IDF Room	Closed	05/14/2015	05/24/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref:[ASI 128/TE1-9002 thru TE1-9006] Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A Per Paging Systems block diagrams as shown on TE1-9002 through TE1-9006, the ELD-1 (Speaker End-of-Line) device is placed in the same IDF as the originating Amplifier. Can the ELD be placed in an IDF closer to the end of line speaker chain in that PA zone? Please advise.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No, end of line device must be in IDF for its corresponding amplifier. Answered by Design Team: 5/21/15 Closed by Webcor: 5/27/15			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2681 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3041	ELV- Switchgear Submittal Clarification	Closed	05/18/2015	05/28/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell			
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Specification section 26 24 12 Location: Zone [N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A The specification Section 26-24-12 Paragraph 1.6 A requires that several items must be completed prior to the finalized review of the Switchgear. The proposed manufacturer, Square D will be performing several item listed under Paragraph 1.6 A. Square D is reluctant to submit the Main Switchgear until they complete the coordination Short Circuit, Coordination and Arc Flash system studies as they have been informed by the Consultant WSP that none of the equipment can be submitted until the coordination study is completed. This will require input from PG&E and realizing that this may take significant time for PG&E to complete. This is preventing Fisk from providing Gear Submittals. In reviewing the specifications, Fisk views the specification as a multi-step review process, as Seismic Restraint and anchoring details, Factory Certified test reports, As-Built record switchgear drawings, cannot be completed prior to receiving an conditional approval of the Switchgear. Furthermore the Short Circuit, and coordination study is typically performed after the switchgear is submitted, reviewed, manufactured and shipped to the site. Please review Fisk requests for allowing us to submit on the Switchgear while PG&E completes the required information for the coordination Short Circuit and Arc Flash studies.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is generally understood there are several steps involved prior to final switchgear approval. Therefore, Fisk shall submit all data is can but included within its upcoming product data submission detailed explanations of what's missing and why. The product data submission will probably be returned as revise & resubmit, but at least the initial data will have been reviewed in preparation of remaining specified requirements.			
<hr/>							
T-3042	DAT - Access Control Card Procurement	Open	05/18/2015	05/28/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: This question contains Sensitive Security Information and is available only to individuals who have been granted access to the document that is the basis for the question.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3043	ELT - Elevator Shaft Wall Finish	Closed	05/18/2015	05/18/2015	05/18/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal			
Co-Author: Otis Elevator Company Gary Shandalov							
REQUEST: Ref: A1-7575 Det 1 & 2 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A Sheet A1-7575, details 1 and 2 illustrate typical shaft wall constructions. It appears that running the interior of the shaft is a 2" finished, painted sheetrock wall. This covers the metal posts that Otis Elevator has instructed be located along the hoistway edges, preventing a connection. This is a very unusual construction of an elevator shaft wall and will cause clearance issues on nearly all elevators. In addition, the detail is citing a CBC OSHPD detail, and it is Otis Elevators? understanding that this job is not subject to OSHPD requirements. Please consider alternative methods for fire-rating the shaft.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The interior drywall elevator shaft lining is not for rating, it's for architectural finish (furring) that requires coordination with elevator rail installations. The CBC OSHPD refers to the fire rating assembly only and does not apply to the interior furring condition			
<hr/>							
T-3044	ELT - Interior Elevator Shaft Lining	Closed	05/18/2015	05/28/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Otis Elevator Company Gary Shandalov							
REQUEST: Ref: Dtl 1/7575 - Interior Elevator Shaft Lining Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A Please confirm that Note: CBC OSHPD FIRE RESISTIVE STANDARD DETAIL NO FR 3.08 only refers to the direct shaft wall assembly and applied steel fire proofing only. The note DOES NOT apply to the interior shaft wall furring required for painted architectural finish.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed Answered by Design Team : 5/21/2015 Closed by Webcor : 5/27/2015			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2683 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3045	ELT - Elevator Interior Car Panel Card Reader	Open	05/18/2015	05/28/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:					
Co-Author: Otis Elevator Company Gary Shandalov							
REQUEST: Ref: Spec Section : 14 21 00 , Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A Specification Section 142100 requires all elevators to have "Card Reader Access" but does not go any further than this. In order for accurate material to be delivered, Otis needs to understand the intended security system, whether card readers will be located in the hall call panels or in the car panels or both, and how these fixtures are intended to be integrated into the elevator systems.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<hr/>							
T-3046	PLG - Clarification on TD-2 Location	Closed	05/18/2015	05/28/2015	05/29/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: P1-2303 Location: Roof Park Closest Column Line Intersection is 10-D Add' Doc Ref's: N/A On P1-2303 at column lines 10.1 between D-F the background and note #40, drawing indicates a trench drain TD-2. The Landscaping drawings L1-7331 does not show a trench drain in this location. This is an area of concern due to the concrete beams below the trench drain location. It may require an alternate discharge point of connection, such as a side outlet drain and new location of penetration.Please advise.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
		Refer to attached sketches T-3046_SKP1-2203 and T-3046_SKP1-2303. Architectural zone plan and slab edge also updated. Refer to enclosed sketches SKA-4676 and SKA-4677. Refer also to enclosed Landscape sketches SKLA_429-2 and SKA_429-1. Answer by Design Team: 5/28/15 Closed by Webcor: 5/29/15					
<hr/>							
T-3047	SCS - Referenced Document Request	Closed	05/21/2015	05/31/2015	05/21/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Roof Level		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
		QBD's are scope of work clarifications that become part of the basis of bids and contract document					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<div><div>Gridline: GL 13 & F</div><div>Add'l Doc Ref: Submittal TG0702-167 Response</div><div>In submittal TG0702-167 response, a reference is made to RFI TG13.1-048 and TG13.1-047 at GL 13 & F. Please provide these two referenced QBD's for official distribution to the contractor.</div></div>				<div>clarifications that have already been issued to the Contractor. The QBD responses are in Constructware and additionally are issued to the Public as part of the bidding process. WOJV is responsible for distribution all information to their subcontractors and shall develop a method of sharing all QBDs with all subcontractors similar to RFIs that are also in the same Constructware location. The CMGC shall determine a means for distributing these documents to all subcontractors without the design team providing the same information in multiple RFI locations.</div> <div>Note: An ASI is currently in the works that will update the Contract Documents with all RFIs/QBDs issued to date.</div>		
T-3048	SSS - Missing Roof Park Restaurant Elevator Info	Closed	05/21/2015	05/31/2015	05/26/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Quang Le</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div></div> <div>Co-Author:</div>			<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>				
<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Contract Doc: S1-2703, C/S1-2708</div><div>Location: Roof Park Restaurant, Zone 1</div><div>Gridlines: E.6/F and 5</div><div>Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1</div><div>The elevator at the roof park restaurant are missing information. Please confirm the following below:</div><div>1) Please provide missing HSS size.</div><div>2) HSS location are unknown. Please provide missing HSS dimensions.</div></div>			<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div><div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>1-) HSS size is not missing. Refer to Sheet S1-2701.</div><div>2-) To be coordinated with elevator manufacturer (see typ detail 9/S1-7630). Design team is going to review and approve the locations proposed by the elevator manufacturer.</div><div>Answered by design team: 5/21/15</div><div>Closed by WOJV: 5/26/15</div></div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2686 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div><div><div><div>- Lug Plates at elevation -8'-2" per Detail 6/A2301 (similar at 7 other locations).</div><div>- Mounting lugs to attach to cast nodes per Detail A-A/A2331 (typical at all Ring Assemblies).</div><div>- Shear plates for mounting to Ring Assemblies per Connection Plate Weld Detail/SK401 (typical at all cast nodes with shear plates)</div><div>- Lug plates to attach to Light Columns at elevation -8'-2" per Detail 1/SK413 (typical at 7 other locations).</div></div><div><div>Please confirm the following:</div><div><div>1. The weld profile as seen in the attached photos are acceptable at all inside corners of T-Joint CJP welds.</div><div>2. The flush grind to be within +1/16-inch is intended only for butt joints and outside surfaces of corner joints.</div><div>3. It is acceptable to grind the inside corners of T-Joints smooth while retaining the reinforcing weld at "T/4" with a maximum of 3/8".</div></div></div></div></div>						
T-3050	BGP - Embedded Column Rebar	Closed	05/22/2015	06/01/2015	06/02/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Area 16, Second Lift Wall Gridline: 34 & 34.8 Add'l Doc Ref: Attached.				Per field walk with SCCI, Gerdau, and TT field representative, the 2 1/2" cc spacing indicated in the RFI does not occur and there is no need to modify the contract ties as detailed. At embedded columns C33 and C34, the wall thickness increases 6" and the indicated reinforcing occurs in a separate layer.			
Due to the added vertical reinforcing on each side of the Future Train Box opening in Area 16 2nd Lift Wall, the spacing at the embedded columns will be reduced from 5" to 2 1/2" center to center. The 135 degree hook on the #5 contract hairpin will conflict with the adjacent vertical before being able to engage the intended vertical. For constructability, Gerdau proposes the use of a #4 hairpin with a 180 degree hook in lieu of the 135. Hairpin spacing would remain unchanged. Please advise.				Field walk indicated that #5 cross ties delivered to the site for use in embedded columns C33 and C34 do not accommodate the additional 6" of Foundation Wall thickness.			
				With reference to Section 6/S1-3307 for Columns C33 and C34 within the projection of the spandrel and moment frame beams, the embedded column ties may consist of bundled pairs of #5 and #4 cross ties. The #5 cross tie shall engage all outside face wall verticals and the extensions of the inside face wall			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2687 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-3052	SSS - Structural Steel Framing for Security Booths	Closed	05/22/2015		06/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: Sheet S1-2306 (ASI 130 dated 2/27/15) Sheet A1-2306 (ASI 132 dated 4/27/15) (ASI 128 dated 12/16/14) Detail 1 & 4/S1-8021 Detail 3/A1-8275 Location: Ground Level Closest Column Line Intersection: GL 30-31/C & G Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A Sheet S1-2306 calls out "Booth Framing" and references Details 1 & 4/S1-8021. Details 1 & 4/S1-8021 show aluminum framing for the Operator's Booth at the Ground Level. Sheet A1-2306 calls out "GGT Supervisor Booth" and "SFMTA", both referencing Detail 3/A1-8275. Detail 3/A1-8275 shows the Prefabricated Booth Type 2 SFMTA floor plan. Per conversations with Turner and AAI, the Operator's Booths have been replaced with Prefabricated Booths as a part of value engineering. Please confirm the Prefabricated Booths as shown in the Architectural drawings will be used in lieu of the Operator's Booth as shown in the Structural Drawings and that TG07.1 is not to provide the Prefabricated Booths or the Structural Steel Framing for the booths as shown on Sheet S1-2306.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Provide prefabricated booths in the Ground Level Muni Bus Plaza as shown in the Architectural drawings. Omit HSS Columns noted by TG08 in Structural details 1 & 4 on S1-8021 and framing shown in details 2, 3, 5 & 6 on S1-8021. Refer to note on all details shown on S1-8021 regarding TG08 scope. Provide concrete curbs in TG07 scope as noted in detail 7/S1-8021. Contractor to coordinate final curb size, location and any necessary embedments with prefabricated booths' manufacturer. Answered by design team: 6/8/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/12/15		
T-3053	SCS - Reinforcing Details for Conflicts with Sleeves and Curbs	Closed	05/25/2015	06/04/2015	06/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2691 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3056	MCS - Testing and Inspection Program	Open	05/26/2015	06/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Southwest Specialty Contractors, LLC Anthony Laws							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: 09 51 23					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specification 09 51 23 Section 1.9 C.4 calls for every 1 out of 100 panels to be tested.					Specification 09 51 23 Section 1.9 C.4 refers to including testing at full negative design pressure, on one unit per 100 manufactured for the Project. Testing shall be witnessed and certified by the Design Engineer.		
The proposed Gordon, Inc. design allows for the W-14 corrugated panel to connect to the suspension tee with a horizontal torsion spring system. The failure of the panel will be the shear of the metal at the torsion spring assembly. Gordon, Inc. proposes to test a tee, spring clip and panel connection assembly with an outside, third party Testing Agency to demonstrate that the panel to suspension tee connection pullout exceeds worst case specified loads.					The testing described above is actually for the pull-out test of the hanger itself from the concrete slab, not from the ceiling panel to the ceiling support system. The contractor should test one hanger per bay per floor, in lieu of one per 100 units. A bay is defined as the space between the east/west column lines.		
Please confirm this is an acceptable alternative to testing 1 out of every 100 panels, as currently required in the specification 09 51 23: 1.9 C.4.					The proposed independent testing of a tee, spring clip and panel connection assembly with an outside, third party Testing Agency to demonstrate that the panel to suspension tee connection pullout exceeds worst case specified loads is acceptable.		
					Design Team Answered : 05/27/2015 WOJV Closed: 05/28/2015		
<hr/>							
T-3057	MCS - Factory Mockup	Pending	05/26/2015	06/05/2015	05/27/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author: Southwest Specialty Contractors, LLC Anthony Laws							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: 09 51 23					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
As the current designed W-14 Metal Ceiling system is repetitive in nature, Southwest Specialty Contractors and Gordon, Inc. propose one profile in Module Type A, including two (2) Collection Pans, complete with insulation, light fixtures, sprinkler heads, speakers, other ceiling mounted items or components (devices to be provided by WOJV or TJPA for mockup purposes) to Gordon, Inc. Mockup will also include suspension mains/tees, side by side and end to end panel joints (to exhibit panel break), as well as a transition reveal from flat ceiling to sloped ceiling.					The Design Team has no general objections to the proposed outline for the factory mock in this RFI. However, before we confirm this mockup, we require a drawing of the mockup. We also would like to ask that the DB Contractor include a segment of the River Cove, as this is an extensive and important element that will require special attention.		
					Design Team Answered: 05/27/2015 WOJV Closed: 05/28/2015		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2692 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>Please confirm this is an acceptable alternative to the currently specified provision of eight (8) panels of each profile.</p>							
T-3058	ELT - Service Elevator Hall Lantern	Closed	05/26/2015	06/05/2015	06/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:				Type B: Provide round type lenses, sized to meet code and projecting a minimum of ½-inch from faceplate; mounted in 11-gauge stainless steel faceplate, and mount with tamper resistant fasteners.			
Contract Doc Ref: 14 21 00				Answered by Design Team : 06/04/2015			
The service elevators are calling for a type B hall lantern at all floors.				Closed by Webcor: 06/15/2015			
Requirements for a type B hall lantern are not provided in the specifications.							
Please provide requirements for the type B hall lantern that the service elevators are calling for.							



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3059	ELV - Track Busway Design Parameters	Closed	05/26/2015	06/05/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: [ASI 128 Specification 262501/E1-0053 thru E1-0061] Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A Fisk Electric is in the process of generating product submittal material for the Track Busway under Division 26 25 01. In reviewing the product data provided by the specified manufacturer Universal Electric Corporation for their Starline series busway, the following items have been identified as not possible to meet the specification requirements for the 60 Amp products only. Division 26 25 01 Track Busway, Paragraph 2.2 (C) identifies all of the the Ampacity rating as 225A, 100A and 60A. Item (E) states that all Phases A,B,C and 200% Neutral) for all Ampacity ratings. Drawing E1-0053 also requires that the 60 A Track Busway have AIC RMS: rating of 22,000A. The specified manufacturer Universal Electric Corporation "Starline" Busway Series does not meet the 200% Neutral and the 22KAIC ratings on the 60 AMP Busway. Their design for 60 AMP is 100% Neutral and 10KAIC for the 60 AMP Busway. Please confirm acceptability of the Starline 60 AMP Busway design parameters.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Double neutral bus will not be required for these systems. Stricke this requirement from specification section 26 25 01. 2) AIC fault ratings must be adequate to meet available fault currents with busways loaded to 100%. Propose method to meet fault current ratings and confirm required ratings with project short circuit analysis required by section 26 24 13. Method may include higher ampacity busways to meet fault current requirements. Answered by Design Team : 6/3/2015 Closed by Webcor : 6/4/2015				
T-3060	ELV - Missing Ground Level Blockout at GL 8 and D	Closed	05/27/2015	06/06/2015	06/01/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref:ASI 128/ E1-2203, E1-2303, A1-2863, A1-2883 Location: Zone[Ground] , Level [03] Closest Column Line Intersection is [8,D] Add'l Doc's Ref's: Shimmick Shop Drawing TG0702-029.1 SCS Detail: G01.16 Per Electrical Document E1-2203, there is a riser location off of grid D-8 that calls for (2) 2" conduits from the Lower Concourse to the level above(Ground Level). This location is not specified in detail on the Architectural Edge Of Slab		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to enclosed sketches SKA-4704 and 4705 for electrical block out at Ground Level. Answered by Design Team: 05/29/2015 Closed by Webcor: 06/01/2015				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2694 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3061	<p>Plan for the Ground Level(A1-2863). The Shimmick drawings also do not show this 14"x6" block out on their drawing G0.16. The Electrical plan does call out for this block out for the Ground Level. The single line also specifies that FE059 (2"C.) connects from the EDPH-B1-B-EMG-2 on the Lower Concourse to the ELPH-3-B-EMG-2 on the Bus Deck. The Second conduit FE060(2"C.), goes from the EDPH-B1-B-LRS on the Lower Concourse to ELPH-3-B-LRS-2 on the Bus Deck. Provide a revised ground level zone 03 slab edge plan with the missing blockout location and dimensions.</p> <p>SSS - PE502 & PE503 Clarifications</p> <p>From: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>To: Webcor Construction LP</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-7108 and S1-7136 Location: PE 502 and PE503 Add'l Doc Ref's: n/a</p> <p>1) Confirm the elevator post spacing on WOJV 6 applies to below the Ground Level and above the Bus Deck Level only. 2) Confirm the 9'-0 vertical spacing as shown on SK3 is acceptable. 3) Confirm the elevator post locations between the Ground Level and the Bus Deck Level on (4) sides are still per 2/S17108 with revised dimensions per the ES5 Approval Submittal on E12. 4) Confirm the connections per RFI T-1743.2 (SK 841.3, CD 627,2) still apply at the noted location.</p>	Closed	06/04/2015	06/14/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			SUGGESTION:		Otis comment's below: 1) Confirmed 2) Confirmed 3) Confirmed 4) Confirmed		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3062	SSS - PE202 Guide Rail Post Plate Clarifications	Closed	06/04/2015	06/14/2015	06/04/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton		To: Webcor Construction LP	Quang Le				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Quang Le					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-7101		Otis comments below:					
Location: PE202							
Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1A							
1) Confirm the fillet welds are required on the vertical edges only.		1) Otis third party engineer recommends 4" of 5/16 weld wrapped around each corner. See attached WOJV 1A. In forthcoming submittal, please cloud the welded areas for design team to verify.					
2) Per the note on SK1, the intent of the spacing for the PL 1/2" x 18" x 2'-0 is not clear. Shown is the spacing at repetitive intervals starting at the bottom, which will place the plates 9'-2 1/4 above the Second Level. Confirm that is the typical intent at all elevators or clarify the intent.		2) Confirmed.					
3) Work with item 2 and confirm the PL's 1/2 x 18 x 2'-0 are not required at the noted location as they will foul other steel at the Floor Level.		3) Install a PL 1/2x18x2'-0 below steel at the floor level and resume 9' plate attachment throughout. Attachment spacing below 9' is acceptable but not spacing exceeding every 9'.					
T-3063	SSS - Restaurant Elevator Specifications	Closed	05/27/2015	06/06/2015	06/05/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Quang Le	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author:		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: C/S1-2708, S1-2701		Refer to attached Specification Section 14 21 00					
Location: Roof Park Restaurant, Zone 1		Electric Traction Elevators mark up.					
Gridlines: F and E.6							
Add'l Doc Ref's: n/a							
The restaurant elevator is independent of the other elevators within the project. Please provide a specification for the restaurant elevator.		Answered by design team: 6/2/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/5/15					
T-3064	SCS - Seismic Joint Block-out	Closed	05/27/2015	06/06/2015	06/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Kamran Azarbal	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-5005, A1-2893, A1-2895		The location of the of the construction joint shall be selected by the contractor as part of their means and methods. The selection shall allow for a minimum slab rebar tension development length across the joint, LTE, per Schedule 1/S1-3001. The extension past the					
Location: Bus Deck Level							
Gridline: 10 & 20							
Add'l Doc Ref: Attached							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2696 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Per the discussion in the Construction Issues Meeting on 5/27, it appears that the development of the rebar shown below dictates the extent of the concrete block-out required for the seismic joints at GL 10 & 20.</p> <p>1. Please provide dimensions from the construction joints to Grid Lines 9.9 and 10.1 (see sketch attached.) 2. Please provide the rebar development length required. (see sketch attached.)</p>						
					joint shall also satisfy the 2'-3" dimensional requirement in Detail 1/S1-5005 relative the drop at embedded angle. Until the contractor selects a product, the minimum distance satisfying the aforementioned criteria cannot be determined; however, it is acceptable to oversize the blockout in anticipation of the range of available products. It is also acceptable to run the slab reinforcing long and trim it as required when the product is delivered.		
					Answered by Design Team: 6/11/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/12/15		
T-3065	SCS - W2 Embed and Rebar Conflict	Open	05/28/2015	06/07/2015	06/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Contract Doc Ref: S1-3700 Location: Ground Level Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: Sketches Attached				Conflict #1:		
	See attached S1-3700 that shows curb reinforcing where W-2 embed conflicts occur. Please confirm that the proposed options to the conflict shown in attached drawings are acceptable. Please provide additional information as needed. The proposals are conceptual in nature only.				1). Confirmed. Per discussion in meeting on 5/28, additional horizontal bars are to be provided (center to the embed) near the top of the curb between the shear tabs on embed.		
	Conflict #1 (Page 3, 4): C Channel plate tabs and embed hooks conflict with the top two layers of #4 horizontal rebar.				2). Not acceptable. The horizontal bars shall be inside of the curb vertical bars as discussed in the meeting. Where the horizontal bars conflict with the hook bars on embed, the vertical bars may be bent slightly (2" clearance reduced to 1 5/8" clearance) to allow the horizontal bars clear the hook bars.		
	Proposed Solution #1 (Page 5): Drop the horizontal bars below the plate tab and outside of embed hook.				3). Clarify which bar cover is to be reduced.		
	1. Please confirm that it is acceptable to drop the top layer of horizontal bars below the steel tabs. 2. Please confirm that it is acceptable to move the top				Conflict #2.		
					DBAs were used where the vertical bars cannot be developed.		
					4). The vertical bars may be bent slightly in the		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2698 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3065.1	SCS - W2 Embed Rebar Conflict	Closed	06/08/2015	06/18/2015	06/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-3700 Location: Ground Level Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: Sketches Attached As a follow-up to RFI-T-3065 response and recent coordination meetings, please confirm the following for the 12" wide W2 curbs at the Ground Level: 1. Typical horizontal wall reinforcing may be placed in the exterior layers maintaining 1-1/2" clear cover minimum. 2. The topmost horizontal bars may be located immediately below the channel reinforcing weld tabs. 3. At each channel, (2) #4's x 4'-0" will be placed between the channel reinforcing weld tabs except at corner locations. At end conditions, this reinforcing will terminate with a standard hook. 4. Curb reinforcing at corner conditions will either conform to the attached sketch or to Detail 3/S1-3001.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Confirmed 2. Confirmed 3. Confirmed 4. Confirmed Answered by Design Team: 6/9/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/11/15		
<hr/>							
T-3066	SCS - Concrete Beam at Grid Line C & G	Closed	05/28/2015	06/07/2015	06/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-5022 Location: Gridline: GL C and G Add'l Doc Ref: Attached. 1) Detail 1/S 1-5022 and 4/S 1-5022 shows a concrete beam running along the steel beam at Grid C and G line. The face of concrete is 3" from the face of flange. This concrete beam on the Grid C and G line, between the Moment Frame Beams (MFB), do not have any reinforcement. The as-installed condition in the field do not have any nelson studs on the web between the MFB.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) No concrete on the web of spandrel beam along Grid C & G (see details on Sheet S1-37 series). 2). Confirmed. 3). Confirmed. Answered by Design Team: 6/6/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/8/15		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2699 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Please confirm no reinforcement is needed in the concrete beam at Grid C and G line.</p> <p>2) Detail 1B/S 1-5022 shows concrete chamfered at 1:1 to the edge of the bottom flange for the concrete beam running along the steel beam at Grid C and G line. Please confirm the concrete chamfered edge is intended to remain.</p> <p>3) S1-5022 only shows locations where the bottom of MFB is below or near the bottom of steel flange. Please confirm that for locations where the bottom of MFB is above the bottom of steel flange, the bottom of the concrete beam running along the steel beam at Grid C and G line will match the bottom of MFB elevation.</p>						
T-3067	BGP - Seismic Joint at Lower Concourse Weld Detail	Closed	05/29/2015	05/29/2015	06/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contract Doc Ref: S1-3205 Location: Lower Concourse Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: Attached				1/4" fillet weld all the way around is acceptable.			
Detail 3B on plan sheet S1-3205 shows an Embed plate next to a 1/2" x 29" x 2" Steel Plate (see attached), but does not show a weld detail for the connection between the two. Please provide the weld detail for this connection.				Answered by Design Team: 6/8/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/9/15			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T-3068	INT - Wall Type 47 Thickness Clarification	Closed	05/29/2015	05/29/2015	06/03/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: A-0021 (ASI 128 12/16/14)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: N/A					Confirmed.		
Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A							
Wall Type 47 calls out for the use of 4" studs and four layers of 5/8" gyp. bd. This produces an overall thickness of 6-1/2". The diagram for Wall Type 47 calls out for an overall thickness of 5-1/2" from face of gyp. bd. to face of gyp. bd.							
Please confirm the overall thickness of Wall Type 47 is to be 6-1/2" from face of gyp. bd. to face of gyp. bd.							
T-3070	PLG - Clarification on Drain Lines from Pavers	Closed	05/29/2015	06/08/2015	06/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: L1-7332 / L1-7340 / L1-7336					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location: Shaw Alley					All drain lines from the illuminated paver boxes are shown on L1-7332. They are not shown on the plumbing drawings as they are part of the landscape work. The plumbing drawings indicate only the drainage points of connections that are collected in the lower concourse level ceiling.		
Closest Column Line Intersection is NA							
Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A					Answered by Design Team: 06/04/2015		
Sheet L1-7332 indicates drain lines from the illuminated pavers to the "Shaw Ally" trench drains.No provisions for this scope of work as indicated on L1-7332 is shown on plumbing drawings. Also illuminated paver detail #2/L1-7340 appears to indicate drain elevation lower than the trench drain detail #1/L1-7336 would accommodate. No point of connection detail is shown in drawings. Please advise					Closed by Webcor: 06/08/2015		
T-3071	SSS - Transfer Girder Non DCW Joint Penetration Welds	Open	06/01/2015	06/11/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-5052 Location: Ground Level, all transfer girders Add'l Doc Ref's: SK001, SK002, SK003, SK004, SK005, SK006, SK007, SK008, SK009, SK010, SK011, SK012, SK013, SK013, SK014, SK015 1. Our fabricator, Thompson Metal Fab, is proposing to provide full depth PJP welds in lieu of CJP welds at the stiffeners highlighted in attached sketches, SK 001 through SK007. These stiffeners are typical to all transfer girders and we are requesting approval to provide full depth PJP as a typical weld in such locations. 2. Second, we are seeking approval to provide similar full depth PJPs at the specific locations highlighted in sketches SK 008 through SK 015. These stiffeners are specific to TR3 and TR22 that will be welded shortly. Please confirm this is acceptable.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
T-3072	GCW - Elevation of W-12 HSS embed supports	Closed	06/01/2015	06/11/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-8016 Location: Roof Park Level Closest Column Line Intersection: GL 19.1-22 As proposed by the Design Build team for glazing system W-12 in design meeting 5/28/2015, please confirm the revised elevation of top of concrete wall and top of HSS embed documented in sections in drawing S1-8016.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> As proposed by the Design Build Contractor for glazing system W-12 in design meeting 5/28/2015, the elevation of top of concrete wall and top of HSS embed documented in sections in drawing S1-8016 is revised by Greenlite's drawings received 5/28/2015 dated 5/12/2015. The new typical elevation of top of concrete and HSS embed is: 83'-10 1/4 Date Answered by Design Team: 6/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015				
T-3073	GCW - W-12 Additional Embed Support	Closed	06/01/2015	06/11/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:**REQUEST:**

Contract Doc Ref: S1-6043
Location: Roof Park Level
Closest Column Line: GL 19.1

For the Design Build System W-12, as proposed by W-12 Design Build team, please confirm that, at section 2 on drawing S1-6043 an additional HSS embed is required near gridline 19.1.

SUGGESTION:**ANSWER:****Accept Suggestion:** ☐

At the W-12 glass floor perimeter supports, the Design Build Contractor has requested additional two HSS embeds (north and south) east of gridline 19.1. Note that the Design Team calculations did not require these embeds. The Design Build engineer should complete their calculations and confirm these embeds are indeed required.

Date Answered by Design Team: 6/8/2015
Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015

T-3074**BGP - Zone 1 Foundation Walls at Stair 901 - W474A/B and W473B****Closed****From:** Webcor Construction LP

Kamran Azarbal

To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello**06/02/2015****06/12/2015****06/12/2015****Potentially****Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal**Co-Author:** Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell**REQUEST:**

Contract Doc Ref: N/A
Location: Vehicle/Bike Ramp - W474
Gridline: V
Add'l Doc Ref: Documents Attached.

Per SEOR Field Representative, Foundation Wall W474B requires added horizontal bars to tie into Foundation Wall W474A. Please confirm it is acceptable to use standard hooks that match the horizontal reinforcing size and spacing to tie the corner together.

Please see attached sketch and confirm the following:
A. Extend Foundation Wall 2'-0" east. Wall thickness is 30" to accommodate Stair 901 entry plane and 6" threshold trench.

B. Trim back Foundation Wall step flush with Stair 901 interior wall (doghouse) face.

C. 6"x6" threshold trench.

1. Provide typical Foundation Wall verticals and ties in wall extension. Inner face may be placed inboard of existing horizontal steel below. Develop new verticals below EL 15'-0" such that they lap 78"


SUGGESTION:**ANSWER:****Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed that standard hooks matching horizontal size and spacing are required to be lapped in W474B and hooked to W474A. Hooks into W474A shall extend to the outside curtain.

The (4) sketches attached to the RFI are confirmed.

The contractor is reminded to locate the B142 corbel such that the center point of the beam bottom support plate and lower PTFE shown in Detail 1/S1-3411 coincides with the centerline of B142 per sketch (3) of the RFI.

Answered by Design Team: 6/9/15
Closed by WOJV: 6/12/15



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>with existing reinforcing.</p> <p>2. Provide typical Foundation Wall verticals and ties in reduced wall width. Develop new verticals below EL 15'-0" such that they lap 78" with existing reinforcing.</p> <p>3. Cut existing wall verticals to EL 14'-3" to accommodate threshold trench with 3" clear cover.</p> <p>4. Cut existing wall outside face horizontal to provide 3" min clear from wall thickness transition.</p> <p>5. Splice new matching horizontal hooks same layer inside face and new layer outside face.</p> <p>6. Cut existing wall verticals to EL 14'-9" that are inside of Stair 901 interior wall or do not provide 3" min cover to inside face of Stair 901 interior wall.</p> <p>7. Provide typical Foundation Wall verticals and ties in reduced wall width. Develop new verticals below EL 15'-0" such that they lap 78" with existing reinforcing.</p> <p>8. Cut existing wall outside face horizontal to provide 3" min clear from wall thickness transition or end of trimmed wall.</p> <p>9. Splice new matching horizontal hooks same layer inside face and new layer outside face.</p>						
T-3075	INT - Fire Rated Assemblies at Bus Deck Level	Open	06/02/2015	06/02/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Tram Nguyen		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: (ASI 128 dated 3/31/14) Figure 7 & 8/A-1308 Details 1 & 2/A-1354		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2704 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Sheets A1-2502 through A1-2507</p> <p>Location: Bus Deck Level</p> <p>Closest Column Line Intersection: Gridlines B-H/1 Gridlines H/11-34 Gridlines B/27-34</p> <p>Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>Per Figure 7 & 8/A-1308, "Code Required 1 Hour Fire-Resistance-Rated Exterior Wall" is required at Gridlines B-H/1, Gridlines H/11-34 and Gridlines B/27-34 on the Bus Deck Level.</p> <p>Details 1 & 2/A-1354 Bus Deck Level Fire Life Safety Fire Rating Plan does not show 1 hour fire-rated assemblies at Gridlines B-H/1 , Gridlines H/11-34 and Gridlines B/27-34 on the Bus Deck Level.</p> <p>Sheets A1-2502 through A1-2507 Bus Deck Level Floor Plans do not call for 1 hour fire-rated assemblies at Gridlines B-H/1 , Gridlines H/11-34, and Gridlines B/27-34 on the Bus Deck Level.</p> <p>Please confirm that the "1 Hour Fire-Resistance-Rated Exterior Wall" as called out on Figure 7 & 8/A-1308 is not required.</p>						
T-3076	ELV - Engine Generator System Clarification	Closed	06/02/2015	06/12/2015	06/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Aseem Goyal	To: Turner Construction Company		Phil Militello		
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company		Orvil Anthony	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Contract Doc Ref: ASI 12[Spec 263213]			1) Tier 2 is the requirement.				
Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A]			2) Please submit a substitution request if supplier				
Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A]			meets project Buy America requirements.				
Add'l Doc's Ref's: EPA stationary tier chart							

Page: 2705 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2706 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3077	SSS - Bus Deck Level Shear Stud Clarifications GL 26 & 31	Closed	06/02/2015		06/11/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2506 Location: Zone 4, Ground Level Gridlines: 26 & B, 31 & H Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1 1) At line B, grid 26 is a W40x503 beam without shear studs indicated. Please confirm if this is correct or an omission. If studs are required please provide the quantity. 2) At line H, grid 31 is a W40x297 beam without shear studs indicated. Please confirm if this is correct or an omission. If studs are required please provide the quantity.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1-) Provide same number of studs as the beam at the opposite side. (53) 2-) Provide same number of studs as the beam at the opposite side. (27) Answered by design team: 6/12/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/12/15			
T-3078	HVC - HP-3-B-1 Relocation due to Access Issue	Closed	06/03/2015	06/13/2015	06/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal							
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: M1-2504 Location: Room No: 034843 Janitors Closet Closest Column Line Intersection :NA Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A The room 034843 Janitor closet is too small to accommodate the design as it is shown on M1-2504. As it is shown their will not be enough room for the access of the heat pump. Is it acceptable to eliminate the return air transition and up size the 3-B-4 FSD to match the return air opening of the heat pump. Please confirm that this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is acceptable to eliminate transition and match FSD-3-B-4 size to heat pump return air opening. Answered by Design Team: 06/08/2015 Closed by Webcor: 06/10/2015			
T-3079	PLG - Clarification on the location of AD-4	Open	06/03/2015	06/13/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Answered By:							
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: P1-2303, L1-7331		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3080	<p>Location: NA Closest Column Line Intersection is NA Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>On P1-2303 the AD-4 drains between D-F do not match sloped to drain locations shown on landscaping drawings L1-7331. Please advise.</p> <p>PLG - Clarification on the location of TD-2 at Ground Level</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail</p> <p>REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: P12303 , L1-7331 Location: NA Closest Column Line Intersection is 8 & D Add'l Doc Ref's: N/A</p> <p>On P1-2303 in front of the escalators along column line 8 and between D-F the background and note #40, drawing indicates a trench drain TD-2. The Landscaping drawings L1-7331 does not show a trench drain in this location. Please advise.</p>	Closed	06/04/2015	06/14/2015	06/10/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal				
			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The two trench drains in front of the elevators are shown on architectural drawings (For example A1-7202). There are two drain lines, one from each trench drain. Refer also to sketch T-3046_SKP1-2303 that was issued with RFI T-3046, along with architecture and landscape sketches which already provided a comprehensive response to this area in question.</p> <p>Answered by Design Team : 06/08/2015 Closed by Webcor: 06/10/2015</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2708 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3081	SSS - MFBs and Stud Location Conflict	Closed	06/04/2015		06/08/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: 4/S1-5022 Location: Ground Level, Zone 2 Gridlines: 10.1-11 Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV 1, WOJV 2					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
1) There are no stud spacing call outs for MFB's wider than 30". Please confirm the 12" OC horizontal and 6" OC vertical stud spacing are correct. 2) At C01 north GL 10.1 to 11, the two MFBs do not have proper concrete cover due to close proximity between stud and MFB sides. Please confirm if the beam sides could be flared out to encapsulate the studs. If so, please provide the required dimensions.					1) 12" horizontal spacing of stud columns and 6" vertical spacing of stud rows is acceptable. 2) Where condition occurs, including minor misalignments, the concrete beam may be widened within an area defined by the edge of formwork parallel to the steel beam and the steel beam web. For each face of MFB, the widening shall provide 3" of concrete measured from the stud centerline to the widened face. In no case shall the widening of an MFB face exceed 6" from planned. The widening may be rectangular and need not be tapered.		
					Reason for RFI (TT): " clarification for issues on means and methods" and "no cost clarification"		
					Date Answered by design team: 6/6/15 Date closed by WOJV: 6/8/15		
T-3081.1	SSS - MFB and Stud Misalignment Correction	Closed	06/08/2015		06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Ground Floor Gridline: GL C between GL 11 & 12 Add'l Doc Ref: See Attached Sketches					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
In order to correct the misalignment between the MFB's and steel studs shown on the attached sketch between GL 11 & 12, the contractor is proposing to pre-attach the studs onto a 1/2" plate and then attaching the plate with 5/16" welds on either side of each stud. This is done due to the congested condition existing in the field. There will be a 2" minimum clearance between the edge of the stud and the edge of the MFB. One row of studs at each MFB will be abandoned in place. Please confirm that this is acceptable or advise otherwise.					Provided that the method of correction is at no additional cost to the owner, the proposal is acceptable. Reason for RFI (TT): " request for corrective field work"		
					Answered by design team: 6.9.15 Closed by WOJV: 6.11.15		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2709 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3082	BGP - Trestle Pile Lean Concrete Mix	Closed	06/04/2015	06/14/2015	06/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Scott Bunnell							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Mat Slab Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: RFI T-3008 Reference the attached RFI T-3008 BGP - Trestle Pile Concrete. Please confirm it is acceptable to use lean mix # 1571722 for filling the inside of the trestle piles located at the Mat Slab. Mix # 1571722 was previously submitted by TG 18.1 and accepted for use.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed. Answered by Design Team: 6/10 Closed by WOJV: 6/12		
T-3083	SCS - Foam Blockout Desing through Ground Level	Closed	06/05/2015	06/05/2015	06/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: N/A Location: Ground Level Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: RFI T-1858 Please see attached design for foam block-out to be utilized for Ground Level soffit and Metal Deck slab in order to pour Partition Walls. This block-out design will meet all the requirements described on the response to RFI # T-1858. This block-out will be positioned such that no rebar is relocated or cut. During the pour-back at the soffit the 1" gap between bottom of slab and top of Partition Wall will be kept with a 1" filler material. At the Metal Deck, the cut to create access in the pan-decking will be smaller in diameter than the foam block-out to ensure a repair can be made to the pan-decking prior to the pour-back occurring. The metal piece will be tack welded after the concrete wall is poured per RFI T -1858. Please confirm the design is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The foam block-outs proposed are acceptable. Answered by Design Team: 6/12/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/12/15		
T-3084	BGP - Bike / Vehicle Ramp Beam B132	Closed	06/05/2015	06/15/2015	06/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: Location: Lower Concourse, Zones 1 and 3 Gridlines: 1.4 & E.6 , 20.1 & D.8 Add'l Doc Ref's: Sheet 402</p> <p>Train box column A503 is set in place at the jobsite. The box column is (11-11/16") short overall height. (NCR# forthcoming to BIM360)</p> <p>TMF will modify Box column A402 to replace and ship to the jobsite. When the non-conforming A503 column return ships to TMF, the plan is to modify the column length adding a CJP splice at the bottom. This splice will be to both flanges and web will generate the length required to re fabricate a new Column A402 for grid line 1.4. All other items on the column will be fabricated per drawing A402 Rev 1.</p> <p>Please confirm this splice proposal is acceptable.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Full CJP splice near the bottom end of the column is acceptable. Reason for RFI (TT): We agree with the reason for request: Alternate Proposal. We categorize this RFI as request for corrective field work.</p> <p>Answered by design team: 6/6/15 Closed by WOJV: 6/8/15</p>				
T-3089	GCW - Level 1 W-2 Embed Layout	Closed	06/05/2015	06/15/2015	06/09/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Michelle Collanton</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p>	<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>				
<p>Co-Author:</p>							
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc: 08 44 25 Location: Ground Level Gridline: Global</p> <p>Please confirm Ground Level locations of concrete curb steps for W-2 areas in Edge of Slab Plans.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The enclosed sketches, SKA-4710, SKA-4706, SKA-4707, and SKA-4708 modify the Ground Level locations of concrete curb steps and top of concrete elevations for W-2 areas in Edge of Slab Plans. We are also enclosing the W-2 Sill Heights drawing that modifies A1-8191. These drawing submission is a result of additional coordination of concrete curbs affected by the Design Build W-2 glazing system addition of doors at Retail Façade Pop-Outs, coordination of mullion anchor embeds with curb steps, widening of door RO opening as a result of hardware coordination and optimization of sill steps.</p> <p>Below is al list of Submittal packages that have been returned, which cover geometry and elevations of the concrete curbs at W-2.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2713 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
				TG0702-029.0 SCS-Comprehensive Layout-Ground Lvl-GL 06-10			
				TG0702-029.1 SCS-Comprehensive Layout-Ground Lvl-GL 06-10			
				TG0702-030.0 SCS-Formwork-Comprehensive-Ground Level-GL 10 to 13			
				TG0702-030.1 SCS-Formwork-Comprehensive-Ground Level-GL 10 to 13			
				TG0702-031.0 SCS-Comprehensive-Ground Lvl-GL 13-19			
				TG0702-074.0 SCS-Ground Level - GL 06 to 10			
				TG0702-075.0 SCS-REBAR - Ground Level - GL 10 to 13			
				TG0702-075.1 SCS-Concrete Reinforcement-Ground-GL 10-13			
				TG0702-075.2 SCS-Concrete - Ground Level - GL 10 to 13			
				TG0702-075.3 SCS-REBAR - Ground Level - GL 10-13			
				TG0702-076.1 SCS-REBAR - Ground Level 13-19			
				TG0702-075.4- Potential re-submittal as AAI has not received this yet, though it has been assigned in Constructware.			
				Date Answered by Design Team: 6/8/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/9/2015			
T-3090	SCS - 1" Gap Around Column Baseplate over Formed Concrete Slabs	Closed	06/08/2015	06/18/2015	06/15/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Kamran Azarbal	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger		
Co-Author: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture		Spencer Sayles					




Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2715 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>4) If the 1 inch gap in question 2 above is confirmed, please revise the various structural section details for each of the C & G line columns with baseplates. For example, refer to the C & G line perimeter columns along 12 line that are detailed structurally from framing plan S1-2303 by details 3/S1-3705 and 9/S1-3702, respectively. In these details the formed deck rebar and concrete are shown to encapsulate the steel transfer beam and don't depict the column baseplate or any structural steel separation from the concrete slab. This condition repeats for other column baseplates details. However, Details 6 & 7/S1-3707 depict the baseplate at Column Lines 19.9, 20.1, 22 & 24 and could possibly be incorporated for the other column lines.</p>						
T-3091	SSS - Weld Inspection at Corner Cast Node	Closed	06/09/2015	06/19/2015	06/17/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Contract Doc Ref: n/a Location: Zone 1, Ground Level Gridlines: 1.4 and G Add'l Doc Ref's: SK001</p> <p>Contract specification section 05 10 00-8 5e. requires a 24 hr delay period after welding before final NDT can be carried out for heavy shapes.</p> <p>At the ground level corner cast nodes, several welds will ultimately be boxed in and enclosed following completion of welding continuity plates at the back of the ground level corner cast nodes. See attached SK 001.</p> <p>To meet the 24 hr delay period on these highlighted welds presents a significant risk to the integrity of the restrained welds at the cast node-transfer girder interface. In the past, our fabricator has experienced an increased rate of cracking and repairs when subjecting these areas to multiple or unevenly distributed heat patterns and cycles.</p>				<p>The proposal to limit the node to one heat cycle and verify the boxed-in welds with high temperature UT is acceptable provided that:</p> <p>1. The independent inspector, ISI, has an approved procedure for hot UT inspection</p> <p>2. The required oil-based couplant is known to cause porosity if it comes into contact with joints that have not been completely welded. The removal of couplant from joints at elevated temperatures with volatile solvents may be difficult at elevated temperatures. While the independent inspector will make efforts to keep couplant away from unwelded joints, the burden of preventative measures, preparation, cleanup, and repairing possible subsequent weld flaws in joints exposed to the couplant will fall on the fabricator. If condition 2 is not acceptable to the fabricator, they are free to have UT performed after cool down and delay period for both the box-in joints and the exterior joints.</p>			



Date answered by design team: 6/16/15
Date closed by WOJV: 6/17/15

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>excavations of these indications has extended deep into the casting material in an effort to completely remove the indication. This removal is a requirement, in accordance with the provisions of the AWS D1.1 Code for the Fabricator doing the repair. However, such removal is not a requirement for the applicable ASTM A216 or A958 casting specification. It is proposed that the Fabricator be given relief to allow repair of non-linear indication in casting base material based upon the attached repair narrative provided by Bradken entitled Casting Excavated Preparation - Base Material" dated 5-27-15. Each Fabricator (TMF, OIW and XKT) will perform the weld repairs in accordance with their attached Weld Procedure Specifications (WPS). It is noted that the weld procedures are based upon successful completion and approved Procedure Qualilification Records for casting to casting and casting to steel that have been previously submitted (referenced on the individual WPS).</p> <p>Does the SEOR confirm the each Fabricator may make repairs to casting base material in accordance with the provisions of the Bradken Casting Excavated Preparation ¿ Base Material narrative utilizing the applicable weld procedures shown and as described in Item #2 ?</p>						
T-3093	SSS - Studs Per Flute at Roof Level GL 16.1 - 19.1	Open	06/09/2015	06/19/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton</p>		<p>ANSWERED By:</p>					
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Contract Doc Ref: S1-2604 Location: Roof Level, Zone 2-3 Gridlines: 16.1 to 19.1 at lines D & F Add'l Doc Ref: WOJV 1</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER:</p>		<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>RFI T-1930 confirmed that the maximum number of studs per flute is three. Conditions where there are more than three required would be evaluated on a case by case basis. We have two such cases at the Roof Level.</p>							
<p>Please reference sheet S1-2604, lines D & F, 16.9 ¿ 19.1.</p>							

- Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2719 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-3095	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Approval Comment Clarifications	Open	06/11/2015	06/21/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2701 Location: Roof Park Level, Zone 1 Gridlines: 5-6 Add'l Doc Ref's: WOJV1 and SK2 1) The noted dimension is shown as 2'-0 5/8 on drawing S1-2701 following the response in RFI T-1983 (SK 961, CD 715). Supply a solution to the problem documented in RFI T-1983 if the column is to be moved. 2) The noted dimension is currently 2'-0 3/4 per S1-2701. Confirm the intent is to move the column 1/8" to the south. 3) The noted dimension is correct per S1-2701 but it will become 15'-11 5/8 with the requested 26'-6 3/8 dimension. Confirm the intent is to move the column 1/8" to the east.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-3096	EAW - Mock-UP W-1 Patch Plate Details	Closed	06/11/2015	06/21/2015	06/12/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: ANSWERED BY: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 08 44 27 Location: Global Please provide drawings and 3D model describing the two patch plate options that CCI is to include on their W-1 mock-up.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please see attached files describing the two patch plate options for CCI to include on the W-1 mock-up. Date Answered by Design Team: 6/12/2015 Date Closed by WOJV: 6/12/2015			
T-3097	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Approval Comment Clarifications	Open	06/12/2015	06/22/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton ANSWERED BY:							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 1/S1-7103, S1-2703 Location: Roof Park Restaurant Gridlines: near 5 & E.6-F Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1, WOJV1, WOJV 2, and WOJV 3 1) Please confirm the shear plate connection for beam		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2720 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	20117 as shown in SK1, that the model view is acceptable or supply a new detail. 2) Please confirm the shear plate connection for beam 20125 as shown in WOJV2, that the model view is acceptable or supply a new detail.						
T-3098	DAT - Shallow Floor Box Outlet Clarification	Open	06/12/2015	06/22/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref:ASI 128 [Spec Section: 26 27 26, TE1-8001] Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A There is no recessed floor box specification in division 27, or 28. Recessed flush floor box specification section 26 27 26 2.6 D 1-8 call out for all combination and telecom floor boxes to be cast iron "Walker/Wiremold OmniBox series or Hubbell B2414 series". The minimum size for telecom is 1 ¼" conduit. Both specified floor boxes largest conduit trade size opening is 1". Per detail 1/TE1-8001, it has a picture of a floor box and it appears to be a Walker/Wiremold RFB4 Series which will accommodate a 1 ¼" conduit. This floor box is not cast iron nor is it "Buy America". 1) What floor box are we to use for combination outlets? 2) What floor box are we to use for telecom outlets? Please advise.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-3099	PLG - Clarification on Bus Jet Fountain Piping Penetrations	Open	06/12/2015	06/22/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: L1-7003, P1-2504 & A1-2904 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Bus Jet Fountain Piping Diagram (L1-7003) depicts four penetrations through the slab for supply and return water piping but Plumbing Plan (P1-2504) and Slab Edge Plan (A1-2904) depicts two penetrations. Please advise.							
<hr/>							
T-3100	PLG - Missing Plumbing Information for East Fountaion Equipment Room	Open	06/12/2015	06/22/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref: L1-7004, L1-7019, P1-2505 & P1-2506 Location: N/A Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Bus Jet Fountain Orientation Plan calls out for an east fountain equipment room at GL 30/E but the piping for the fountain from the east fountain equipment room is missing from the Plumbing drawings(See attached). Please provide updated Plumbing Plans for the same.							
<hr/>							
T-3101	SSS - E407 & E408 Shoring at Metal Deck	Open	06/12/2015	06/22/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Contract Doc Ref: S1-2504, 1/S1-7304, 10/S1-5002 Location: Bus Deck Level, Zone 2 Gridlines: 18-19.1 & E Add'l Doc Ref's: n/a					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please reference Bus Level escalator pit at grid line E,							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2722 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>between 18 & 19, as shown on sheets S1-2504 and 1/S1-7304. Each end of the metal deck bears on ledger angles in the webs of the beam as shown in detail 10/S1-5002. To install the deck, one end of the sheet is knifed into the web of one beam and the other end of the sheet is lowered past the top flange of the opposite beam.</p> <p>The beams are 12'-1½" apart with a clear span of approximately 11'-6". The metal deck requires 2" minimum of bearing at each end. However, in order to install the deck past the beam flange, the deck was field cut to the maximum length possible to clear the flange. The net result of the deck length only allowed for 2" of bearing at one end and 1½" of bearing at the other end, however this difference can be split to give 1 ¾" bearing on either end.</p> <p>Given the reduced bearing and that the deck approaches the maximum un-shored single span length of 12'-0", please confirm that additional shoring will be provided by the contract trade subcontractor or that the metal deck span and 1 ¾" bearing on either end is acceptable as is.</p>						
T-3102	PLG - Clarification on Gravity Piping for Bus Jet Fountain	Open	06/12/2015	06/22/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Ref: L1-7034, L1-7035, P1-2503 & P1-2504 Location: Bus Deck Level Closest Column Line: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's : N/A L1-7034 & L1-7035 calls out for the return piping from fountain to be gravity but does not indicate any inverts. It also seems like there won't be enough space to accommodate the invert required for the length of pipe run. Please advise.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2724 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	and fire sprinkler (Blue) subcontractors in the train platform level. Please confirm that the locations of the sleeves shown in the vertical knee walls on the shop drawings is acceptable. Piping details for the slab connecting to these sleeve locations will be forthcoming.						
T-3105	DAT - Deep Floor Box Outlet Clarification	Closed	06/12/2015	06/22/2015	06/16/2015	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony						
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128 [Spec Section 262726/TE1-8001] Location: Zone[N/A], Level [N/A] Closest Column Line Intersection is [N/A] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A The recessed flush floor box specification section 26 27 26 2.6 D 1-8 call out for all combination and telecom floor boxes to be cast iron "Walker/Wiremold OmniBox series or Hubbell B2414 series". The minimum size for telecom is 1 ¼" conduit. Both specified floor boxes largest conduit trade size opening is 1". Detail 2/TE1-8001 depicts a deep floor box but doesn't call out any specification or part number for the same. Division 27 & 28 also don't specify telecom floor box, please confirm what floor box are Fisk suppose to use.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1" conduit is acceptable provided the following requirements are maintained: 40% fill ratio minimum bend radius (10 times OD of conduit) maximum of (2) 90 degree bends between pull points. Answered by Design Team : 06/15/2015 Closed by Webcor : 06/16/2015				
T-3106	SCS - Tolerances of W-2 Embeds in Curbs	Open	06/15/2015	06/25/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:				
	Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang						
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	Please confirm that all the W-2 embeds will be set to the same tolerances as specified for the curbs per ACI 117.						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2725 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-3107	DAT - Zone 03 JB on Glass Walls Clarification	Open	06/15/2015	06/25/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128[E1-2303, TE1-2303] Location: Zone[03], Level [Ground] Closest Column Line Intersection is [F, 9.9] Add'l Doc's Ref's: TG1004-304 ELV- SD#4 TP to RP Deck Sleeves GL 7-10 Sheet E1-2303 Grid lines F&9.9 call out for a wall mounted J-Box on W-2 System. Sheet TE1-2303 grid lines F&9.9 call out for an 880CM1 series floor box (See attached). This is typical in several locations. Please confirm the intent is to have these two connections in a combination floor box and also provide the exact location of the floor box.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-3108	DAT -Zone 05 JB on Glass Walls Clarification	Open	06/15/2015	06/25/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Aseem Goyal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:					
Co-Author: Fisk Electric Company Orvil Anthony							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: ASI 128[E1-2305, TE1-2305] Location: Zone[05], Level [Ground] Closest Column Line Intersection is [G, 22.7] Add'l Doc's Ref's: N/A Sheet E1-2305 Grid lines G&22.7 call out for a wall mounted J-Box on a W-3 System. Sheet TE1-2305 grid lines G&22.7 call out for an 880CM1 series floor box (See attached). This is typical in several locations. Please confirm the intent is to have these two connections in a combination floor box and also provide the exact location of the floor box.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
T-3109	SCS - Steel Plate Under Tall Curbs	Open	06/15/2015	06/25/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kamran Azarbal To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:					
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Henry Chiang							
REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: 6/S1-5003		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2726 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Location: N/A Gridline: N/A Add'l Doc Ref: Documents attached						
	1. Please confirm that all steel plates under tall curbs, per 6/S 1-5003, are intended to be perpendicular to curb.						
	2. At the edge of decking where DBA's are required within tall curbs, please confirm that it is acceptable to place the steel plate across the top flute of the decking so one row of DBA's can be welded onto the plate (page 1 & 2).						
	3. At curb comer, please confirm that it is acceptable to place two plates with one DBA attached to each plate as shown in sketch on page 3.						
	4. Please confirm that at curb comer it is also acceptable to overlap steel plates as shown on page 3.						
T-3110	FPR - Fire Resistance Rating for Roofs	Void	06/15/2015	06/25/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: Clayton National	Tram Nguyen Richard Clayton	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello	Answered By:			
	REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: Sheet A-1300 Location: N/A Closest Column Line Intersection: N/A Add'l Doc Ref's: Table 601 of California Building Code 2007 Sheet FP-0001 of Submittal Number 078100-0005.0 in Submittal Package TG1608-038 RESPONSE FPR-Shop Drawings (Main Structure) Per Sheet A-1300, the construction classification for this building is "Type 1B, mixed-use, fully sprinklered" with a "2-Hour Fire-Resistance Rated Floor" requirement at	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2727 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>occupiable roofs.</p> <p>Attached is Table 601, Building Element Structural Frame for Type 1B, Footnote "b" of the California Building Code 2007, which states "Roof supports: Fire-Resistance ratings of structural frame and bearing walls are permitted to be reduced by 1 hour where supporting a roof only."</p> <p>Per the AAI notes from Sheet FP-0001 of Submittal Number 078100-0005.0 in Submittal Package TG1608-038 RESPONSE FPR-Shop Drawings (Main Structure), the primary beams and HSS beams having direct connections to columns at unoccupied roofs are required to have 2-Hour Fire-Resistive Ratings in lieu of the 1-Hour Fire-Resistive Rating originally submitted.</p> <p>Please confirm that unoccupied roofs are to be in conformance with the California Building Code 2007 and have 1-Hour Fire-Resistive Rating primary frame as allowed by the building code.</p>						
T-3111	PLG- Bollard Drains on Lower Concourse	Open	06/15/2015	06/15/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Justin Graham		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author: Desert Mechanical, Inc. Mark Mikhail							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contract Doc Ref: P1-2207, P1-2307 Location: Zone 07, Lower Concourse and Ground Level Closest Column Line Intersection: 33.2/B to 33.2/C and 33.2/G to 33.2/J Add'l Doc's Ref: See attached documents							
ASI #132 revised previous wedge barriers to more numerous, smaller barriers along Grid 33.2. The revised drainage now show draining several barrier pits draining directly over two Lower Concourse IDF rooms (see attached). Please advise is these lines require drain pans and, if so, provide drainage details (where applicable).							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
T-3112	MWP - Paint Color for W-16, W-17, and W-19	Open	06/16/2015	06/26/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint VentureJonathan FlamingTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Answered By:</div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<div>Contract Doc Ref: 07 42 13</div> <div>Location: Global</div> <div>Specification 07 42 13 provides the design and performance requirements for the W-16, W-17 and W-19 wall systems.</div> <div>Specification 07 42 13 does not list the paint color code to be used for the W-16, W-17 and W-19 systems.</div> <div>Provide paint color code to be used for the W-16, W-17 and W-19 systems.</div>							
T-3113	PLG- Fuel Oil Piping and Conduit Clash	Open	06/17/2015	06/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LPJustin GrahamTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Answered By:</div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<div>Contract Doc Ref: P1-2404, TE1-2404</div> <div>Location: Zone 04/Second Level</div> <div>Closest Column Line Intersection:16/C.3</div> <div>Add'l Doc's Ref: See attached BIM screen shot</div> <div>On the attached screen shot is a rated shaft that is occupied by fuel oil piping for the generator from second level to ground floor. The shaft also is shown to be the riser location for the telecom conduit (TE1-2404). Per conversations during the coordination meetings it was discussed that the fuel oil piping is to remain in the rated shaft and that the telecom conduit is to relocate. Please confirm that the fuel oil piping is acceptable where it is located and confirm where the telecom conduit is to be relocated.</div>							
T-3114	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Approval Comment Clarifications	Open	06/17/2015	06/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div>From: Webcor Construction LPQuang LeTo: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</div> <div>Answered By:</div>							
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2729 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Contract Doc Ref: 9/S1-5000, S1-2703 Location: Roof Park Restaurant, Zone 1 Gridlines: 6 and C.5 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1 1) The noted revision to the contract drawings is not clear as no specific detail is provided. Detail 9/S1-5000 (shown) requires a back-up beam. Please supply a detail showing the added brace connection. 2) The brace is not removed but moved as stated in the clouded note. The brace was moved as shown above in order not to foul the beam connection on the other side. Confirm that is acceptable or supply an alternate solution.						
T-3115	SSS - Roof Park Restaurant Dimension Clarifications From: Webcor Construction LP Quang Le To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton REQUEST: Contract Doc Ref: S1-2701, S1-2703, S1-2705, S1-2706 Location: Roof Park Restaurant, Zone 1 Gridlines: E.6-F and 4-6 Add'l Doc Ref's: SK1, SK2, SK3, and SK4 1a) Confirm the (5) beams hi-lighted in yellow move south 3/8" along with the columns as noted on SK1. 1b) If yes, confirm the edge of slab locations shown in blue remain the same and do not move. 2) Confirm the noted beam is to move south 3/8" along with the columns as noted on SK1. 3) The noted dimension is currently taken from 5'-0 5/8 south of grid F. Confirm the dimension is to move south 3/8". 4a) Confirm the (4) beams hi-lighted in yellow move south 3/8" along with the columns as noted on SK1. 4b) If yes, confirm the edge of slab locations shown in blue remain the same and do not move. 5) Confirm the beam spacing may remain as they are and will not be impacted by item 4.	Open	06/17/2015	06/27/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2730 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-4000	Void	Closed	06/12/2015	06/22/2015		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Andy Khuu		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
T-474.1	BGP - Waterproofing Micropile on Slope	Closed	05/02/2013	05/12/2013	05/03/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please reference response to RFI# T-0474. The manufacturer and installer will not provide a waterproofing detail for the micropile located in the sloped sump pits. Please provide a waterproofing detail acceptable for the use under the conditions specified in RFI# T-0474.				As indicated in the response to RFI T-0519, the contract drawings and specifications cover the general requirements and waterproofing system parameters.			
				Per the General Conditions, shop drawings shall be submitted to demonstrate the way the CM/GC proposes to conform to the information given and the design concept expressed in the contract documents.			
				As the response to RFI T-0474 previously directed, please submit a shop drawing based on the waterproofing manufacturer's recommendations for this condition.			
T-509	BGP - Orientation of Protection Board	Closed	04/23/2013	05/03/2013	04/26/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Kody Cooper		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author: Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. Ben Gordon							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Specification: 07 12 10 - 3.2.D				Install the protection board as specified. It is not intended for protection, but to serve as a substrate for the waterproofing assembly.			
This section states "Install Protection board on vertical surfaces with long dimension vertical and the polyethylene film side facing the soil/cement surfaces." Per the manufacturer's installation instructions, "the protection board will be installed length wise for easier handling during the fastening procedure." SCCI suggests installing the protection board length wise per the manufacturer's instructions. Is this acceptable?				Protection board is 4' x 8'. When installed vertically, the edges of the boards will be butted and fastened at each pile. This will provide a line of fasteners on the edge of each board and help accommodate the board to pile misalignment. When installed horizontally, the board will be fastened on the intermediate pile which will complicate the installation if the piles are twisted			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2731 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2732 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
T-719	BGP - Spandrel Beam Modifications in Area 7	Void	09/11/2013	09/21/2013	09/16/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Documents: Exhibits A - B Further to response to RFI T-637 please find attached proposed changes to the spandrel beams in pour Area 7 for location plan see exhibit - A Exhibit - B shows the plan view of the modification necessary to the spandrel beam on the north and south elevations due to the revised reinforcement width of the foundation wall due to encroachment of the CDSM beams as well as typical cross sections of the revised spandrel beams. RFI T - 628.1 shows the extent of the modification to the foundation wall on the north and south elevations of Area 7. Please confirm that this modification as outlined at this location is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See RFI T-0719.		
T-777.1	BGP - Lower Concourse Concrete Finishes	Closed	06/05/2014	06/15/2014	06/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titché To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference specification sections - 03 30 20 (Dated August 30, 2012) - 09 67 24 (Dated March 31, 2014) Reference Drawings - A1-2202 thru A1-2211 (Dated March 31, 2014) - A1-9523, A1-9524, A1-9525 (Dated March 31, 2014) - A1-9602 (Dated March 31, 2014) Per specification 03 30 20-3.6, B.1 Concrete Finishes: Scratch finish is specified with FF/FL and is clarified in RFI T-777. (see attached) New Lower Concourse drawings A1-9523, A1-9524 & A1-9525 issued in IFC set dated 3.31.14 delineate certain areas of structural concrete slab to remain as exposed and will not receive topping slab. These sheets do not show any reference for concrete surface finish other than			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to attached (SKA-3576, SKA-3577, SKA-3578, SKA-3579, SKA-3580 and SKA-3581) which show updated topping slab information at B1 and B2 . Fine broom finish is to be used at water storage tank rooms as specified in 07 13 55. Elevator/ escalator pits and transformer vault's sump pump areas to receive float finish. All Lower Concourse floor areas that are to receive floor coating FC-3 are to comply with surface preparation requirements as specified in 09 67 24, so that in all cases CSP shall not exceed 6 or less than 3.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2733 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>what is specified under specification 03 30 20 and RFI T-777. The contractor has stated that this finish will be provided using a Fine Broom.</p> <p>Please confirm this understanding is in alignment with the designer's intent for the areas of structural slab that will remain exposed.</p> <p>Also, please confirm for all Concourse floor areas (topping slab, interim topping slab or no topping slab) that are to receive floor coating FC-3 the specified scratch finish is the designer's intent for concrete finish. FC-3 Spec section 09 67 24 located per floor finish plans A1-22___ Series drawings and Floor finish schedule A1-9602.</p>						
T-980.1	SSS - Perimeter Girders at Ground Level	Closed	12/30/2013	01/09/2014	01/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Gregory Kemerer		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch	Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author: Skanska USA Civil West California DisRyan Clayton							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
<p>As a revision to parts 1 & 2 of SK RFI 238 (T-0980), please refer to the following and CD RFI 162.1 SK1 & SK2 attached which are modifications to the BU girder connection details on 3 &7/S1-4350:</p> <p>1.) Confirm it is acceptable to provide the beam web, flange, and plate assembly as indicated. The CJP indicates the plate to flange weld above the beam per 5/S1-4350 while the PJP indicates the proposed web to flange weld. The web to flange fillet welds per RFI # T-0704.1 will be applied beyond the shown CJP and PJP welds.</p> <p>2.) Per the response to SK RFI 238 (T-0980), it is acceptable to stop the bottom flange plate short as shown, extend the web plate of the BU WT to the web plate of the BU beam. Please verify the proposed weld is acceptable. The web to flange fillet welds per RFI # T-0704.1 will be applied beyond the shown CJP welds.</p>			1). Confirmed.				
			2). Confirmed.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2734 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
T0860.1	BGP - Rebar barlocks for interior Walls in Area 3	Closed	11/13/2013	11/23/2013	11/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Spillane To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Further to the response to RFI-860, Please find attached information (see exhibit A) on the proposed class 2 barlocks which are intended to be used at the noted partition walls in Area 3 as outlined in original RFI T-0860 see exhibit B.					George Metzger 11/18/2013 RESPONSE: Acceptable		
Due to the overall diameter of these Type-2 bar locks, please confirm that it is acceptable to have reduced concrete clear cover to the barlocks which will be approximately ¾". This reduced clear cover will only be applicable for the length of the barlocks itself, which at worst case is approximately 12".							
Please confirm that this is acceptable							
TG03.00-0001	TG03 Question 0001 - E & O Insurance	Closed	08/04/2010	08/18/2010	08/24/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Exhibit A, 2.A & 4.F					A. The insurance requirements for this scope of work are as described in Exhibit A, Section VI. Insurance Requirements.		
A. Confirm \$25,000 dollar policy is required. Conflicts w/ 16.4 (page 11) of the LONG FORM SUBCONTRACT document. However, 16.9 says more stringent of requirements apply.					B. 4.F of Exhibit A, Section VI. Insurance Requirements was revised in Addendum 2 stating the professional liability insurance maintenance period will be for a period of 3 years beyond the Contract Final Completion.		
B. Confirm duration of E & O insurance. EXB-A Section 4.F states insurance shall be maintained "...10 years beyond the Contract Final Completion Date..." Considering the internal bracing, trestle, and bridges are temporary shouldn't the policy only apply when the system is in use. Once removed (street level construction complete), the liability should shift to the permanent structure's design team as the station superstructure is erected. Taken literally, this could require the E & O maintained 17 years (7 years of construction + 10 years beyond).							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewitt Infrastructure West Co.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2735 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
08/03/2010							
TG03.00-0002	TG03 Question 0002 - BIM	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Manuel Saldana			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference Project Bidding Manual Section IV-G				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
A. Confirm that BIM modeling is only a requirement for construction documents and not bid documents or bid presentation.				Confirmed.			
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastruture West Co. 08/03/2010				Answered by Webcor / Obayashi 08/13/2010			
				TG03 Question & Answer Post #1 Posted 08/23/2010			
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0003	TG03 Question 0003 - Electronic Drawing	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference: N/A				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
A. Can Revit or Autocad backgrounds be made available to accelerate pre-bid design of systems (Permanent Terminal Architectural and Structural Drawings). Floor plans and sections only. Details not necessary.				The CM/GC will distribute electronic documents. See specification section 00 08 07 included with Addendum 1.			
B. Can PDF Versions of the drawings be made available for downloading?				Answered by George Metzger Adamson Associates, Inc. 08/20/2010			
Submitted by Charles m. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/03/2010				TG03 Question & Answer Post #1 08/23/2010			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2736 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
TG03.00-0004	TG03 Question 0004 - Deep Foundations	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Michael Constable				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference Exhibit A, IV.C.20 thru 6			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
A. Pin piles, micropiles, and other deep foundation systems are noted that they may remain in the permanent mat slab once the temporary structures are removed. What is the criteria for locating these items so they do not interfere with permanent foundatoin system by interrupting mat slab reinforcing, installation of column base plates or similar? Will deisgn team provide a "stay clear" or "no fly zone" type of instruction or plan related to proximity to permanent building columns, tie downs, permanent walls, and other special regions of the mat?			1. Pin piles (piles for supporting shoring wall struts) can bae placed at the locations determined by the contractor, but they shall not affect the future construction of the columns, walls, elevator pits, etc. The contract documents for other work to be issued in the distant future will include waterproofing details around the pin piles, where pin piles penetrate through the mat slab (this work is not a part of the scope for the BSE package).				
B. See also Page A3-3 of Exhibit A, last item.			2. Micropiles are to be located, in general, in accordance with the typical layout shown on Sheet S1-2024. Minor deviation in location will hvae only a small effect on the mat slab reinforcement, which the design team will address after receiving micropile layout shop drawings from te contractor. Per note C on S1-2024, the micropile contractor shall coordinate the locations of the micropiles with the shoring contractor.				
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/03/2010			3. Trestle piles: Trestle piles are to be located and detailed in the shop drawings and submitted for review. Trestle pile locations shall be coordinated with pin piles and micropiles by the contractor.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
TG03.00-0005	TG03 Question 0005 - Temporary Bridge	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner					
Co-Author:			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner					
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference Exhibit A Render on page SL-006					The Engineer of Record for the street bridge and trestle shall determine minimum clearance so as not to interfere with the shoring wall. Note - Specific criteria related to placement of temporary features such that they do not damage permanent features should be directed to designer of such permanent features.			
A. Provide design criteria, if any, for minimum clear distance between street bridge columns, trestle, and shoring wall in the train box trench. Render shows single line of columns on either side of the trestle approximately equal distance between shoring wall and trestle edge.								
B. Confirm that clear-spanning from shoring wall to trestle is not required.					Answered by David Fyfe URS-Corporation 08/18/2010			
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/03/2010					TG03 Question & Answer Post #1 08/23/2010			
TG03.00-0006	TG03 Question 0006 - Temporary Bridge	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner					
Co-Author:			Answered By:Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau					
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference specs.					Temporary bridge shall be designed for the stipulated 500,000 lb equipment crossing, as well as other design load requirements as defined in 01 53 13 - 1.3.A.1. Trestle design requirements per Bid Manual Exhibit A - Attachment 3 apply to trestle design only.			
A. Spec. section 01 15 13, 1.2.A states that street bridges shall be designed to support a "Fully assembled Manitowoc 999 crane weighing 500,000 lbs traveling w/out a hook load". Page A3-1 of Exhibit A states that the Manitowoc 999 crane body and counterweight weighs approximately 250,000 lbs, and gives unclear informatoin regarding the boom weight, and critical swing angle. Please clarify if 500,000 lbs applies to street crossings or can the same criteria for the trestle be applied to the street crossing bridges with respect to crane loads only.					Answered by Alfred Lau TJPA (PMPC) 08/17/2010			
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/03/2010					TG03 Question & Answer Post #1 08/23/2010			
TG03.00-0007	TG03 Question 0007 - West End Train Box	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/12/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner					
			Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference Geotechnical Drawings

A. Both the Architectural and Structural drawings show the west end of the train box curve continuing to the south west to an extent greater than that shown on the Geotechnical drawings. The structural drawings indicate a line showing the "extent of shoring wall in the bid package". Please confirm that the shoring wall's final design will follow the geometry shown in the architectural and structural drawings.

B. Both the Architectural and Structural drawings show the south east of the train box curving once Beale street is reached. The Geotechnical drawings show the wall continuing straight along line J until it intersects the end wall. Please confirm that the shoring wall's final design will follow the geometry shown in the architectural and structural drawings.

C. Please provide new workpoints & centerline dimensions of CDSM Wall based on the correct end conditions at both the east and west ends.

Submitted by Charles M. Gardner
Kiewit Infrastructure West Co.
08/03/2010

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

This will be addressed in an Addendum.

Answered by George Metzger
Adamson Associates, Inc.
08/12/2010

TG03 Question & Answer Post #1
08/23/2010

TG03.00-0008	TG03 Question 0008 - Micropile	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/19/2010	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture	Manuel Saldana	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference: Structural Drawings; tiedowns

Questions:
1. 10" diameter tiedowns are shown in the structural drawings. Confirm this drawing is typical along the train box between grids A & J.
2. At the longer bays (51'), what is the tiedown configuration?
3. South of line J, where the train box curves at south west end, please provide a drawing indicating tiedown

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Micropile layout for the typical bay (42'-6" bay) is shown on S1-2024. The contractor shall bid based on the quantity indicated on S1-2024. Prior to the contractor start of the shop drawing process, the base building structural engineer will provide a micropile layout for the entire Trainbox.

Answered by George Metzger
Adamson Associates, Inc.
08/19/2010



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2739 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	locations. Submitted by: Charles Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 8/3/10.						
					</		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2740 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0010	TG03 Question 0010 - Bid Bond	Closed	08/04/2010	08/18/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Answered By: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Ref: Project Bidding Manual V.A.3				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Question:				Yes. Bid Bond Form for Trade Subcontractor will be issued in a future addendum.			
Is another Bid Bond Form for the trade subcontractor going to be issued?				Answered by Webcor / Obayashi Joint Venture 08/13/2010 Webcor / Obayashi Joint Venture			
Submitted by: Charles Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 8/3/10				TG03 Question & Answer Post #1 08/23/2010			
TG03.00-0011	TG03 Question 0011 - Bid Bond Form	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/26/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Authority Sara Gigliotti							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Ref: Spec sections 31 63 29, 31 56 13				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Question:				Insurance policies cover the entity holding the policy.			
Please confirm that the internal bracing is designed to adequately support the loading indicated on dwg GT-1110, and work is installed (and top buttress removed) in compliance with the specifications, that the design for the drilled shafts (31-63-29) and CDSM shoring wall (31-56-13) is adequate to prevent further movement of 301 Mission St. and trade subcontractor's professional liability would not extend to the owner's design.							
Submitted by: Charles Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 8/3/10.							
TG03.00-0012	TG03 Question 0012 - Electronic Drawing	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Answered By: Transbay PMPC Gerry MacClelland							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Ref: N/A				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				See response to question 3.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2741 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Question: Will the owner or general contractor please provide bidders with electronic copies of the contract drawings for the Transbay Joint Powers Authority Contract No. 08-04-CMGC-000? Specifically those drawings which pertain to Trade Package #TG03.</p> <p>Submitted by: Kelly Wigton Shimmick Construction, 8/4/10</p>				<p>Answered by Gerry MacClelland TJPA (PMPC) 08/17/2010</p> <p>TG03 Question & Answer Post #1 08/23/2010</p>		
TG03.00-0013	TG03 Question 0013 - Milestones Clarification	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Ref: Exhibit A - Trade Subcontractor Package				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Question: Page 15 Milestones state, "All submittals are to be provided within 10 days of NTP #1." Please clarify the expectation ("All" submittals?), and how this milestone relates to Milestone NTP #2 Start Date.</p> <p>Submitted by: Charles Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 8/4/10</p>				<p>Exhibit A, Page 15, NTP #01 - The last sentence will be changed to state "Submittal schedule shall be provided to Contractor within 10 days of NTP #01." This will be included in an upcoming Addendum #2.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2742 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0014	TG03 Question 0014 - Demolition	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:Transbay PMPC Gerry MacClelland	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Ref: Exhibit A - Trade Subcontractor Package, D-1001, D2200							
Question: Drawing D-1001 shows processed concrete rubble from demolition contract left within the existing basement to approximately existing ground elevation. Drawing D-2200 note 1 indicates depth and thickness may vary. For bidding purposes, please clarify: 1. That the amount of processed rubble will not exceed the sections as shown on D-1001, or ground elevation, and 2. That all material on-site by the demolition subcontractor will be certified free of all contaminants.			The amount of crushed/processed demolition concrete/material left on site will not exceed existing ground elevation. 2) The Demolition Contractor (Transbay Transit Center - Existing Terminal and Ramps Demolition Project - Contract No. 000-08-DM-000) will remediate the Terminal building and bus ramps prior to placement of crushed/processed demolition concrete/material.				
Submitted by: Charles Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 8/4/10			Answered by Gerry MacClelland TJPA (PMPC) 08/18/2010				
			TG03 Question & Answer Post #1 08/23/2010				

TG03.00-0015	TG03 Question 0015 - Night Noise Permit	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Ref: 01 15 70 3.2.A.12							
Question: Specification section 01 15 70 3.2.A.12 states, " Work is restricted during the holiday moratorium (day after Thanksgiving to January 1. inclusive, 24 hours a day, seven days per week as set forth in the Blue Book by the SFMTA. Blue Book allows work at night within the restriction zone , "...as long as the proper night noise permit is obtained." Please confirm that DPW issues the night noise permit, what are the parameters, and that it will be obtainable so that we may at least work night shifts during this period.			DPW issues authorization for work in the public right-of-way that generates night noise. TJPA is responsible for night noise authorization for work done on TJPA property.				
Submitted by: Charles Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 8/4/10			Please note that there is no specific threshold or criteria that qualifies for or would guarantee DPW night noise authorization; issuance of this authorization is solely at the discretion of DPW. However, DPW is cognizant that there are times when compelling reasons make it in the public’s interest to allow for night noise and DPW reasonably grants night noise authorization.				
			Generally, the application for night noise authorization				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2743 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
				requires: submission by a responsible party. In this case, the contractor would prepare the application form and provide it to TJPA to submit to DPW. the following information is needed for the permit: project description and address/location, including map and/or drawing compelling reasons for work at night rather than during the day description of night work to be accomplished description of all equipment used for night work, including associated noise level days/time of proposed night work contractor doing the night work contact phone for 24/7 response by both the contractor and project sponsor demonstration that those within a 150¿ radius have been notified at least 5 days in advance of the night noise work			
TG03.00-0016	TG03 Question 0016 - Professional Liability Insurance	Closed		08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Exhibit A, VI.2.B. and spec. 00 08 05, 1.3.B				The Professional Liability and Commercial Liability requirements included in the TG03 BSE package are the same as those required during prequalification for this scope of work. All five prequalified Trade Subcontractors responded in the affirmative that they have ¿or can obtain a liability insurance policy issued by an insurance company licensed in the state of California¿ for these limits. These insurance requirements are higher than those required of the CM/GC under the prime contract due to the risk associated with the design-build aspects of the BSE work, and because the work will be performed by parties other than Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture.			
Specification 08 05 1.3.B requires Professional Liability Insurance in the amount of \$10,000,000 each claim with a deductible not to exceed \$50,00 each claim. Exhibit A VI.2.b requires \$25,000 with a deductible not to exceed \$250,000.							
Q. Can you clarify why the Trade Subcontractor would be held to an amount higher than the CM/GC?							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/04/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2744 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0017	TG03 Question 0017 - Commercial Liability Insurance	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Exhibit A, BI.1.B and 00 08 05, 1.2.B				Refer to response TG0300-0016.			
Specification 08 05, 1.2.B requires Commercial Liability Insurance in the amount of \$25,000,000 each occurrence. Exhibit A, VI.1.B requires \$100,000,000.							
Q. Can you clarify why the Trade Subcontractor would be held to an amount higher than the CM/GC?							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/04/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2745 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0018	TG03 Question 0018 - Fees	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference specification 00 08 13, 1.8					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Muni Code 2.4 requires,					Administration, inspection and other fees associated with the permit process will be paid for by the Trade Contractor and reimbursed by the TJPA in accordance with Section 01 14 10/APA (See Addendum 2).		
"Each applicant shall submit and maintain with the Department a bond, cash deposit, or other security acceptable to the Department securing the faithful performance of the obligations of the owner and its agent under any permit(s) to excavate and the compliance with all terms and conditions of this Article (the "deposit"). The deposit shall be in the sum of \$25,000 in favor of the "Department of Public Works, City and County of San Francisco."							
Also there are Administration fees daily inspection fees and other "additional fees"							
Please clarify which fees the Trade Subcontractor on this project will be required to make.							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/05/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0019	TG03 Question 0019 - Wastewater Discharge Permit	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/10/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference specification 31 23 19, 1.7.C					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Spec section 31 23 19 1.7.C requires Contractor to obtain a wastewater discharge permit from the City of San Francisco. Who pays for the cost of is charging into the local municipal waste water collection system? Who pays for the analytical testing?					Cost for dewatering discharge into public sewer system shall be paid by TJPA. An allowance shall be defined as issued in an upcoming addendum. Analytical testing of dewatering water shall be performed by TJPA's representative.		
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/05/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2746 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0020	TG03 Question 0020 - Buy America Requirements	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Sara Gigliotti				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference specification 00 08 13/APA.17					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Spec section 00 08 13/APA.17 Buy America Requirements provide , " **					Specification 00 08 13/APA 17 incorrectly states that Buy America requirements do not apply to lower tier Subcontractors. The certification requirement does not apply to lower tier Subcontractors, e.g., lower tier Subcontractors do not have to each submit Buy America certifications. However, the Buy America requirement applies to the entire contract and the Prime Contractor is responsible for ensuring that lower tier Subcontractors are in compliance, and the CM/GC is requiring the certification from all Bidders (but not Bidders' subcontractors). A revised Specification will be issued in a forthcoming addendum.		
** This provision applies only to the following types of Agreements: construction agreements of any value; agreements for the acquisition of goods valued at more than \$100,000; and agreements for the acquisition of rolling stock valued at more than \$100,000. This requirement does not apply to lower tier Subcontracts. 00 08 13/APA 17 (b) further states that, "The Prime Contractor is responsible for ensuring that lower tier subcontractors are in compliance.							
A) Please confirm "This requirement does not apply to lower tier Subcontracts"							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/05/2010							
TG03.00-0021	TG03 Question 0021 - SBE Program	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Sara Gigliotti				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Exhibit A Section IV Scope Section D					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Exhibit A Section IV Scope Section D SBE Program states that "Trade Subcontractor shall obtain a minimum SBE participation of 24% of the total value of Trade Subcontractors bid value". Volume 1 section 00 08 21 1.3B states that the SBE goal for this contrat is 17%. Please clarify what the SBE requirements are for the Trade Subcontractor for the BSE package. Also clarify how the % is calculated. Is the SBE participation % based on the total value of the Trade Subcontractors bid price or is it based on the amount of the bid that has been subcontracted to others?					17% is the overall SBE goal for the entire CM/GC contract. The CM/GC will set varying percentage goals for each individual package. The goal for the BSE package is 24%. SBE percentages are calculated by determining the ratio of firms in the nine-county Bay Area for a particular NAICS code to the number of SBE firms in the same area for that same NAICS code. SBE participation is calculated based on the total value of the Trade Subcontractor's bid price. For example, if the total bid is \$1,000,000, and the SBE goal is 24%, the Trade Subcontractor (if not an SBE itself) must make good faith efforts to subcontract out at least \$240,000 to SBE subcontractors.		
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2747 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
08/05/2010							
TG03.00-0022	TG03 Question 0022 - Bid Date	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture	Manuel Saldana	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference Exhibit A II - Bid Due Date				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Due to extensive design required, we request a postponement of the Bid Date by six (6) weeks to October 26, 2010.				A forthcoming Addendum will include a time extension of 4 weeks beyond the current bid date. The TJPA will continue to monitor contractor questions and the content of future addenda to be satisfied it allows a reasonable period to finalize contractor bids.			
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/06/2010							
TG03.00-0023	TG03 Question 0023 - Geotechnical Reports	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture	Manuel Saldana	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:Transbay PMPC Mark O'Dell				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference: N/A				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
In regards to the reference documents: under the Folder: Geotechnical Reports, Volume 3 from the "Final Geotechnical Data Reports" cannot be found. Volumes 1&2 were clearly uploaded. Will you please upload V3 - or let me know where to find the document on the FTP website? Thank you.				The Final Geotechnical Data Report contains a total of 2,266 pages. The pdf version located on the ftp site is broken-up into 2 volumes. The hard copy versions provided to Webcor/Obayashi were separated into 3 volumes for convenience in handling.			
Submitted by Briana Harvey Malcolm Drilling Co. 08/06/2010				Therefore the pdf version located on the ftp site as Volume 1 and Volume 2 is equal to the 3-volume hard copy version located at Webcor/Obayashi's Office. A Volume 3 will not be uploaded.			
TG03.00-0024	TG03 Question 0024 - Ancillary Permits	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture	Manuel Saldana	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Project Bidding Manual (20/44) and specification 01 14 10/APA 1 Please clarify the definition of "ancillary permits". Request specific differentiation of responsibilities between Contractor/Trade Subcontractor/ TJPA. Perhaps a new responsibility matrix with a column for the Trade Subcontractor would help. Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastruncture West Co. 08/06/2010		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Revised Specification 01 14 10 / APA 1 will be provided in an upcoming Addendum. Trade Subcontractor is responsible to obtain all permits identified in the matrix as Contractor's responsibility, that are required for Trade Subcontractor's work.			
TG03.00-0025	TG03 Question 0025 - Access Trestle	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: SL-001 Concept drawing for the access trestle shows a width of 48' in Zone 4 and 32' wide everywhere else. Are there minimum width requirements for the access trestle? If so, please provide details. Are there maximum width constraints? If so, please provide details. Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/06/2010		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The access trestle shown in the drawing is conceptual only. Since there is minimal access at the perimeter of the site the intent of the trestle is to allow for access for excavation, shoring, structural concrete and steel erection. See Exhibit A, Attachment 3 for minimum requirements. There are no maximum requirements.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG03.00-0026	TG03 Question 0026 - Surveyor Insurance	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Exhibit A, Section VI			The intent of Exhibit A, Section VI.2.A is to require \$25,000,000 in professional liability insurance with respect to the design-build elements of the work, which can be obtained either by the Trade Subcontractor or its retained engineers. However, with respect to land surveyors only, the Trade Subcontractor or its retained engineers should only have to evidence \$1,000,000 in professional liability insurance covering that scope of work, consistent with the standard requirements set forth in Article 16 of the Long Form Subcontract. This will be included in Addendum 3.				
Part 2A indicates the Trade Subcontractor must utilize surveyors who can provide \$25,000,000 of insurance. This will effectively eliminate many survey engineers from being able to bid on this work. The resultant effect will be higher bid costs. Please consider this and confirm what the insurance requirements are for land surveyors.							
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/06/2010							
TG03.00-0027	TG03 Question 0027 - Temporary Street Closures / Detours	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Exhibit A, Section VI			The traffic routing requirement is specified in spec section 01 15 70. This Section will be revised in a future addendum.				
Will temporary closures and/or temporary detours of First St, Fremont St, and Beale St be allowed so the contractor can perform activities such as 1) installation of CDSM elements, 2) demolition, 3) installation of temporary street elements? If not, how is the Owner proposing these work elements be performed?							
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/09/2010							
TG03.00-0028	TG03 Question 0028 - Trade Subcontractor DBE Participation	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Sara Gigliotti				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference specification 00 08 21, Section 1.2.B			As stated in the Specification, the DBE percentage is not an enforceable goal and compliance with the				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2750 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Section 1.2B states "The DBE Availability Advisory Percentage is not an enforceable goal under the CalTrans mandated changes to the DBE program, and compliance with the advisory is not a condition of the contract" Please clarify what the Trade Subcontractors requirement is regarding DBE participation on this contract.</p> <p>Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/09/2010</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2751 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0030	TG03 Question 0030 - Trade Subcontractor Insurance	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference specification 00 08 05				Refer to Exhibit A, Section VI for TG03 Trade Subcontractor insurance requirements.			
Section 00 08 05 contains specific insurance requirements. These requirements differ materially from those contained in Exhibit A Section VI as well as section 16 of the proposed subcontract between Webcor / Obayashi and the Trade Subcontractor. Please clarify what the insurance requirements are for the Trade Subcontractor.							
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/09/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0031	TG03 Question 0031 - Contaminated Groundwater	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/19/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference specification 01 35 65, sections 1.7.G & 1.7.H.				Settlement Treatment			
Section 1.7H.2 describes construction of a "small-scale batch wastewater treatment system to remove dissolved contaminants" such as petroleum hydrocarbons, benzene, toluene, etc. Please verify that the treatment costs to handle contaminated groundwater will be paid as extra work by TJPA.				Costs associated with settlement of dewatering effluent to reduce sediment load prior to discharge are not to be treated as extra cost items.			
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/09/2010				Chemical Treatment			
				Costs associated with treatment to removed dissolved contaminants, as described in specification 01 35 65, section 1.7H.2 will be considered extra cost items only if chemical testing shows elevated levels of dissolved contaminants that cannot be brought into compliance with SFPUC permit requirements by settlement alone. Treatment shall be done in the most cost effective manner to bring dewatering effluent into compliance with SFPUC discharge permit requirements.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2752 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0032	TG03 Question 0032 - Extend Bid Date	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Sara Gigliotti			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Exhibit A, II, "Key Dates for Bidding Process" of the Project Bidding Manual establishes the Bid Due Date as Sept. 14, 2010, 6 weeks from the date of bid package issuance.				Please refer to the answer to question 47 for information on the SBE program.			
Six weeks is an insufficient amount of time to adequately prepare a \$200M estimate and bid. We therefore request that the Bid Due Date be extended an additional 8 weeks for the following reasons				Response by Gerry MacClelland 8/18/2010			
Design-Build The SBE package includes major deisgn-build elements. The extent of the design work related to shoring, bracing, trestle, cross-street bridging and dewatering that the BSE Trade Subcontractor will be responsible for performing became fully apparent to the prequalified contractors only when the bid package was issued. Developing these required Trade Contractor designs far enough to allow accurate pricing to begin will take time.				A forthcoming Addendum will include a time extension of 4 weeks beyond the current bid date. The TJPA will continue to monitor contractor questions and the content of future addenda to be satisfied it allows a reasonable period to finalize contractor bids.			
Considering the magniute and location of the construction work, the risk accompanying the design is also extremely high. A memorandum of understanding that adequately addresses this risk must be negotiated with the Trade Subcontractor's Professional Engineer before design can even beign. This will take time.							
Similarly, the Trade Subcontractor will likely enlist the services of an independent Professional Engineer to act as a peer reviewer to check the work of the Trade Subcontractor's principal engineer. Reconciliation of any differences identified during this review will take time.							
Liquidated Damges Liquidated damages associated with not meeting the CM/GC's schedule for Substantial Completion are extraordinarily high. It appears to us that the BSE Trade Subcontractor's time for substantial completion, i.e. 1,825 days following Notice to Proceed with pre-construction services, is highly interconnected with the work of other trade subcontractors and also contingent on their performance. If this is the case, it becomes very difficult to accurately assess risk of exposure to liquidated damages. The Joint Venture will need time to clarify with the CM/GC the relationship between the other trade							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2753 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>subcontractors' work and the BSE Trade Subcontractor's substantial completion date. Then we can adequately assess the risk resulting from this relationship, include it in our pricing and secure surety commitment.</p> <p>Small Business Program The Trade Subcontractor is required to achieve a minimum small business enterprise participation of 24% of its' total bid. Given the magnitude of the principal scopes of work required in the BSE package - shoring/bracing, excavation, drilling - most small businesses will neither be interested in participating nor qualified to do so. Time will be needed to identify a sufficient amount of reasonable scopes of work for small business participation and to work with interested small businesses, as necessary, prior to bid day to help them with insurance, bonding, scheduling, and performance issues.</p> <p>Given the circumstances outline above, Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor strongly urges the Transbay Joint Powers Authority and Webcor / Obayashi to postpone the bid date for the TG03 BSE Package until Nov. 9, 2010.</p> <p>Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor, a Joint Venture 08/09/2010</p>						
TG03.00-0033	TG03 Question 0033 - Staging Areas	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:				Refer to Project Bidding Manual, Section IV.A.3 .b - Contractor will not provide areas for staging.			
Reference Project Bid Manual IV, A.3.b.							
Trade Subcontractor Requirements Q - Will Staging areas 9, 10, 12 etc. from the Existing Terminal Ramps & Demolition Plans be made available to the TG03 - BSE Trade Subcontractor?							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner							





Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2755 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
TG03.00-0035	TG03 Question 0035 - Temporary Power	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner					
Co-Author:			Answered By:Transbay Joint Powers Au Sara Gigliotti					
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference Project Bid Manual IV.A. 17.a					The cost of temporary power as defined in the Bidding Manual Appendix A, Section IV.B.A.17, shall be paid by the TJPA.			
Trade Subcontractor Requirements Q Please confirm that the Owner/TJPA will pay the cost of Temporary Power consumption.								
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/09/2010								
TG03.00-0036	TG03 Question 0036 - Unit Prices	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner					
Co-Author:			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas					
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference specification 01 10 20 Section 01 10 20 describes a schedule of unit prices.					Section 01 10 20/APA will be revised in a future Addendum.			
Trade Subcontractor Requirements Q - These items are not shown on the Schedule of Bid Prices found in Exhibit A. How is the contractor to communicate what his applicable bid prices are?								
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/10/2010								
TG03.00-0037	TG03 Question 0037 - Dewatering	Closed	08/10/2010	08/17/2010	08/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner					
Co-Author:			Answered By:Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau					
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference 31 23 19					1. Operation and maintenance of dewatering system shall be paid by unit prices, with 72 months defined as the baseline for bid defined in Bid Manual Exhibit A. This shall be reflected in 01 10 20/APA which will be revised and issued with an upcoming Addendum.			
Trade Subcontractor Requirements Q - Section 31 23 19,Dewatering, is unclear regarding the duration that the Trade Subcontractor remains responsible								



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2756 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>for maintaining the dewatering system. Please provide details of how long the Trade Subcontractor is responsible for the system. Is the system to be turned over to a follow on Subcontractor? Is the dewatering system to be removed by the Trade Subcontractor for the BSE package? If so, when?</p> <p>Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/10/2010</p>						
	<p>2. Upon completion of operation and maintenance of the dewatering system as instructed by TJPA, dewatering contractor is responsible for the deactivation and removal of the system. See Bid Item C-18 in Schedule of Bid prices.</p>						
TG03.00-0038	TG03 Question 0038 - Temporary Power	Closed	08/17/2010	08/31/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Exhibit A Attachment 2							
Q - Logistics, drawing sheet SL-003 Skid Layout (5) has notation "NOT INCLUDED IN THIS SERVICE REQUEST"							
Q -Please confirm that the Owner/TJPA will be providing this Skid, typically per detail 4/SL-003							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/11/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
TG03.00-0039	TG03 Question 0039 - Access Trestle	Closed	08/11/2010	08/18/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference Exhibit A - Attachment 3.1				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Q - Please confirm access trestle shall be designed (similar to Temp Bridges) for a Manitowoc Crane 999 Series 2 which weigh's approximately 475,000 lbs				Design load criteria for equipment on the Access Trestle is specified in Exhibit A, Attachment 3.			
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/11/2010							
TG03.00-0040	TG03 Question 0040 - Access Trestle	Closed	08/11/2010	08/17/2010	08/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference A3-2 and drawing sheet SL-001				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Q - Please confirm it is the intent of the drawings that the access trestle extends all the way eastward to col line 35+9.75 such that the Trade Subcontractor can access the trestle at the intersection of col line E and col line 35+9.75 (ie; at the east end cdsm wall).				Confirmed for access only, provided Contractor is given access to Parcel N and N', per Specification 01 14 19, 1.4.A.			
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/11/2010				Response by Webcor / Obayashi JV 08/16/2010			
TG03.00-0041	TG03 Question 0041 - Grid Spacing	Closed	08/11/2010	08/17/2010	08/17/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference drawing sheets GT-0100, S1-2022, & S1-2027				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Q - The structural drawings show grid spacing @42'-6". This makes the distance between Grid 1 & 35 equal to 1,445'. Drawing GT-0100 gives coordinates and a dimension of 1,462.54' between 1 & 35. Please clarify.				GT-0100 is correct. Not every structural bay is the same dimension.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2758 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
Submitted by Shad Gardner Balfour Beatty 08/11/2010							
TG03.00-0042	TG03 Question 0042 - Dimensions	Closed	08/11/2010	08/17/2010	08/17/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference drawing sheet GT-2101		This will be corrected in an Addendum.					
Q - Dimensions to the radius' center point for wall segment R2-1 do not correspond to the given radius. Please revise.							
Submitted by Shad Gardner Balfour Beatty 08/11/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0043	TG03 Question 0043 - Liquidated Damages	Closed	08/11/2010	08/17/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Exhibit A Section 5 last paragraph references Specification 00 05 20 for responsibilities for liquidated damages.		It is anticipated that NTPs will be issued as described in the IFB. Liquidated damages as well as Contractor's costs and those of other Trade Subcontractor's may be assessed if the late completion of any zone impacts the critical path of the project or affects the work of follow on Trade Subcontractors.					
Q - The liquidated damages described in 00 05 20 are based on a requirement for the completion of Trade package No. 1 in 1,825 calendar days beginning with Notice to Proceed with Pre-Construction Services. 1) Please provide the Notice to Proceed date for Pre-Construction Services. 2) Please advise how liquidated damages will be assessed for late completion of Zone 1, Zone 2, Zone 3, and Zone 4. Since any of these zones could potentially be late, it is not clear how the CM/GC will assess potential LD's.							
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/11/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2759 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
TG03.00-0044	TG03 Question 0044 - Existing Utilities	Closed	08/11/2010	08/17/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference drawing sheet D-2230					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Q - Note #2 states that, unless otherwise specified, all utilities to be removed have been cut and capped. The only remaining utilities shown to be cut and capped are the sewer systems at First, Fremont, and Beale. We interpret this note to mean that, except for the sewer systems discussed, there are no other active utilities in the work zone (including in First St, Fremont St, and Beale). 1) Please confirm there are no other active utilities that the Trade Subcontractor has to either cut/cap or maintain in place. 2) If there are other utilities that have to be cut and capped, please provide specific details. 3) If there are other utilities that have to be maintained in place, please provide specific details.					1) Protect in place active existing sanitary and combined sewers, manholes, catch basins and storm drain culverts as indicated on the plans. Protect in place NEW active sewers constructed as part of the Relocation of Utilities Project as shown on the plans. Coordinate with and protect in place NEW active utilities (PG&E and Verizon) constructed by the private utilities that will be supported by the temporary bridge. With the exception of the utilities indicated, all known active utilities will be demolished capped and/or plugged by the Relocation of Utilities Project at the demarcation line indicated in the plans. The Relocation of Utilities Project includes exploratory subsurface trench explorations in First, Fremont, Beale, Minna and Natoma streets at the demarcation line where the new CDSM wall crosses perpendicular to each street. Following subsurface investigations, all unknown (as well as known) active and inactive encountered utilities will be demolished capped and/or plugged at these locations by the Relocation of Utilities Project.		
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/11/2010					2) Demolish and plug existing sewers per City of San Francisco Standard Plans and Specifications.		
					3) See response to part 1.		
					Responded by David Fyfe (URS Corporation)		
TG03.00-0045	TG03 Question 0045 - Escrow Documents	Closed	08/12/2010	08/18/2010	08/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference specification 00 02 12, 1.3.A					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Q - Paragraph 1.3A states escrow documents are to be submitted within 3 working days after the date of bid opening. This contradicts Project Bidding Manual page 15 which states that escrow documents are to be submitted within 3 calendar days after the bid opening date. Please					Three working days is correct. An Addendum will be issued.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2760 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	clarify.						
	Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite /CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/11/2010						
TG03.00-0046	TG03 Question 0046 - Construction Schedule	Closed	08/12/2010	08/18/2010	08/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference specification 01 13 10, 1.2.B				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Q - Paragraph 1.2B states a construction schedule is to be submitted within 15 days after bid package Notice to Proceed. This contradicts Exhibit A Section 5 which states the schedule is to be submitted within 15 calendar days of award. Please clarify.				The Exhibit A requirement of 15 calendar days of award shall apply and supersedes the specification.			
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/11/2010							



30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0047	TG03 Question 0047 - SBE Program	Closed	08/12/2010	08/18/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Transbay Joint Powers Au Sara Gigliotti			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Exhibit A, Part IV and specification 00 08 21, paragraph B, item D and paragraph 1.3, item B.				That assumption is correct. 17% is the overall SBE goal for the entire CM/GC contract. The CM/GC will set varying percentages for each individual package, and the goal for this package is 24%.			
Q - Exhibit A, Part IV., Scope of the Package and Bid Item Information, Paragraph B., General Work, Item D., SBE Program states "Trade Subcontractor shall obtain a minimum SBE participation of 24% of the total value of Trade Subcontractor's bid value." However, Section 00 08 21, Disadvantaged & Small Business Enterprise and Equal Employment Opportunity/Employment Nondiscrimination Requirements, Paragraph 1.3 Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Program Requirements, Item B. states "The TJPA has established an SBE Utilization Goal of 17% overall for this Contract."							
Are we correct in assuming that the SBE participation is to be 24% of our bid value for this contract (Contract No. 08-04-CMGC-000), but that the SBE Goal for the entire Transit Center Project is 17%?							
Submitted by Gerald Brown Tutor-Salib Corporation 08/12/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0048	TG03 Question 0048 - Instruction to Bidders	Closed	08/12/2010	08/18/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Instruction To Bidders, subparagraph D.				BQS Form is not required. This will be removed from the Project Bidding Manual in a future Addendum.			
Q - Reference is made to Part III. Instruction to Bidders, Subparagraph D., Bidding Process and Procedures, Item 6. Statutory Bidding Requirements, Subitem b) Bidders Qualification Statement (1) which states that "Bidder shall list on the Bidder's Qualification Statement (BQS in Forms Section) its current contractor license number. . ." we can not find such a form. Please provide.							
Submitted by Gerald W. Brown Tutor-Saliba Corporation 08/12/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0049	TG03 Question 0050 - Bid Due Date	Closed	08/12/2010	08/18/2010	08/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Sara Gigliotti	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Part III Instruction to Bidders, Section V, Paragraph A, Item 3			This request is granted. This form is not required to be submitted with the Bid. The Instructions to Bidders will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.				
Q - Reference is made to Part III. Instruction to Bidders, Section V., Webcor/Obayashi Bidding Forms, Paragraph A., Bidding Checklist (BCL), Item 3. which states "Each Bidder shall submit with its Bid the following forms, properly completed and executed." Following this statement there are various forms listed including "Escrow Agreement for Security Deposits in Lieu of Retention (Section 00 06 30)." Since this "Escrow Agreement for Security Deposits in Lieu of Retention" form states that - "pursuant to the construction contract entered into between the TJPA and Contractor for Transbay Transit Center. . . in the amount of _____ dated _____", we request that this form be among those forms submitted by the successful Trade Subcontractor after the Notice of Intent to Award and not with the bid form. Please advise.							
Submitted by Gerald W. Brown Tutor-Saliba Corporation 08/12/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0050	TG03 Question 0050 - Bid Due Date	Closed	08/12/2010	08/18/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Transbay Terminal Center Bid Package TG03 Shoring, Buttress and Excavation (Cont.)			A forthcoming Addendum will include a time extension of 4 weeks beyond the current bid date. The TJPA will continue to monitor contractor questions and the content of future addenda to be satisfied it allows a reasonable period to finalize contractor bids.				
Q - We have started into our second week of intensive review of bid documents and drawings in which to grasp what is prescriptive work and what requires additional contractor design and scheduling in our bid proposal preparation. Having been involved in not only pre-bid contractor designed support-of-excavations but final design and construction of numerous deep supported excavations in urban environments in numerous cities in California, we look forward to working on this unique and challenging project. This project brings additional elements to be considered during design of support-of-excavation							
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2763 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>and traffic supported trestles that would not normally be considered in below street level construction. One, the width of the supported excavation at approximately one hundred and eighty L.F., will require at least two intermediate vertical piles to support the horizontal bracing levels. Second, the need to incorporate both longitudinal and transverse traffic trestle decking whose vertical support locations will add to the constraints and interference with the location of the horizontal bracing levels. Third, the phasing of the shoring and excavation will require various locations of bracing levels of the CDSM cut-off walls. Fourth, the tie-down anchors will have to be designed to meet project specifications. Fifth, the volume of information including as-builts and the myriad of geotechnical information provided will consume considerable time which our designers can ill afford not to digest the pertinent information. And lastly, the tremendous coordination and evaluation of the various key subcontractors scopes and proposals will be itself a considerable effort since various proprietary information will be provided to them for pricing Tutor-Saliba's in-house designs. For these various reasons, we strongly urge a postponement of at least four weeks to the current scheduled bid date of September 14th in which we can properly develop the most complete and competitive design concepts and pricing proposal to Webcor/Obayashi. It is very important that you evaluate this request in a timely manner in which we can allocate the limited time available to our engineering and estimating forces. Your timely written response is appreciated.</p> <p>Submitted by Gerald W. Brown Tutor-Saliba Corporation 08/12/2010</p>						
TG03.00-0051	TG03 Question 0051 - Elevations	Closed	08/13/2010	08/19/2010	08/19/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:				Tables 3, 4, 7, & 8 on sheet GT-1100 will be revised in			
Reference drawing sheet GT-1100 and drawing tables 3,							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2764 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
4, 7 & 8	Q - The lateral earth pressure diagram and tables 3&4 have the top street at elevation +4, but tables 7&8 show elevation +6 Which is correct						
	Submitted by Shad Gardner Balfour Beatty 08/13/2010						
							an Addendum to show the top strut elevation as +4ft. Note that, per note 10 on GT-1111, the top strut elevation shall be determined by the Contractor.
TG03.00-0052	TG03 Question 0052 - Mud Slab	Closed	08/16/2010	08/22/2010	08/17/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference drawing sheets S1-3003 & A1-8711. Q - Detail 2/S1-3003 indicates a 3" Mud slab (SAD). Detail 2/A1-8711 indicates a 4" Mud Slab w/ 6"X6" Wire Mesh. Please confirm that the Architectural detail governs, and that the BSE sope ends at the top of Mud Slab and WPM and up by others. Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/13/2010	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Mud slab is shown on 5/S1-3003 (Addendum #1). The BSE scope of work does not include the waterproofing, protection board, concrete protection slab and 5' thick mat slab on top of the mud slab. The mud slab reinforcing shown in the "for reference only" drawings 2/A1-8711 will be revised in an Addendum to match the structural drawings.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2765 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0053	TG03 Question 0053 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/16/2010	08/22/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference specification 31 55 00. Q - Section 1.5 N states that primary struts are to be proof loaded to 125% of maximum design force. This appears to be either in conflict with 1.5 O, or is referring to something other than pre-loading by jacking. We note that proof load is defined, but the definition appears to be similar to what is generally understood by pre-load. Please clarify intent of proof loading. Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/13/2010		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Proof load and preload are not the same. There is no conflict. Responded by Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)			
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0054	TG03 Question 0054 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/16/2010	08/22/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference drawing sheet GT-1110 Q - Loads for re-bracing struts or rakers are not given on sheet GT-1110. Please clarify required loads. Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/13/2010		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Strut loads in the build-out case can be determined by the Contractor based on the information provided on GT-1110.			
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0055	TG03 Question 0055 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/16/2010	08/22/2010	08/26/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference drawing sheet GT-2101. Q - Is the use of tiebacks acceptable for support of this wall segment? Is the project planning on eventually taking the properties under which such tiebacks would be placed?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The property is identified for property acquisition.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2766 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/13/2010							
TG03.00-0056	TG03 Question 0056 - Access Trestle Permanent Structure	Closed	08/16/2010	08/22/2010	08/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Exhibit A, Attachment 3 A. Q - We note that the access trestle is to be coordinated with permanent construction, not conflict with the permanent structure except for penetrations, and is to be at the same level of the temporary bridges at the connections. This would appear to require that the trestle deck be below the bottom of the ground floor permanent structure section, with built-up ramps to match the street bridges. We also note that the permanent ground level structure is lower at the street crossings than elsewhere. This would push the trestle deck further down, conflicting with the limits of placement of the top level bracing strut. No guidance is given regarding how the future Trade Subcontractor will want to use the trestle to construct the ground floor or the superstructure. Please clarify where the top of trestle deck is intended to be located, and whether it is acceptable to locate the trestle deck at ground floor level, such that it could be used for sequential construction of the ground floor and superstructure.Is there an upturned longitudinal beam down the middle of the street crossings? . Schedule A on S1-3201 only indicates a 30" slab. Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/13/2010		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A. Per Exhibit A, Attachment 3 "The level of the Access Trestle shall be the same as the level of the Temporary Bridges at the connections." B.(insert TT answer)			
TG03.00-0057	TG03 Question 0057 - Access Trestle	Closed	08/16/2010	08/22/2010	08/19/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2767 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Exhibit A, Attachment 3 Q - Crane load is indicated to be considered at any location on the access trestle. Only total weight is given, not the concentrated load that occurs when the crane reaches out on one side or the other to the maximum under load. Please confirm that the trestle is to accommodate the crane operating, not just standing or walking, at any location on the trestle. Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/13/2010		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Confirmed.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
TG03.00-0058	TG03 Question 0058 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/17/2010	08/31/2010	08/22/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference drawing sheet GT-1111 Legend. A. Q - Please help to clarify the strut and waler system stiffness requirements. Our initial interpretation and the associated analyses indicate that strut and waler sizes increase very significantly over what would be required by strength considerations alone. Please provide a sample calculation or procedure for determining stiffness for comparison with the values given in kip per foot, per foot of wall. B. Pre-loading will take out a portion of the axial shortening of the struts. We assume that it is appropriate to subtract out that deflection from the stiffness calculation. Please confirm. Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/13/2010		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: The strut and waler system stiffnesses are governed by the need to control ground movements outside the excavation. Consequently the operational stresses in struts and walers implied by the specified stiffnesses will be lower than would be obtained by factoring ultimate stresses. See Attached SSK-RFI TG0300-058. Question B is not clear.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG03.00-0059	TG03 Question 0059 - Demolition	Closed	08/16/2010	08/22/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference D-1076 (Existing Terminal Demo).				Confirmed.			
Q - Existing Terminal Demolition Drawing D-1076 indicates (E) Cantilever Wall for 301 Mission St Building (60 story Tower) to be relocated by others. Please confirm this will be completed prior to the TG03 Work in this area.							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/13/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0060	TG03 Question 0060 - Milestones	Closed	08/16/2010	08/22/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Exhibit A Section V				Refer to answer to TG0300-0013.			
Q - Milestones indicates the Trade Subcontractor is to provide all submittals within 10 days of NTP #1. This contradicts innumerable sections of the specifications which provide specific and reasonable time frames for submittals. It is not reasonable to expect all submittals to be delivered within 10 days of NTP #1. Please provide clarification on the contract requirements for delivery of submittals.							
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/13/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0061	TG03 Question 0061 - Micropile	Closed	08/16/2010	08/22/2010	08/17/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference specification 31 63 33, 2.1.A.2.				145 psi grout pressure is a minimum requirement.			
Q - Specification require micropile contractor to select							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2769 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	installation means & methods to develop load capacity & performance required by project documents. Paragraph 2.1.A.2 dictates an installation method of grout pressure at least 145 psi. We request this sentence is removed since it appears to conflict with objective of contractor selected construction procedures.						
	Submitted by Rob Jameson Malcolm Drilling 08/13/2010						
TG03.00-0062	TG03 Question 0062 - Micropile	Closed	08/17/2010	08/31/2010	08/17/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:				Confirmed. Drilling mud or chemical stabilizers are not to be used.			
Reference specification 32 63 33, 3.1.B. & 3.7.B.							
Q - Section 3.7.B requires temporary casing or other method of drill hole support in caving or unstable ground. By reference to Section 3.1.B & 3.7.B we understand that use of fluid containing bentonite, drilling mud or chemical stabilizers will not be permitted on the project.							
Submitted by Rob Jameson Malcolm Drilling 08/13/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2770 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0063	TG03 Question 0063 - Micropile	Closed	08/16/2010	08/22/2010	08/17/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference specification 33 63 33, 3.2.C.K.2. Q - Performance test acceptance criteria is defined in terms of parameter "T" - maximum test load. Parameter T is not defined in performance test schedule. By referral to proof test schedule we infer: T = 1.4 x 1.1 x Design Load Please confirm or provide definition of "T" which is applicable to performance test acceptance. Submitted by Rob Jameson Malcolm Drilling 08/13/2010			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Performance test load is specified in table A of specification section 31 63 33. F=1.4 x F.S. x Design Load F.S. = 2.0	
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0064	TG03 Question 0064 - Micropile	Closed	08/16/2010	08/22/2010	08/17/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference specification 34 63 33, 3.5.D. & A. Q - Per Micropile allowable construction tolerance, centerline of piling shall not more than 3" from indicated location on drawings. We understand that centerline of reinforcing shall be not more than 0.5" from centerline of pile, I.E. tolerance is cumulative such that reinforcing cannot exceed 3.5" from plan centerline location. Please confirm. Submitted by Rob Jameson Malcolm Drilling 08/13/2010			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Specification 34 63 33 / 3.5.D will be revised in an Addendum to read as "Centerline of reinforcing steel shall not be more than 0.5 inch from centerline of the pile."	
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0065	TG03 Question 0065 - Bid Due Date	Closed	08/17/2010	08/24/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Gerry MacClelland	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Our QBD 1 sent on 8/9/10 requested an 8-week extension to the bidding period and provided reasons for our request. We would like to reiterate our concern that it is not possible to provide an accurate design-build bid of this			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> A forthcoming Addendum will include a time extension of 4 weeks beyond the current bid date. The TJPA will continue to monitor contractor questions and the content of future addenda to be satisfied it allows a	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2773 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0069	TG03 Question 0069 - Permits	Closed	08/18/2010	08/24/2010	08/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Project Bidding Manual, IV.A.6 and specification 01 14 10.				Refer to TG0300-0024.			
Project Bidding Manual IV.4.6 a0 states "Trade Subcontractor shall obtain all required ancillary permits to complete their scope in a timely manner. Refer to Specifications Section 01 14 10 for project permits" Specification 01 14 10 does not distinguish between the Contractor and the Trade Subcontractor. Please clarify specifically which permits are considered "ancillary" and not reimbursed by TJPA. (I.e DPW Tree Planting / Removal, Rock Wheel? SFMTA Traffic Control Plan?, etc.)							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/17/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0070	TG03 Question 0070 - CDSM	Closed	08/18/2010	08/24/2010	08/19/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference drawing sheets GT2101, GT2101, GT2103, S1-2027, & S1-2030.				GT 2101, GT 2102, GT 2103 take precedent.			
The Drawings GT 2101, GT 2102, GT2103 show one CDSM Layout and Drawings S1 2022 thru S1 2027, S1 2030 show another CDSM Layout and the dimensioning do not match, the distance to CL of CDSM at A /1 and A / 35 do not match between the two different Layouts.							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/17/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2774 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0071	TG03 Question 0071 - As-Built Drawings	Closed	08/18/2010	08/24/2010	08/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference specification 01 17 20.				Each Trade Subcontractor is responsible to provide as-builts for their contract work.			
Who is responsible for utility relocation as-built drawings, TG03 or TG04?							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastrcutre West Co. 08/17/2010							
TG03.00-0072	TG03 Question 0072 - Electronic Files	Closed	08/18/2010	08/24/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
1. Will the owner or general contractor please provide bidders with CADD digital files (preferably AutoCAD format) of the drawing provided to TG03 Trade Subcontractors?				1. Refer to answer to TG0300-0003.			
2. Will the owner or general contractor please provide bidders with Primavera digital files for Exhibit I schedule contained in the bid package?				2. No.			
Submitted by Kelley Wigton Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 08/17/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2775 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0073	TG03 Question 0073 - Existing Piles and Pile Caps	Closed	08/18/2010	08/24/2010	08/19/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
After reviewing the reference documents we are not able to find details of the existing San Francisco Terminal pile caps and piles to be removed. Document No. 1 in the attached listing appears to be the one we need. Where can we get a copy of this document and any other pertinent as-built drawings for the existing terminal structure?				This information is available and will be added to the TJPA FTP site referenced in Section 00 03 31.1.1B. A hard copy will be provided to Webcor/Obayashi. An addendum will be issued adding a reference to these requested drawings to Section 00 03 31.1.2D			
Submitted by Kelley Wigton Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 08/17/2010							
TG03.00-0074	TG03 Question 0074 - Tax Certificate	Closed	08/18/2010	08/24/2010	08/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Project Bidding Manual, Section V, paragraph A (BCL), #3 Item # 3 requires each bidder to provide a specifically what certificate is required. Is this certificate issued by the State or by the Federal government? It is our understanding that General Partnerships are not usually registered with the State of California, therefore this document would presumably be a Federal certificate. Please advise.				Refer to Specification Section 00 04 54.			
Submitted by Chad Trabucco Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 08/18/2010							
TG03.00-0075	TG03 Question 0075 - Temporary Bridge	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
	<p>Reference specification 01 53 13, paragraph 1.3.A.1</p> <p>Specification states "design shall include cross bridge travel including typical semi truck traffic and a fully assembled Manitowoc 999 crane weighing 500,000 lbs traveling from trestle to trestle without a hook load." Please verify it is the intent of the specifications that the 999 crane only travels across the temp street while moving from trestle to trestle and that the temp street design does not have to include the Manitowoc 999 loading at any other area of the temporary street.</p> <p>Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 8/18/2010</p>						
TG03.00-0076	TG03 Question 0076 - Access Trestle	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/19/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>		<p>ANSWERED By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</p>					
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Exhibit A</p> <p>Attachment 3, Access Trestle Criteria, states "The level of the access trestle shall be the same as the level of the Temporary Bridges at the connections." Attachment 3 also states "The layout for each member of the Access Trestle, shall not conflict with the permanent structure." Tying the trestle to the cross streets will cause the trestle structure (which is approx 7' deep) to conflict with the concrete roof of the follow on structure. It is our understanding that the CM/GC understands this and will coordinate the removal of the acess trestle and the temp streets such that the concrete roof can be constructed after these conflicting structures are removed. Pls confirm.</p> <p>Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/18/2010</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Coordination is the responsibility of the Trade Subcontractor. Temporary roadways/bridges must remain in place until the permanent structure can support the permanent roadway.</p>			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0077	TG03 Question 0077 - Mat Slab Pile Sleeve	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: 2/S1-3003 Slip Detail @ Trestle Pile/Mat connection shows a pipe sleeve over the trestle pipe pile to allow for vertical movement of the mat slab per Note 2. Not clear how that will be achieved since the detail shows the Mat slab with the mud slab directly bearing on the concrete encasement of the trestle pipe pile. Please clarify. Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/18/2010		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The slip detail is to allow the mat slab (and the waterproofing to adhere to the mat slab) to move upward when ground water table rises to the design level (mat slab will move up approximately 1" under the designed ground water pressure).			
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0078	TG03 Question 0078 - CSM	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/19/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref: CSM Width/GT-5101 Plan Sheet 35 of 105, GT-5101, detail 2 shows 3' diameter multi auger soil mixing or a cutter soil mixing system (CSM) with conflicting widths. The stated width is 3'-6", yet the schedule width equals 3'-0", which matches dimension of the multi auger system. However, a 30" wide CSM system and a 36" multi auger system provide the same minimum width. Please confirm the desired width of the CSM system, 30, 36, or 42 inches. Submitted by Andres Melgoza Drill Tech & Shoring Inc 08/18/2010		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 3'-6" dimension for the CSM system on detail 2/GT-5101 should read 3"-6" maximum. GT-5101 will be revised to reflect this in an Addendum.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2778 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG03.00-0079	TG03 Question 0079 - Insurance	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference General Requirements - Insurance				With respect to land surveyors only, the Trade Subcontractor or its retained engineers should only have to evidence \$1,000,000 in professional liability insurance covering that scope of work, consistent with the standard requirements set forth in Article 16 of the Long Form Subcontract. This will be included in Addendum 3.			
Says surveyor must carry professional liability of \$25 million/claim. What general liability would the surveyor need to carry? I assume it is not the \$100 million/occurrence as noted for the trade subcontractors. The insurance would cost the surveyor more than it would cost to survey the project.							
Submitted by Lyndi Love MVE 08/18/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0080	TG03 Question 0080 - Schedule	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Exhibit A, Section V				Refer to Exhibit I, BSE Concept Schedule.			
Reference NTP #6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Please provide specific dates when the Trade Subcontractor will be required to perform the removal work associated with these NTP's. It is not possible to estimate costs for managing and maintaining this project without that specific information.							
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/18/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0081	TG03 Question 0081 - Police Officers	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference specification 01 15 70, 3.4.A				The Trade Subcontractor shall pay for the cost of the 10B officers and this cost will be reimbursable. This			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2779 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Section states "Contractor shall provide uniformed...police officers, as required by the TJPA representative..." It is our understanding that per the contract definitions, the Contractor is defined to be Webcor/Obayashi. Please confirm that Webcor/Obayashi will direct and pay the costs for the uniformed officers described herein. If it is the intent of the contract that the Trade Subcontractor direct and pay the costs for these officers, please provide specific guidelines on when these officers will be required. Simply stating "as required by TJPA" will result in exorbitant bid costs due to the lack of specific information provided. Suggest an allowance for this.</p> <p>Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/18/2010</p>						will be issued in a upcoming addendum.
TG03.00-0082	TG03 Question 0082 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Ref: GT-1110 Ref Note 3 "strut loads are working stress level." Regarding 301 Mission Buttress Case Table 3 & 7; is Table 7 loading cumulative, or must Table 3 & Table 7 be additive? Regardless of cumulative or additive do Table 3 & 7 loads represent "working stress level"?				Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 are additive to Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. All loads in these tables are working stress. Note: Tables 3 and 7 have been revised in Addendum 2.			
Submitted by Gerald W. Brown Tutor-Saliba Corporation 08/19/2010							
TG03.00-0083	TG03 Question 0083 - Dimensions	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2781 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0085	TG03 Question 0085 - Cut Off Wall	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference drawing sheet GT-2103. Is cutoff wall between grids 33 & 34 required? Schedule appears to show excavation on both sides of this wall going down at the same time. Submitted by Gerald W. Brown Tutor-Saliba Corporation 08/19/2010		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Note 12 on drawing GT-2101 regarding location of the cut-off walls.			
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0086	TG03 Question 0086 - Wood Pile Removal	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference drawing sheets GT-5000 & GT-5301. 1. Can wood piles be drilled out and material (Grout) replaced VRS extracted and grouted as shown. 2. How does removal of wood piles and placement buttress piles work with regard to schedule. Submitted by Gerald W. Brown Tutor-Saliba Corporation 08/19/2010		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Evaluation of the Contractor's proposed alternative method for extracting the existing timber piles requires more detail than that included in the RFI. Except where Non-Ground Deformation Control Methods are noted as acceptable on the Drawings, pulling out timber piles directly from the ground and grouting without any precautionary measures to control settlements caused by pile extraction is prohibited.			
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0087	TG03 Question 0087 - Dimensions	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference drawing sheets S1-2030, S1-2029, & GT-2103 Drawings appear to have made contradiction regarding limits of contract VRS location of shoring wall at both SW and SE project corners.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See response to RFI 0070.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2782 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Submitted by Gerald W. Brown Tutor-Saliba Corporation 08/19/2010							
TG03.00-0088	TG03 Question 0088 - Train Platforms	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Will train platforms be constructed prior to/after removal of wall & Trestle/Bridge vertical support removal?				Train platforms construction is not in the scope of the work.			
Submitted by Gerald W. Brown Tutor-Saliba Corporation 08/19/2010							
TG03.00-0089	TG03 Question 0089 - Access Trestle	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference specification 01 53 13, 1.3.A.2				Yes. Refer to the the second paragraph of the "General" section of Attachment 3 in Exhibit A.			
Do deflection limits for temp bridges also apply to work trestle?							
Submitted by Gerald W. Brown Tutor-Saliba Corporation 08/19/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2783 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0090	TG03 Question 0090 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference drawing sheet GT-1112				Noted			
Vertical supports of shoring are shown in all stages up to stage 16. Vertical supports will still be required at stage 16 and and beyond to support work trestle & roadways.							
Submitted by Gerald W. Brown Tutor-Salbia Corporation 08/19/2010							
TG03.00-0091	TG03 Question 0091 - Mat Slab Pile Sleeve	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference drawing sheet 2/S1-3003					This is a detail to illustrate the trestle pile design requirements.		
What is the intent of this detail, how does it work and at what stage of construction is it to be installed?					Trestle pile is a contractor design/build item. Other than supporting the trestle, there are two issues that need to be addressed by the contractor:		
Submitted by Gerald W. Brown Tutor-Saliba Corporation 08/19/2010					1. Trestle Pile shall not restrict the mat slab from upward movement.		
					2. Trestle pile shall have two steel seep rings (as shown) with waterproofing/flashing integrated into the lower ring.		
TG03.00-0092	TG03 Question 0092 - Insurance	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference Exhibit A, paragraph section VI				Refer to response TG0300-0001.			
4.F. as written is commercially unavailable. The clause							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2784 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	requires Trade Subcontractor to maintain professional liability coverage continuously throughout the the term of the Contract, and without lapse, for 10 years beyond the Contract Final Final Completion date. The maximum policy term commercially available is 10 years combined for the construction and extended reporting period. A more usualreporting period is 3 years. Please change the extended reporting period to 3 years, or revise the requirement to a total of 10 years. Carrying \$25,000,000 professional liability insurance for 10 years will addsignificant cost to the Project without corresponding benefit as the majority of the design performed by Trade Subcontractor is for temporary work rather than the permanent structure.						
	Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/19/2010						
TG03.00-0093	TG03 Question 0093 - Insurance	Closed	08/19/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Exhibit A, paragraph 1.B		In an upcoming addendum, the following language will be added to 1.B of Exhibit A, VI. Insurance Requirement: ¿Notwithstanding Section 16.7 of the Long Form Subcontract, the requirement to maintain \$100,000,000 in Commercial General Liability Insurance shall apply ONLY to the bidding Trade Subcontractor. Sub-subcontractors/Lower-Tier Subcontractors shall maintain the levels of Commercial General Liability Insurance set forth in Section 16 of the Long Form Subcontract agreement.¿					
Section 1.B requires the Trade Subcontractor to maintain \$100,000,000 Commercial General Liability Insurance. Section 16.7 of the proposed subcontract between Webcor and the Trade Subcontractor requires that Sub-subcontractors carry the same amounts of coverage. Potential SBE sub-subcontractors will not be able to provide \$100,000,000 CGL. As a result, Trade Subcontractors will not be able to reach the 24% SBE Goal. It is highly likely that all of the Trade Subcontractors will offer 0% SBE participation as a result of section 16.7. Please advise if Webcor intends to modify section 16.7 and if so, how will it specifically be changed?							
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2785 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
08/19/2010							
TG03.00-0094	TG03 Question 0094 - Vibration Level	Closed	08/23/2010	08/30/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference specification 00 35 65.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1.11.A. States "Limit or prohibit use of construction techniques that create high vibration levels. Do not drive piles"				There will be no hammer-driven piles on this project. References to pile driving in 01 35 65, 1.11.C.3 are for illustrative purposes only. Other construction techniques that may create high vibration levels are limited to the hours and times defined in section 1.11.C.3. Applicable vibration guidelines are issued b the FTA Office of Planning and Environment¿s Transit noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (Table 12-3 for building categories I, II and III).			
1.11.C.3. States "Perform vibration intensive activities such as pile driving only on weekdays during daytime hours between 7 a.m. and 8 p.m."							
These two sections contradict each other. Please confirm that pile driving, if desired, may be performed on this project.							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/23/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG03.00-0095	TG03 Question 0095 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/23/2010	08/30/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference specification 31 55 00.				Proof load to be applied to the fully installed element.			
31 55 00 Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall 1.5.N Please clarify if primary struts can be proof loaded prior to installation or if they must be proof loaded once in place and all connections made.				Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)			
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/23/2010							
TG03.00-0096	TG03 Question 0096 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/23/2010	08/30/2010	08/26/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference drawing sheet GT-2101, note 16.				Temporary tiebacks are acceptable on wall segment X1-1. The embedded length of the tieback shall not exceed 50 feet.			
Note 16 on GT-2101 requires the internal bracing system to permit removal of wall segment X1-1 PRIOR to the completion of the excavation. When or at what stage of excavation will this wall be removed? Can tiebacks be used to support wall X1-1?							
Submitted by Shad Gardner Balfour Beatty 08/23/2010							
TG03.00-0097	TG03 Question 0097 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/23/2010	08/30/2010	10/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference drawing sheet GT-1111.				The revised shoring wall layout shown in Addendum 3 is too close to the final southwest train box wall. The latter will be placed once the adjacent properties are acquired and demolished. Tiebacks installed at			
GT-1111 requires a minimum stiffness of the internal bracing system which makes strut sizes dependent on the							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2787 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>strut's length & spacing regardless of the load. This makes a very inefficient bracing system . Would the Authority consider providing an allowable design deflection criteria, in lieu of the stiffness requirement.</p> <p>Submitted by Shad Gardner Balfour Beatty 08/23/2010</p>						
TG03.00-0098	TG03 Question 0098 - Cut-Off Wall	Closed	08/23/2010	08/30/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference GT drawing set.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The SCDSM cut-off walls are to be located by the contractor as needed. Do these walls serve any purpose for the final design? If not, can other earth retaining systems be used or could they be eliminated if they are not needed by the contractor.				Cut-off walls do not serve any purpose of the final design. Other earth retaining systems can be used or cut-off walls can be eliminated with Trade Subcontractor's means and methods if Trade Subcontractor can meet the milestone requirements without sectionalized dewatering.			
Submitted by Shad Gardner Balfour Beatty 08/23/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
TG03.00-0099	TG03 Question 0099 - Dewatering	Closed	08/23/2010	08/30/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference specification 31 23 19, paragraph 1.3.A, drawing sheet S1-2024, Note A Exhibit I, and Schedule (Dewatering).					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The above ref specification indicates TG03 dewatering system responsibility for duration of TG03 package. The referenced schedule shows dewatering thru March 2016. Note A DWS S1-2024 states dewatering maintained thru all dead load applications. Question: Does TG03 dewatering responsibility end Feb 2015 and remaining dewatering responsibility by subsequent contractors? (Pump Ownership/Pump/etc).					No. TG03 Trade Subcontractor shall have all responsibilities for dewatering work specified in Exhibit A, IV. C18 and C19. Specification Section 31 23 19 will be revised in a upcoming Addendum.		
Submitted by John Foote Balfour Beatty Infrastructure 08/23/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0100	TG03 Question 0100 - Timber Pile Removal	Closed	08/23/2010	08/30/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference drawing sheet GT-5000, Section 1.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Section 1 Stage 3(B) removes existing piles (this stage) Stage 4 notes that (E) Timber piles to be removed during excavation. Please clarify.					The existing piles to be removed in Stage 3 are those at the buttress, as shown on GT-2202.		
Submitted by John Foote Balfour Beatty Infrastructure 08/23/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0101	TG03 Question 0101 - Demolition	Closed	08/23/2010	08/30/2010	08/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2789 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Reference drawing sheet D-2210.</p> <p>There is a discrepancy in the drawing versus the reference information dated 8/19/2004 (Webcor Existing Foundation Conditions - Hemisphere - 80 Natoma Street). The summary of production piles shown on Table 1 of the Webcor information indicates that Pile 129 was not installed. Also per the Table Pile 145-149 and 153, 154 were installed which are not shown on sheet D2210. Please clarify.</p> <p>Submitted by John Foote Balfour Beatty Infrastructure 08/23/2010</p>						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0103	TG03 Question 0103 - Monitoring	Closed	08/24/2010	08/31/2010	09/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference specification 39 09 13							
<p>The plans show geotechnical instrumentation including inclinometers, MPBXs, piezometers and settlement points. Specification Section 39 09 13 states that "... Geotechnical instrumentation consists of inclinometers, settlement casings, settlement monitoring points, survey reference points, piezometers and multiple point borehole extensometers." The plans state that the geotechnical instruments for monitoring the TBT excavation and shoring work are to be drilled and installed by the TJPA representative. However, the specifications call for "...furnishing, installing, monitoring, reading, recording, maintaining, protecting geotechnical instrumentation." The specifications go on to state that "...where shown on the drawings, the Contractor will procure and install the specified instrumentation." We find no notes on the plans calling for the Contractor to procure and install the specified instrumentation nor notes as to who is responsible for monitoring the shoring performance. The plans appear to be inconsistent with local practice in that it is customary in Northern California for the Contractor to furnish, install and monitor appropriate geotechnical instrumentation when the Contractor is responsible for constructing works involving deep excavations and shoring. We recognize the Internal Bracing Specification requires a monitoring program for struts, but is silent on exterior monitoring.</p>		<p>1. All instrumentation shown on the 7/30/10 geotechnical drawings will be procured, installed, and monitored by the TJPA's Representative. The specifications describe monitoring, which is the responsibility of the contractor, e.g., monitoring procedures to check internal bracing performance in Section 31 55 00, and monitoring wells for the dewatering system in Section 31 23 19.</p> <p>2. The TJPA will monitor ground movements inside and outside the excavation using the instruments shown on GT-1301 and 1302. The Contractor will monitor the internal bracing system.</p> <p>3. The TJPA is evaluating the implementation of an automated data collection and management system which uses a web-based portal to assemble data generated by contractor, the TJPA's Representative, and others for examination by relevant parties. In lieu of this, the TJPA's Representative will read the instruments at a frequency dictated by the stage of construction and by the magnitude of movements observed.</p>					
1. What is the Owner's intent in this regard?							
2. Will the TJPA be responsible for the exterior monitoring as implied, and the Contractor be responsible for monitoring the performance of the shoring systems in the Specifications which state "...furnishing, installing, monitoring, reading, recording, maintaining, protecting geotechnical instrumentation." , Or will the TJPA representatives read and monitor for all the geotechnical instrumentation?							
3. If the TJPA representatives read the geotechnical instrumentation, will the TBJPA representatives take the geotechnical instrumentation data readings on a daily basis? If the TJPA representatives are to be responsible for timely reading and reporting on the shoring systems							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2791 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>performance, will the TJPA representatives set up the geotechnical instrumentation to be read via dataloggers with in-situ sensors and cellular modems in the case of the inclinometers and/or similarly in the case of the piezometers and MPBXs? Timely notification of all parties should be required.</p> <p>Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/23/2010</p>							
TG03.00-0104	TG03 Question 0104 - Dewatering	Closed	08/24/2010	08/31/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per the Bid Documents, the Trade Subcontractor for the BSE package is responsible for removing the dewatering system. Is the Trade Subcontractor for the BSE package also responsible for pouring back the void left in the base slab once the dewatering well is removed? We also request confirmation that the waterproofing will be tied into the dewatering well casing by others. Finally, please provide a detail for abandoning the well casing in place.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> TG03 Trade Subcontractor will not be responsible for the pouring back of the void. Waterproofing will be installed by others. Dewatering well casing shall be capped and left in place.			
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010							
TG03.00-0105	TG03 Question 0105 - Utilities	Closed	08/24/2010	08/31/2010	10/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Turner Construction Comꝑ Daphne Faulkner			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Can we get a copy of Site Utilities Trade Packages: Package TG04.7		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please see response TG0300-0287 that supersedes previously posted response TG0300-0104.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2792 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Package TG04.1 Package TG04.3 Package TG04.4 Package TG04.6 Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/24/2010							
TG03.00-0106	TG03 Question 0106 - Hazardous Material	Closed	08/24/2010	08/31/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture	Manuel Saldana	To: Turner Construction Company	Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Exhibit A Please confirm that the "hazardous/High -PH" material that may result from the Perimeter Shoring Diaphragm wall, disposal costs will be included in the Shoring Wall Bid Items and not in the additive Class I and II Soil Disposal Premium. Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/24/2010	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	Confirmed, only the existing hazardous material on site shall be included in the additive Class I and II Soil Disposal Premium.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2793 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0107	TG03 Question 0107 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/24/2010	08/31/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference specification 31 55 00.				The incidental loads shall be identified by Trade Subcontractor's Internal Bracing Designer and included in the internal bracing design			
In Spec Section 31 55 00 on Page 5 Sub-Section 1.5.B.3. it says that we are to include incidental loads defined by the Contractor (Webcor/Ob??). Can you Please define these loads now during the Bidding Process?							
Submitted by Chrales M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/24/2010							
TG03.00-0108	TG03 Question 0108 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/24/2010	08/31/2010	08/27/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference drawing sheet GT-1111, Legend				Refer to response TG0300-0058.			
(TG0300-0058) requested: A. Please help to clarify the strut and waler system stiffness requirements. Our initial interpretation and the associated analyses indicate that strut and waler sizes increase very significantly over what would be required by strength considerations alone. Please provide a sample calculation or procedure for determining stiffness for comparison with the values given in kip per foot, per foot of wall. B. Pre-loading will take out a portion of the axial shortening of the struts. We assume that it is appropriate to subtract out that deflection from the stiffness calculation. Please confirm.							
Q/A Answers received this morning did not address this question, and can have a significant impact on the Contractor's design and potential for competitive underbidding of this project. We request your clarification on a priority basis as this may affect our decision to Bid this project.							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/24/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2794 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0109	TG03 Question 0109 - Utilities	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/27/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Response to question TG003-0044 states "Coordinate with and protect in place New active utilities (PG&E and Verizon) constructed by the private utilities that will be supported by the temporary bridge." Please advise where is the information regarding these new utilities so the Trade Subcontractor can review them prior to bid? How does the Trade Subcontractor obtain this information?					Refer to response TG0300-0105.		
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0110	TG03 Question 0110 - Utilities	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/27/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Response to question TG003-0044 states "Protect in place New active sewers constructed as part of the Relocation of Utilities Project as shown on the plans." Please confirm that the project referenced is TG 04.5.1. As these are the only utility relocation plans available to the Trade Subcontractor, we need confirmation that these are the only drawings that must be reviewed prior to bid. If there are other plans the Trade Subcontractor must review in order to ascertain the impacts of new utility relocations, advise where they can be obtained.					Refer to response TG0300-0105.		
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0111	TG03 Question 0111 - Schedule	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2795 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Reference BSE Concept Schedule.</p> <p>Activity UT-204400, titled "Available: Start Shoring Zone 1" has a start date of 14Jul11. Please explain what this date means. Is the trade subcontractor to understand it cannot begin any zone 1 cdsm work (including pre-trenching) until this date? If so, is the date still accurate. Please clarify.</p> <p>Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010</p>						
TG03.00-0112	TG03 Question 0112 - Schedule	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference BSE Concept Schedule.</p> <p>Activity UT-204500, titled "Available: Start Shoring Zone 2" has a start date of 14Jul11. Please explain what this date means. Is the trade subcontractor to understand it cannot begin any zone 2 cdsm work (including pre-trenching) until this date? If so, is the date still accurate. Please clarify.</p> <p>Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010</p>				<p>The attached schedule is a concept schedule for this particular Trade Package. The Trade Subcontractor shall provide a schedule that accurately represents their work plan in accordance with the contract documents. Work in Zone 1 may commence upon the receipt of NTP #03.</p>			
				<p>The attached schedule is a concept schedule for this particular Trade Package. The Trade Subcontractor shall provide a schedule that accurately represents their work plan in accordance with the contract documents. Work in Zone 2 may commence upon the receipt of NTP #04.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG03.00-0113	TG03 Question 0113 - Schedule	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference BSE Concept Schedule.				The attached schedule is a concept schedule for this particular Trade Package. The Trade Subcontractor shall provide a schedule that accurately represents their work plan in accordance with the contract documents. Work in Zone 2 may commence upon the receipt of NTP #04.			
Activity UT-201800, titled "Available: Start Phase 1 Cross Cross Shoring @ 1st Street". Please explain what this activity represents. What work is the Trade Subcontractor unable to perform before 15Jul11? Is this date still accurate? Please clarify.							
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010							
TG03.00-0114	TG03 Question 0114 - Schedule	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference BSE Concept Schedule.				UT-202400 represents the public utilities relocation required after the installation of the traffic bridge at First Street.			
Activity UT-202400, titled "Franchise Utilities Phase 2 @ 1st". Please explain what specific work this activity represents.							
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010							
TG03.00-0115	TG03 Question 0115 - Schedule	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference BSE Concept Schedule.				The attached schedule is a concept schedule for this particular Trade Package. The Trade Subcontractor shall provide a schedule that accurately represents their work plan in accordance with the contract documents. Work in Zone 1 and 2 may commence			
Activity UT-200600, titled "Available: Start Shoring @ Zone 1 & 2 Minna"has a start date of 15Jul11. Please explain what this date means. Is the trade subcontractorto							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2797 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>understand it cannot begin any zone 1 and 2 cdsm work (including pre-trenching) untilthis date? If so, is the date still accurate? Please clarify.</p> <p>Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010</p>						<p>upon the receipt of NTP #03 and NTP #04 respectively.</p>
TG03.00-0116	TG03 Question 0116 - Schedule	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference BSE Concept Schedule.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Activity UT-200900, titled "Start Shoring @ Zone 1 & 2 Natoma" has a start date of 02JUn11. Please explain what this date means. Is the trade subcontractor to understand it cannot begin any zone 1 and 2 cdsm work (including pre-trenching) until this date? If so, is the date still accurate? Please clarify.				The attached schedule is a concept schedule for this particular Trade Package. The Trade Subcontractor shall provide a schedule that accurately represents their work plan in accordance with the contract documents. Work in Zone 1 and 2 may commence upon the receipt of NTP #03 and NTP #04 respectively.			
Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2798 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0117	TG03 Question 0117 - Schedule	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference BSE Concept Schedule. Activity UT-203720, titled "Available: Start Shoring Zone 4" has a start date of 25Mar11. Please explain what this date means. Is the trade subcontractor to understand it cannot begin any zone 4 cdsm work (including pre-trenching) until this date? If so, is the date still accurate? Please clarify. Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The attached schedule is a concept schedule for this particular Trade Package. The Trade Subcontractor shall provide a schedule that accurately represents their work plan in accordance with the contract documents. Work in Zone 4 may commence upon the receipt of NTP #02.	
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0118	TG03 Question 0118 - Schedule	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference BSE Concept Schedule. Activity UT-201100, titled "Available: Start Shoring @ Zone 3 Natoma" has a start date of 18Mar11. Please explain what this date means. Is the trade subcontractor to understand it cannot begin any zone 3 cdsm work (including pre-trenching) until this date? If so, is the date still accurate? Please clarify. Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The attached schedule is a concept schedule for this particular Trade Package. The Trade Subcontractor shall provide a schedule that accurately represents their work plan in accordance with the contract documents. Work in Zone 3 may commence upon the receipt of NTP #05.	
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0119	TG03 Question 0119 - Shoring Wall	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference drawing sheet GT-1110.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The limits of these cases is shown on GT-1110, "Reference Design Location Plan," with the following	

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Drawing defines four different design cases for temporary shoring design. Please specify limits for each case relative to building column lines. Submitted by Kelly Turner Granite / CJA / NCC Joint Venture 08/24/2010						clarification: the boundary between Case West and Case East occurs at Grid 17 as shown on drawing.
TG03.00-0120	TG03 Question 0120 - Dewatering	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference specification 31 23 19, paragraph 1.1.A. Please refer to our previous inquiry regarding dewatering. (TG0300-0099) The bid form docs show 72 mo for maint. However, the above spec section allows for "transfer of ownership." Our concern for 72 mo has to do with issues related to bond limits/duration; definition of final completion; and retention release. Also, what is the warranty period and when does it commence. Submitted by John Foote Balfour Beatty Infrastructure 08/25/2010	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to response TG0300-0099.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2800 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0121	TG03 Question 0121 - Utilities	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Referene drawing sheet U-2009. Per Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project drawing sheet U-1121 (30 of 172) issued 8-6-10 there are 2 large vaults indicated on the SW corner of Minna and 1st Streets. According to the Demolition and Construction Sequence note 6 ¿after electric services are connected and existing electric ductbank is abandoned by PG&E, demolish as indicated existing electrical ductbank manholes, and contents to the limits shown¿ as well as all other utilities that run North and South on 1st Street between Minna and Natoma. Drawing sheet U-2009 (50 of 172) do not indicate these utilities in the Composite Utility Plan and Elevation. Please confirm as per Transbay Transit Center Program Butress/ Shoring/ Excavation drawing D-2230 detail 1 Remove Utilities that the utilities removal will be complete by the TG03 contract start date. Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/25/2010		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Exhibit I, BSE Concept Schedule.			

TG03.00-0122	TG03 Question 0122 - Logistics	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/25/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Project Bid Manual IV.A.12.a, 27.b, and Site Logistics Exhibit A. These sections reference material/personnel hoists. Is the TG03 Contractor to provide access for the follow on trade subcontracts? Please provide specifications for size, type, and capacity, otherwise hoists will be designed to minimum requirements for this Trade Subcontractor to complete its work. Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/25/2010		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes, the Trade Subcontractor shall provide the access. Refer to Exhibit A. 2. Minimum hoist requirement shall be dual hoists, each with 10,000 lb capacity, approximately 5' x 12' inside dimensions and non hydraulic system. This will be included in an upcoming Addendum.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2801 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0123	TG03 Question 0123 - Internal Bracing	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	09/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference specification 31 55 00.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
In Spec Section 31 55 00 on Page 5 Sub-Section 1.5.B.3. it says that we are to include incidental loads defined by the Contractor (Webcor/Ob??). Can you Please define these loads now during the Bidding Process?				1. Incidental Loads: See response TG0300-0107, posted 8/31/10.			
In Spec Section 31 55 00 on Page 6 Sub-Section 1.5.I. it says that we are to coordinate clearances with the Contractor (Webcor/Ob???). Can you Please define the required clearances now during the Bidding Process?				2. Clearance: Refer to response to TG0300-0005 (posted 8/23/10) for comment on clearances.			
In Spec Section 31 55 00 on page 8 Sub-Section 1.7.D. it says that the Contractor (Webcor/Ob???) shall retain a Special Inspector. Does ¿shall retain¿ mean that the Contractor (Webcor/Ob???) will also pay for the Special Inspector services and their testing(s)?				3. Special Inspector: For Section 31 55 00, Page 8 paragraph 1.7.D - Inspections of temporary works are the responsibility of the Trade Contractor.			
In Spec Section 31 55 00 on page 8 Sub-Section 1.8.B. there is reference made to Section 33 55 00 1.4.B.7.. This Section 33 55 00 does not exist in the documents, but should be a reference to 31 55 00 1.4.B.7., The 33 should be a 31. Can we get this confirmed and changed?				4. Reference to Section 33 55 00 paragraph 1.4.B.7: Yes, confirmed that reference to 33 55 00 should be 31 55 00.			
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/25/2010							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0124	TG03 Question 0124 - Warranties	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference specification 01 17 40.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1) Please confirm that the 2 year warranty for subsurface work applies to this Trade Subcontractor package				1. The warranty requirements in Section 01 17 40 are for the project as a whole and are not specific to an individual package. The warranty items for the BSE package, if any, would be limited to those works in place when the contract is complete.			
2) Request a copy of the Contractor's Builder's Risk insurance so we can review terms and conditions.				2. The Builder's Risk policy will be made available prior to the start of construction. Refer to Section 00			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
3)	Does the California Public Contract Code 7105 (Acts of God) statute apply in this Trade Subcontract?						
4)	Will a Contractors Protective Professional Indemnity policy in the amounts specified in Exhibit A section VI be sufficient evidence of coverage to the Owner? 5) Request the general liability requirements be amended to more customary rated A-VII or higher						
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/25/2010							
08 05, paragraph 1.3.A, in Addendum 2 for the Contractor's requirements.							
3. The Public Contract Code 7105 allows public entities to require Builder's Risk insurance from public works contractors to cover damage to the construction site. The requirements of Section 00 08 05 are for the CM/GC. The insurance requirements for the Trade Subcontractors is defined in the Webcor/Obayashi long form subcontract.							
4. Yes, a Contractor's Protective Professional Indemnity Policy (CPPI) is sufficient evidence of coverage.							
5. See Addendum 2 for the revision to rating.							
TG03.00-0125	TG03 Question 0125 - QBD	Closed	08/25/2010	09/01/2010	08/27/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference Project Bidding Manual 37/44.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please refer to the attached spreadsheet for status of QBD's submitted, corresponding TG Question number and response dates. Currently, there are a number (18) QBD's unanswered that were submitted as of 8/20/10.				Question numbers missing in the sequence either have been answered or are still under review and will be published in future responses.			
Request your review of this list and response to the unanswered QBD's as soon as possible.							
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/25/2010							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0126	TG03 Question 0126 - Shoring Wall	Closed	08/27/2010	09/03/2010	09/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference drawing sheet GT-5102. Section 9/GT-5102 Indicates CLSM Shoring wall placed abutting the existing 301 Mission Wall. 301 Mission Drawings Sheet SH-31 Wall D section indicates a grade beam which may extend south past the wall line. This may interfere with the CLSM Shoring wall installation. Please provide more detail to confirm the coordinates of the existing building at 301 mission and the interface with the new CLSM wall, and confirm that the CLSM wall is sufficient to act as one side of shoring for the existing pile removal program. Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 08/26/2010			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The 301 Mission drawings show the grade beam on the 301 Mission side of the property line and therefore should not interfere with installation of the Transbay Transit Center CDSM shoring wall. Regarding the adequacy of the existing 301 Mission shoring walls to act as one side of shoring for the existing pile removal program, no information regarding the as-built and as-remaining/buried condition of these walls has been provided. These walls should not be needed to retain earth on the 301 Mission side of the wall since the 301 Mission structure is deeper than the depth of excavation required to remove the timber piles. However, the integrity of the existing shoring wall to support itself is unknown.	
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0127	TG03 Question 0127 - Temporary Power	Closed	08/27/2010	09/03/2010	08/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference page 22 of 44, note #17. Project Bid Manual Temp Power Page 22 of 44 note #17; calls out for Temp Power per Site Logistics Plan in exhibit A. This is on sheet SL-003 (see attached) Exhibit A - Scope of Package (general work) Page 6 calls for Temp Power skids to be used for dewatering only Base Bid Item Scope Page 11 #18 Dewatering System calls out for power to be provided per attachment #2 which is the Site Logistics Plan in exhibit A drawing SL-003. In this paragraph it also says that there might be power available for our use in this scope of work. Do we need to provide the 4-skid units as shown on attachment #2 Site Logistics Plan? If so please electrical load and voltage requirements. Documents imply there is an existing temp power system for the dewatering? If so please provide information & how it is to be modified for this project.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Exhibit A, Section IV.B.A.17 Temporary Power. Temporary power may be available by the time of the start of dewatering; however, Trade Subcontractor shall design system such that it can operate in the absence of temporary power.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2804 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0128	TG03 Question 0128 - Temporary Lighting	Closed	08/27/2010	09/03/2010	08/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference page 22 of 44, note #18.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Project Bid Manual Temp Lighting Page 22 of 44 note #18; states that the subcontractor is to provide per code all required temporary lighting.					The cost of temporary lighting shall be included in the base bid. The Trade Subcontractor shall provide all code required temporary lighting. Refer to Exhibit A, Section IV.B.A.18 Temporary Lighting.		
Do we need to provide pricing for this scope of work? If so, please provide site drawings with the layout of the Temp Site lighting with your requirements for this project.							
TG03.00-0129	TG03 Question 0129 - Temporary Lighting	Closed	08/27/2010	09/03/2010	08/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Exhibit A - Scope of Package (General Work page 6 state.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Exhibit A - Scope of Package (general work) Page 6 States 18 Temporary lighting Trade Subcontractor shall be responsible for installing and maintaining temporary lighting at the perimeter traffic/pedestrian barricades, at pedestrian walkways, and as required to provide code-minimum lighting at egress paths, as well as sufficient foot candle lighting levels to safety perform the work at all times, including within the excavation. At a minimum, Trade Subcontractor's lighting plan will include temporary poles at street level. In addition to supporting lighting, temporary poles shall include conduit for security cameras, power at the pole tops for security cameras, and mounting hardware for security cameras. Security cameras will be installed and maintained by others. Temporary lighting work item includes, but is not limited to, installing lighting poles, installing all hardware, switch boxes, breakers, conduits, and pulling strings among temporary power skids/generators/lighting poles and maintenance required for temporary lighting works. Trade Subcontractor's lighting plan will be a submittal requirement for the project.					1. The cost of temporary power and lighting shall be included in the base bid.		
Do we need to provide pricing for this scope of work? If so,					2. Yes, refer to the Documents for existing conditions.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2805 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>are there drawings showing existing conditions and areas that require Temp Lighting, Street Lighting, and Pedestrian & Traffic Signal, size of Generator required, CCTV, and Electric Security requirements.</div>							
TG03.00-0130	TG03 Question 0130 - Temporary Power	Closed	08/27/2010	09/03/2010	08/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Base Bid Items Scope #1.				Bidders shall include the cost of temporary power and lighting in the base bid. Refer to the Documents for the temporary power and lighting requirements.			
Base Bid Item Scope #1 Mobilization refers you to Section 01 15 05 which calls out in Summary of Work #3, to install temporary construction power and wiring. What temp power is this referring to? (Lay-down area, office trailers, etc.)							
Are we to provide pricing for this scope of work? If so, please define the scope of work required in SOW #3.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2806 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0131	TG03 Question 0131 - Temporary Lighting	Closed	08/27/2010	09/03/2010	08/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			Page 14 of Exhibit A refers to Construction Schedule and Milestones. Please clarify question.				
Page 14 - Exhibit A #23 5- 23 Bridge at First Street call for street lighting at pedestrian walkways and hanging/un-hanging of existing utilities Page 13 Exhibit #24 Bridge at First Street call for removal street lighting.							
Do we need to provide temp lighting, or permanent lighting or both?							
Is lighting required on the bridge and on the underside? If so, what are the lighting requirements?							
Does the bridge work referenced here pertain to only the portion of the bridge that crosses over 1st street?							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0132	TG03 Question 0132 - Schedule	Closed	08/27/2010	09/03/2010	08/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			Electronic copy of the BSE Concept Schedule is not available. Please refer to the Div.00 and Div.01 Specifications for requirements of calendars, work weeks, and other restrictions.				
CPM: The concept schedule provided in the Bid Documents does not provide sufficient details for Subcontractors to review risk and workforce requirements. We are requesting you to provide electronic Primavera files for the concept schedule, so we can apply sorts, review calendars, work weeks, restrictions, etc. Cost information can be terminated from these file, as we do not need that information.							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0133	TG03 Question 0133 - Insurance	Closed	08/31/2010	09/07/2010	08/31/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			Exhibit A professional liability requirements govern. Refer to response TG0300-0026 for survey liability requirements.				
Reference specification 00 08 05 and Exhibit A IV.2.A.							
Professional Liability Insurance limits cahnged to \$2,000,000 each occurrence in addendum #2 in spec							





Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2808 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference specification 01 13 50 and 31 00 00.

Specification Section 01 13 50 requires management of existing soils consistent with the Contract Documents. Specification 31 00 00 1.3.J states the Testing Agency is an, "Independent testing and inspection organization complying with ASTM E32 and employed by the TJPA to perform verification and testing." Please confirm that TJPA will perform testing and will pay the cost for analytical testing associated with soil characterization of Class I and Class II material if required by the appropriate disposal facilities.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Confirmed. Please note that Section 01 13 50 should be read in tandem with 01 13 50/APA, Site Mitigation Plan.

TG03.00-0137	TG03 Question 0137 - Unforeseen Or Differing Conditions	Closed	08/31/2010	09/07/2010	09/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture	Manuel Saldana	To: Turner Construction Company	Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland			

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference specification 00 03 20-1, 1.5A.

"Refer to section 00 08 11 Unforeseen or Differing Conditions, for the differing site conditions." This section is not included Please provide.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

The section entitled "Unforeseen or Differing Conditions" is found in Section 00 07 00.3.05.

TG03.00-0138	TG03 Question 0138 - Schedule	Closed	08/31/2010	09/07/2010	09/09/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture	Manuel Saldana	To: Turner Construction Company	Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference Exhibit A (NTPs).

There are no set dates for NTP's 6-10 and they are contingent on follow on Trade Subcontractor schedules. All of the excavation is required to be completed in 2014. Are NTP's 6-10 going to be issued in a timely manner to ensure the subcontractor is not waiting idle?

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

The concept schedule includes the construction plan per the most current construction documents. The concept schedule indicates an approximate start and duration for bracing removal.

Refer to response TG0300-0150.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2809 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0139	TG03 Question 0139 - Access Trestle	Closed	09/01/2010	09/08/2010	09/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
REQUEST: Reference Attachment 3. Please confirm that all horizontal members of the access trestle must be above the ground floor slab at all locations.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to "Level of the Access Trestle" in Exhibit A, Attachment 3. Refer to Section IV. C., Base Scope Item 21. Access trestle shall not interfere with the permanent structure.		
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0140	TG03 Question 0140 - Business Tax Registration	Closed	09/01/2010	09/08/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
REQUEST: Reference is made to Part III. Instruction to Bidders, Subparagraph D., Bidding Process and Procedures, Item 6. Statutory Bidding Requirements, Subitem b) Tax Registration that was changed per Addendum No. 2 and states "Bidder shall list its current contractor license number on the Business Tax Registration Declaration (Section 00 04 54) its San Francisco business tax registration certificate number, as well as the current contractor license number and San Francisco business tax registration certificate number for each Subcontractor listed on the Subcontract list". This form was not changed per Addendum No. 2 and does not contain spaces for us to include this information. Is this form going to be revised or are we just to type this information anywhere on the form?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Current Contractor license and Business Tax Certificate is not required on the Business Tax Registration Declaration. This will be addressed in Addendum 3.		
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0141	TG03 Question 0141 - Bid Forms	Closed	09/01/2010	09/08/2010	09/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
REQUEST: Reference is made to the various forms that were revised per Addendum No. 2 (i.e. Acknowledgment of Receipt and Review - Project Bidding Manual; Bid Form and Schedule of Bid Prices; Bidding Checklist (BCL); Bid Bond Form; etc). All these form now have "FINAL FOR ADDENDUM" stamped across them. Is it your intent that we submit			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The bidder shall submit the most recent version of the forms, whether the forms are in the original bid documents or an Addendum.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2810 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
these forms as is or are you going to be providing us with a separate Bid Package of these forms without this reference stamped across them?							
TG03.00-0142	TG03 Question 0142 - Schedule	Closed	09/01/2010	09/08/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Owner response to question TG0300-0080 is incomplete. The BSE concept schedule does not contain any information concerning the removal of the access trestle nor the temporary streets. Further, the concept schedule provided shows no work activities beyond the construction of the lower concourse walls. Please provide specific information regarding the expected dates for these NTP's so the bidders can estimate the total costs for performing this work.				Refer to response TG0300-0150.			
TG03.00-0143	TG03 Question 0143 - Long Form Subcontract	Closed	09/01/2010	09/08/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Exhibit B "Long Form Subcontract". Some of the terms and conditions that were provided in the Long Form Subcontract to be utilized as the written agreement between Webcor/Obayashi and the low bid Subcontractor are overly burdensome, unacceptable and potentially not in conformance with statues and regulations. Please confirm that mutually agreeable terms can be negotiated with Obayashi/Webcor prior to the bid date for the Project.				Refer to response TG0300-0150.			
If the terms and conditions for the Subcontract are not negotiable, then we regret to inform you that we will not be able to supply a bid for this Project.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2811 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
TG03.00-0144	TG03 Question 0144 - CDSM	Closed	09/01/2010	09/08/2010	09/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The CDSM wall requires no vertical interruptions in its drilling path, the utilities will have to wait until a portion of the CDSM wall is complete. Once a portion of CDSM wall is complete then relocation may happen and the utilities will have to be cored through the CDSM wall. Why is the owner relocating the utilities prior; and just not wait until a portion of CDSM is in before locating?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the current utility drawings for sequence. Utility relocation is sequenced such that utility service will remain uninterrupted during shoring wall installation. Refer to Addendum 3 for these reference documents.		
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0145	TG03 Question 0145 - Schedule	Closed	09/01/2010	09/08/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Zone 2 NTP within 235 cd of NTP 1 Finish within 570 cd ----- From NTP1 805 cd Zone 3 NTP within 265 cd of NTP 1 Finish within 535 cd ----- From NTP1 800 cd Is requirement to have zone 3 completed prior to zone 2 the owners true intent?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> It is the intent to have both zones complete at the same time or, as per the schedule in Exhibit A, within 5 calendar days of each other.		
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0146	TG03 Question 0146 - Utilities	Closed	09/02/2010	09/09/2010	09/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference specification 02 41 01, 3.3.C.1. 1. referenced Specifications states, "...Contractor shall remove and dispose of as the Contractor's property the			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The utility relocation drawings posted on the TJPA ftp site identify the AWSS lines that will be abandoned in the cross streets (First Street and Beale Street). The AWSS pipes come in 12 ft. lengths. The abatement		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2812 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>San Francisco Fire Dept's (SSFD) Auxillary Water Supply System (AWSS) High Pressure Piping in accordance with (AWSS) standard plans and specifications..."</p> <p>Please identify which lines are the AWSS lines and if any abatement procedures will be required.</p> <p>2 Please confirm the existing 16" HPG line indicated on Survey drawing sht. 4 of 10 will be relocated and/or abandoned prior to construction.</p>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2813 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0148	TG03 Question 0148 - 301 Mission Wall	Closed	09/02/2010	09/09/2010	09/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference 301 Mission St. Drawings, drawing sheet GT-5102.					The 301 Mission drawings show the grade beam on the 301 Mission side of the property line and therefore should not interfere with installation of the Transbay Transit Center CDSM shoring wall.		
The Temporary Shoring and Earth Retention Drawings for 301 Mission St. show a grade beam on K line in Section 1 Drwg. SH-32 under the screening wall that is to be relocated by others, it appears that this grade beam carries through the parking structure as shown in Section 2 Drwg. SH-31 and Section 9 Drwg. GT-5102 of these bid documents. Please confirm this grade beam will be demolished prior to CDSM Shoring wall obstruction removal and Geotechnical Monitoring Instrumentation.					GT-5000 is consistent with D-5103 regarding the amount of crushed concrete backfill at the start of the contract.		
In Transbay Demolition Plans, drawing # D1060, and D1076, show the backfill material fill to first floor elevation in the area adjacent to 301 Mission Building. In BSE Plans, drawing # GT5000 shows the backfill material fill to about basement slab elevation. Please confirm which one is correct?							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0149	TG03 Question 0149 - Geotechnical Report	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference plan sheet GT-5100, notes 11 and 12.					Refer to Section 00 03 20, Geotechnical Data, for the procedure to obtain the report.		
On sheet D-5100 of the plans notes 11 and 12 reference "draft report results of the prototype test program installation of shoring walls using the cement deep soil mixing method" and "prototype test program and monitoring during construction of drilled shafts." How can I obtain these reports? Are they available online? Please send response to (e-mail address). Thank You.							
Submitted by Jesse Johnson Becho Inc 09/02/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2814 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0151	TG03 Question 0151 - Demolition	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/09/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Drawings D-2210, D-2211, D-2212 and D-2213 are showing to remove existing pile caps and piles. But there are no details regarding which ones are timber and which ones are concrete. Please clarify. Submitted by Aparna Alla Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/02/2010		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> For information on existing pile caps and piles, refer to Existing Terminal and Ramps original construction drawings: San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge Railway Facilities. State of California Department of Public Works, March 1937 and February 1939. See Section 00 03 31, paragraphs 1.2.D.1 and D.8. Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)				

TG03.00-0152	TG03 Question 0152 - Demolition	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Gerry MacClelland	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference documents for the (E) 80 Natoma Piles and Shoring wall don't match. Document #3 - 80 Natoma Installed Piles and Document #5 - 80 Natoma Foundation and Structure Plans show a difference of over 400 installed piles. Please confirm which document shows the correct number of installed piles for the (E) 80 Natoma structure. Submitted by Aparna Alla Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/02/2010		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Based on the information provided by the documents listed in Section 00 03 31, paragraphs 1.2.A.3. & 1.2.A.4, it appears that 1.2.A.2 represents the 'as-built' condition of piling at 80 Natoma, and 1.2.A.4 represents the design drawings prepared by the design engineer. Since the project was terminated before its completion, it is likely that not all the design requirements are installed. As noted in paragraph 1.3 of this section, these reference documents are available for information only. The TJPA does not warrant the completeness of the reference documents, nor does it make any representation, either express or implied, that the conditions indicated in the drawings or records are representative of those existing at the Site, or that different conditions may not occur or materials other than or in proportions different from those indicated may not be encountered. See also response to bidders' question TG0300-0101 in response set #3.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2815 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0153	TG03 Question 0153 - Pile Removal	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Drawing GT-2202 says that the existing piles in the buttress area have to be removed and it refers to Drawing GT-5301 for schematic diagrams of pile removal methods.				Refer to Section 02 41 19, paragraphs 3.1 B and C. There are locations noted on the drawings where Non-Ground Deformation Control Methods may be used, for example, on sheet GT-2103, along wall segment 35-1.			
Please clarify that only the piles in the buttress area have to be removed by one of the methods specified in GT-5301 and all the other piles can be removed during excavation as specified in Stage 4 of Drawing GT-5000.							
Submitted by Aparna Alla Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV 09/02/2010							
TG03.00-0154	TG03 Question 0154 - Buttress	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Installation sequence Notes 6 & 7 in Drawing GT-2201 states that Primary Shafts C/4, C/6, C/8 and Secondary Shafts C/5 and C/7 shall be filled with concrete from bottom of shaft to ground surface (elevation +17.00 +/- 2.00) which contradicts with the detail 1 on GT-5201 and Detail 16 on GT-5202. Details on GT-5201 and GT-5202 show that the shafts get filled with concrete to subgrade elevation(i.e.,bottom of excavation -45.00 +/- 2.00) Please clarify the top elevation of concrete in shafts.				There is no contradiction. Shafts C/4 thru C/8 are to be filled as noted in notes 6 & 7 on GT-2201; all other shafts are to be filled as noted on GT-5201.			
Submitted by Aparna Alla Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/02/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2816 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0155	TG03 Question 0155 - Buttress	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Drawing GT-0000 and GT-2201 say that Secondary Shafts gets filled with Type "A" (6000 psi) concrete and Primary Shafts gets filled with Type "B" (2000 psi) Concrete.				GT-0000 and GT-2201 are correct. The legend on GT-5201 will be corrected in an addendum.			
The legend for Primary and Secondary Shafts on GT-5201 contradicts with the above detail.							
Please clarify.							
Submitted by Aparna Alla Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/02/2010							
TG03.00-0156	TG03 Question 0156 - Buttress	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Drawing GT-5201 and GT-5202 shows that the shafts gets extended to Working Platform. If so, the shaft above the subgrade elevation shows it getting filled with 300 PSI CLSM, but per drawing GT-2201 it calls for Type "A" in the primary shafts and Type "B" in the secondary shafts up to ground surface?				As shown on the drawings, Type "A" and "B" concrete are placed to the elevation noted on GT-5201 with the exception of Primary Shafts C/4, C/6, and C/8 and Secondary Shafts C/5 and C/7, as noted on GT-2201, "Installation Sequence Notes."			
Please clarify.							
Submitted by Aparna Alla Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/02/2010							
TG03.00-0157	TG03 Question 0157 - Shoring Wall	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
On dwgs GT-2101, 2102, 2103 calls for sectional details for CDSM wall which gives the details about pre-trenching. As per the Specification 31 56 13, the contractor shall				Pre-trenching is required along the entire alignment of the shoring walls and the cut-off walls. The sections on sheets GT-5103 thru GT-5105 are taken at			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2817 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i><u>Number</u></i>	<i><u>Subject</u></i>	<i><u>Status</u></i>	<i><u>Date Created</u></i>	<i><u>Date Required</u></i>	<i><u>Date Answered</u></i>	<i><u>Cost Impact</u></i>	<i><u>Proceed</u></i>
	<p>construct a trench along the entire alignment of the shoring wall& cut-off walls. But for walls X2-1, J/12.3 -13, A/19-25, A/25-26, A/26-30, A/30-33.5, A/33.5-35, J/25-27, J/33.5-35, 35-1&cut-off walls do not have any pre-trenching details shown. Can the contractor assume that the walls with no pre-trenching details do not require any pre-trenching?</p> <p>Submitted by Aparna Alla Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/02/2010</p>						
TG03.00-0158	TG03 Question 0158 - Specific Project Requirements	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Specification section 00 08 13 1.6 B states that the Contractor shall comply with Ordinance #175 91, Article 21 of the SF Municipal Code restricting the use of potable water for soil compaction and dust control activities. Does this specification also apply to water being used for drilled shaft excavation?				The restriction is limited as defined in the code. The contractor is allowed to obtain water from SFPUC for use in the drilled shaft work.			
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 09/02/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2818 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0159	TG03 Question 0159 - Temporary Bridge	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
<p>Schedule A on S1-3201 identifies top of structure elevations. When these elevations are cross referenced against the elevations of the cross streets the temporary bridges that tie into it will be several feet above grade, unless there is a provision for a concrete "leave out" Drawing A 5206 shows First Street Elevation at 14.94. The top of structure at this zone is from 12.79' to 13.47', this allows less than 2' for the temporary bridge installation. Depending on the final Temp. bridge design and clearance necessary to construct box structure below the bridge deck may be as much as 6' above the city street. Is it the owners intent to ramp up on the city street to the temp bridge elevation? If so what is the max grade allowed for the approach ramp?</p> <p>Also, please comment on the intent for side sloping, access for business, support of fill, etc. This condition applies to Beale street as well.</p> <p>Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 09/02/2010</p>					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			<p>S1-3201 shows general top of structural elevations at the Ground Floor Slab. The schedule is not intended to show all top of structual elevations.</p> <p>Utility corridors are to be provided at the cross streets of Beale, Fremont, and First. Where required, the temporary bridges are provided over the area of the utility corridors, which are lower than the adjacent slabs. See architectural drawings A1-6000, A1-6118, and A1-6231 provided for reference.</p> <p>Note that drawing A-5206 referred to in the information request was not included in the BSE package.</p> <p>The temporary bridges will be set to tie into existing street grades without significant changes in elevation. This approach will avoid the need for side sloping, or other grading for access.</p>				
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0160	TG03 Question 0160 - Schedule	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
<p>Response to TG0300-0080 indicates , "Refer to Exhibit I - BSE Concept Schedule" BSE Concept schedule zones conclude with "Verticl Walls (2nd Lift) to Ground Level" with it's successor being "(Finish) Below Grade Structure Zone 'X'"</p> <p>Is it the Concept for this activity to include the Top Deck of the Below Grade Structure? Do the removal activities described in NTP #7-10 commence after completion of the Finish Below Grade Structure activities?</p> <p>Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 09/02/2010</p>					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Refer to response TG0300-0150.				



There is no conflict; 24-ft. (min.) of clear unobstructed access by operation of gates is required by specification.

The elevation of the top strut shall be no lower than the following elevations (NAVD88): at Case West +11.00 (install) and +8.00 (removal); at Case East +6.00 (install) and +3.00 (removal); at 301 Mission Buttress Case and 301 Mission Podium Case +4.00 (install) and +1.00 (removal). This information will be included in an Addendum.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2821 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>J/25-27 +15.0 +4 =11' that exceeds 10'</p> <p>Does the note on Stage 2 on Drawing GT-1111 infer that the Owners Design of the CDSM wall can take the "Over Cantilever" because we can dig to a specific Elevation of +8 west of Grid Line 17 and to Elevation + 7 east of Grid Line 17? Or does the Owners Design need to be Revised to add an additional Strut/Waler Level to the Owners Wall Design? Can we get a clarification on the 10' max shown on Drawing GT-1111 and the west end walls? Can we use 14', 13', 12', 11' cantilever to the first strut level elevation shown at +11, +6, and +4 vs the 10' max shown on GT-1111 Drawings?</p> <p>Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure 09/03/2010</p>						
TG03.00-0165	TG03 Question 0165 - Excavation	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Earthwork 31.00.00, 3.19.B.2 which states "Protect newly excavated areas from traffic and erosion...Barricades shall be installed at the tops of the sloped embankments to prevent vehicles and storage loads within seven feet of the tops of the slopes."</p> <p>a. Does this specification apply to the top edge of the vertical face main excavation? (i.e. perimeter shoring wall)</p> <p>b. If seven foot distance is required (at the top edge of the main excavation), then can it be assumed to start at the inside face of CDSM wall and stop at the outside toe of barrier? If not, then please define start and stop of the seven foot distance.</p> <p>c. CDSM wall and excavation occurring on Minna and Natoma streets exist in close proximity to numerous private garages, driveways, and pedestrian entryways. With a further 7 ft setback restriction, this will virtually take</p>				<p>The sentence, "Barricades shall be installed at the tops of the sloped embankments to prevent vehicles and storage loads within seven feet of the tops of the slopes" in Section 31 00 00, paragraph 3.19.B.2, will be replaced with, "Protection of sloped faces within the area being excavated is the responsibility of the Contractor." This change will be included in an upcoming addendum.</p>			

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the remaing portion of Minna and Natoma street, relegating any traffic along these alleys to existing sidewalks. A specific example would be on Natoma between column lines 14 to 17. Is it the Owner's intent to maintain these setbacks and demolish the existing sidewalks and planter areas by pushing vehicular access closer to the buildings?</p> <p>Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 09/03/2010</p>						
TG03.00-0166	TG03 Question 0166 - Geotechnical	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>		<p>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</p>					
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please provide the design Factor of Safety for skin friction values noted on sheet GT¿1112 or provide a similar chart for east and west cases that show ALLOWABLE SKIN FRICTIONS for embedded columns or pin piles.</p> <p>Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 09/03/2010</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The skin friction values shown are those which are mobilized by an infinitely stiff pile after 1/2" vertical displacement. The designer of the internal bracing system shall determine the factor of safety appropriate to their design.</p>					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
TG03.00-0167	TG03 Question 0167 - Hazardous Material	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference specifications 00 03 35 and 00 07 00. Research shows that Asbestos is very probable in mortar use before 1975. Abandoned brick sewer lines may have lining and mortar which could contain asbestos. Please confirm any materials found to contain Asbestos in this instance will be handled under section 00 07 00 3.05 of the specifications.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 09/03/2010					Section 00 07 00 article 3.05 is clearly written. Also reference Section 01 13 50.		
TG03.00-0168	TG03 Question 0168 - Demolition	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Specification section 02 41 19 1.4.E requires a submittal of existing timber pile documentation of existing timber piles by, "Survey indicating position and top elevation of existing timber piles and other materials to be demolished and removed."					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Could you clarify the intent and purpose of this requirement, and what "other materials" are?					The position and top elevation of the existing timber piles are needed to assist in the monitoring of the ground movements during pile removal. This survey is required only for the piles specified to be removed on sheet GT-2202. The specification will be revised to clarify this in an addendum. The text "and other materials to be demolished and removed" will be deleted in an addendum.		
Submitted by Charles M. Gardner Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. 09/03/2010							
TG03.00-0169	TG03 Question 0169 - Demolition	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference reference documents 80 Natoma St., Installed Piles.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
In the reference document, only a select number of piles					Reference documents listed in Section 00 03 31 are provided as the basis for the conditions at the site to be encountered. With regard to the bidder's question to this specific reference (00 03 31, paragraph 1.2.A3,		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2824 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>show Pile Top and Pile Tip Elevations in Table 1 (these piles are highlighted in yellow on the drawing). For the piles where no information is given, please provide pile lengths, pile top elevations and pile tip elevations.</p> <p>Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010</p>						
	<p>Table 1, prepared by T&R and pile layout/numbering sketch prepared by American Pile Driving), Table 1 lists known existing piles and where entries (e.g., date installed, pile length, approx. pile top and approx. pile tip) are absent, bidders may assume piles have not been driven. Where undocumented obstructions and/or interferences are found, see contract provisions for changed site conditions.</p> <p>Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)</p>						
TG03.00-0170	Can tiebacks be used for temporary bracing at the transverse end walls (Lines 1 ar Closed		09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner					Answered By:	Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Can tiebacks be used for temporary bracing at the transverse end walls (Lines 1 and 35)? If so, please indicate any requirements or limitations associated with their use.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010					Use of tiebacks in walls adjacent to grid line 1 and 35 is not acceptable due to the complexity of the site conditions, which include adjacent properties and an existing shoring wall, and the quality of the soils.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2825 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0171	TG03 Question 0171 - Internal Bracing	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/17/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: As noted in Question TG0300-0058, preloading the struts will increase the effective stiffness of the bracing system (particularly by pre-compressing the struts). (1) Can this factor be considered when evaluating the average stiffness tributary to a given strut per the note in the lower right-hand corner of GT-1111? (2) Can preload values higher than those specified in Tables 1 through 4 on GT-1110 be used to increase the effective stiffness of the bracing system? Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> We do not believe that preloading increases the effective stiffness of the struts. The struts will expand and contract due to temperature variations and this could be interpreted as changing the effective stiffness, but we do not believe it is feasible to control the temperature at the time of installation and pre-loading to account for this when selecting the member sizes.	
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0172	TG03 Question 0172 - Schedule	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/09/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Exhibit A, Section V. In reference to the concept schedule (Exhibit I), it is stated that although the schedule activities should not be assumed to be a complete or binding work plan . . . it is mandatory that each Completion Date be met so as not to impact follow-on Trade Subcontractors or the Critical Path of the Project. Are the Excavation Finish Dates for each of the Zones the mandatory Completion Dates referred to above? Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the durations indicated in the milestones for NTP 2-5 are mandatory.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2826 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG03.00-0173	TG03 Question 0173 - Demolition	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/27/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Alfred Lau	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Exhibit A, Section IV.C.14 (p. 10).				Note 10 on D-0001 (and similar notes on others drawing sheets) requires Contractor to provide means for temporary ground support as required and as necessary to protect adjacent ground when excavation demands such protection. One example of this requirement is the pre-trenching activities prior to installing CDSM wall as required per note 11 on GT 2101 (and similar notes on other sheets). The temporary shoring walls installed for excavation by this Work will need to be removed by this trade contract as part of underground structure demolition and clearing per the same note 10 on D-0001.			
Exhibit A states: ¿Existing temporary shoring wall installed by Existing Terminal and Ramps Demolition Contractor at the eastside of Fremont Street shall be removed and disposed in accordance with the Contract Documents.¿							
However, the Terminal Demolition Plans include notes stating that ¿. . . Contractor to furnish and install shoring and bracing as necessary to ensure no adverse impacts to adjacent roadways and building.¿ These notes seem to apply to the entire perimeter of the existing building and not just to the eastside of Fremont St.							
Please clarify if the TG03 Contract includes removal of the previously installed shoring and bracing along the eastside of Fremont Street only, or also around the entire perimeter of the existing terminal structure.							
Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010							
TG03.00-0174	TG03 Question 0174 - Shoring Wall	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Will it be permissible to shed bracing loads from the transverse end walls (near Lines 1 and 35) into the longitudinal CDSM walls (Lines A and J)? If this is acceptable, please indicate if there are any limitations or restrictions on the design assumptions regarding the amount of load that can be shed over a given length of wall.		Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010		Diagonal bracing at the corners of the excavation is acceptable. See Note 11 on GT-1111.			
TG03.00-0175	TG03 Question 0175 - Shoring Wall	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/17/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2827 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The response to previous question TG0300-0054 states that the rebracing loads can be determined based on the information provided on GT-1110. Please identify the specific information on GT-1110 that is to be used to determine these loads. We note that the computation of these loads will depend upon the assumed degree of CDSM wall fixity at the base slab, the assumed distribution of seismic loads, as well as, other inherent assumptions. The CDSM wall analysis and design computations (which we assume must have included an analysis of the bracing removal/rebracing stages) have not been made available to the bidders so it is not possible to ascertain the basic loading and support conditions assumed by the CDSM wall designer for the bracing removal/rebracing conditions. We recommend that the static and seismic components of the rebracing design loads be provided so that all bidders are designing the rebracing for bracing demands that are consistent with the CDSM wall designer's computations. Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Our staged analysis of the build-out case indicates that the total compressive force due to soil pressure does not change from that obtained from our analysis of the excavation case. This is compatible with the need to control ground movements during the build-out stages. The soil loads on the temporary re-bracing struts and the permanent structural elements used for propping the shoring wall can be determined by tributary area using the pressure diagrams on GT-1110.				
TG03.00-0176	TG03 Question 0176 - Below Grade Structure	Closed	09/09/2010	09/09/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Michael Constable		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Will it be permissible to incorporate additional reinforcing steel in the permanent structure concrete walls so that a portion of the wall can act as a wale to spread loads to the rebracing rakers/struts? Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Shoring Contractor may propose a waler design that would allow the concrete wall to act as a waler. Contractor-proposed design shall include calculations and supporting design data. All aspects of the design shall comply with requirements in the Contract Documents and the design intent of the building systems not fully designed at this point. Note the maximum spacing of rebracing elements is to be modified in Addendum 3.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0177	TG03 Question 0177 - Internal Bracing	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference drawing sheet GT-2101.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Regarding previous question TG0300-0084, part 1 which was unanswered: At what stage of excavation in Zone 1 will wall X1-1 be removed?				It is anticipated that the shoring line adjustment will occur prior to the start of installation.			
Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010							
TG03.00-0178	TG03 Question 0178 - Micropile	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference drawing sheet S1-3003.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Detail 1 indicates that the micropile design shall be by the Contractor, or in this case, by the micropile subcontractor.				(1) Yes. (2) Yes.			
(1) Is the micropile subcontractor responsible for designing the micropile anchorage in the concrete base slab?							
(2) Is the micropile subcontractor responsible for furnishing and installing micropile anchorage reinforcing steel?							
Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010							
TG03.00-0179	TG03 Question 0179 - Shoring Wall	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
CDSM wall layout sheet GT-2101 shows Wall Segment X2-1 on the south side of the building between grid lines				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
				This will be revised in an addendum.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2829 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
	11 and 13. The CDSM Shoring Wall Schedule (16/GT-5101) does not list this wall segment. Please clarify.							
	Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010							
TG03.00-0180	TG03 Question 0180 - Buy America	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	10/21/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From:	Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture	To:	Turner Construction Company	Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:			Transbay Joint Powers Au Sara Gigliotti
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:	Reference specification 00 08 13/APA, paragraph 17.	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Please clarify the following questions regarding the Buy America requirements as they relate to the SBE Trade Subcontract:			1. Temporary construction materials that will be removed from the project, such as steel used in the bracing, trestle and cross street bridge, are not subject to Buy America.				
	(1) Can manufactured steel products such as wide flange sections, pipes, H piles, plate, etc. used in the SBE Trade Subcontract for temporary bracing, trestle and temporary cross street bridge construction be manufactured by foreign sources?			2. Shoring materials that will be abandoned in place are subject to Buy America. However, secondhand steel that the Trade Subcontractor has on hand may be used if it is provided at no cost by the Trade Subcontractor.				
	(2) Can the W sections used in CDSM shoring wall be manufactured by foreign sources?							
	Submitted by Rich Zito Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2830 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG03.00-0181	TG03 Question 0181 - Internal Bracing	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/21/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Sheet GT-1110 shows numerical values for horizontal strut loads. GT-1110 also shows a design profile. Are we to use the numerical values shown or are we to calculate loads based upon the design profile?				The "Design Profile" earth pressure was obtained by fitting a trapezoidal diagram to the strut loads obtained by analysis. Therefore, the results obtained using tributary areas from the "Design Profile" will vary slightly from the strut loads presented in tables 1 thru 4. Tables 1 thru 4 shall be used for strut loads. For seismic increment strut loads, refer to tables 5 thru 8.			
Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010							
TG03.00-0182	TG03 Question 0182 - Demolition	Closed	09/07/2010	09/13/2010	09/14/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Demolition Drawing D-2213 is showing ro remove (E) Fremont Street temporary shoring wall and note 9 on the same drawing says that As - Built information for type and location of temporary shoring wall will be available on or about the first quarter of 2011.				For bidding purposes, bidder may assume the temporary Fremont St. shoring wall is a conventional interlocking sheet pile shoring system. Bidder may assume a wall length of 195 feet, a retaining height of 20 feet, and an embedment depth of 50 feet for a total driven sheet length of 70 feet.			
Please provide some information (Sheet piles? Dimensions?) regarding this temporary shoring wall for bidding purpose.				Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)			
Submitted by Aparna Alla Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST) 09/07/2010							
TG03.00-0183	TG03 Question 0183 - Geotechnical	Closed	09/08/2010	09/14/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</div><div>Manuel Saldana</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please provide the "Geotechnical Recommendation Report" referenced in paragraph 6.1.2.2--Subsurface Conditions of the Final Geo-technical Data Report				The sentence is a typo. There is no report titled "Geotechnical Recommendation Report." The Final Geotechnical Data Report includes a description of stratigraphy and information on the characterization of the major soil strata.			
Submitted by Greg Overhage Shimmick / Skanska / Traylor JV (SST)							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2831 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
09/07/2010							
TG03.00-0184	TG03 Question 0184 - Shoring Wall	Closed	09/09/2010	09/15/2010	09/09/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
GT-5102 & GT-5105		Answered by George Metzger, 9/9/10	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Drawings from GT-5102 to 5105 shows CDSM wall sections with pre-trenching details. As per the scale on these drawings, the pre-trench depth varies from 12' to 25'.		Refer to Section 31 56 13, article 3.2 A: "The depth and width of the trench shall be that required to remove the obstructions from the path of the shoring wall."	Answered by George Metzger, 9/9/10				
Please confirm.			Refer to Section 31 56 13, article 3.2 A: "The depth and width of the trench shall be that required to remove the obstructions from the path of the shoring wall."				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2832 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0185	TG03 Question 0185 - Hazardous Material	Closed	09/09/2010	09/15/2010	09/14/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: 1. As per the Site Mitigation plan by Treadwell & Rollo, the extent of hazardous of material information is available for the proposed project location except in the CDSM wall segment X1-1 & R2-1 areas. Please provide the related hazardous material information for the above mentioned areas.			SUGGESTION: Answered by Gerry MacClelland, 9/14/10 At the time the Site Mitigation Plan was drafted there was uncertainty concerning the perimeter of the shoring wall, so a conservative boundary was used which did not cross south of Natoma St. Information on the soil contamination in the area of wall segment X1-1 and R2-1 can be found in the following reference documents: Soil Investigations of 546 Howard and 75 Natoma, ERM West, January 2009 Site Investigation Report, San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge West Approach Project Including Transbay Terminal Loop. California: Professional Service Industries, Inc., 1999. (see pg. 43) See Section 00 03 35 for references to these documents.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> At the time the Site Mitigation Plan was drafted there was uncertainty concerning the perimeter of the shoring wall, so a conservative boundary was used which did not cross south of Natoma St. Information on the soil contamination in the area of wall segment X1-1 and R2-1 can be found in the following reference documents: Soil Investigations of 546 Howard and 75 Natoma, ERM West, January 2009 Site Investigation Report, San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge West Approach Project Including Transbay Terminal Loop. California: Professional Service Industries, Inc., 1999. (see pg. 43) See Section 00 03 35 for references to these documents.		
TG03.00-0186	TG03 Question 0186 - Traffic Routing	Closed	09/09/2010	09/15/2010	09/14/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The traffic lane requirements as per the specification 01 15 70 says that contractor needs to maintain 3 lanes of 11' at all the times on the First Street from Mission to Folsom and also at the intersection of Fremont and Natoma. With the above restrictions, safe operations for CDSM walls by using big equipment may not be obtained. Is it allowable for contractor to perform the work with half the street closed?			SUGGESTION: Answered by Gerry MacClelland, 9/14/10 Base your bid on maintaining the requirement of 3 lanes of 11 feet each, per the specification.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Base your bid on maintaining the requirement of 3 lanes of 11 feet each, per the specification.		
TG03.00-0187	TG03 Question 0187 - Shoring Wall Traffic Routing	Closed	09/09/2010	09/15/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG03.00-0192	TG03 Question 0192 - Buttriss	Closed	09/09/2010	09/15/2010	09/14/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
REQUEST: Reference drawing sheet GT-5202. This plan calls out "(4) 4 in. diameter PVC or steel pipe sleeves...tied to the reinforcement steel cage" We assume that these are the access tubes for the required Cross Hole Sonic Logging Test. Usual access tube size is only 2 inches in diameter. Please confirm that you specifically require 4 in. or that regular 2 inches in diameter access tubes (PVC or steel) can be used instead. Question B: Can reinforcement spiral be replaced by regular ring hoops?			SUGGESTION: Answered by: George Metzger, 9/14/10 The four 4-inch-diameter pipes shown on the plans are required. Regarding Question B, #7 circular hoops at 6" o.c. with couplers or welded splices are acceptable in lieu of spiral reinforcement.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Answered by: George Metzger, 9/14/10 The four 4-inch-diameter pipes shown on the plans are required. Regarding Question B, #7 circular hoops at 6" o.c. with couplers or welded splices are acceptable in lieu of spiral reinforcement.	
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0193	TG03 Question 0193 - Site Maintenance	Closed	09/13/2010	09/19/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso				
REQUEST: Reference Project Bidding Manual, page 34 paragraph 6. The Project Bidding Manual states: "Trade Subcontractor shall include in the Bid two man-hours of cleanup for every forty man-hours of work. This Labor, provided by Trade Subcontractor, will be used as part of a Composite Project efforts to maintain a clean work area. The actual clean-up hours used versus the number of hours owed (tracked through certified payroll) will be reconciled. Contractor has option to deduct this from Trade Subcontractor's scope of Work incrementally or in its entirety and execute the Composite Project clean-up." Is this necessary for the entire TG03 package or just the portion that we are coordinating trestle removal? And/or re-shoring?			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Answered by W/O Doc Control, 9/13/10 This requirement applies to the entire scope of work.	
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0194	TG03 Question 0194 - Temporary Power	Closed	09/13/2010	09/19/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso				



Co-Author:		
REQUEST: Exhibit A.V Construction Schedule and Milestones: 1) NTP #03, #04, and #05 are indicated to be issued , "no later than" 175, 235, and 265 calander days (respectively) for each of Zones 1,2, and 3. What is the "no earlier than" dates for these milestones? Theoretically TJPA could issue NTP #03-#05 immediately after NTP#02 which would stack the work. Request earliest start date to realistically plan our work. 2) What are the durations of Milestones NTP#06 through #7? 3) How are Milestones NTP #06 through #10 tied to the critical path?	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Answered by W/O Doc Control, 9/15/10 1) There are no early start dates for NTP #03, #04, #05. 2) Refer to response TG0300-0150. 3) Refer to response TG0300-0150.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2837 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0196	TG03 Question 0196 - Access Trestle	Closed	09/13/2010	09/19/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The Scope of Work for the Removal and Disposal of Access Trestle as described in Exhibit A IV.C.22 indicates, "The Structural Steel Trade Subcontractor shall remove/dispose the Access Trestle above the Lower Concourse slab,¿"			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm that the Access Trestle remains the property of the BSE Trade Subcontractor, and will be disposed at a location (within the Bay Area) of their choice.			Answered by W/O Doc Control, 9/13/10				
			The Structural Steel Trade Subcontractor shall remove and dispose of the Access Trestle above the Lower Concourse slab.				
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0197	TG03 Question 0197 - Geotechnical Report	Closed	09/13/2010	09/19/2010	09/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The Final Geotechnical Data Report prepared by Arup North America Ltd. Article 6.1.2.2 indicates,"A more detailed description of stratigraphy and information on the characterization of the majormajor soil strata are presented in the Geotechnical Recommendations report."			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Is this report available? If so, how may we access this?			Answered by George Metzger, 9/16/10				
			Refer to response TG0300-0183.				
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0198	TG03 Question 0198 - Site Area	Closed	09/13/2010	09/19/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Exhibit A drawings SL-001 & SL-002.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Dwg. SL-001 shows the area bounded by First, Fremont, Minna and Mission Sts. as an "Emergency Gathering Point" Dwg. SL-002 shows outbound trucks exiting this area. The "Staging Parcels" sketch in Section 01 14 19 does not show this area. Is this area available for staging/laydown use by the SBE Subcontractor? If so, are			Answered by W/O Doc Control, 9/13/10				
			Refer to response TG0300-0162.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2838 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
there any restrictions on its use?							
TG03.00-0199	TG03 Question 0199 - Retention	Closed	09/13/2010	09/19/2010	09/14/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Answers to Pre-Bid Meeting Questions.				Answered by Gerry MacClelland, 9/14/10			
The answer to Question 13 says that retention is withheld for the duration of each subcontractor's scope of work rather than the entire project. Most of the SBE Subcontractor's scope of work will be complete with the placing of the rat slabs. However, the contract will continue until the SBE Subcontractor's responsibility for shoring/bracing removal and trestle/bridge removal is complete. The schedule for this work is contingent on other Trade Subcontractors and the completion date for the entire scope of the SBE Trade Subcontract Package is unknown. Will Webcor/Obayashi release retention attributable to all work completed up until the placing of the rat slabs when the placing of the rat slabs is complete?				Retention to the CM/GC shall be reduced as described in 00 70 00.9.04. Section 00 05 20.5.04D states "the CM/GC must proportionately reduce retainage for its Trade Subcontractors." The amount of retention released upon placement of the rat slab will be based on the amount to the Trade Contractor's contract billed at that time.			
TG03.00-0200	TG03 Question 0200 - Temporary Lighting	Closed	09/13/2010	09/19/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Exhibit A, Section IV.B.A.18, "Temporary Lighting"				Answered by W/O Doc Control, 9/13/10			
Is the SBE Trade Subcontractor responsible for maintaining temporary lighting until the rat slabs are placed or until the end of the SBE Trade Subcontract?				The BSE Trade Subcontractor's responsibility for maintaining temporary lighting will end at the acceptance of the rat slab.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2839 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG03.00-0201	TG03 Question 0201 - Tax Certificate	Closed	09/13/2010	09/19/2010	09/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Transbay Joint Powers Au Sara Gigliotti				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference is made to Part V, Webcor/Obayashi Bidding Forms, Item A. Bidding Check List, Subitem 3. Current Business Tax Registration Certificate. In Addendum 2 you specifically deleted the requirement for us to submit our "Current San Francisco Business License Certificate". You also changed "Current Business Tax Certificate" to "Current Business Tax Registration Certificate". We have various city Business Tax Registration Certificates. Is it your intent for us to only submit our current Business Tax Registration Certificate for "San Francisco".			Answered by Sara Gigliotti, 9/16/10		Answered by Sara Gigliotti, 9/16/10		
			Per project bidding manual section III.D.6.b, the requirement is for a San Francisco Business Tax Registration No.		Per project bidding manual section III.D.6.b, the requirement is for a San Francisco Business Tax Registration No.		
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0202	TG03 Question 0202 - Bid Due Date	Closed	09/13/2010	09/19/2010	09/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Our QBD sent on 9/02/10 expressed our serious concern with the SBE Trade Package schedule, liquidated damages and other contract terms. We requested that Webcor/Obayashi meet with the SBE Trade Package bidders, as soon as possible, in order to clarify and resolve the major issues of concern. We also requested that the bid due date be postponed by 6 weeks.					Answered by W/O Doc Control, 9/13/10		
					Refer to response TG0300-0150.		
We have not yet received a response to our 9/02/10 QBD. We cannot continue to expend resources on this bid without Webcor/Obayashi acknowledging our concerns and committing to act timely to help resolve them.							
We ask that Webcor/Obayashi provide us with a response to our 9/02/10 QBD by Friday 9/17/10, otherwise we will have to suspend our estimating effort on Bid Package TG03.							
<hr/>							
TG03.00-0203	TG03 Question 0203 - Regulatory Requirements	Closed	09/15/2010	09/21/2010	09/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2840 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: 1. Reference section 1 of the Long Form Subcontract (last sub-paragraph); also reference paragraph 2.05 of section 00 05 20 of the Agreement and section 01 14 10 Regulatory Requirements: which require compliance with applicable federal laws and guidelines. Several other specifications (particularly, those relating to health and safety) specifically list specific provisions of the Code of Federal Regulations that the Contractor (and therefore, where relevant, the Trade Subcontractor) must comply with. Provide a list of all applicable federal laws and guidelines (other than those specific provisions of the Code of Federal Regulations that are already included in the General Conditions and other bid documents) that the Trade Subcontractor must comply with on this project. In particular, provide a list of all Federal Acquisition Regulations that apply to Trade Subcontractor's obligations on this project.	SUGGESTION: Answered by W/O Doc Control, 9/15/10 Those documents are available in the public domain. The project is not subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulations.	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Answered by W/O Doc Control, 9/15/10 Those documents are available in the public domain. The project is not subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulations.				
TG03.00-0204	TG03 Question 0204 - Payment	Closed	09/15/2010	09/21/2010	09/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Reference 4.1 of the Long Form Subcontract: The second paragraph of this provision states that the CM/GC has no obligation to pay the subcontractor until TJPA approves the CM/GC's application for payment and TJPA actually pays the CM/GC. We request that you correct this provision to comply with the California public policy against pay-if-paid provisions.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to response TG0300-0150.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2841 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG04.5.1-0001	TG0451 Question 0001 - SBE Program	Closed	08/18/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
REQUEST: Reference RFQ, p6 Is this project only open to SBA's for bidding? Is this set aside for only SBA bidders? Submitted by Heather Kay KJ Woods Construction Inc. 08/16/2010			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SBE contractors are excluded from bidding this scope of work or performing work required for this trade package 100% SBE participation is required per section IV.C of the bidding manual.		
<hr/>							
TG04.5.1-0002	TG0451 Question 0002 - SBE Program	Closed	08/18/2010	08/25/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
REQUEST: W.A. Rasic is not an SBE. However, we fully intend to conduct a comprehensive GFE to increase overall SBE participation (1st, 2nd tier subcontractors, vendors, etc.) Can W.A. Rasic bid on this project direct to the J.V.? Submitted by John Solis W.A. Rasic Construction 08/16/2010			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SBE contractors are excluded from bidding this scope of work or performing work required for this trade package 100% SBE participation is required per section IV.C of the bidding manual.		
<hr/>							
TG04.5.1-0003	TG0451 Question 0003 - SBE Program	Closed	08/19/2010	08/26/2010	08/23/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
REQUEST: Reference specification section IV, paragraph #1 We are not a SBE or DBE are we excluded from bidding on this project TG04.5.1. Submitted by Tom Cornett Underground Construction Co., Inc. 08/16/2010			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SBE contractors are excluded from bidding this scope of work or performing work required for this trade package 100% SBE participation is required per section IV.C of the bidding manual.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2842 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG04.5.1-0004	TG0451 Question 0004 - Liquidated Damages	Closed	08/31/2010	09/07/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference specification 00 05 20-11, 4.02.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
This section requires \$50,000 liquidated damages per day if project is not substantially complete more than 90 days. This is for the entire project and not TG04.5.1. Please Clarify. Page 11 of Bid manual and forms specifies 4 Milestones without and LD's.				Subcontractor is responsible for any damages resulting from Subcontractor delays as set forth in section 7 of the long form subcontract.			
<hr/>							
TG04.5.1-0005	TG0451 Question 0005 - Project Staffing Requirements	Closed	08/31/2010	09/07/2010	09/01/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference Exhibit H Safety, page 7.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
If we have 61 employees work on site, we need to have 2 full time designated safety persons (DSP) on site. Is this correct? Is this in addition to the requirements of 00 70 00-68 paragraph 12.01.B?				Exhibit I (safety manual) provides direction on this matter on page 7 - section titled ¿ Project Staffing Requirements.¿ Section 00 07 00 12.01.B does not apply to the Trade Subcontractor for this bid package only.			
<hr/>							
TG04.5.1-0006	TG0451 Question 0006 - Bid Bond	Closed	08/31/2010	09/07/2010	09/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference Bidding Manual, page 12 paragraph 4.C., document 00 04 30-1.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Project Bidding manual page 12 of 44 requires bid security made to Webcor/Obayashi JV. Document 00 04 30 Appears to be between TJPA and JV. Please clarify.				See Addendum 1 for correct Bid Bond Form. Section 00 04 30 is not for Trade Subcontractor.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2843 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG04.5.1-0007	TG0451 Question 0007 - BIM & CPM	Closed	08/31/2010	09/07/2010	09/01/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference specificatoin 01 13 10-2, paragraph 13.A				No - Microsoft Project is not compatible with P6.			
Contract Requires premavera P6 or compatible format. Is Microsoft Project Acceptable?							
<hr/>							
TG04.5.1-0008	TG0451 Question 0008 - Length Of Warranty	Closed	08/31/2010	09/07/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Exhibit "B" Warranty, 2nd paragraph.				Refer to Section 01 17 00.1.3C. Since it is the intention to put these relocated utilities into service once complete, this paragraph establishes the basis for an early Substantial Completion. Also see Section 00 07 00.3.19C. The period for the warranty is generally defined in Section 01 17 40 as well as in individual specification sections, as stated in 01 17 40.1.2B.			
Does warranty period extend to after completion of the entire project or only after TG04.5.1 is completed? The warranty form says indicates after "Filing Notice of Completion on all improvements". See attached which can be more than 4 years.							
<hr/>							
TG04.5.1-0009	TG0451 Question 0009 - Length Of Warranty	Closed	08/31/2010	09/07/2010	09/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference specification 01 17 40-2, paragraph 1.5.A.				See response to TGO4.5.1-0008.			
Exhibit "B" is blank for period of warranty. 01-17-40-2 requires 2 years after substantial completion of TG04.5.1. Draft Subcontract agreement seams to indicate warranty after completion of the entire project. Please Clarify.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2844 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG04.5.1-0010	TG0451 Question 0010 - Maintenance Bond	Closed	08/31/2010	09/07/2010	09/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Gerry MacClelland				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference specification 00 08 13/APA, page 15, paragraph 6.B. Is Maintenance Bond Required?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please refer to Section 00 07 00.10.02B, which describes the TJPA's requirements for a Performance Bond, including corrective Work required during the correction period.		
TG04.5.1-0011	TG0451 Question 0011 - Insurance Requirements	Closed	08/31/2010	09/07/2010	09/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference specification 00 08 05, paragraph 1.2. Please confirm that \$25,000,000 limit on GL is not for TG04.5.1 contract. This question was repounded to during pre-qualification process (Question #1).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See section IV.I of the project bidding manual as clarified in section IV.A of exhibit A.		
TG04.5.1-0012	TG0451 Question 0012 - Mobilizations	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference specification 01 15 05 & Bid Form Exhibit A. This section is about mobilization cost and how it is release, however there is no mobilization line item on bid form (exhibit A). Should bid form be revised to included mobilization?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Bid form modified per Addendum 2.		
TG04.5.1-0013	TG0451 Question 0013 - Personnel Requirements	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Reference specification 01 14 00, paragraph 1.8.B. This section requires a full time graduate licensed engineer or architect to be on site as CQC manager. Is this position filled with CMGC or Trade Contractor for TG04.5.1.						
	The Contractor's Quality Control (CQC) Manager, as referenced in Section 00 14 00, Quality Control, paragraph 1.8.B, will be provided by the CM/GC. Trade Subcontractor is responsible for providing QC personnel as required by Section 01 14 00, Quality Control, paragraph 1.8.C. Qualifications for this personnel include a minimum of 10 years of relevant construction experience, specific to the Trade Subcontractor's scope of work, of which 5 years must be in quality control for public works projects.						
TG04.5.1-0014	TG0451 Question 0014 - Fall Protection	Closed	09/03/2010	09/10/2010	09/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Reference specification 01 15 45-5, paragraph 1.6.C. Fall protection is required for all trenches 5 feet or deeper. Does this requirement include lifeline harness, lanyard, tie down, etc>?	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			Refer to exhibit H (Webcor/Obayashi Site Specific Safety Program - Revision 0, dated 7-30-2010), Code of Safe Conduct and Work Practices/Excavation (page 15).				
TG043-0001	Site Survey	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Do we provide all survey for our work? W/O to provide answer.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			Yes.				
TG043-0002	SBE Requirements	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Sara Gigliotti				
	Co-Author:						

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: This project is indicated as to be 100% SBE. Please confirm that this means that all of our subcontractors (and sub tier subcontractors if any) and truckers must therefore be SBE companies. Please also confirm that not all suppliers must be SBE. It will be impossible to obtain quotations for asphalt, VCP, aggregate import materials etc. from SBE companies.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
			All subcontractors, at any tier, including truckers, must be SBEs. Good faith efforts must be made to purchase materials and supplies from SBE manufacturers or dealers. If materials or supplies are purchased from an SBE manufacturer, 100 percent of the cost counts as SBE participation. If materials or supplies are purchased from an SBE dealer, count 60 percent of the cost of materials and supplies toward SBE participation.				
TG043-0003	Lead in AWSS Pipes	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Are AWSS pipes to be demolished? If so, how is the hazardous lead in the joints to be handled?	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: VOID	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
TG043-0004	Permit Reimbursables	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
	Co-Author:						
	REQUEST: Will we be reimbursed for all excavation, street space, meter, and other permits?	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: See Section 01 14 10/APA for a matrix of permit responsibility.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2847 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG043-0005	Phase II Drawings	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Do we include anything indicated in the Phase II drawings? W/O to provide answer.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: No.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
TG043-0006	OCIP Requirements	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC Guy Hollins			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Is there (or will there be) an OCIP on this project? If so, what insurances will this OCIP include?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: There is no current, or planned OCIP for this project.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
TG043-0007	Bid Form Clarification	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The bid form is far too complex. We can possibly understand the need for the data indicated by the bid form from the subcontractor awarded the project, but we can see no need for each and every bidder to fill out every space in a ten page bid form. In addition the bid form requires us to fill in the quantities. As every subcontractor will have different quantities, this seems somewhat odd. A typical SF PUC style bid form, with quantities provided, would result in bids that could be confidently compared with each other- ¿Apples to Apples¿, not¿ Oranges to Apples¿. We request that such a bid form be provided. If the bid form is not simplified greatly, we will not be able to bid this project, since it will take more time to complete the form than actually estimate the project. W/O to provide answer.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: See revised bid form in Addendum 3.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2848 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG043-0008	Bid Date Extension	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Guy Hollins	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Can the bid date please be delayed?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		The bid opening date will proceed as currently scheduled.	
TG043-0009	Exhibit I Schedule and Exhibit A.V	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP		David Hungerford	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Exhibit I, Schedule, appears to show the physical work occurring between 1/27/11 and 3/31/11, approximately 68 calendar days (CD). This is approximately 48 working days. In this amount of time we are to install the sewer, install the water, get SFWD to do the tie ins (which often takes 2 weeks) and then do all the demolition and restoration. Please confirm that this is your intent. Also note that Exhibit A.V appears to require (under milestones) that the water work be completed within 80 CD of NTP-thus it seems that the water will have to be completed prior to the sewer. Please confirm this is your intent. W/O to provide answer.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		VOID	
TG043-0010	Bid Package Drawing Clarification	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP		David Hungerford	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Exhibit A.IV, Clarification of Bid Package. It states that the revisions are for construction of Bid Package TG04.5.1 ONLY. However the Delta 1- Field Order-revisions state that the revisions (are) for TG04.3 and TG 04.4. So if they are for construction of Bid Package TG04.5.1 ONLY, why are they revisions for TG04.3 and TG04.4? Are you trying to say- Use all the drawings as provided, and then when we give you a contract we will reissue the drawings, without changes, other than stating		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		The list of drawings to be used in this bid package is found in section 00 01 15.1 of the specifications. Use all of the drawings provided. Upon completion of this bid process, a conformed set of these documents for this trade package will be issued at a later date.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2849 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>that they are now issued for construction¿? Please clarify exactly what you mean.</p> <p>W/O to provide answer.</p>							
TG043-0011	Investigative Trench Drawing	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Exhibit A.IV (page 9), Number 11 states to include two investigation trenches as shown on sheets U-1007 & U-1008 dated 8-27-10. This is not the date of the drawings provided. Please clarify.				Correction: Correct drawing is 9-29-10 "For Construction Drawings."			
W/O to provide answer.							
<hr/>							
TG043-0012	Demolition of Existing Electrical, Gas and Telecom	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Sheet U1110 and all the other demo sheets. On sheet U1110 note 5 does not specifically state that the gas is to be demolished by PG&E, note 7 does not say duct bank to be removed by AT&T (other notes are similar), but the notes also do not specifically state that ¿Trade contractor is to demolish¿ or something similar. Exhibit A.IV.D.2 (page 7), third bullet, states: ¿Unless noted otherwise on the drawings, Electrical, Gas & Telecommunication lines will be abandon and all feeders removed by the respective utility owners prior to demolition by this contract.¿ Thus there is an ambiguity. Are we, or are we not to include demolition of the Electrical, Gas & Telecommunication lines? In either case, who removes the boxes, vaults etc.? Please clarify. Exactly what is required at all locations on the plans?				Demo as shown on the drawings. Note 5 says ¿"DEMOLISH AS INDICATED EXISTING HP GAS" Note 7 says ¿"DEMOLISH AS INDICATED EXISTING TELECOMMUNICATIONS DUCTBANKS/ MANHOLES"			
W/O to provide answer.				In regard to Exhibit A.IV.D.2, demolish as shown in the drawings.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG043-0013	Demolition of Utilities	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Referenced: Sheet U1110 Are the utilities to the east of the wall, (and on U1111 to the west of the wall) to be demolished by others? Please confirm.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: VOID	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<hr/>							
TG043-0014	Temporary Tie In	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Who is to perform Exhibit A.IV.D.4 (page 8), 4th bullet and any other, temporary tie in? Please provide drawing showing exactly what is required for the temporary tie in(s). Include line, grade, size etc. W/O to provide answer.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: VOID	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<hr/>							
TG043-0015	Tie In Sequence	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Exhibit A.IV.D.4 (Page 8), 7th bullet. This states that "final tie into buildings will be performed after complete commissioning of the water systems at 1st, Howard, & Natoma Streets east of First Street. As this work will not be under our control, how can we be sure we can complete this work in the time allowed for in bid Exhibit A? Please discuss and clarify. W/O to provide answer.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: If a coordinated commissioning of the water system falls outside of the prescribed duration required for this scope of work, a modification to the required schedule dates will be made as is appropriate.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
<hr/>							
TG043-0016	Liquidated Damages	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Are there liquidated damages associated with this subcontract?</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Liquidated damages will be as shown in Section 7 of the long form subcontract as issued in Addendum No. 2.</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p>			
TG043-0017	Open Trenches	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div> From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner </div> <div> Co-Author: </div> <div> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Exhibit A.IV.D.11 (page 9) discusses the two investigation trenches to be excavated (and backfilled) in this scope of work. For these trenches, do we open up end to end and plate? If so, how long will they be kept open, who will move and replace the plates etc.? Or, can we trench and backfill concurrently, with representatives observing and taking requested measurements, thus limiting the amount of open trench?</p> </div> <div> <p>SUGGESTION:</p> </div> <div> <p>ANSWER:</p> <p>VOID</p> </div> <div> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> </div>							
TG043-0018	Mark Up Clarification	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div> From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner </div> <div> Co-Author: </div> <div> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Specs. 000700.6.06.C.2 states that markup on labor is direct cost plus Caltrans surcharge plus 15%, or is it direct cost including bonds and insurance plus 15%? As the current Caltrans surcharge is approximately 11% and our liability insurance and WC insurance total 16.21% and adding the approximately 6.20% FICA, 1.45% medicare, 1.5% SF payroll tax, 7.1% unemployment & training taxes equals approximately 32.5% which exceeds the sum of the 11% surcharge and 15% markup, this is a very important point. As currently written, we would do any extra work at a loss. Note that Caltrans uses the surcharge plus 33% for labor, which allows a profit. Please explain why we should bid a project that guarantees that all extra work would be performed at a loss, or change or clarify the specification.</p> </div> <div> <p>SUGGESTION:</p> </div> <div> <p>ANSWER:</p> <p>This is to confirm that 00 07 00 ¿ 6.06.C.2 allows, for Work performed by a Subcontractor, a markup that equals a maximum of 15% of its direct costs, as defined in 6.06.A., including Subcontractor bonds and insurance.</p> </div> <div> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> </div>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2852 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG043-0019	Testing Payment Responsibilities	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC Guy Hollins			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 000700.8.02. Do we have to pay for any testing such as compaction testing, concrete testing, water quality testing, soils analytical etc.?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		Testing by others. Retesting due to failure of Trade Subcontractor will be borne by Trade Subcontractor.	
TG043-0020	Utility Crossing Rate Schedule	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Transbay PMPC Guy Hollins			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs . 000810/APB contains Cost of Utility Crossing Schedules dated January 2004. These are obviously not the current rates. Will we be paid for support and work around of non-governmental and SFWD facilities? If so, will the rates be the rates in effect when the work will be done (2011) or not?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		Contractor should use current published Costs of Utility Crossing Schedules at the time of construction.	
TG043-0021	Fire Hydrant Use	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 000813.1.6. Will we be allowed to use hydrant water?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		Comply with specifications.	
TG043-0022	Excavation - Public Notice	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 000813.1.8.B. Who does the excavation permit public notifications?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		TJPA representative will perform outreach based on timely notification by contractor.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2853 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG043-0023	Waste Management Plan	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 000815. Is Webcor/Obayashi's Solid Waste Management plan available? What do we need to do to comply with your plan? W/O to provide answer.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No - not available. Trade Subcontractor is to plan per City of San Francisco requirements.		
TG043-0024	Unit Prices for Class 1&2 Disposal	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 011020. Do you already have unit prices for Class 1 & 2 disposal? Do we have to match these? W/O to provide answer.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Unit pricing to be established by Trade Subcontractor as part of bid.		
TG043-0025	Groundwater Discharge	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: For groundwater discharge does the allowance cover all our costs including fees, testing and analysis, metering etc.?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There is no discharge allowance for the utility relocation. Dewatering and associated costs for the utility relocation project are borne by the Trade Subcontractor.		
TG043-0026	Class 1 - Contaminated Soil	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Transbay PMPC Guy Hollins				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	Specs. 011020. What is the definition of Class 1 Contaminated soil? Is it Federal Class 1 RCRA or California Class 1 Non-RCRA or what exactly?						
TG043-0027	Class 2 - Contaminated Soil	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Guy Hollins		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 011020. What is the exact definition of Class 2 Contaminated soil?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Class II waste is material not classified as Class I RCRA/Non-RCRA but that still contains contamination that prevents it from being disposed of as unrestricted waste. This is determined on a case-by-case basis by landfill operators. The TJPA environmental consultant will assist in the identification of Class II hazardous waste.				
<hr/>							
TG043-0028	HASP	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SMP plan page 8. Is your HASP available? W/O to provide answer.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The HASP included in Exhibit H of the Long Form Subcontract.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2855 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG043-0029	Traffic Control Requirements	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
REQUEST: Specs. 011570.1.2.D requires that the contractor or subcontractor to have a C-31 license to do the traffic control. We have an A license. Does this mean we cannot do our own traffic control, but must instead hire a subcontractor? Or, are you providing traffic control including plans, signs etc.? If we are allowed to provide our own traffic control (or if we must hire a subcontractor) does the three man traffic control need to be dedicated solely to performing traffic control work?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic control to be by trade subcontractor. Traffic control to be as required by specifications.		
<hr/>							
TG043-0030	Changeable Message Sign Requirements	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
REQUEST: Specs. 011570.2.4.A. Do we need to include changeable message signs?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes.		
<hr/>							
TG043-0031	K-rail requirements	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
REQUEST: Specs. 011570.2.5. Do we need to provide K rail?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, (Section 01 15 70.2.6 is the correct reference).		
<hr/>							
TG043-0032	Temp. Tape and Markers	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
REQUEST: Specs. 011570.2.7. Do we need to provide temporary tape and markers?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2856 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG043-0033	Traffic Loop Repair	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
REQUEST: Specs. 011570.2.8. Do we need to provide traffic loop repair?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Yes.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
TG043-0034	Traffic Lane Requirements	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
REQUEST: Specs. 011570. Traffic Lane requirements. Does Natoma need a lane open, 1 at 11¿ westbound and if so where? It is difficult to understand what is required where, perhaps due to the line spacing of the table. And, how are we to keep an 11¿ lane open on a 22¿ wide street and still perform the work? Please allow closure of Natoma with local traffic access.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Contractor is to follow the Traffic Lane Requirements in the specifications. If the number of lanes and/or lane widths for through traffic cannot be achieved, contractor shall submit for a Special Traffic Permit.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
TG043-0035	Specialty Traffic Permits	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
REQUEST: If special traffic permits are required, are the costs reimbursable?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: See Section 01 14 10/APA.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
TG043-0036	Truck Routes	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
REQUEST: Specs. 011570.3.23. Are there specific approved truck routes? If so, please provide.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: No.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2857 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
W/O to provide answer.							
TG043-0037	Trench Plate installation method	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Guy Hollins		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 013565.1.5.B. This section requires that plates be flush with street or sidewalk. Does this mean all plates must be in cut-in depressions in the street, and not placed on the street with cutback ramps as is normal procedure in SF? Please confirm.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> In accordance with the specifications, contractor shall install plates or decking flush with the existing street or sidewalk.		
<hr/>							
TG043-0038	Depth of Bedding above Pipe	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:AECOM Technical Servicε Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 312310.1.8.A. This section states "pipe zone shall include...from bottom of pipe...to a horizontal level above the top, as specified below." Could not find anywhere "below" where information regarding the depth of the bedding above the top of the pipe was provided. Please provide.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> "Below" is a reference to next numbered section: Section 31 23 10.1.9, Bedding.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG043-0039	Pavement Mill and Fill Requirements	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 321217.3.4.A. This section states that ç Contractor shall mill and fill AC pavement as directed by TJPA representative.ç Prior to bid we must be told exactly which areas are to be milled & filled. If you cannot provide exact and complete parameters (such as a drawing showing the exact limits of the mill and fill required), we will have to assume that absolutely no mill and fill is required. We cannot be expected to know what the TJPA representative will require.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Restore all excavations for the Work in accordance with the specifications inclusive of DPW Order No. 176,707, "Regulations for Excavation and Restoring Streets in San Francisco," which describes the limits of milling and filling for ACWS restoration.				

TG043-0040	Permanent Pavement Restoration Requirements	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 321724. Typically in SF all permanent pavement restoration is provided by SF at no cost. Are we to provide permanent restoration of pavement markings or will SF provide at no cost?			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The Paint Division of the SFMTA will furnish and install all the permanent thermoplastic stripes and pavement markings in accordance with Section 01 15 70.3.8.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2859 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG043-0041	Fire Hydrant Procurement Clarification	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs 331100.1.1.B & 331100.3.3.C&D. There is ambiguity regarding fire hydrants. It appears SFFD installs fire hydrants. Do they supply the hydrants? If not, do we have to pay for the hydrants and valves etc.? If we have to pay, EXACTLY what must we obtain and EXACTLY what is the cost? If we are required to purchase something from one source only, we need to be provided with information regarding what we are buying and what it will cost.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> SFFD installs fire hydrants. Furnish all materials for Fire Hydrant Services per 33 11 00.3.3.C. Purchase materials from SFFD (through SFPUC) in accordance with 33 11 00.3.3.D. Contact the SFPUC City Distribution Division Material Coordinator at 1990 Newcomb Ave., San Francisco, CA.				
TG043-0042	SFWD Temp. Connections	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs 331100.1.1.C. Does SFWD perform temporary connections that are indicated by the bid documents?			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Connections of any new pipe (including new pipe indicated as temporary in the Plans) to existing shall be by SFWD.				
TG043-0043	SFWD Material Transportation	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 331100.1.3.B. This requires that we move SFFD & SFWD material. What material is that? Perhaps we will understand the fire hydrant situation if previous question, above is answered, but what material is SFWD providing that we have to move? For connections, SFWD has always transported their own material. Please specify exactly what material we need to transport.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Transport materials that are purchased and procured from SFFD and SFWD.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2860 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG043-0044	Water Dist. Piping & Valves Clarification	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 331100.3.2.E. See items 2 and 5. What do they mean? This does not make any sense as written. Please provide rewritten specification that can be understood.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See Addendum 3 for reformatted specification section.			
<hr/>							
TG043-0045	Side Sewer Replacement Clarification	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 333110.1.1.A.4. This section says ¿to replace existing side sewers and/or culverts which are to remain in place as per plans.¿ This could be interpreted to mean that all side sewers and culverts on all portions of the project are to be replaced in their entirety. Is that the intent? If so, please indicate more obviously.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Replace existing side sewers and/or culverts as indicated on the plans.			
<hr/>							
TG043-0046	ACWS and Planning Limits	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Specs. 333110.1.1.A.9. As stated above, please provide exact limits of planning and ACWS.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Restore all pavement in accordance with the specifications inclusive of DPW Order No. 176,707, "Regulations for Excavation and Restoring Streets in San Francisco," which describes the limits of milling and filling for ACWS restoration.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2861 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG043-0047	Catch Basins and Traps	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPDavid Hungerford</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyDaphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LPDavid Hungerford</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: Specs 333110.1.1. A.5 & 11.				VOID			
Please provide exact limits and count of catch basins requiring cleaning and installation of traps and caps.							
TG043-0048	Spigot Type	Closed	11/02/2010	11/16/2010	11/04/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPDavid Hungerford</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyDaphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: AECOM Technical ServiceEric Zagol</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
333110.2.1.B.						See Addendum 3 for revised specification wording.	
Define ¿spigot¿ type. Is this Bell x Spigot or Spigot x Spigot (Band seal) pipe?							
TG05.02-0001	Inclusion of Engineering Enterprise in Bid	Closed	02/11/2011	02/21/2011	02/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPDavid Hungerford</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyDaphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LPTim Maxwell</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Sieera Electric wants to include the Engineering Enterprise for this bid. The Engineering Enterprise (at the advise of their insurance carrier) carries a \$75K deductible not a \$50K deductible. The Engineering Enterprise is registered as an SBE with the State of California. They have been in business for 36 years and never have had a claim filed against them. Their Insurance Company will not allow the deductible changed for any singular project. Is there a way the deductible difference can be waived?				Insurance requirements as set forth in the subcontract boilerplate exhibit is the responsibility of the firm entering into contract with Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture.			
TG05.02-0002	Amount for Liquidated Damages	Closed	02/11/2011	02/21/2011	02/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LPDavid Hungerford</div><div>To: Turner Construction CompanyDaphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LPTim Maxwell</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
An actual Dollar amount is not specified for the LD's. What				Refer to Specification Section 00 05 20 Article 4			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	is the Dollar amount in the LD's and will it be based on per calendar day.			paragraph 4.02			
TG05.04-0001	Insurance Requirements	Closed	02/10/2011	02/20/2011	02/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Does a submitting JV need its own insurance meeting the requirements stated in the RFP, or is the specified coverage being met by the partner firms making up the JV sufficient for the General Contract/Selection Panel?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> YES - if contracting as a JV the JV must be a legal entity with it's own insurance.				
TG05.04-0002	Definition of a Joint Venture	Closed	02/10/2011	02/20/2011	02/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: What is the Agency's Definition of a Joint Venture and what agreements need to be in place if firms want to submit their proposal as a Joint Venture?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The CM/GC defines a joint venture as provided in California Business and Professions Code section 7029, et seq. Any respondent joint venture must be properly licensed as a single entity and must submit with its Qualification Statement a copy of the joint venture agreement. The agreement shall identify the responsibilities of each partner in the joint venture for the scope of work established by the RFP, demonstrate the relationship between partners, and provide for contractual relationships and authorities to bind each entity to the obligations of the joint venture. The joint venture respondent should submit experience and qualifications as an entity and should submit experience and qualifications for each joint venture partner.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2863 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG05.04-0003	Temporary Pavement Clarification	Closed	02/10/2011	02/20/2011	02/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu		Answered By:Transbay PMPC		Alfred Lau	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
In the Traffic Control Specification 01570-2F # 10 "TEMPORARY PAVEMENT" is Temporary Pavement in regards to traffic controls limited to the following: A. Pothole Patching; B. "Cutback or Coldpatch" at bridging and plating, handicap ramps, and sidewalk repairs; C. Misc Roadway Maintenance; D. Does not include Roadway Grinding or Hot Asphalt Application.				Section 01 15 70, paragraph 1.2.F.10 defines temporary pavement as part of the scope for Traffic Routing Work. The requirement for temporary pavement is to accommodate construction traffic control and maintenance of public and construction safety throughout the complete construction duration. It is envisaged that the scope may include pothole patching; "cutback or coldpatch" at bridging and plating, handicap ramps, and sidewalk repairs; and misc. roadway maintenance. Usually, roadway grinding and hot asphalt application, which are typically utilized for larger paving areas, and possibly permanent installations, will not be necessitated by temporary pavement work. However, without the opportunity to review the traffic control plan as stipulated in 1.2.A of the same section, we cannot preclude the need at this time.			
<hr/>							
TG05.2R-0001	Bass Electric - Switch Board AIC Rating	Closed	03/29/2011	03/29/2011	03/29/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please provide AIC rating for the (5) five 2500 Amp temp switch boards.				All overcurrent protective devices within equipment must be able to clear a fault without extensive damage to the equipment itself, as required by the NEC. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the design engineer of the switchgear/switchboard manufacturer/supplier retained by the successful bidder to determine the required AIC rating.			
<hr/>							
TG05.4-0004	Team Leader Preference	Closed	02/10/2011	02/20/2011	02/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Will there be a preference for teams led by a Contractor				No Preference as long as the entity possess required			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2865 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG05.4-0008	Traffic Control Plan Budget	Closed	02/10/2011	02/20/2011	02/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Has an overall budget for the Traffic Control Plan development and execution been establish or is that TBD?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No Budget Established for this RFP.		
TG05.4-0009	Non-Discrimination in Contracts and Benefits	Closed	02/10/2011	02/20/2011	02/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The proposal checklist in Attachment 2 specifies "NonDiscrimination in Contracts and Benefits (section 00 04 70)" but the only mention of this section is in the Specifications' table of contents where the title and information are struck through/crossed out. What do the submitters need to include in proposals to satisfy the checklist requirement?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion of form is a misprint. Section 00 04 70 was deleted under Rev. 2 of the contract Specifications. The form is no longer required and will not be included in RFP reviews.		
TG08.1-A001	Blast Loading	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/06/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 26 - 1.5.B.f Is "Blast Loading" criteria applicable to all systems? It is shown in all of the specifications, but is only used by Schlaich Bergman in the design of W-3 (CW-2).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Each system must comply with the Blast Criteria outlined in the performance criteria for each system in the following specification sections: 08 44 23/1.5-C.1.k, 08 44 26/1.5-B.1.f, 08 44 33/1.5-A.2.f, 08 44 36/1.5-B.1.f, and 08 63 03/1.5-B.1.h. W1 and W10 must be tested for Blast, per sections 08 44 26/1.8-G and 08 63 03/1.8-C.		
TG08.1-A002	Spec Clarification	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/06/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 03; S1-6000; 08 44 36;			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Section 08 44 03 does not exist. S1-6000 and		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2867 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG08.1-A005	Glass Spec - Frit	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/06/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 26-25 / A-8021 & A1-8140 No frit is required according to spec 08 44 26-25, para 2.2-A-1-a Glass with frit is shown on dwgs. A-8021 / A1-8140. Should there be glass with frit or not?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Frit is required on the W-1 glass as shown on the drawings. Specification section 08 44 26 will be corrected to include a frit requirement when issued for bid.		
TG08.1-A006	Corner Supported Glazing Assemb (W-1)	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/06/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 26-2 3. Joints: Ventilation shall be provided through the awning through the 3/4" gaps between each of the glass panels, according to spec 08 44 26-2, para 1.2-A-5. [More]"¿designed using rainscreen system with 2 layers of defense with rainscreen seal and continuous air seal system." - spec 08 44 26-8, para 1.5-D. Interpret that the joints shall be opened, not sealed. If the joints will not be sealed, all items specifying the sealing system in spec 08 44 26, will not be applied to W-1? Please confirm the interpretation.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Two layers of defence with rainscreen seal are not required at W-1. Paragraph 1.5-D will be deleted from Section 08 44 26 when the section is issued for bid.		
TG08.1-A007	Cable supported glazed curtain wall (W-3) - Steel	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	11/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 33-2 / A1-8100; A1-8201 1. Steel spec: "with stainless steel Tee sections consisting of steel plates and a double row of stainless steel cables" - spec 08 44 33-2, para. 1.2-A-1.; [note] "PTD. Galv steel horizontal girder" and "S.S. clip screwed to welded T-section" per dwg. A1-8100; [note] "painted galv. steel horizontal girder" per dwg A1-8201. Interpret that painted galv. steel horizontal T-section and stainless steel cables and cable clamps are required. Is that correct?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This question will be resolved prior to the documents issued for bid.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2868 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG08.1-A008	Cable supported glazed curtain wall (W-3) - Glass	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/06/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 33-27 2. Glass spec: "heat strengthened" glass per spec 08 44 33-27, para 2.2-C; "fully tempered float glass" per spec 08 44 33-27, para 2.2-C-1 & C-2. Should the glass be "heat strengthened" or "fully tempered"?			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> "Heat strengthened" glass in accordance with Section 08 44 33/2.2-C is required. References to full tempered float glass will be removed from the section in the documents issued for bid.		
TG08.1-A009	Cable supported glazed curtain wall (W-3) - Glass Type GL-1B	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/06/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 33-27 3. Glass spec: GL-1B are spandrel panels according to spec 08 44 33-27, para 2.2-C-2. Cannot locate GL-1B in the drawings. Please advise on location of type GL-1B.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Glass type GL-1B has been eliminated from the W3 system. Section 08 44 33 will be revised to reflect this in the documents that will be issued for bid.		
TG08.1-A010	Cable supported glazed curtain wall (W-3) - Fall Protection system	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	11/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 33.7 4. Fall protection system: per spec 08 44 33-7, para 1.5-A-3, should the fall protection system be included in the W-3 package? Please advise of the locations if the fall protection package is required in this assembly.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Fall protection is not required on the W-3 system. The specification section will be modified in the documents issued for bid.		
TG08.1-A011	Cable supported glazed curtain wall (W-3) - Firestopping	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/06/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 33-28			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Firestopping is not required anywhere with the		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2870 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 36-26 2. Glass spec: according to 08 44 36-26, para 2.2-A-3 & A-4, there are glass types GL-2 & GL-2A. Please advise on the location(s) of GL-2 & GL-2A.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> GL-2 is used on all vertical surfaces of the cafe shown on A1-8360. GL-2A is used on all skylight roof surfaces of the cafe shown on A1-8360.			
TG08.1-A015	Steel-framed glazed curtain wall (W-8) - Glass Frit	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 36-26 / A1-8351 3. Glass spec: According to spec 08 44 36-26, para 2.2-A-1, no frit is required for GL-1. Glass with frit is shown on dwg. A1-8351. Should this glass be provided with frit or not?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> GL-1 is required on elevation 1/A1-8352 and 1/A1-8353. GL-1A is required on the glass roof as referenced 1/A1-8351. GL-1A is required on elevation 1/A1-8351 below elevation 96"-9". In the documents issued for bid, the frit will be eliminated above elevation 96"-9" on the north and south elevation shown on 1/A1-8351, and the glass in this zone will be noted GL-1. See A1-8357 for frit patterns.			
TG08.1-A016	Steel-framed glazed curtain wall (W-8) - Removable sections	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 36-26 4. Removable sections; please clarify and advise on the location(s) of the "removable section of curtain wall" per spec 08 44 36-2 & 36-3, para 1.2-A-12 and parap 1.2-B-12.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The removable glass requirement will be deleted in the documents issued for bid.			
TG08.1-A017	Steel-framed glazed curtain wall (W-8) - Firestopping	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/06/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2871 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 44 36 5. Fire stopping: per spec 08 44 36-2, para 1.2-A-18 & spec 08 44 36-32, para 2.7-C, is there any fire stopping required for the W-8 assembly? Please advise on the location of the fire stopping, [if required].		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Firestopping is not required anywhere with the W8 system. Specification section 08 44 36 will be modified to delete the firestopping paragraph 2.7-C in the documents issued for bid.			
TG08.1-A018	Metal-framed skylights (W-10) - Steel	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: A1-8401 1. Steel spec: "All grid shell members, nodes, mullions, cables, glass clamps & fasteners are to be stainless steel, per dwg. A1-8401. Please confirm that all of these parts are to be stainless steel? Or should only the cables be stainless steel?"		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This question will be resolved prior to the documents issued for bid.			
TG08.1-A019	Metal-framed skylights (W-10) - Glass	Closed	11/30/2010	12/14/2010	12/06/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec Section/Dwg Sheet: 08 63 03-25 2. Glass spec: per spec 08 63 03-25, para 2.2-A, shown to be "heat strengthened" glass; per spec 08 63 03-25, para 2.2-A-1, shown as "fully tempered float glass". Should the glass be "heat strengthened" or "fully tempered"?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> "Heat strengthened" glass in accordance with Section 08 63 03/2.2-A is required. As noted, "Final glass schedule to be determined from the results of testing defined in section 1.5 A 12.g and calculations."			
TG08.1-A021	Steel (W-10) - AESS type	Closed	12/01/2010	12/15/2010	12/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger			
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2872 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>It is specified Architecturally exposed structural steel, but drawing A1-8401 indicates stainless steel for system W-10. What material shall be used for the grid shell of the skylights?</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>This question will be resolved prior to the documents issued for Bid.</div></div></div>							
TG08.1-A022	Blast Loading Reqs	Closed	12/01/2010	12/15/2010	12/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Joanne Filipas</div></div>		<div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div>		<div>Answered By:Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger</div>			
<div><div>Co-Author:</div></div>							
<div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>The blast requirement is mentioned in all above listed specifications but the "Transbay transit Center Basis of Design Report" from Schlaich Pergermann and Partner LP dated October 18, 2010, indicates blast load only for the Grand Hall façade (w-3)? Which glazing systems have a bomb blast requirement?</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>See responses TG08.1-A001 and TG08.1-A012. The Basis of Design Report from Schlaich Bergermann and Partner LP will be modified in the documents issued for bid.</div></div></div>							
<hr/>							
TG19.01-0001	TG19.1 Questions 0001 - (E) Lighting	Closed	10/11/2010	10/25/2010	10/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Joanne Filipas</div></div>		<div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div>		<div>Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div>			
<div><div>Co-Author:</div></div>							
<div><div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Ref C-2000</div><div>There are currently (E) light fixtures in the (5) planter boxes. Are we required to stub up electrical conduits for the future installation of light fixtures in the planter boxes?</div></div><div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div><div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Contractor is to locate, cut, and cap all existing electrical lines feeding existing lights within existing planter boxes. Prior to removal of the planters, the contractor shall verify the location of existing electrical lines within the limits of work. Cutting and capping of existing electrical lines shall occur at the face (north) of the new interim screen wall and shall facilitate the future use and connection to reinstalled planter boxes (and lights) by others at a future date. See Note 3 on Drawing C-2000.</div><div>Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)</div></div></div>							
<hr/>							
TG19.1-0002	TG19.1 Questions 0002 - Stone	Closed	10/11/2010	10/25/2010	10/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Joanne Filipas</div></div>		<div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div>		<div>Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2873 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref S-0002 Note 6-B Please provide "Architect Approved" stone support system, anchors, and accessories for the stone walls.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor is to propose stone support systems, anchors and accessories that comply with requirements of the Contract Documents; Architect to approve. Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)			
TG19.1-0003	TG19.1 Questions 0003 - Stone	Closed	10/11/2010	10/25/2010	10/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref S-0002 Note 6-A Please provide manufacturer & specs for the stone panels.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> New stone panels to match existing stone panels. All available information on existing stone panels has been provided on the drawings. Contractor is to submit manufacturer and specs of new stone panels to Architect for approval. Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2874 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG19.1-0004	TG19.1 Questions 0004 - (N) Lighting	Closed	10/11/2010	10/25/2010	10/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Joanne Filipas</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Ref C-2000 Note 10			Contractor shall disconnect existing underground electrical lines servicing existing in-ground lights and reconnect existing electrical lines to new in-ground lights. New in-ground lights are to be inset into asphalt pavers/topping slab. New in-ground lights shall be located at new wall slots (4 total) and shall be placed between the face (north) of the new wall and the new concrete curb. See Note 10 on Drawing C-2000.				
Please provide the locations where the (N) in ground lights will be reconnected to. Electrician needs to know where the (N) in-ground lights will receive power.			Existing electrical power source servicing existing in-ground lights is to be located in field; locating and shut-off of existing power source to be coordinated with TJPA Representative.				
			Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)				
TG19.1-0005	TG19.1 Questions 0005 - (E) Lighting	Closed	10/11/2010	10/25/2010	10/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Joanne Filipas</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Ref C-2000 Note 10			Type, model, size, and manufacturer of existing in-ground lights to be determined in field by contractor. Contractor to submit manufacturer and specs of new in-ground lights to TJPA Representative for approval.				
Please provide specifications for the (E) in-ground lights. Require specs in order to match manufacture, size, and model type.			Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)				
TG19.1-0006	(E) Lighting	Closed	10/15/2010	10/29/2010	10/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Joanne Filipas</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner</div><div>Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas</div></div>							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Ref C-2000 Note 10			The depth and alignment of existing electrical conductor/conduit shall be determined in field by the Contractor; work shall be coordinated with the TJPA Representative.				
Note 10 calls out contractor to disconnect (E) underground electrical line servicing (e) in ground lights and reconnect to (n) in ground lights. There are no asbuiltd drawings showing (e) conduit routing and depth to determine if			Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2875 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
additional demo of concrete or excavation for conduit routing is required. Please provide additional information.							
TG19.1-0007	Nelson Studs Welding Requirements	Closed	10/15/2010	10/29/2010	10/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Ref S-500, S-4000 2&3/S5000 On wall elevation A on sheet S-4000 and detail 2/S-5000 the #6 verticals are referred to as Nelson Studs. Are the #6 verts to be welded to the (e) embed plate? If so, what are the welding requirements? If the (e) embed is not continuous or does not exist, do the #6 verts get drilled and epoxied into the (e) concrete?				#6 verticals referred to as a nelson product are deformed bar anchors. Yes, #6 verticals are welded to the existing embed plate. The welding requirement is full penetration. If the existing embed plate is not continuous and/or does not exist, the #6 verticals shall be drilled and epoxied 6" into existing concrete with Hilti RE500 or approved equal. Fyfe, David (URS Corporation)			
TG19.1-0008	(E) Chain Link Fence	Closed	10/15/2010	10/29/2010	10/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Ref A/C-5000 Note calls out for (e) chain link gate to be removed and relocated. Drawings do not show were the gate shall be relocated or if additional fencing is required. Please clarify.				Remove and relocate (E) chain link gate/fence as-required. The location of the gate shall be coordinated in field with the TJPA Representative. The extent of the new temporary construction fence is shown on Drawing C-2000. Fyfe, David (URS Corporation) 10/15/2010			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TG19.1-0009	Joint Sealant	Closed	10/15/2010	10/29/2010	10/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: A-B/A-6000 In details A&B, the drawings show a 1/2" joint between the aluminum composite panel and the epoxy set stone panel with no sealant. The (e) wall joint is caulked with sealant. Should this joint be sealed?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> No, there is no sealant between the aluminum composite panel and the epoxy set stone panels. Fyfe, David (URS Corporation) 10/15/2010				
TG19.1-0010	Painting	Closed	10/15/2010	10/29/2010	10/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: A&D/A-6000 The drawings call for the wall on the transbay terminal side to receive 16ga galv. Coated G90 rolled steel panels. The (e) wall looks to be plaster w/expansion joints. Are there any specific requirements for joints etc. on the (n) wall. Does the (n) wall get painted?		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The requirements for the joints on the terminal side are shown on Detail E/A-6000 for the vertical joints and Detail D/A-6000 for the top and bottom horizontal joints. Intermediate horizontal joints should not be provided. Note on Detail E/A-6000 the SASM waterproofing sheet behind, and the 2" overlap of the 16 Ga steel sheet. The overlap also includes a 3" width of sealing tape between the sheets. The metal sheet joints are then secured to the plywood backer behind with stainless steel self-tapping sheet metal screws at 8" on center. The rolled sheet is to be galvanized for weather resistance, but is not painted. Fyfe, David (URS Corporation) 10/15/2010				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2877 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG19.1-0011	TG19.1 Questions 0011 - Concrete Curbs	Closed	10/15/2010	11/18/2010	10/15/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Manuel Saldana		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: C-2000 & C-5000 Plan view on sheet sht C-2000 calls for (4) new 9" x 12" concrete curbs. Detail B-C-5000 shows the curbs in section. Do these curbs get placed on top of the (E) pavers or do they go down on top of the 4" topping slab w/pavers around the (N) curb? Are there any rebar or epoxy anchorage requirements?		SUGGESTION: Answered by David Fyfe, 10/15/10 New concrete curbs are to be placed on top of existing 4" topping slab. Remove and replace existing pavers as required to facilitate construction of new concrete curb. Height of curb shall be measured from top of pavers. For vertical reinforcement, use four #3 bars (equally spaced with a minimum of 4" cover at each end); for anchorage, drill four 1" embeds per curb. For longitudinal reinforcement, use two #3 bars with minimum 3" cover.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> New concrete curbs are to be placed on top of existing 4" topping slab. Remove and replace existing pavers as required to facilitate construction of new concrete curb. Height of curb shall be measured from top of pavers. For vertical reinforcement, use four #3 bars (equally spaced with a minimum of 4" cover at each end); for anchorage, drill four 1" embeds per curb. For longitudinal reinforcement, use two #3 bars with minimum 3" cover. Fyfe, David (URS Corporation) 10/15/2010			
TG4.2R-0001	AWSS Experience Requirement	Closed	01/24/2011	02/03/2011	01/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference BOE Specifications Section 02723, Part 3 There was discussion at the Pre-Bid Meeting that an upcoming addendum may change the experience requirements to do the AWSS work, above the usual DPW requirements currently in the specifications. This has the potential to rule out perfectly competent bidders and reduce the pool of bidders. Shaw Pipeline hopes there will not be a change from the specifications in this regard		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> There will be no change to requirements currently carried in bid documents.			
TG4.2R-0002	AWSS Fittings Procurement Schedule	Closed	01/24/2011	02/03/2011	01/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Vt Richard Buellsbach			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The foundry that fabricates the fittings recently quoted Shaw Pipeline Inc. 18-20 weeks to procure fittings. Assuming this timeframe will be similar at the time of contract award, the current schedule will not be		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The response to this QBD will require input from all parties involved. W/O will not be providing a preliminary answer at this time			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2878 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
achievable. Will an extension of time by granted, equal to the time taken to get the fittings?							
TG4.2R-0003	AWSS Fittings Materials Payment	Closed	01/24/2011	02/03/2011	01/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner		Answered By:Transbay Joint Powers Au Sara Gigliotti			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The foundry that fabricates the fittings will require payment in full upfront. Assuming it is a further 18-20 weeks before the contractor get the fittings to install, will a payment be made upfront to the trade subcontractor at the time the foundry requests payment and of the full cost of the materials?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Federal, State, and local law prohibit TJPA from paying for materials prior to their incorporation into the public work. The limited exception to this rule is that the CM/GC may apply for a partial payment (up to 75% of fair market value) for materials delivered and stored on site, subject to inspection and specified restrictions. (Contract General Conditions (Section 00 07 00), at 9.03I.)			
TRANSWORLD 012	Detail required for concrete sleeve installation	Closed	02/08/2011	02/08/2011	04/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Transworld Construction, Inc. Erik Liu		To: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: ---- detail required for concrete sleeve installation The existing condition of the manhole covers is not consistent with our contract documents. Detail 1/C- 5001 indicates that the existing manhole sits on existing concrete slabs to which we are to drill 1 inch embedment. However, if you refer to the attached photograph indicated as picture one, you can clearly see that the manhole cover is actually a part of a concrete ring assembly. Please provide a new detail and instructions for the installation of the required concrete sleeve.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI is superseded by Transworld RFI 012.1, forwarded to Turner as T-0030.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2879 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TRANSWORLD 014	RFI is not applicable	Closed	04/20/2011	04/30/2011	04/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Transworld Construction, Inc. Erik Liu		To: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: RFI has been VOIDED. See attachment.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFI has been VOIDED. See attachment.		
TRANSWORLD 021	Instructions on new Barricade Wall	Closed	03/21/2011	03/22/2011	03/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Transworld Construction, Inc. Erik Liu		To: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please provide instructions on what barricade wall is desired in lieu of the plywood wall. The storm this past weekend is a clear indication that a solid material wall should not be used as a visual baricade. The storm blew down that wall. Please issue instructions on how we are to proceed. At present, A-frame barricades, caution tape, and safety cones are up.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Due to field directives to mitigate the problem, this RFI is null and void.		
TRANSWORLD 022	Electrical work for the existing conduit protruding from the soil from the basemen	Closed	03/29/2011	03/29/2011	03/29/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Transworld Construction, Inc. Erik Liu		To: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: There is one existing conduit on the south side of the wall protruding from the soil coming from the basement wall. The electrical conduit is approximately 6 feet east from the western transformer vault vent opening. Attached you can see the pictures of this conduit that is currently sticking out below the scaffolding planking. Please provide instructions on electrial work.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI is superseded by Transworld RFI 022.2, forwarded as T-0031.1.		
TRANSWORLD 022.1	Electrical work for the existing conduit protruding from the soil from the basemen	Closed	03/29/2011	03/29/2011	03/29/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2880 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>There is one existing conduit on the south side of the wall protruding from the soil coming from the basement wall. The electrical conduit is approximately 6 feet east from the western transformer vault vent opening. Attached you can see the pictures of this conduit that is currently sticking out below the scaffolding planking. An added supplemental plan is also attached for your reference. Please provide instructions on electrical work.</p>						
TRANSWORLD 023	Void below existing embed	Closed	03/31/2011	04/10/2011	03/31/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Transworld Construction, Inc. Erik Liu		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Regarding the grouting work scheduled for tomorrow to fill the voids per W/O RFI #T-0045 ... the grouting contractor is requesting to use the grout mix design as indicated in the following sheet. Apparently this matter was raised with Mr. Doug Jacobson who knows that this substitution request! RFI is on the way. The attached sheet is a specification program from another project not related to the Transbay Project. Our contractor's recommendation is to use this same grout mix design. Please advise if the use of this grout mix design is acceptable.				VOID RFI. Work was already completed and this RFI no longer applies. See confirmation attached.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2881 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
TRANSWORLD 025	Electrical conduit and box detail	Closed	04/04/2011	04/05/2011	04/15/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Transworld Construction, Inc. Erik Liu		To: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
We need direction for the electrical installation inside the new concrete stem wall. We are planning on installing the formwork for the south-side of the wall starting Wednesday morning. As such, we need to install the electrical conduits and boxes tomorrow, Tuesday, at the latest to meet our schedule. Please provide detailed information on the entire conduit run and the elevation of the boxes. It is our understanding that we are completing abandoning the originally anticipated electrical lighting work as anticipated in our contract documents.			The question stated "It is our understanding that we are completing abandoning the originally anticipated electrical lighting work as anticipated in our contract documents." However there are no electrical drawings in the contract documents. This RFI was recieved at 4:28pm, the day before the wall was to be closed up, and requests an answer by tomorrow, which is not enough time to review. Due to the timing of this RFI, it was not submitted to the design team, but instead a meeting was held with URS in the field for direction. For record, see the attached inspection report and email for what is to be done.				
<hr/>							
TRANSWORLD 026.1	301 Mission Wall - Framing Modifications and Base Plate Conflict	Closed	05/06/2011	05/16/2011	06/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: C/S-5000, B/A-6000, attached sketches, and referenced RFI's Field verified measurements and layout for the location of the structural steel does not coordinate with the stucco inset locations as shown on detail C/S-5000. In addition framing around the perimeter of the wall (aluminum panel locations) had to be modified due to assembly and installation methods. (See attached pictures and sketches. This RFI addresses three framing issues. All issues have been discussed in the weekly 301 Mission Wall subcontractor meeting with URS, Turner, Transworld, TJPA and Webcor-Obayashi. 1.) In two of the four stucco slot locations, field conditions show that a portion of the base plate conflicts with the stucco slot. This base plate encroaches into the stucco panel per dimensions shown on the attached sketch. Please advise. 2.) The structural steel had been relocated to CL of the wall (per RFI T-0098) and therefore studs around the steel per B/A-6000 could not be set per plan. Transworld			Can't find answer in Constructware.				
<hr/>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>has installed hat channel metal framing to the face of the structural steel tube using fasteners into the structural steel as per RFI T-0106 as well as modified the boxed framing per attached sketches around the perimeter of the wall. Sizes of metal framing were used to align with adjacent framing per plan. This work is currently installed, please confirm framing modifications per attached marked up details are acceptable.</p> <p>3.) Blocking a the top of the wall at the north side (between the framing and 8"x 8" tube steel) was not installed, as there was no room between the framing and steel. Framing was attached directly to the tube steel. See attached.</p> <p>Please confirm that the framing modifications in item 2 and 3 are acceptable and provide direction at the base plate conflict per item 1.</p>						
TRANSWORLD 028	Install the sleeves for light fixtures	Closed	04/14/2011	04/24/2011	04/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Transworld Construction, Inc. Erik Liu		To: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Per W/O Field directions, TCI was required to install 1-1/2" sleeves for future light fixtures at new concrete footing below the asphalt paver. Please confirm if this is acceptable.		See attached URS email for direction on placement of conduit installations through the 301 Mission concrete wall.					
		Email from David Fyfe on 04/07/11 states: "We met in the field this morning and agreed to provide/install three conduit layout options to maintain scheduled pour and help ensure the new electrical/conduit alignment provides a code compliant preferable connection to the future lights;					
		1) conduit/boxes in wall as installed prior to today with minor adjustments to provide required clearances to steel; 2) conduit running east-west along north side of wall as installed this morning; 3) conduit running east-west along south side of wall, (note this option only required providing 4 short					



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>(approx. 18") conduit runs from south side of wall to north side of wall prior to pour, and was provided in case there are issues with options 1 and 2)."</div>							
TRANSWORLD 029	Extra HSS Steel Column needed	Closed	04/13/2011	04/23/2011	04/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Transworld Construction, Inc. Erik Liu		To: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: S-4000 On sheet S-4000, it is indicated that the tube steel should be maintained 8" clear on both sides where the utility vault is located. The two (2) steel tube at the east end wall is more than 5' apart. Please clarify that an additional tube steel is needed?		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Proceed per contract documents. Specifically notes on S-4000 regarding the spacing requirements of the 10" x 10" tube steel. 1. HSS 10" x 10" x 5/8" at 5'-0" O.C. MAX, UNO 2. Maintain 8" clear from edge of utility vault vent opening to centerline of post.			
TRANSWORLD 031	Stone and Aluminum Panel layout sketch	Closed	06/08/2011	04/19/2011	04/19/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Transworld Construction, Inc. Erik Liu	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Please confirm the attached aluminum and stone tile layout is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This RFI does not clearly state an issue or a good question. Why is it being asked? We will not forward this on until more detail is provided. Responded to RFI in an email on 4/19/11.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TRANSWORLD 038	Concrete mix design for concrete repair work	Closed	06/08/2011	06/18/2011	06/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
This is to respond to submittal title TA1010.S-5000.A01 Rapid Set for Concrete Repair (TCI #31) Please identify a product or a custom mix design that would meet these specifications. In our past practice we have successfully used the suggested grout product as a concrete patch. In our investigations with suppliers and other contractors, it seems that the general conclusion is that using a grout product (such as the one proposed) would be the appropriate product for this application and condition. The proposed grout seems to offer greater strength and structural performance than the original concrete that has since been removed. Is there another product that you could identify that would achieve these specifications? Since we are not the project designers, we can only suggest those products that would generally be used and accepted in our standard of practice It was based on this standard of practice that we submitted the RapidSet grout product.		The submittal response referenced in this RFI is incorrect. The suggested product was never submitted past Webcor-Obayashi's possession. Due to compliance with the direction given per response to RFI T-0130, a submittal was not required. An email chain was generated from conversations between W/O and Turner, then a message sent between Turner and URS, which relayed the product type and an email chain starting from URS was recieved noting that the material is not acceptable. Upon further review of codes, the material is acceptable, which had been discussed in the weekly subcontractor meeting held on Monday June 6, 2011. This RFI is no longer valid. Transworld is to submit products that will be used to repair this condition, per sub meeting. Transworld is aware of this and is submitting product for review.					
TRANSWORLD 039	301 Mission Wall - New concrete curb detail	Closed	06/13/2011	06/30/2011	06/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	Answered By: Transworld Construction, I Erik Liu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please provide detail for the new concrete curb		David, Hold the RFI and product submittal that you got today. I will revise the rfi b ased on today's discussion and the concrete submittal may not be nessassy based on a conversation I had with danny. -Erik					
U-0001	First Street Electrical or Telecom Trench	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: AECOM Technical Servicε Eric Zagol				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2885 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Ref U-2016, U-2020 and Attached Sheet U-2016 calls out a 9-6", 1-4" E by PG&E. Sheet U-2020 calls out the same trench as AT&T's. The section shows it as a AT&T's. Please confirm this trench is AT&T's.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Sheet U-2020 call out for the subject trench is correct, the trench is AT&T's.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
U-0002	Conflict with Electrical and Water Pipe Station 5.50	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Ref U-3408 and attached. During the review of the model, we have found that a conflict exists between the joint trench electrical conduits and water pipes. Please advise.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Adjust Joint Trench per U-3400 General Notes 2, 3, 5 and 6. Construct hydrant lateral to maintain a minimum 28-inch cover (18-inch below street concrete base) and adjust joint trench at lateral crossing to maintain a minimum 6-inch separation at crossing per U-3400 General Note 6.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
U-0003	Conflict Between Electrical trench and telecom conduit near station 1.50	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas		To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner	Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Ref U-2007, and attached During our review of the model, we have found a conflict between the electrical joint trench and telecom conduit near station 1.50 on Minna Street. Please advise.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: 4-6" Electric ductbank is to cross under the 6-4" Telecommunications ductbank, see U-3407 and U-3410 Section E.	Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2886 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0004	Telecom and Water Conflict Station 3.25	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref U-2007 and attached.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
During our review of the model, we have found that the water lateral running north on Minna street is in conflict with telecom conduits in the joint trench. Please advise.					Adjust Joint Trench per U-3400 General Notes 2, 3, 5 and 6.		
					Construct hydrant lateral to maintain a minimum 28-inch cover (18-inch below street concrete base) and adjust Joint Trench at lateral crossing.		
U-0005	Water, Telecom and Electrical Conflict at Station 5.50	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref U-2008, U-2030 and attached.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
During our review of the model, we have found that the water system running in the east/west direction along Minna Street at station 5.50 is in conflict at three locations with the Electrical/Telecom joint trench. Please advise.					At water laterals crossing Joint Trench: - Adjust Joint Trench per U-3400 General Notes 2, 3, 5 and 6. - Construct hydrant lateral to maintain a minimum 28-inch cover (18-inch below street concrete base) and adjust Joint Trench at lateral crossing.		
					At water main crossing with 6-4-inch conduit constructed by AT&T in Phase II (Sheet U-2030): - Construct water main as shown. - AT&T to design and construct Phase II AT&T conduit to avoid water main constructed under TG04.5.1.		
U-0006	Gas and Electrical Conduit Conflict	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref U-2008, U-2030 and attached.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
A conflict exists between the 4" HPG and electrical conduits near station 6.45. Please advise.					Electrical trenches at STA 6+42 +/- and at STA 6+85 +/- as shown on Sheet U-2030 are Relocation of Utilities Project Phase II work Not Included in Package TG04.5.1. The FINAL alignment and elevation of these trenches will be coordinated and designed by		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page:2887 of 3091

Date:06/17/2015

Time:02:27 PM

Job:30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0007	Water and Electrical Conduit Conflict at Station 6.50	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Ref U-2030 and attached.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The water line running east/west along Minna street is in conflict with an Electrical trench at station 6.45. Please advise.			Electrical trenches at STA 6+42 +/- and at STA 6+85 +/- as shown on Sheet U-2030 are Relocation of Utilities Project Phase II work Not Included in Package TG04.5.1. The FINAL alignment and elevation of these trenches will be coordinated and designed by others pending the conduit penetration elevations through the Transit Center perimeter shoring wall and into the Transit Center West Center Electric Vault. U-2030 elevation shows the ductbancks crossing under the 8-inch water in Minna Street.				
SUGGESTION:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2888 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0008	Gas and Water Conflict at Station 7.30	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref U-2009 and attached.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
A conflict exists between the HPG and water line at station 7.30 along Minna Street. Please advise.					Adjust Joint Trench per U-3400 General Notes 2, 3, 5 and 6.		
					Construct hydrant lateral to maintain a minimum 28-inch cover (18-inch below street concrete base) and adjust joint trench at lateral crossing to maintain a minimum 6-inch separation at crossing per U-3400 Note 6 with approval from PG&E on-site inspector.		
U-0009	Joint Trench and Sewer Conflict on First Street at Station 9.25	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref U-2009 and attached					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The sewer line running in the north south direction at station 9.25 along First street is in conflict with the electrical joint trench. Please advise.					Adjust Joint Trench per U-3400 General Notes 2, 3, 5 and 6.		
					Joint Trench crossing 10-inch SD at STA 9+29 +/- is shown in U-3409 and U-3031 Profile D.		
U-0010	Electrical Line Transition In Joint Trench from Minna to Shaw Alley	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Ref U-3408, Q/U-3410, P/U-3410 attached.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Section Q/U-3410 shows a 5" and 2" electrical line on the north side of the joint trench. Section P/U-3410 shows the same 5" and 2" electrical lines on the west side of the joint trench as it turns north on Shaw Alley. Is the intent for these electrical lines to cross within the joint trench? Please advise.					No. The 5-inch and 2-inch electric conduits in Section Q/U-3410 should be located on the south side of the Joint Trench		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0011	Manhole #203 Elevation Conflict	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref U3031, U3007 and attached. Detail B/U-3031 shows the elevation of manhole #203 at 21.75 however U-3007 calls out an elevation of 22.0. Please confirm what the elevation of Manhole #203 is.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Construct sewer MH#203 rim to match existing grade at EL 22.0 +/- as shown on Sheet U-3007.		
U-0012	Electrical/Telecom Conflicts between Plan and Section	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref U-1108, U4000, H/4001 and attached. 1. Section H/U-4001 shows the (E)(6)4"E(D) just north of the (E)T(NR) however the plans show it north of the (E) SS. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Existing Topographic and Utility Survey Sheets and Sheet U-1108 show the horizontal location north of the (E) sewer. Section H on Sheet U-4001 shows the subject (E)(6)4"(D) at two locations, one is incorrectly shown. The horizontal location of the subject duct in Section H on Sheet U-4001 should be consistent with location shown in the Existing Topographic and Utility Survey Sheets and Sheet U-1108.		
U-0013	Water Connections at Howard	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Ref I-3120, U-3116, U-3112 There is a discrepancy in the elevations called out for the 12" water line connections at Howard. The First and Howard connection shows the elevation at 13 on U-3120 and no elevation is provided on Howard. If we were to scale, the elevation should be at 14. Please provide the connection elevation.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Construct the 12"x12"x12" TEE at center line EL 13.0 as shown on Sheet U-3120.		
U-0014	Size of Gas Line on First Street	Closed	10/25/2010	11/08/2010	11/05/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2891 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0017	JT Conflict with Basement @ Rickenbacker Rest.	Closed	11/09/2010	11/23/2010	01/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference sheet U-3407. PG&E has been potholing on the south east corner of Minna @ 2nd St. for a new gas line over the past number of days. We have observed in their potholes that a basement structure for the Rickenbacker Restaurant (123 2nd St.) extends out beyond the property line and under the sidewalk, along both Minna and 2nd Street. The basement appears to extend almost up to the roadway curb on 2nd Street and to face of curb or beyond on Minna. The joint trench at its current alignment (on Plan Sheet U-3407) along the south east corner of 2nd & Minna will be in conflict with this basement structure. Please review and advise.			E. Zagol 1/11/11 See revised Joint Trench Plan and Elevation Phase I Plans titled "Revisions - Minna Street 12/27/10" for realignment of Joint Trench. ***** E. Zagol 12/17/10 The Joint Trench as currently shown in Sheet U-3407 is in conflict with the 123 Second Street sidewalk basement between Minna Street stations 0+75 and 0+90. Separate from the conflict mentioned above, PG&E has requested TJPA to add additional conduits to the Joint Trench. Revised drawings will be provided that address the following: Realignment of Joint Trench west of station 2+00, realignment of the sewer west of station 2+25, and revisions to the water line (vertical and hydrant lateral) west of station 1+02 to address the conflict with 123 Second Street sidewalk basement. Modifications to Joint Trench sections from First Street to Second Street to accommodate PG&E's additional conduits. Modifications at the future Transit Center stubouts to accommodate PG&E's Joint Trench configuration revisions. RFI-U0050. ***** ***** E. Zagol 11/18/10 AECOM will attend the planned site visit to 123 Second Street on 11/19/10 to evaluate conflict. We are actively working with PG&E to identify options for the Joint Trench alignment west of STA 1+12 if 123 Second Street basement is confirmed in conflict.				

Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project



U-3201 shows two street lights to be relocated from



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2894 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2895 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0019.2	Light Pole at Station 4+12.03: Reroute existing conduit	Closed	12/21/2010	12/31/2010	02/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran			To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith				
Co-Author:			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Michelle Smith				
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Question from RFI #U-0019.1 ----- Reference: RFI #U-0019, attached picture and sheet U-3201 The streetlight at station 4+12.03 was laid out per the response to RFI #U-0019. When the new location was potholed, a number of existing utilities were discovered. Per inspection with BLHP on 12/20/2010, inspector Robert Kawano requests to re-route existing conduits in the new light pole ftg. location at STN. 4+12.03. Utilities seem to be privately owned by 555 Mission St.. Please advise.				Electrical conduit has been relocated by 555 Mission St. property management. Webcor/Obayashi to relocate irrigation conduit to be out of the way of the light pole base location. Coordinate with 555 Mission (Julian Marsh 415-546-6036 or Rob Edlenbos 415-546-6037) to have the irrigation controllers shut off for the work. ----- RFI U-0019.1 Response - Eric Zagol - 12/27/2010 Unforeseen condition requiring improvements by property owner to relocate privately owned utilities in the City right of way. TJPA Representative to coordinate with property owner to relocate utilities.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2896 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0020	Street Lighting Relocation Plan for Minna	Closed	11/15/2010	11/29/2010	11/18/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley			To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Plan/Drawing Reference: U-3201					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>We have been informally advised that the Design Engineer and BLHP are considering a revised installation plan for the street lights on Minna. This would include the installation of temporary overhead power lines to feed the relocated street light poles, until such time as the new lights are powered from underground by Trinet.</p> <p>Here is a sequence as Trinet understands it. Trinet would install the new light pole foundations on the north side of Minna and then relocate the light poles from the south side, per plans. BLHP would then install overhead cable, extending from a pole on 2nd St., to provide power for the lights. During installation of the new foundations, Trinet would install underground conduit from the pole to an adjacent splice box, and then later extend the underground conduit from the splice box to the PG&E power source, as depicted on the plans.</p> <p>Please clarify the street lighting relocation plan currently under consideration. Also, if the BLHP plan to feed the lights temporarily from overhead, will any changes be required to the foundation and light pole installation plan to accommodate an overhead power feed?</p> <p>Please review and advise.</p>					<p>11/18/2010, per Eric Zagol; At the request of the TJPA, SFPUC BLHP provided temporary overhead power for four street lights on Minna St. The temporary overhead power is shown in the attached sketch RFI-U0020 SKU-01. The temporary overhead street light power allows PG&E to de-activate existing underground electric ductbanks in Minna St. while maintaining power to the existing street lights.</p> <p>The temporary overhead power to existing street lights can remain active until the two street light relocations in Minna Street are constructed, new underground street light duct, bull boxes and cables are constructed, and new underground power connections have been coordinated with SFPUC BLHP and PG&E.</p> <p>Since SFPUC BLHP provided temporary power to the existing street lights, the construction sequence of the new street lights with respect to the other works on Minna St. now has more flexibility and is not required prior to performing other works in Minna St.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2897 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0021	M.H. #501 and existing utilities	Closed	11/17/2010	11/22/2010	12/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley		To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith		Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Plan/Drawing: U-3021				Please provide a mark up of U-3021 indicating the horizontal location of the utilities discovered that correlate to the section sketch provided. Also, please clearly indicate those utilities that were not marked in the field in response to the USA ticket for this excavation work.			
During potholing activities in 1st St. where Manhole #501 is to be installed Trinet has encountered a number of existing utilities which occupy the same intended space for Manhole #501. Please see the attached sketch for locations and clarifications of these utilities.				*****			
Some of these utilities, particularly UT Group #2 and UT Group #5 (reference sketch) are intended to be disconnected by PG&E by November 24th. Please confirm.				E. Zagol 11/24/10			
UT Group #1, which appears to be owned by ATT is noted on the drawings as to be disconnected and demolished. Please advise as to when this utility is scheduled to be disconnected.				In response to items listed above:			
UT Groups #3 and #4 are unidentified and were not included in the USA markings for this area. In order to construct M.H. #501 per the contract drawings these utilities must be removed or relocated. Please advise as to the ownership of these utilities and provide direction on how to proceed.				1. As of 11/17/10 PG&E has stated that the de-energization of Minna St. will be complete by 11/24/10. In accordance with Specification 024100 1.3 B and 024100 3.5 B obtain in writing a Utility Severance Certificate (or equal) that all connections have been disconnected and the utility is not active.			
Note: due to construction, we are requesting that this RFI be answered by 11/22/10 if possible.				2. As of 11/17/10 AT&T has stated that contents in AT&T existing ducts along First St. have been terminated with the exception of the new duct from Howard St. to 400 Howard St. property. Confirm that the existing AT&T duct subject of discursion is the exiting duct from TMH-1887 to Existing Transbay Terminal as shown to be demolished on U-1121. In accordance with Specification 024100 1.3 B and 024100 3.5 B obtain in writing a Utility Severance Certificate (or equal) that all connections have been disconnected and the utility is not active.			
				3. Groups #3 and #4 utilities are not shown on AECOM's existing utility plans and as noted in the RFI are not included in the USA markings. Pending direction from TJPA's representative in accordance with Specification Section 00 08 10 the suggested first course of action is to notify USA and request a "No Response Follow Up Message". Other suggested actions have been provided to TJPA PMPC for consideration and direction further direction provided by the TJPA's Representative.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2898 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
					E. Zagol 11/26/10		
					RE item #1, See attached email and email attachment from Antonio Chan (PG&E) dated 11/24/10 confirming de-energization of electric ducts in Minna St. and First St.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2899 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0022	SFWD crossings at Minna St. and 1st	Closed	11/17/2010	12/01/2010	12/03/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Plan/Drawing: U-1002 and attached PDF.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Current USA markings have identified (2) SFWD laterals which are not indicated on the drawings. These are located at approximately STA 8+59 and 9+06 and extend from the main in Minna St., North toward the building of 100 1st. ST. These laterals need to be identified and recorded in order to properly document and construct both the new water line and the new joint trench.					100 First St. Building Engineer confirmed existing laterals do not provide service to 100 First St.		
Any additional work associated with these utilities may result in a cost or schedule impact. Please review and provide direction on how we should proceed.					After new water in Minna Street is constructed, water services and hydrant laterals are connected; main to main connections are made by CDD, and pipes are secure; and the existing water main is abandoned, demolish existing laterals identified at approx. STA 8+59 and 9+06.		
					DO NOT provide a connection from new water main to existing laterals at approx. STA 8+59 and 9+06.		

					Tap record and meter information provided by SFPUC Customer Service Bureau indicates two water laterals to the 100 First St. property entering the building from First Street approximately 50 feet south of Mission St. Meter boxes located along First St. west sidewalk.		
					Coordinate with the 100 First St. Building Maintenance, Bradford J. Collins (CAC Real Estate Management Co., Inc.), Tel: 415.243.8803 thru the TJPA's representative to confirm that laterals do not provide service to 100 First St. property from Minna Street.		
U-0023	MOP 1 for de-energizing PG&E at Minna St. between 1st and 2nd St	Closed	12/01/2010	12/02/2010	12/02/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
There is a live PG&E cable in conduit (see RFI U-0021) in First Street at intersection of Minna Street.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Per spec section 01.01.42 / AT2-1 MOP for the Utility Shutdown Template, MOP 1 was created and sent via email on 11/29/10 requesting signatures from TJPA and PG&E for verification the conduit is de-energized. Copy					Please see attached document. This will be the MOP Form that W/O and its subcontractors are to use for the duration of the project for the deenergization, disconnect, or demolition of any utilities.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0024	<p>EBI demo dwgs and schedule for coordination</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Due to ongoing demolition work by EBI, W/O is requesting formal transmission of the most current demolition drawings and schedule.</p> <p>These documents will be used for coordination efforts with</p>	Closed	12/02/2010	12/03/2010	12/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<p>Answered By: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Per our utilities working session yesterday (12/7/10), the demolition drawings being used are the original set issued for construction, dated 1/14/10. C. Traylor will follow up to find out if/when Webcor/Obayashi was issued a copy of this set, or issue a new one for your</p>					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2901 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0025	Capped 6" Water Main in First St Investigative Trench at Minna St.	Closed	12/03/2010	12/06/2010	12/08/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order), and attached sketch					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Trinet has encountered a capped 6" water main running along the center of the First St. investigative trench at the east end of Minna St. - see attached sketch . Please confirm if the line is active or dead. We cannot excavate this section of trench to the required 8' depth until this water line is removed.					Contact USA and request SFWD (or SFPUC CDD) contact information.		
					Contact SFWD (or SFPUC CDD) and request field visit to determine status (active or abandoned) of existing capped 6" water pipe.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2902 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0026	Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 21'-7 from Curb	Closed	12/03/2010	12/06/2010	12/09/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 21'-7" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.					Verizon (MFS and MCI) conduits appear to be labeled in section however unknown conduits are indicated either directly below or adjacent to the identified Verizon conduits. How were the Verizon conduits (MFS and MCI) identified? Did Verizon confirm those labeled as Verizon (MCI and MFS) are theirs and the others are unknown? Please clarify. As per Demolition Plans, protect Verizon (MFS and MCI) structures in place until temporary bridge is constructed and Verizon conduits are relocated.		
U-0027	Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 18'-7 from Curb	Closed	12/03/2010	12/06/2010	12/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 18'-7" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.					- Confirm the "unidentified" utility was not marked by a utility in response to USA ticket. - Confirm that USA No Response Follow-Up procedures (First, Second and Third No Response Follow-Up) were followed in an effort to identify the utility including notifying utilities. Investigation information provided appears to be consistent with plans indicating a PG&E utility. - Confirm PG&E was contacted via USA process to mark underground facilities.		
U-0028	Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 14'-7 from Curb	Closed	12/03/2010	12/06/2010	12/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's					- Confirm the "unidentified" utility was not marked by the utility in response to USA ticket. - Confirm that USA No Response Follow-Up procedures (First, Second and Third No Response		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2903 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0029	Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 13'-4" from Curb	Closed	12/03/2010	12/06/2010	12/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order) See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 13'-4" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> - Confirm the "unidentified" utility was not marked by the utility in response to USA ticket. - Confirm that USA follow up procedures were followed in an effort to identify the utility including notifying utilities with no response.				
U-0030	Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 9'-10" from Curb	Closed	12/03/2010	12/06/2010	12/10/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order) See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 9'-10" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Verizon (MFS and MCI) conduits appear to be labeled in section however unknown conduits are indicated either directly below or adjacent to the identified Verizon conduits. How were the Verizon conduits (MFS and MCI) identified? Did Verizon confirm those labeled as Verizon (MCI and MFS) are theirs and the others are unknown? Please clarify. As per Demolition Plans, protect Verizon (MFS and MCI) structures in place until temporary bridge is constructed and Verizon conduits are relocated.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2904 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0031	Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 7'-2" from Curb	Closed	12/03/2010	12/06/2010	12/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 7'-2" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.					- RFI states "unidentified" utility yet highlighted utility in New Section 1 states "10 AWSS", please clarify question.		
U-0031.1	24in Concrete Wall in First St. Invest Trench - 7ft 2in from FOC	Closed	12/23/2010	01/02/2011	12/29/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached section and plan sketches, and attached documentation of notifications to USA North					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See the highlighted wall on attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the East side of First St. from Stn. 10+00 to 9+70. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007 Trinet requests direction regarding the unidentified 24" concrete wall found 7'-2" from the East face of curb and 10" cover that was encountered but not indicated on the contract plans.					Unknown 24" concrete wall to be demolished by Transit Center Project (NIP) within the area impacted by the CDSM shoring wall and mass excavation.		
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this wall by 12/27/10.					Answered by Eric Zagol AECOM 12/29/2010		
U-0032	Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 3'-2" from Curb	Closed	12/03/2010	12/06/2010	12/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					- Confirm the "unidentified" utility was not marked by a		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2905 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0032.1	Unidentified 18" Concrete Wall in First St Invest Trench - 3ft-2in from Curb	Closed	12/23/2010	01/02/2011	12/29/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached section and plan sketches, and attached documentation of notifications to USA North			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See the highlighted item on attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the East side of First St. from Station 10+00 to 9+70. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet requests direction for the demolition of the 18" concrete wall found 3'-2" from the East face of curb and 17.5" covered that was encountered but not indicated on the contract plans.			Unknown 18" concrete wall to be demolished by Transit Center Project (NIP) within the area impacted by the CDSM shoring wall and mass excavation.				
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/27/10.			Answered by Eric Zagol AECOM 12/29/2010				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2906 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0033	Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 5'-8" from Curb	Closed	12/03/2010	12/06/2010	12/07/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on First St. at Minna St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 5'-8" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.					- Confirm the "unidentified" utility was not marked by the utility in response to USA ticket.		
					- Confirm that USA No Response Follow-Up procedures (First, Second and Third No Response Follow-Up) were followed in an effort to identify the utility including notifying utilities. Investigation information provided appears to be consistent with plans indicating traffic signal utility.		
					- Confirm SFMTA was contacted via USA process to mark traffic signals and street light underground facilities.		
U-0033.1	Unidentified 2in Pipe in First St Invest Trench - 5ft-8in from Curb	Closed	12/23/2010	01/02/2011	12/29/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached section and plan sketches, and attached documentation of notifications to USA North					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the East side of First St. from Station 10+00 to 9+70. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet requests direction for demolition of the unidentified 2" pipe found 5'-8" from the East face of curb and 15" covered that was encountered but not indicated on the contract plans.					Confirm exposed 2" pipe is Traffic Signal conduit as shown in the Plans. Once confirmed demolish in accordance with Demolition Plans.		
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/27/10.					Answered by Eric Zagol AECOM 12/29/2010		
U-0034	Station 9+10 New Hydrant Conflict with Sidewalk Basement	Closed	12/09/2010	12/20/2010	12/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2907 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	REQUEST: Reference: Sheet U-3109 (dated 2010-09-29) During Trinet's potholing for the Joint trench along the North side of Minna St, a basemenet for building "100 First St." was revealed. The basement wall is located just behind the face of curb and extends to more than 8 feet below finish grade. The extent of the basement is unknown, but assumed to run the length of the "100 First St" property. The basement structure is in conflict with the proposed new fire hydrant installation at Station 9+10. Please provide layout for the fire hydrant.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The wall encountered appears to be an abandoned side walk basement wall for the 4 story brick building that existed prior to the current 100 First St. building. Approximate width of wall is 2 feet and the outside face is approximately at the face of curb. Neatly cut and remove wall to form a trench. Required trench width and depth per Detail 7 on U-5101. Construct hydrant lateral, riser and hydrant as shown in Detail 2 on Sheet U-5101.		
U-0035	Installlation Depth of Storm Drain New Catch Basins	Closed	12/09/2010	12/13/2010	12/13/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Reference: Sheet U-3023, U-3033 (Detail B), Attached detail from Department of Public Works Buearu of Engineering Trinet is concerned that the installation depth for many of the new catch basin does not comply with SFDPW Sewer Departent guidelines, specifically regarding access to the traps for the maintenance department. The DPW sewer maintenance crews need to have ready access to the p-trap during flooding emergencies. DPW crews need to be able to reach the p-trap to, either remove the cleanout cap and release the flow to the culvert pipe (if the trap bottom is plugged), or rod the culvert line through the trap (if the culvert is plugged). To get some clarification of the installation guidelines, Trinet had informally talked to one of the design engineers at the SF Bureau of Engineerring, Hydraulics Department. He advised Trinet that new catch basins should be installed with center of trap and discharge piping grade located between 3 and 4 feet below the culvert runs to cross under existing utilities that are in conflict with a direct run to the discharge manhole. Bends should be 22	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AECOM has confirmed with SFDPW Hydraulics that limited vertical bends in the 10-inch culvert run are acceptable. SFDPW also confirmed that from a maintenance perspective the clean out on the cast iron trap is more accessible at a depth of 3 to 4 feet below ground surface. Please submit subsurface utility investigation information including top, bottom and size of existing utilities along the 10-inch culvert alignment from catch basin to manhole such that the 10-inch culvert can be engineered and the catch basin depth can be determined to avoid existing and future utilities.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	1/2 degrees where possible as required, and if 45 degree bends must be used we should limit the number to two (2).						
	Please provide the depth of CB#603 on Fremont Street. To expedite the work in the field, we require an answer by 12/13/10.						
U-0035.1	Fremont Street Storm Drain from CB#603 to (E) Manhole	Closed	12/23/2010	01/02/2011	12/28/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jason Dunne		To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu	Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Refer to Sheet U-3023, U-3033 (detail B) and see RFI #U-0035		Based on a site visit on 12/28/10 with Jason Dunne (W/O) and Victor (Trinet) to review exposed trench alignment for 10-inch culvert it was confirmed that the culvert alignment will clear the new temporary 8-inch water and existing 8-inch water main with adequate separation.					
Per the response to RFI #U-0035, find attached for your review a drawing showing the proposed alignment for the catch basin (CB# 603) installation and storm drain run to the existing manhole on Fremont St.		Alignment as shown in the attached drawing is acceptable.					
Please confirm this proposed alignment is acceptable or provide another solution.		Note, existing 3" HP Gas immediately west of the catch basin is to be abandoned by PG&E per Sheet U-1123 Demolition and Sequence item 2. Coordinate with PG&E to confirm 3" HP Gas is inactive and can be demolished and removed to facilitate construction of the catch basin and culvert, if required.					
***Please confirm this alignment by 12/27/10 if possible.		Answered by Eric Zagol AECOM 12/28/2010					
		***** ***** *****					
		Please indicate the location of new temporary 8-inch water main in Fremont Street in the section drawing and resubmit for review.					
		Answered by Eric Zagol					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2909 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

AECOM 12/27/2010



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2910 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0036	Unidentified 6in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 7ft-9in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 28 and documentation of notifications to USA North			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 6" steel pipe at 7'-9" from the east face of curb and 3'-4" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.			Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.				
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.			In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLES AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:				
			Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)				
			Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.				
			Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.				
			Note, 6" steel pipe is in the same alignment as PG&E's excavated manhole 1675. Coordinate with PG&E to see if PG&E has demolished this line.				
U-0037	Unidentified 2in Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 7in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
	<div>REQUEST: Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 16 and Documentation of notification to USA North See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U - 1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 2" steel line found 7" from south face of curb and 2'-2" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line. Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.</div>	SUGGESTION:						
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>			
			Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.					
			In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:					
			Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)					
			Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.					
			Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.					
U-0038	Unidentified 4" Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 7ft 4in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	From: Webcor Construction LP	David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company	Kevin Chiu	Answered By: AECOM Technical Service			Eric Zagol
Co-Author:								
	<div>REQUEST: Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 17 and documentation of notifications to USA North</div>	SUGGESTION:						
			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>			
			Confirmed that the existing 4" steel line is an abandoned PG&E conduit connected to the abandoned PG&E manhole 1354 abandoned and de-					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page:2912 of 3091

Date:06/17/2015

Time:02:27 PM

Job:30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U - 1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4" steel line found 7'-4" from north face of curb and 2'-11" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.</p> <p>Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.</p>						
U-0039	Unidentified 4" Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 6ft 7in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu					Answered By:AECOM Technical Service	Eric Zagol
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
	Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 18 and documentation of notifications to USA North		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	<p>See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U - 1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4" steel line found 6'-7" from north face of curb and 2'-3" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.</p> <p>Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.</p>		<p>Confirm that the existing 4" steel line is an abandoned PG&E conduit connected to the abandoned PG&E manhole 1354 abandoned and de-energized as part of PG&E's Minna Street Stage I de-energization work. Demolish and remove conduit and contents following confirmation of abandonment by PG&E.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0040	Unidentified 4in Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 5ft from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 19 and documentation of notifications to USA North				Existing 4" steel conduit is directly in line with abandoned PG&E manhole 1354. Confirm that the existing 4" steel is an abandoned PG&E conduit connected to the abandoned PG&E manhole 1354 abandoned and de-energized as part of PG&E's Minna Street Stage I de-energization work. Demolish and remove conduit and contents following confirmation of abandonment by PG&E.			
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4" steel line found 5' from north face of curb and 2'-10" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.							
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0041	Unidentified 1in Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 2ft 9in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 20 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 1" steel line found 2' 9" from north face of curb and 18" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2915 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0042	Unidentified 6in Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 6in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/16/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 21 and documentation of notifications to USA North					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 6" steel line found 6" from north face of curb and 36" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.					Confirm with PG&E that the 6" steel line identified is an abandoned PG&E 6" cast iron gas main. Demolish abandoned 6" cast iron pipe and contents as required to construct the Joint Trench.		
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.							
U-0043	Fire Hydrant at St. 5+70 on Minna	Closed	12/13/2010	12/23/2010	12/14/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Mario Saldana Sr. To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
INFORMATION NEEDED					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See the attached picture of the proposed fire hydrant location as indicated by drawings on Minna St. at Stn. 5+70. This location is in conflict with an existing driveway apron not shown on drawing # U-2008. Eric Zagol from AECOM is aware and has seen this issue in the field. NOTE - Due to the 8" water line currently being installed, the location for the "T" section oinstall could be as early as Tuesday the 14th. Please provide direction by 12-14-10 if possible.					Due to the close proximity to the existing street light at the suggested location, please construct the hydrant east of the existing driveway at STA 5+87.5.		
We propose to move the fire hydrant location 6' West to Stn. 5+64. Please advise.							
U-0044	Unidentified 4ft x 6.5ft Wall Encountered in Minna St. - 1ft from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2916 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 22 and documentation of notifications to USA North</p> <p>See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4' x 6.5' wall (bottom was not found) at 1' from north face of curb and 18" to cover that Trinet encountered in the east wall of the trench. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this structure.</p> <p>Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Demolish and remove structure as required to construct Joint Trench.</p>		
U-0045	Unidentified Concrete Wall Encountered in Minna St. - in line with FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/29/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford		To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:							
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 23 and documentation of notifications to USA North</p> <p>See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified concrete wall (bottom was not found) in line with the north face of curb and 30" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this structure. Also, this wall may effect Trinet's ability to build the catchbasin at Station 2+13.</p> <p>Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Two part question, responses are as follows:</p> <p>1. In reference to the exposed concrete wall, TJPA Representative to confirm that the concrete wall exposed is an old sub sidewalk basement backfilled with concrete during construction of the 101 Second St. building.</p> <p>2. In reference to "this wall may effect Trinet's ability to build the catchbasin at Station 2+13", pothole in accordance with the contract documents at catch basin location to identify any conflicts.</p> <p>Answered by Eric Zagol AECOM 12/29/2010</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2917 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0046	Unidentified Concrete Wall Encountered in Fremont St. - in line with FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/29/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 24 and documentation of notifications to USA North					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified concrete structure wall (the bottom was not found) at the east face of curb and 18" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this structure.					Unknown concrete wall to be demolished by Transit Center Project (NIP) within the area impacted by the CDSM shoring wall and mass excavation.		
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.					Answered by Eric Zagol AECOM 12/29/2010		
U-0047	Unidentified 3in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 5ft-8in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 25 and documentation of notifications to USA North					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 3" steel pipe at 5'-8" from the east face of curb and 4'-3" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.					Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.		
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.					In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:		
					Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2918 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0048	Unidentified 3in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 6ft-10in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 26 and documentation of notifications to USA North			Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.				
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 3" steel pipe at 6'-10" from the east face of curb and 18" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.			In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:				
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.			Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)				
SUGGESTION:							
identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)							
Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.							
Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0049	Unidentified 1in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 6ft-10in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 27 and documentation of notifications to USA North			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 1" steel pipe at 6'-10" from the east face of curb and 4'-3" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.			Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.				
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.			In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:				
			Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)				
			Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0050	Lower Sewer Laterals on Minna	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	01/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Mario Saldana Sr.		To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:				1/11/11			
Reference: Sheets U-3007 & 3008, and Trinet RFI 41				See revised Sewer Plan and Elevation Phase I Plans titled "Revisions - Minna Street 12/27/10" for revisions to sewer main elevations.			
Two of the active sewer service laterals potholed on Minna St. are lower than the new sewer main and will not drain. The details of each issue are as follows:				*****			
1. Station 5+05 - Service for #2 Shaw Alley				12/27/10			
Top of pipe grade @ FOC for the 6" VCP sewer lateral is 11.37. The invert elevation is approximately 10.8. The invert elevation of the new 24" sewer main @ Station 5+05 is approximately 11.4				Adjust new sewer main in Minna Street to accommodate existing laterals as shown in the "Minna Street Revisions" sheet revision forthcoming addressing both this RFI and RFI U-0017.			
2. Station 2+10 - Service for Anchor & Hope Restaurant							
Top of pipe grade @ FOC for the 6" VCP sewer lateral is 13.51. The invert elevation is approximately 12.94. The invert of the new 18" VCP sewer main @ Station 2+10 is approximately 13.4.							
Please review these issues and advise. An expedited response is requested by 12/16/10.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2921 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0051	Unidentified 6in x 6in Concrete Duct Encountered in Fremont St. - 10ft-1in from FC Closed		12/15/2010	12/25/2010	01/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 30 and documentation of notifications to USA North			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 6in x 6in concrete duct at 10'-1" from the east face of curb and 5' to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.			Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.				
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.			In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:				
			Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)				
			Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.				
			Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.				
			Note, 6"x6" conc. duct is in the same alignment as PG&E's excavated manhole 1675. Coordinate with PG&E to see if PG&E has demolished this line.				
U-0052	Unidentified 12in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 11ft-6in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2922 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 32 and documentation of notifications to USA North</div><div>See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 12" steel pipe at 11'-6" from the east face of curb and 3'-6" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.</div><div>Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>					
	<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Confirm with PG&E that the 12" steel line identified is an abandoned PG&E 12" cast iron gas main. Following confirmation from PG&E, cut and cap existing abandoned 12" cast iron gas main at the demarcation line shown on U-1123.</div></div>						
U-0053	Unidentified 3in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 10ft-3in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>David Hungerford</div><div>To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu</div></div>						
	<div><div>Co-Author:</div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 31 and documentation of notifications to USA North</div><div>See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 3" steel pipe at 10'-3" from the east face of curb and 3'-10" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.</div><div>Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.</div></div>	<div><div>SUGGESTION:</div></div>					
	<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.</div><div>In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:</div><div>Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to</div></div>						



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2923 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0054	Unidentified Pair of 4in Pipes Encountered in Fremont St. - 22ft from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 33 and documentation of notifications to USA North			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified pair of 4" steel pipes at 22' from the west face of curb and 2'-7" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.			Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.				
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.			In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:				
			Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If				

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0055	Unidentified 10in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 14ft 3in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/20/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu Co-Author:			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
REQUEST: Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 34 and documentation of notifications to USA North See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 10" steel pipe at 14'-3" from the west face of curb and 2'-11" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line. Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Confirm with PG&E that the 10" steel line identified is an abandoned PG&E 10" cast iron gas main. Following confirmation from PG&E, cut and cap existing abandoned 10" cast iron gas main at the demarcation line shown on U-1123.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0056	Unidentified 4in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 12ft 3in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/29/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 35 and documentation of notifications to USA North					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4" steel pipe at 12'-3" from the west face of curb and 2' to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.					Confirm 4" steel pipe is SFPUC BLHP street light conduit as shown in the Plans. Once confirmed demolish in accordance with the Demolition Plans.		
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.							
U-0057	Unidentified 2.5in Pipes Encountered in Fremont St. - 4ft 10in from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/30/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 36 and documentation of notifications to USA North					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified pair of 2.5" steel pipes at 4'-10" from the west face of curb and 21" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.					Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.		
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.					In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLES AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:		
					Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0058	Unidentified 4in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 2ft from FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	12/29/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 37 and documentation of notifications to USA North			Confirm 4" steel pipe is SFPUC BLHP street light conduit as shown in the Plans. Once confirmed demolish in accordance with the Demolition Plans.				
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4" steel pipe at 2' from the west face of curb and 15" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.			Answered by Eric Zagol AECOM 12/29/2010				
SUGGESTION:							
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2927 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0059	Unidentified 6in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - in line with FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	01/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 38 and documentation of notifications to USA North					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 6" clay pipe at the west face of curb and 4'-7" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.					Possible existing Transbay Terminal sewer laterals. Coordinate with Existing Terminal & Ramps Demolition Plans Project (Demolition Project) through the TJPA Representative to confirm that the Demolition Project has abandoned sewer laterals. Sewer laterals should be abandoned per SFDPW Standards.		
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.					Once confirmed abandoned, cut and plug at the demarcation line shown in the Drawings.		
U-0060	Unidentified 6in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - in line with FOC	Closed	12/15/2010	12/25/2010	01/04/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 39 and documentation of notifications to USA North					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 6" clay pipe in line with the west face of curb and 6'-6" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.					Possible existing Transbay Terminal sewer laterals. Coordinate with Existing Terminal & Ramps Demolition Plans Project (Demolition Project) through the TJPA Representative to confirm that the Demolition Project has abandoned sewer laterals. Sewer laterals should be abandoned per SFDPW Standards.		
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.					Once confirmed abandoned, cut and plug at the demarcation line shown in the Drawings.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2928 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0061	Revised drawing for 8" water line on Minna St. at Second St.	Closed	12/20/2010	12/30/2010	12/21/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Mario Saldana Sr. To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: Sheet U-3407			Please see the attached sketch that shows revisions to the water line along Minna Street as a result of the Joint Trench realignment due to the sub sidewalk basement conflict at 133 Second St.				
Please provide drawing for the 8" water line and vertical / hydrant installation on Minna St. (reference RFI U-0017 response) west of Station 1+02. Please provide A.S.A.P. as field construction should be at this point by Tuesday pm.							
U-0062	Unidentified 8in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 8ft 3in from FOC	Closed	12/22/2010	01/01/2011	01/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference: Sheet U-1008 (dated 2010.09.29) and attached sketch from Trinet			Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.				
See attached section through the investigative trench at Station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4, on sheet U-1008 Trinet requests direction on an unidentified 8" steel pipe found 8'-3" from the East face of curb and 4'-4" to cover that was encountered but not indicated on the contract documents.			In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:				
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this pipe by 12/27/10.			Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)				
			Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.				
			Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0063	Unmarked service lateral on Minna St. at Station 3+08	Closed	12/22/2010	01/01/2011	12/27/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol					
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference: Sheet U-3107 (dated 2010.09.29) During excavation for the 8" water main along Minna Street, Trinet encountered a 1" Polyethylene service lateral at station 3+08, that extended into the vacant lot on the south side of the street. The service was broken during construction and Trinet has temporarily capped it. The utility was not shown on any utility plans. There is also no new service lateral, or reconnection of an existing, depicted on the new water main drawings at or adjacent to this location. Please advise on what should be done with the service. The repair is only temporary and a permanent reconnection will need to be performed by the SFWD if the service is to be maintained active. If the service is to be de-activated, then Trinet recommends that it be shut off at the connection to the old main.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown service lateral to vacant lot. Coordinate with SFWD through TJPA Representative to shut off broken lateral. Answered by Eric Zagol AECOM 12/27/2010				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0064	Unidentified Facility in First St. Invest Trench - from Stn. 9+70 to 9+59.5	Closed	12/22/2010	01/01/2011	01/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference: Sheet U-1007 and attached sketch of areas plan view

See attached, plan views of the investigative trench on the East side of First St, West of the concrete MUNI median, from Stn. 9+70 to 9+59.5. Per note 4 on sheet U -1007, Trinet requests direction on the 4" Cardboard Pipe found 2'-0" West of the concrete MUNI median face of curb and 3'-6" to cover that was encountered but not indicated on the plans.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/23/10.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0065	Two Unidentified 4" Pipes in First St. Invest Trench from Stn. 10+00 to 9+70	Closed	12/23/2010	01/02/2011	12/29/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of areas in plan and section, attached USA North tickets			Confirm 2-4" concrete and redwood encased pipes are the inactive 2-3" AT&T conduits from AT&T manhole TMH1887 to the Existing Transbay Terminal as shown in the Plans. Once confirmed demolish in accordance with the Demolition Plans.				
See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the East side of First St.from Stn. 10+00 to 9+70. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007 Trinet requests direction regarding the two 4" concrete and redwood encased pipes found at the East face of curb and down 2'-3" that was encountered but not indicated on the plans.			Answered by Eric Zagol AECOM 12/29/2010				
Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/27/10.							
<hr/>							
U-0066	Minna St Station 2+09 - 4" Water Service Lateral Encountered	Closed	12/23/2010	01/02/2011	12/28/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Refer to Sheet U-3107			Existing 4-inch service for 83 Minna Street is indicated in specification 331160 Appendix A. Service is an active fire service to 83 Minna Street and must be connected to the new 8-inch water main.				
During the water installation on Minna St we encountered an existing 4" water service lateral at Sta 2+09. The 4" service extends from the old 8" water main to 83 Minna St (Anchor & Hope Restaurant). This is in addition to a 1" service lateral to the same building which we encountered at station 2+09. The contract drawings only show the 1" water lateral service connecting to the new main.			Furnish and install 8"x8"x4" tee with joint restraint in accordance with the specifications. Furnish and install service 4-inch DIP, fittings and valve. Set 4-inch service and valve elevation to match existing 4-inch service elevation.				
Please advise if the existing 4" service lateral is active and if it must be connected to the new water main. There was no material on site to install a tee in the line, and to avoid delaying the work, the new water main isntallation continued past the 4" service lateral. The recommendation is that if the 4" service line needs to be connected to the new main, work can be performed by SFWD as an additional tie-in.			Connection from new 4-inch service valve to existing 4-inch service by SFWD. Answered by Eric Zagol AECOM 12/28/2010				
<hr/>							
U-0066.1	Minna St Station 2+09 - 4in Water Service Lateral Encountered	Closed	01/10/2011	01/20/2011	01/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2932 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Jason Dunne	To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu	Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Reference Sheet U-3107 and Trinet RFI 059.1	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	This is a follow up to the engineer's response to Trinet RFI #59 (RFI#U-0066). Upon further evaluation of the 4" fire service connection at 83 Minna by Tom Farhnam (SFWD Senior Inspector), the water department proposed the attached installation detail for an 8"x4" tee in the 8" main, to be performed by Trinet, and the connection detail to the existing 4" service, to be performed later by the SFWD crew. This change was proposed to avoid conflicting utilities running along the south side of teh new 8" main. AECOM's Design Engineer, Eric Zagol, was advised of the changed design plan proposed by SFWD in the field on 12/28/2010. Please confirm if the attached plan is acceptable and approved for construction.		Construct water serve lateral in accordance with contractor's attached plan and note the following:				
			1. Provide full joint restraint in accordance with contract documents				
			2. Provide 4" DI pipe for the section labeled "9" DI NIPPLE"				
U-0067	Buried Manhole in First St. Invest Trench - 15ft 7in from FOC	Closed	12/23/2010	01/02/2011	12/28/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu	Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached section and plan sketches, and attached documentation of notifications to USA North	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
	See the highlighted man hole on attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the East side of First St.from Stn. 10+00 to 9+70. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007 Trinet requests direction regarding the unidentified manhole found 15'-7" from the East face of curb and buried 4'-6" deep that was encountered but not indicated on the contract plans.		Manhole appears to be an abandoned separated sanitary sewer manhole.				
	Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this wall by 12/27/10.		Please provide data on utility material (e.g. brick) and condition (e.g. filled with sand or concrete) in accordance with 02630 4.1 G.5 such that the demolition can be determined.				
			Answered by Eric Zagol AECOM 12/28/2010				
U-0068	Minna St Water Main Conflict w Abandoned Sewer MH	Closed	12/23/2010	01/02/2011	12/27/2010	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford	To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu	Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2933 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

See attached drawings and photos

During the water main installation on Minna St, Trinet encountered what appears to be an old abandoned sewer manhole in the trench line at station 1+15. The structure was not indicated on the drawings and was not discovered until the pavement asphalt was removed. The sewer manhole is directly in conflict with the alignment of the new water main. The installation of the watermain cannot proceed further until the manhole is demolished and/or abandoned.

Per a field walk with Eric Zagol on 12/23/10, the existing MH was confirmed abandoned. Please confirm/advise the top of the MH will be demolished to allow the installation of the waterline, and the MH will be backfilled with CDF.

****Please provide direction by 12/28/10.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

1. Remove and dispose of existing abandoned separated sanitary sewer system manhole to a depth of 1 foot below bottom of new water main.

2. Plug existing abandoned 8-inch sanitary sewer with concrete per 024100 3.6 A.

3. Backfill abandoned manhole with CDF to an elevation 1 foot below bottom of new water main.

4. Provide 6-inches of bedding material between CDF and bottom of trench bedding per Detail 7 on Sheet U-5101 such that the total depth of trench bedding crossing the abandoned structure is 1 foot.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/27/2010

U-0069 **Street Light CCTV Camera-East Side of Fremont St. @ Stn. 5+45**

Closed

From: Webcor Construction LP

Richard Buellesbach

To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu

01/05/2011 **01/15/2011** **01/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Reference Sheet U-3302 and Trinet RFI 62

During removal of the light pole arm on the east side of Fremont St. @ Stn. 5+45, Trinet observed that there is a CCTV camera and associated wiring on the light pole. Please advise of the plan for removal of CCTV camera.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

1/14/11

Remove and salvage existing CCTV camera as part of the traffic signal equipment removal. Deliver traffic signal equipment and camera to the Traffic Signal Shop Yard in accordance with specification 02 41 00 par. 3.4 C 4.

1/12/11

Please clarify how this RFI relates to RFI U-0073
"VOID - reference RFI U-0069"



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2934 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0070	Subsurface Structures in Conflict with Minna St. AT&T Vault	Closed	01/10/2011	01/20/2011	01/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jason Dunne To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet U-2008 and Trinet RFI 63			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
During our potholing on Minna St. for the proposed AT&T vault in the sidewalk (Stn. 3+72), we encountered an existing subsurface foundation and slurry shoring wall. The top of the subsurface foundation is at a depth of approximately 4' from the top of the sidewalk and is in conflict with the installation of the proposed AT&T vault. Installation of the proposed AT&T vault in accordance with the plans will require partial demolition of the existing foundation wall encountered. Please advise.			As determined during a site visit on 1/10/11 with W/O, Turner, AECOM and Tishman Speyer, the exposed wall is an abandoned sidewalk basement wall. Remove and dispose of existing abandoned sidewalk basement wall as required (approx. 1.5 feet in depth) to construct proposed AT&T vault.				
U-0071	Existing fittings at tie in location for Minna St. 8 in. Water Main (Stn. 9+30)	Closed	01/10/2011	01/20/2011	01/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Richard Buellesbach To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet U-3109 and Trinet RFI 64			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Due to the presence of existing fittings installed in the existing 8 inch water main at our tie in location (Stn. 9+30) at First St. and Minna St. for the new 8 inch water main on Minna St., SFWD inspector Dan Helmnik has requested to extend the limits of the tie in excavation beyond the locations of the existing fittings. This is beyond what would normally be required for a tie in of this nature. Existing conditions were reviewed in the field by W/O, Turner, SFWD, Eric Zagol from Aecom, and Trinet personnel.			Provide labor and equipment to excavate and shore trench for pipes, fittings, and valves as necessary for connections to the existing water mains by SFWD in accordance with U-3100 Note 4 and specification section 33 11 00 par. 3.5.				
Please advise. An expedited response is requested.							
U-0072	Fremont St traffic Signal Pole to be removed and salvaged - has Muni Cable attach	Closed	01/10/2011	01/20/2011	01/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jack Adams				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet U-3302 and Trinet RFI 65			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			J. Adams 01/18/2011				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2935 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>		
	<p>Per contract, Trinet is required to remove and salvage the existing light pole indicated in the attached drawing. Through observation in the field, the existing light pole has a MUNI cable attached which runs to the intersection of Fremont St. and Mission St.. Based on these findings, should the light pole be removed as indicated? Mario Saldana from W/O was present when this item was observed and issue has been discussed with Eric Zagol from AECOM.</p> <p>Please advise. An expedited response is requested by 01/12/2011.</p>				<p>These are MUNI OCS Poles not Lighting Poles. Both OCS poles along east side of Fremont near 301 Mission Tower are in use by MUNI OCS System. MUNI has designated each OCS pole to hold different guy wires at Fremont and Mission see Demolition drawing Sheet 105 of 137. The poles are to remain and be deleted from Webcor-Obayashi/Trinet scope.</p> <p>NOTE: Evans Bros Subcontractor Reliance Electric are to correct OCS cables to both of these OCS Poles. Reference Demolition drawing plan sheet 105 of 137. A second cable will be installed at OCS Pole 4030 and the cable will be reinstalled at OCS Pole directly north of Pole 4030 per contract.</p> <p>*****</p> <p>J. Adams 01/13/2011</p> <p>The MUNI Overhead Contact System (OCS) Pole in question not light pole. This OCS pole was to have the guy wires relocated to nearby MUNI OCS Pole by the Demolition Contractor in July 2010 during mods to Transbay Terminal MUNI OCS system. Demo drawing plan sheet 105 of 137 shows the guy wires relocated to pole 4030 - this is in EBi scope.</p> <p>Pole 4030 is shown to remain per Demo drawing above - But, Pole 4030 is shown to be removed per RUP U-3302 .</p> <p>It should be noted that upon relocation of this OCS guywire the removal of the pole is Webcor-Obayashi scope per drawing U-3302.</p> <p>*****</p> <p>E. Zagol 01/13/2011</p> <p>Change in existing conditions. New MUNI guy wire was attached to existing pole at STA 5+45 as part of the Existing Terminal & Ramps Demolition Plans project.</p> <p>1. Remove and salvage traffic signal equipment per U-</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2936 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0073	Fremont St. Light Pole and Muni Cables to be protected - indicated light pole has r Closed						
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu							
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
Reference Sheet U-3302 Traffic Signal E and Trinet RFI 66			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
As indicated on the plans, Trinet is required to "Remove and Salvage Traffic Signal Equipment. Protect Pole and Muni Cables in Place." Conditions were reviewed in the field and there is no Muni cable attached to the (E) light pole.			Can't find answer in Constructware.				
Mario Saldana from W/O has observed there is a CCTV cable attached to the pole not mentioned in Trinet RFI 66 and requests clarification on ownership and status of the CCTV line. This issue has been discussed with Eric Zagol from AECOM.							
Please advise. An expedited response is requested by							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2937 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2938 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0075	Water Main Connection at 2nd St and Minna St - expose new line for SFWD	Closed	01/11/2011	01/21/2011	01/12/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Mario Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3107 and attached photos					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
At the intersection of 2nd St and Minna St, there is an existing 2in gas line running directly on top and next to the existing 8in main to be tied into. SFWD cannot make the Tee connection due to the bells of the fittings with the 2in gas line so close.					Provide labor and equipment to excavate and shore trench for pipes, fittings, and valves as necessary for connections to the existing water mains by SFWD in accordance with U-3100 Note 4 and specification section 33 11 00 par. 3.5.		
The end of the new line installed by Trinet will need to be exposed about 2ft for SFWD to move the end of the line by 1ft east so that SFWD can make the connection without moving the gas line. This will require extra work for Trinet to expose the new line for SFWD. Eric Zangol from AECOM and Dan Helminiak from SFWD were present during the discussion of this issue.							
Please provide direction as soon as possible as this will impact the chlorination and tie-in schedule.							
U-0076	Water Main Connection at 2nd St and Minna St - demo/excavate per SFWD	Closed	01/11/2011	01/21/2011	01/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Mario Saldana To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3107 and attached photos					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
At the intersection of 2nd St and Minna St, the new 8in water main is to be connected to an existing 6in water line. The new 8in line installed by Trinet is above and below existing utilities, and SFWD requires more demo/excavation to make the connection.					Provide labor and equipment to excavate and shore trench for pipes, fittings, and valves as necessary for connections to the existing water mains by SFWD in accordance with U-3100 Note 4 and specification section 33 11 00 par. 3.5.		
This will require extra work for Trinet to demo/excavate per SFWD. Inspector Dan Helminiak is scheduling the SFWD to come back and measure this afternoon (01/11/2011). Eric Zangol from AECOM was also present during the discussion of this issue.							
Please provide direction as soon as possible as this will impact the chlorination and tie-in schedule.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2939 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0077	Fire Hydrant Installation at Minna St Stn. 0+90	Closed	01/12/2011	01/22/2011	01/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3107					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
With reference to the fire hydrant at Minna St. Stn. 0+90, (northeast corner of Second St. and Minna St.) General Note #5 on sheet U-3107 directs Trinet to "replace in place existing fire hydrant."					As discussed on site with Daniel Helminiak (SFPUC Inspector) and those mentioned above, the proposed construction sequencing of the fire hydrant at Minna St. STA 0+90 is acceptable.		
Per on site field discussions with Eric Zagol from AECOM, Robert Friend from Trinet and Mario Saldana from W/O, it was determined that the existing hydrant would remain in place until after the new water main connections are performed by CDD crews. After which the existing hydrant will be removed and new hydrant and lateral piping will be installed and tested.					Coordinate with Daniel Helminiak (or assigned SFPUC Inspector) and the SFWD to ensure the fire hydrant is properly decommissioned by SFWD and SFFD following main connections by SFWD and prior to abandonment of the existing main in Minna Street by SFWD prior to fire hydrant installation by Trinet. Coordinate with SFPUC inspector to ensure SFWD and SFFD installs a black hydrant "donut" on the existing fire hydrant and new fire hydrant prior to the new fire hydrant being placed in service. Coordinate the removal of the "donut" once new fire hydrant is in service.		
Please confirm if this is acceptable. An expedited response is requested.							
U-0078	6in and 4in Service Laterals to 2 Shaw Alley	Closed	01/12/2011	01/22/2011	01/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-2008					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The existing 4" water service found at Stn. 5+37 has been confirmed abandoned by SFWD personnel through on site investigations. Since the service is determined to be inactive, Trinet intends to not provide service from the new main for this 4" service as discussed in the field, with Eric Zagol from AECOM, Mario Saldana from W/O, Dan Helminick from SFWD and Robert Friend from Trinet. In addition, Dan Helminick from SFWD requested to have the service tee installed in the new 8" main which was to provide service for this 4" lateral removed and straight pipe installed. Please confirm if this is acceptable.					Existing 4" water service at STA 5+37. Subsurface utility investigations should have been performed and submitted prior to installation of water main to determine status of existing lateral in accordance with U-3108 General Note No. 3. It is acceptable to remove the 8"x8"x4" tee installed and replace with straight pipe per the request of SFPUC SFWD inspector.		
The 6" water service lateral found at Stn. 5+30 has been confirmed as an active fire service to 2 Shaw Alley by SFWD personnel through on site investigations. Trinet					Provide 6" water service later at STA 5+30 per contract documents.		
					AECOM suggests that there is no change in contract price to perform this work.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2940 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	intends to provide service from the new water main for this 6" service as discussed in the field with Eric Zangol from AECOM, Mario Saldana from W/O, Dan Helminiak from SFWD and Robert Friend from Trinet.						
	An expedited response is requested.						
U-0079	Fremont St Temp Water Line Installed over AT&T Duct	Closed	01/17/2011	01/27/2011	01/19/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Sheet U-3123 and attached detail							
During Trinet's installation of the temporary water line in Fremont St., Trinet encountered an existing AT&T duct that was in direct conflict with the temporary water line. Trinet was directed by Eugene Chu of SFWD/SFPUC to run the temporary water line over the existing AT&T duct using 45 degree bends. This resulted in less cover for the piping than what is required by the Water Department. Due to the lack of cover, Trinet was directed to install a 1/2in steel plate beneath the concrete base along the trench as depicted in the attached detail. The plate was approximately 2ft wide by 6ft long and extended to the limits of the installed 45 degree bends. Please provide confirmation that this is acceptable.		It is AECOM's understanding that Trinet encounter an existing PG&E electrical duct (4-4") crossing the water alignment feeding 301 Mission property and not an AT&T duct as referenced above. It is also AECOM's understanding that Trinet encountered an existing PG&E electrical duct (8-3") parallel to the water alignment which is ultimately to be abandoned by PG&E and demolished by Trinet. Both PG&E ducts are shown in the plans. Per sequencing shown on U-1123, the water line should be constructed after PG&E completes their work on Fremont Street.					
		Given the fact that the PG&E duct parallel (8-3") has not been abandoned by PG&E, and given the fact the option to go under the existing 4-4" PG&E duct per plans is not feasible because the existing 8-3" PG&E duct is not demolished, and given the fact that the new water main is a temporary condition, the above mentioned installation proposal is acceptable.					
		AECOM suggests no additional cost to contract price to perform this work.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2941 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0080	Proposed Design Change for MH #501	Closed	01/17/2011	01/27/2011	01/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-2021 and attached drawings					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Trinet proposes to change the design of sewer manhole #501 from a Modified Box Manhole (per SF Standard Plan #87,184) to a Precast Concrete Manhole (per SF Standard Plan #87,181 - see attached drawing). The proposal includes the installation of a temporary 24" PVC pipe stub, extending south from the manhole and connected to the brick sewer per SF Standard Plan #87,197.					CCSF DPW Standard Plan #87,181 referenced specifies a 4 ft diameter precast concrete manhole. Three (3) 24-inch pipes connecting to a 4 ft diameter manhole at invert elevation as proposed by contractor may yield an unstable structure and is not approved. A larger diameter precast concrete manhole may be acceptable however the alternative would need to be submitted as a substitution for CCSF SFDPW approval.		
The proposed manhole design will facilitate construction around the many utilities identified in the excavation - see RFI # U-0021 (Trinet RFI 04). It is also the preferred manhole design for 24in pipe per the SF Standard Drawings, especially since the brick sewer on the south side will later be abandoned and plugged (in the manhole) by the owner. This plan will also facilitate the later abandonment of the outlet to the south, as the owner will just have to plug the 24in outlet pipe and not a 3x5 brick sewer.					As per the response to RFI U-0021, please provide a mark up of U-3021 indicating the size, and horizontal and vertical location of the utilities identified in the excavation for review.		
Please consider. An expedited response is requested.							
U-0080.1	Proposed Design Change for MH #501	Closed	02/09/2011	02/18/2011	02/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-2021, RFI #U-0080, and attached drawings					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
In response to the Engineer's concerns with the number and size of pipes in Trinet's original revised detail for MH 501 (RFI#U-0080), Trinet has changed their proposed installation drawing to include a 5' I.D. cast-in-place MH base. The lower precast section of the MH will be 5' I.D., with a precast reducer section transitioning from 60" to 48" I.D. placed above. Attached is the revised drawing for MH 501 and shop drawings for the precast MH sections. The design was discussed with Cliff Wong from the SF Bureau of Engineering, Hydraulics Department, and he did not have a problem with a 5' I.D. manhole.					02/22/2011 - Kevin Chiu		
					A Change Request (CR) may be issued for the accepted substitution of the 5-foot diameter precast concrete manhole in lieu of the cast in place Modified Box Manhole.		
					----- ----- 02/18/2011 - Eric Zagol		
					The proposed design change for sewer manhole #501 from a Modified Box Manhole per SFDPW Standard		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0081	Water Main Alignment - Howard St STA18+72 and STA19+98	Closed	01/19/2011	01/28/2011	01/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3119 and attached drawing					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm that it is acceptable for M Squared to install the new 12in water line in a straight line as sketched on the attachment. Contract Drawings show the pipe offsetting between Sta 18+72 and Sta 19+98. Due to existing utilities discovered in potholes the 12in line will be installed 18ft from centerline.					1. Contract Drawings indicate an offset to avoid a bus island, as shown on the plans, that was to be constructed as part of the Transbay Temporary Terminal Project. AECOM received confirmation from Philip Sandri TJPA/PMPC that the bus island was deleted from the Transbay Terminal Project. It is acceptable to eliminate the offset and construct water main between STA 18+72 and STA 19+98 at 18ft from centerline.		
Also, please confirm the elevations of the water line can be raised dependant on the depths of the existing utilities					2. Elevations of the water line can be raised dependant on the depth of the existing utilities. Minimum depth of cover shall be 18-inches below the bottom of the concrete base pavement section per DPW Order No. 176,707 or 28" which ever is greater.		
Also, the referenced drawing has a discrepancy shown between the 12in water line bend station called out and the location shown in plan view. Please confirm that the first 45degree bend is located at 18+72, and not 18+27.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0082	Sewer System Quality Assurance Clarification	Closed	01/19/2011	01/29/2011	01/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference Specifications Section 33 31 10, 1.4.E			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please clarify if TJPA or DPW is going to complete the inspection of the pipe as described in the referenced specification section.			For general materials, please follow the specification requirements regarding delivered materials in 01 16 00 1.6D.				
SUGGESTION:			For materials falling under specification section 33 31 31, section 1.4C determines that all piping is SUBJECT to inspection by TJPA and/or DPW. This means that all piping is to be made available upon delivery if TJPA/DPW deems it is necessary to inspect the material. Contractor to inform TJPA of all deliveries and assure the storage facility is accessible. TJPA will inform contractor if material will be inspected prior to installation. When TJPA determines that additional labor is needed to move materials around for inspection, please reference 1.4E, which states that contractor is to furnish labor as needed to assist TJPA with this effort.				
			There is no <i>“HOLD POINT”</i> for TJPA or SFWD to inspect materials at manufacturer or upon delivery. TJPA/DPW intends to inspect the materials deliveries of each subcontractor until such time as a confidence level is built that subcontractor and W/O are ensuring the proper amount of quality control through their own material inspections.				
			Per specification Section 01 14 00 1.4, W/O shall verify all dimensions in the field and shall check all field conditions continuously during construction, including materials. Any inspection of materials by TJPA, DPW, or any other agency does not alleviate the subcontractor or W/O of the responsibility of				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0083	Water Main Alignment on Howard at Beale	Closed	01/19/2011	01/29/2011	01/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith		Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Sheet U-3118						Existing 6-inch steel pipe appears to be a 6-inch cast iron abandoned PG&E gas main. Confirm the "6ft x 6ft wooden telecom duct bank" is a 6-inch x 6-inch wooden duct bank and is abandoned.	
Potholes on Beale Street at Sta 14+00, Sta 14+90 and Sta 16+25 reveal a 6in steel line that is unmarked and not shown on contract drawings. The line is 18ft south of the Howard St centerline. This is the proposed alignment for the new 12in water main. The pothole at Sta 14+00 also reveals a 3in steel conduit which is 16ft south of the Howard St centerline. Also there is a 6ft x 6ft wooden telecom duct bank that runs east to west on Howard Street at 15ft south of the Howard Street centerline. This location offers the closest window for the new 12in water line to the original alignment shown in the contract drawings.						Refer to RFI # U-0083.1	
This would require the removal of the wooden duct bank and the removal of the abandoned manhole shown on U-3118 (Sta 14+96 ± 15ft from Howard St centerline)							
Please confirm the alignment of the new 12in water main.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2945 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0083.1	Water Main Alignment on Howard at Beale	Closed	01/24/2011	02/03/2011	01/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
M Squared has confirmed that the wooden duct bank is a 6inch x 6 inch wooden duct bank and is abandoned.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please direct M Squared on how to proceed.					Construct 12-inch water main at the location proposed; 15 ft south of Howard Street centerline. Remove and dispose of abandoned wooden duct bank and abandoned manhole as required to construct new 12-inch water main.		

Question from U-0083:					Refer to response provided for RFI U-0083.		
Reference Sheet U-3118							
Potholes on Beale Street at Sta 14+00, Sta 14+90 and Sta 16+25 reveal a 6in steel line that is unmarked and not shown on contract drawings. The line is 18ft south of the Howard St centerline. This is the proposed alignment for the new 12in water main. The pothole at Sta 14+00 also reveals a 3in steel conduit which is 16ft south of the Howard St centerline. Also there is a 6in x 6in wooden telecom duct bank that runs east to west on Howard Street at 15ft south of the Howard Street centerline. This location offers the closest window for the new 12in water line to the original alignment shown in the contract drawings.							
This would require the removal of the wooden duct bank and the removal of the abandoned manhole shown on U-3118 (Sta 14+96 15ft from Howard St centerline)							
Please confirm the alignment of the new 12in water main.							
U-0084	Water Main Alignment on Beale Street	Closed	01/21/2011	01/31/2011	01/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3124					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
M Squared potholed at Sta 1+10 on Beale Street. We discovered that the 10in High pressure water line is 9ft-5in from the FOC. The existing 12in water line is 14ft-8in from the FOC. The 10in High Pressure line is closer to the FOC that shown on contract drawings. This now means that there is a larger window between the 10in high pressure					Contract drawings show existing 10-inch HPW (AWSS) at 9ft-7in from FOC. Contract drawings show existing 12-inch water line at 13 ft-11in from FOC.		
					Please clarify if dimensions provided by Contractor are to centerline of pipe.		
					Please provide depth to centerline of the existing 10-		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2946 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>water and the existing 12in water main.</p> <p>M Squared would like to install the new 12in water line at 12ft-3in from center line of the pipe to the FOC. This would mean the new 12in water line would be outside the parking strip and the parking strip would stay in tact. SFWD would also prefer it outside the parking strip for maintenance purposes.</p> <p>Please confirm that it is acceptable to install the new 12in water line at 12ft-3in from FOC, going from Sta 0+60 to Sta 1+90.</p>						
U-0084.1	Water Main Alignment on Beale Street	Closed	02/18/2011	02/28/2011	02/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Sheet U-3124 and RFI #U-0084</p> <p>In response to the Engineer's questions, M Square has noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Yes, the dimensions provided are to centerline of the pipe- Depth to centerline of existing 10-inch AWSS is 72-inches		<p>To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>In reference RFI U-0084, it is not acceptable to install the new 12in water line at 12ft-3in from FOC, going from Sta 0+60 to Sta 1+90. As discussed during a site meeting with Noel M. (M2) and Mario S. (Webcor) on 2/11/11, construct 12-inch water line as shown on U-3124. Restore parking strip per Contract Documents.</p>				
<p>Contractor's proposed location at 12ft-3in from FOC is in conflict with proposed Beale St. sewer main.</p> <p>Following receipt of information requested, AECOM will evaluate if water line can be moved west of parking strip.</p>							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2947 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0085	AT&T Duct Bank on Beale at STA 6+00	Closed	01/21/2011	01/31/2011	01/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3125 and attached sketch					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The existing 4no. 4in AT&T lines on Beale Street at Sta 6+10 are not as shown on the contract drawings. See attached sketch. Contract drawings show the conduit crossing M Squared's trench for 6 or 7 feet, however the duct bank is in the trench for 37 feet due to the alignment and width of the duct bank. The conduits are covered with a 2 foot wide concrete cap and appear in the trench for the new 12in water main at Sta 6+12 before leaving the trench at Sta 5+75. M Squared cannot lay the pipe on top of the concrete cap as the pipe will not have the required coverage. Due to this M Squared is unable to install the new 12in water as shown. Juan with AT&T advised that M Squared remove the concrete cap from the conduits to allow for excavation of this portion of trench. With the cap removed it is more likely that the pipe will have the necessary minimum coverage. Please confirm that this is how M Squared is to proceed. An expedited reponse is requested.					Please proceed as per AT&T's suggestion. Please coordinate with AT&T's representative Huan Hunynh and field representative Dave Olson for an onsite inspection by AT&T of the affected AT&T conduits prior to backfill. Confirm minimum cover of 30-inches or 18-inches below concrete pavement base which ever is greater, is maintained. Provide distance between top of water main and bottom of AT&T conduits for review.		
U-0086	Concrete Slab & Rail Ties at Howard STA 13+60	Closed	01/24/2011	02/03/2011	01/25/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3117 and attached sketch					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
M Squared potholed at Howard Sta 13+60. The pothole revealed a 15in thick concrete slab which is in conflict with the proposed alignment of the new 12in water line. M Squared broke out a cross section of the slab and found nothing in it. There was also nothing underneath the slab for 5.5 feet. The southern edge of the slab is 4 feet north of the Howard Street center line. M Squared also discovered 6inch x 8inch x 4foot-6inch wooden rail ties. If M Squared has to remove the concrete slab to install the water line at the alignment shown there is a danger that					As discussed during a site visit on 1/25/11 with Noel (M Squared) and Mario S. (W/O) the Contractor's proposed alignment of 18-inches south of alignment per Plans is in conflict with the existing sewer (limited separation). As discussed, pothole along Howard St. between Fremont St. and First St. to determine if 15-inch concrete slab is a local condition at the intersection of Howard and Fremont streets or if the slab extends to First St.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>the MFS (fiber optic) conduits will be damaged as these conduits sit on top of the slab.</p> <p>Breaking off an 18in section of the concrete slab and also a section of the rail ties would allow M Squared to excavate and install the new water pipe, while keeping away from the MFS conduits and not damaging them. However this will be time consuming.</p> <p>An alternative option is to move the trench for the new 12in water pipe 18in south and just remove the wooden rail ties (as shown in sketch).</p> <p>Mario S. from W/O and Eric Z. from AECOM were present during the discussion of this issue with M Squared in the field.</p> <p>Please direct M Squared on how to proceed with the water line installation. An expedited response is requested</p>						
U-0086.1	Concrete Slab & Rail Ties at Howard STA 13+60	Closed	02/03/2011	02/14/2011	02/04/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>As discussed at the meeting on Friday, 01/28/2011 between Noel (M2), Eric (AECOM) and Mario (Webcor) - due to existing utilities and the presence of the concrete slab and rail ties found in the additional potholing that was requested (Ref. Response to RFI U-0086), the new 12in water main is to be installed 5ft from the northern FOC on Howard Street Sta 12+60 to Sta 9+50.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>			<p>ANSWERED By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Confirmed. See attached sketches SK-U-0003 and SK-U-0004 for the revised alignment.</p>				
U-0087	Compact Sewer Backfill Sand by Jetting	Closed	01/27/2011	02/06/2011	02/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>			<p>ANSWERED By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2949 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference San Francisco Standard Specification Section 703.08, attached</p> <p>Trinet requests authorization from the Engineer to compact the sewer trench backfill sand by jetting in accordance with the San Francisco Standard Specification Section 703.08.</p> <p>The native material along Minna, which Trinet is re-using for trench backfill, is a clean well grade dune sand. Trinet believes jetting is an ideal method of compaction for this type of material. It is also an effective means of compacting the sand around the top and sides of the pipe without disturbing the pipe, and backfilling any voids left from removal of the shoring or that might have formed behind the shoring. This method of compaction is commonly utilized in San Francisco for sewer projects in similar ground conditions.</p> <p>An expedited response is requested.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Jetting in accordance with CCSF DPW Standard Specification Section 703.08 of the backfill layers above the sand backfill (pipe zone) as specified in CCSF DPW Standard Specification Section 703.06 for sewer installations is acceptable.</p> <p>Contractor shall determine that jetting will not result in damage to sewers, adjacent structures, or cause adjacent materials to be softened. Any resulting damage shall be repaired at the Contractors expense.</p> <p>Meet compaction requirements for each horizontal lift. If compaction requirements are not met, discontinue the use of jetting.</p> <p>Notify TJPA's geotechnical engineer through the TJPA representative in advance of jetting to coordinate on-site observation of jetting and compaction testing.</p>		
U-0088	Minna St 18in Sewer Conflict with PG&E MH#1355 at STA 1+77	Closed					
	<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>						
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Reference Sheet U-2007 and attached drawings</p> <p>During layout for the installation of the new 18in Sewer Main on Minna St., Trinet observed that the alignment of the 18in Sewer Main is in conflict with existing PG&E MH #1355 at STA 1+77.50, which is to remain in place. The center line of the new sewer main is 0.10ft north of the outside edge of the manhole wall, as depicted in the attached drawing. The north side wall of the manhole is constructed on top of the existing 3ft x 5ft brick sewer. The brick sewer structure extends approximately 16in into the vault along its entire length. The brick sewer therefore cannot be demolished without undermining the north wall of the electric vault. Eric Z. of AECOM was notified of this issue via phone call on 01/21/2011.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>==UPDATE== 3/24/11</p> <p>See revised drawings Minna Street Revisions dated 3/16/11 associated with ASI#003.</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2950 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2951 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0090	46 Minna St 6in Fire Service Connection	Closed	02/01/2011	02/11/2011	02/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3108 and attached sketch and photos					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The original plan for connection of the 6in Fire Service Lateral @ 46 Minna St. was to leave the existing 6in gate valve (which is located at FOC) in place and connect the new 6in fire line to the downstream side of the old valve (See attached photo and sketch). This plan was proposed by SFWD inspectors, Tom Farhnam and Dan Helminiak, at a field meeting on 12/28/10. On Friday 1/28/11 the SFWD, plumbers when taking measurements for the tie-in, proposed a different plan. They want to extend the new 6in fire line beyond the curb and into the basement, and connect to the homeowners fire line inside the basement (under the sidewalk).					VOID.		
Note: This will require coordination with building owner to put a hole through their foundation. Layout and a detail would need to be provided for the wall penetration, as well a detail to plug the hole where the existing water line is entering the basement.					See RFI U-0093, 46 Minna 6in FS Water & 1in Copper Water Service Lateral at STA 5+17 Tie-In.		
Please provide direction on how to proceed.							
<hr/>							
U-0091	SSMH #301 Located in Crosswalk at Natoma STA 0+81.72	Closed	02/01/2011	02/11/2011	02/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3010					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
SSMH #301 is shown to be located in the crosswalk at Sta 0+81.72.					Construct sewer manhole #301 at the location shown on U-3010. An ASI for a revised SFDPW Standard manhole cover (ADA compliant) is forthcoming.		
Please confirm that it is to be located in the pedestrian crosswalk.							
<hr/>							
U-0092	AWSS Schedule Restrictions	Closed	02/02/2011	02/12/2011	02/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Richard Buellesbach To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2952 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
	<div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Webcor/Obayashi has received Bid Addendum #1 for the TG04.2R bid. As part of this addendum, note number 8 under "General Notes" on sheet U-0008 is deleted. This note had previously placed a constraint on the AWSS construction schedule that the Mission Street work must be complete prior to cutting both the Beale Street and the 1st Street lines. It was acceptable to abandon one or the other prior to the Mission Street work but not both.</div><div>Based on the deletion of this note, it is our understanding that there is no schedule constraint on any of the AWSS system modifications other than the cutting & capping procedures at 1st Street and Beale Street which are required for construction of the TTC Building. Please confirm.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>02/11/2011 - Richard Buellesbach Email to Michelle Smith & Kevin Chiu - The received response to RFI U-0092 is not complete. We require a final resolution for the following language from the RFI response: "TJPA is currently coordinating with SFPUC to determine when AWSS improvements, other than the improvements required to abandon existing AWSS mains on First and Beale streets, are required to be complete." Please be sure that this RFI remains open in Constructware.</div><div>-----</div><div>-----</div><div>02/10/2011 - Eric Zagol - The construction sequence constraint has been removed per GENERAL NOTE 8 on U-0008 (rev. 2 01/31/11) and as detailed in SFDPW BOE AWSS drawings (rev. 1 01/31/11) MA-0, MA-5, MA-6, MA-8, MA-10, MA-11 and MA-19.</div><div>TJPA is currently coordinating with SFPUC to determine when AWSS improvements, other than the improvements required to abandon existing AWSS mains on First and Beale streets, are required to be complete.</div></div>			
U-0093	46 Minna 6in FS Water & 1in Copper Water Service Lateral at STA 5+17 Tie-In	Closed			02/03/2011	02/13/2011	02/07/2011	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol			
	<div><div>Co-Author:</div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Reference Sheet U-3108, attached sketches, and material information sheets</div><div>At 11:30am on 2/2/2011, Michelle Smith (Turner), Eric Zagol (AECOM), Guy Hollins (TJPA), Rick Bowling (46 Minna Property Manager), Dan Helminiak (SFWD Inspector), SFWD water department crew, Robert Friend (Trinet), Jason Dunne (Webcor Obayashi), and Mario Saldana (Webcor Obayashi) met to discuss the 6in Fire Service Lateral and 1in Water Service Lateral for the 46 Minna building.</div></div>	<div>SUGGESTION:</div>			<div><div>ANSWER:</div><div>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div><div>AECOM has coordinated with SFPUC Engineering (Chi Yu, Division Manager) and SFPUC inspector (Eugene Shu) and the direction agreed to is as follows:</div><div>6-inch Fire Service Renewal -</div><div>1. Coordinate with SFWD for the shutdown of the existing 6-inch fire water service. Shutdown by SFWD. SFWD to coordinate shutdown with SFFD.</div></div>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2953 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
	<p>SFWD has proposed the new tie-in pipe configuration.</p> <p>1. New 6in Fire Service Lateral Tie-in at 46 Minna St (See Attachment A)</p> <p>- Old existing fire service lateral is to be cut out of the existing water main up to the gate valve as shown in the sketch, and replaced with straight pipe. A new 10in hole is to be core drilled into the existing basement wall 22in east of the existing service lateral to incorporate the new 6in fire service lateral. SFWD will run the new 6in fire service lateral through the hole and Trinet is to provide Link Seals (see attached material information sheets) to seal the space between the new pipe and wall hole.</p> <p>2. New 1in Copper Service Lateral Tie-in at STA 5+17 (See Attachment B)</p> <p>- Old existing 1in plastic poly pipe is to be cut and plugged with non shrink grout. A new 2in hole is to be core drilled 4in east of the existing 1in service, to incorporate the new 1in copper service lateral. The space between the new pipe and wall hole will be sealed with non-shrink grout.</p> <p>Please advise if this is acceptable. An expedited response is requested.</p>			<p>2. Neatly remove existing fill material between the existing pipe and wall penetration to dislodge and free the existing pipe such that it can be removed by SFWD.</p> <p>3. SFWD to cut and remove existing pipe.</p> <p>4. Remove excess fill material to create flat even surface for link seal type pipe sleeve.</p> <p>5. SFWD to install and connect new service.</p> <p>6. Restore wall per SK-U-0005 attached.</p>				
				1-inch Water Service Renewal -				
				<p>1. Coordinate with SFWD for the shutdown of the existing domestic water service. Shutdown by SFWD.</p> <p>2. Neatly remove existing fill material between the existing pipe and wall penetration to dislodge and free the existing pipe such that it can be removed by SFWD.</p> <p>3. SFWD to cut and remove existing pipe.</p> <p>4. SFWD to install and connect new service.</p> <p>5. Fill void between pipe and exposed wall penetration with non-shrink grout.</p>				
U-0093.1	46 Minna 6in FS Water & 1in Copper Water Service Lateral at STA 5+17 Tie-In	Closed			02/16/2011	02/25/2011	02/17/2011	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP	Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company	Michelle Smith	Answered By: AECOM Technical Service			
	Co-Author:							
	REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<p>Reference Response to RFI #U-0093, Sheet U-3108, and attached sketch</p> <p>The SFWD completed the 1in domestic and 6in fire water service change-overs on 02/15/2011.</p> <p>Part of the detailed provided in the response to RFI #U-0093 for the 46 Minna 6in Fire Service water lateral could not be installed due to the angle of the pipe installed by the SFWD.</p> <p>Per discussion with E. Zagol of AECOM, please confirm</p>				<p>Confirmed. Fill the void on the property side with 2-5 inches of non-shrink grout, finishing grout flush with the inside wall.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2954 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
<div>the direction is to fill the void on the property side with 2-5 inches of non-shrink grout, finishing grout flush with the inside wall.</div>								
U-0094	Joint Trench Alignment Conflict With (E) Steam MH at Minna St. STA 0+85	Closed	02/03/2011	02/13/2011	02/04/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service			Eric Zagol
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference Sheet U-3107 revised 12/27/10				Steam MH at STA 0+75 has been abandoned by NRG Energy. Demolish as indicated on U-1107 (rev. 1 12/27/10) and in accordance with the contract documents.				
The revised drawings show the Joint Trench alignment crossing through an existing old steam MH (Sta 0+85). The vault is a very large structure and extends to the north face of the curb of Minna St. Trinet believes that this vault is an abandoned structure.				Coordinate with Mike Eurkus (NRG Energy) at (415) 644-9668 through the TJPA's representative for the pick up of the salvaged steam MH ring and cover.				
Trinet requests direction for abandonment and/or demolition of this structure.								
U-0095	Utility Company Contacts	Closed	02/03/2011	02/13/2011	02/04/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith		Answered By: Turner Construction Company			Kevin Chiu
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>
Reference Sheet U-0002 General Notes - Existing Utilities				"M Squared has tried to contact most of these numbers"				
Sheet U-0002 - EXISTING UTILITIES lists several phone numbers for contacting various utility companies in the city. M Squared has tried to contact most of these numbers and each one has had either no answer or is currently not in service.				Please provide a list of the specific agencies that M Squared has tried to contact.				
M Squared requests a list of active phone numbers for the utility companies listed. An expedited response is necessary due to utility conflicts.								



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0096	PG&E Conflict with Sewer Installation at Natoma STA 9+50	Closed	02/09/2011	02/19/2011	02/14/2011	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference Sheet U-3012 and attached drawing			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
On 02/07/2011, M Squared encountered what appeared to be a live PG&E duct bank during their sewer installation excavation on Natoma Street STA 9+50. Due to this conflict, M Squared was unable to continue excavating for the sewer (See attachment). On 02/09/2011, M Squared's Superintendant met with a PG&E Representative and PG&E Representative confirmed that the duct bank is live and is not due to be decommissioned for at least 3 months.			02/14/2011 Kevin Chiu				
In order for M Squared to continue with the sewer installation, M Squared is proposing to: - install MH #305 and begin installing pipe west of MH #305 - perform a temporary connection from MH#305 to the existing 3' x 5' brick sewer			See CR U-006 issued on 2/14/11				
M Squared can then perform the remainder of the work once PG&E has decommissioned the duct bank.			----- 02/10/2011 Eric Zagol				
M Squared estimates that the additional cost to perform the temporary tie-in would be approximately \$4,500.			Demolition and Construction Sequence shown on U-1112 and U-1120 lists per sequence order that the sewer work is to commence after PG&E has completed their Phase I work in Natoma and First St., all services cut over and existing duct bank is abandoned by PG&E. Given the fact that PG&E has experienced construction delays associated with their structures on First Street, the proposed sequence for sewer construction is acceptable.				
Please confirm how you would like M Squared to proceed. M Squared requests an expedited response as they are currently stopped work and awaiting a response.			Submit a temporary connection detail for review.				
			Coordinate with PG&E to abandon the existing 2-inch HP Gas along Natoma per U-1112 and U-1120 prior to demolition.				
			Coordinate with Verizon to abandon existing conduit (labeled "U" on base plans) prior to demolition per U-1112 and U-1120.				
U-0096.1	PGE Conflict with Sewer on Natoma at First Workaround	Closed	02/15/2011	02/25/2011	02/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference U-3012 and attached sketch			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Per response to RFI#U-0096, M Squared has provided the attached connection detail.			Proceed with the temporary connection per the M Squared connection detail.				
Please confirm if it is acceptable to proceed							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2956 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0097	PG&E Conflict with Sewer Instll on Natoma at First	Closed	02/10/2011	02/20/2011	02/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3012					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Following on from M Squared's RFI #U-0096, M Squared has confirmed in the field that there is a grade conflict between the proposed sewer and the existing electrical duct bank on Natoma between STA 9+30 to 9+50. The conflict is between the bottom of the electrical duct bank and the top of the new 24" sewer pipe.					Demolition and Construction Sequence shown on U-1112 and U-1120 lists per sequence order that the sewer work is to commence after PG&E has completed their Phase I work in Natoma and First St., all services cut over and existing duct bank is abandoned by PG&E.		
The elevation of bottom of electrical duct bank is 11.5' The top of the 24" VCP sewer is 11.82'					Proceed per response to RFI U-0096.		
M Squared has also confirmed with PG&E that 3 of the 4 concrete encased conduits are occupied, 2 being occupied by 12KV lines. The duct bank is to be abandoned in the future but PG&E was unable to provide a schedule for this work.							
Please advise M Squared on how to proceed.							
U-0098	Potholing at Blackrock	Closed	02/10/2011	02/20/2011	02/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Marina Rosso				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
M Squared is planning to pothole next week at Howard STA 9+40, First St STA 1+50 and First St STA 2+10 to confirm the alignment and depths of the new 12" water main on First St. from Howard to Natoma.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Guy Hollins from TJPA has advised M Squared that Blackrock is requesting additional potholing in the off-hours to determine locations of AT&T facilities in the area.					Can't find answer in Constructware		
Please provide M Squared information regarding the locations of the additional potholes requested, including the requested depths and sizes.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3021, attached sketch, and USA ticket

During excavation for CB#501, Trinet encountered what appears to be a PG&E vault (shown in plans as EMH 7712), PG&E Duct (Shown in plans as 1- 2" & 4-6" EP), 2- 2" steel conduits (not shown in plans), and a concrete shoring wall (not shown in plans).

- The 2-2" steel pipe is in conflict with Trinet's installation of CB#501, and will need to be relocated or abandoned to facilitate the installation of the catch basin. Trinet has done their due diligence (2nd and 3rd No Response follow ups) and these lines were not marked by the owner through USA (attached). Trinet requests direction on the relocation/abandonment of these utilities.

- Trinet proposes to move CB#501 two-feet north to avoid the conflict with the existing EMH 7712. Please advise if this is acceptable.

SUGGESTION:**ANSWER:**

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Pending approval by the TJP, a deductive CR will be issued.

02/28/2011 - Eric Zagol

Following AECOM's review of the Transbay Transit Center Project 50% construction documents (rev. 12/20/10), further review of the Existing Terminal Ramps & Demolition Plans Project construction documents, and AECOM's understanding of the demolition of the existing Terminal "hump" structure and the timing of such demolition, CB#501 is no longer required.

Delete catch basin #501 and associated 10-inch sewer lateral.

U-0102 **First St. CB#206 in Conflict with (E) Subsurface Conc. Structure / Duct Bank** **Closed**
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith

02/23/2011 **03/05/2011** **03/04/2011** **Potentially** ☐
Answered By: Turner Construction Company Daphne Faulkner

Co-Author:**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3009 and attached sketch and photo

During Trinet's excavation for replacement of CB#206 on the northwest corner of First St. and Minna St. (at STA 9+31), they encountered a concrete subsurface structure or concrete encased duct bank not indicated on the contract drawings. The existing catch basin is approximately 30in deep and is constructed on top of the existing concrete structure/duct bank (see attached drawing).

Trinet requests direction on the demolition of the existing catch basin and the installation of the new catch basin CB#206.

SUGGESTION:**ANSWER:**

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Pending approval by the TJP, a deductive CR will be issued.

03/04/2011 - Eric Zagol

As determined during a site visit on 3/3/11 with Trinet, AECOM and W/O; existing unforeseen conditions including an abandoned sub-sidewalk basement wall along Minna Street, an active sub-sidewalk basement wall for the 100 First St. property, and an abandoned telecommunications concrete duct along First Street create a situation where the installation of a new catch basin would require an extensive amount of unforeseen demolition.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2959 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
				In lieu of installing a new catch basin barrel to replace existing modify the existing catch basin as follows:			
				Clean interior walls and bottom. Apply 1/2-inch think uniform layer of mortar on interior walls and bottom. Install cast iron trap. Install pipe culvert and connect to MH#207 as shown in Plans. New culvert size and invert shall match existing culvert at catch basin. Use ductile iron pipe if depth of cover is less than 3 feet.			
U-0102.1	Catch Basin #206 redesign	Closed	04/01/2011	04/11/2011	04/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Colin Azevedo	To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Please clarify the following items relating to the re-design of CB#206:		Eric Zagol 4/12/2011: 1) SikaTop 123 Plus mortar is acceptable. 2) MJ DIP for 22.5 degree fittings is acceptable for culvert runs with less than 3 feet of cover.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1) The only specification section addressing mortar coating is in 33 31 10 Paragraph 2.1.I, which specifies a "Wet Spray Mortar" application. This process would be cost prohibitive for coating only one catch basin. Trinet proposes the use of "SikaTop 123 Plus" mortar - product data sheets are attached. Please advise if this product is acceptable or specify an alternate material.							
2) The RFI response directs Trinet to use ductile iron pipe for culvert runs with less that 3' of cover. If 22.5% DI bends are required to construct the culverts Trinet would prefer to use Mechanical Joint Fittings. Please advise if these are acceptable.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0103	Natoma St. 4in Water Line Conflict with MH#306	Closed	02/24/2011	03/07/2011	02/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Sheet U-1113 and U-3113				It is AECOM's understanding that the existing 4-inch lateral is "killed" (not supplying water) however the "killed" lateral may still be pressurized up to the lateral terminal point at the gate valves located on the south side of Natoma Street at Natoma Street STA 10+95.			
A 4-inch water line runs from east to west on the south side of Natoma from Sta 9+40 to Sta 10+95. At Sta 10+95, the 4-in water line 90degrees into the building at 400 Howard St. This building however, appears to be fed from the existing 8-inch line on 1st St between Howard and Natoma.				Demolish 4-inch water as indicated on U-1112, U-1113 and U-1120.			
Is this 4-inch water lateral at Sta 10+95 on Natoma already abandoned? If not, can M Squared abandon it? It is currently in conflict with the proposed location of MH#306, and is also in conflict with the excavation and shoring for the new 30-inch sewer along Natoma (TG04.1).				Prior to demolition: 1. Coordinate with SFPUC inspector to confirm 4-inch lateral is "killed". 2. Coordinate with SFPUC inspector to confirm that the lateral is not pressurized and that the 4-inch gate valve at Natoma Street STA 9+40 (intersection with existing First Street 8-inch water main) is closed. 3. Coordinate with SFPUC inspector and install cap in First Street as shown on U-1120 at Natoma STA 9+55 +/-.			
<hr/>							
U-0104	Natoma St. Temporary Sewer Connections at Sta 9+25 and Sta 7+20	Closed	02/24/2011	03/06/2011	03/01/2011	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Reference Sheets U-1112, U-1120, U-3012, and RFI#U-0096				Due to existing PG&E duct in conflict caused by PG&E's delay with First St. Phase I relocations, the two 12-inch temporary HDPE connections as proposed are acceptable as an interim condition until PG&E Phase I work is complete and the existing duct in conflict can be demolished per plans.			
In order for M Squared to install the new water main on Natoma Street between Sta 6+40 to Sta 10+00, the existing 3'x5' sewer must first be demolished. The 3'x5' sewer cannot be demolished until the new 24-inch VCP has been installed and connected to the existing sewer on First Street at Sta 9+59. Per sheets U-1112 and U-1120, the new 24-inch sewer is to be constructed after the demolition of the PG&E ducts. However, demolition of the PG&E ducts cannot be completed because PG&E has not completed their relocation work				Daphne Faulkner - Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.			
Per RFI#U-0096 (M Squared RFI #009), as confirmed by							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2961 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0105	<p>PG&E in the field on 02/09/2011, there is a live PG&E duct bank in conflict with MH#305 and the new 24-inch VCP between MH#305 and MH#306, and not due to be decommissioned for at least three months.</p> <p>M Squared proposes to install a 12-inch HDPE pipe from Sta 9+25 to Sta 9+59, and perform a temporary connection to the existing 3'x5' sewer on First Street. Surveys carried out on the electric duct bank at Sta 9+30 on 02/08/11 shows that the bottom of the Duct Bank is approx. 10.8, meaning a 12-inch pipe will fit. In addition, M Squared proposes to perform a temporary connection (also 12-inch HDPE) at Sta 7+20 from the new MH#303 to the existing 3'x5' sewer. This would allow M Squared to demolish the 3'x5' sewer from Sta 7+02 to Sta 9+59, and allow M Squared to install the water from Sta 6+40 to Sta 10+00.</p> <p>M Squared estimates the cost for both of these connections is \$20,000.</p> <p>An expedited response is required to avoid impact to the installation of the water line</p> <p>Natoma St Duct Bank Conflict at Sta 12+92</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST: Reference Sheet U-1113, U-1122, U-3013 and attached drawing</p> <p>A pothole on Natoma Street at Sta 12+92 confirmed that the duct bank shown on Sheet U-3013 is in conflict with the proposed 30-inch VCP sewer (see attached drawing).</p> <p>Per sheets U-1122 and U-1113, the new 30-inch sewer is to be constructed after the demolition of the PG&E ducts. However, demolition of the PG&E ducts cannot be completed because PG&E has not completed their relocation work. Per PG&E's new schedule this work is not scheduled to be completed until 06/31/2011. This would</p>	Closed	02/24/2011	03/06/2011	03/01/2011	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			Due to existing PG&E duct in conflict caused by PG&E's delay with Fremont St. Phase I relocations, the 12-inch temporary HDPE connection as proposed is acceptable as an interim condition until PG&E Phase I work is complete and the existing duct in conflict can be demolished per plans.				
			Daphne Faulkner - Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2962 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>mean M Squared's work cannot start until after this.</p> <p>In order for M Squared to continue with their work, M Squared proposes the use of 12-inch HDPE pipe from Sta 12+80 to existing sewer at Sta 13+15 (proposed location of MH#602). Once PG&E has completed their cutovers and the duct bank is abandoned, M Squared will demo the duct bank per specifications and complete the installation of the 30-inch VCP sewer from Sta 12+80 to MH#602.</p> <p>M Squared estimates the cost for this work is \$15,000.</p> <p>An expedited response is required to avoid impact to the installation of the sewer and water line</p>						
U-0106	First St Sewer MH#502 Adjustment to Avoid Conflict w/ (E) PG&E Duct	Closed	02/25/2011	03/07/2011	02/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Nhi Tran	To: Turner Construction Company		Michelle Smith		
Co-Author:		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol					
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Reference Sheet U-3021 and attached sketch				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
In order for Trinet to avoid a conflict with the existing PG&E duct along the west wall of their excavation, Trinet adjusted the south end of the MH#502 structure by 7 inches to the east (as shown in attached sketch). MH#502 is still aligned to incorporate the connection to the existing brick sewer, and the alignment of the new 24-inch VCP run is unaffected by this change. Trinet will adjust rebar as required to maintain the required spacing and clearances.				The sketch referenced above is based on CCSF DPW Standard #87,184 that shows the minimum reinforcing plan for the connection to the existing 3'x5' brick sewer. Provide reinforcing for connection to 3'x5' per CCSF DPW Standard.			
Please confirm if the adjustment of MH#502 is acceptable.				Confirm that the manhole is being constructed per CCSF DPW Standard #87,182 as shown in Detail 10 on U-5001.			
				Provide width of west wall and location of reinforcing steel at 3'x5' brick sewer connection and 24-inch VCP sewer connection for review.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2963 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0107	AWSS Cap Permit Requirements	Closed	02/25/2011	03/07/2011	02/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: W/O would like to confirm that other than any standard permits required for any excavation in the city of San Francisco, there is no additional permit required by any city agency in order to perform work on the AWSS caps.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per discussions with Michael Smith SFDPW BOE, there are no additional permits required for AWSS construction beyond the standard permits for constructing utilities within the public right-of-way. Notify CCSF SFFD and SFPUC/SFWD through the TJPA's representative in advance the work to isolate work areas.		
U-0108	FH Relocation on Beale St	Closed	02/25/2011	03/07/2011	02/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference sheet U-3124 and attached photo See the photo attached. The proposed location for the FH on Beale St at ~Sta 2+20 is in between a driveway for a parking garage and a driveway for a loading dock. Per discussions with Eric Zagol, please confirm the FH is to be relocated to the East side of Beale St as highlighted by the green line on the attached drawing. Please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Construct FH lateral and FH on the East side of Beale Street at STA 2+04 as shown on SK-U-0008 attached.		
U-0109	First St Sewer Grade Change To Conform to Existing 3'x5' Brick Sewer	Closed	03/02/2011	03/14/2011	03/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet U-3021, U-3009, and attached sketch This RFI confirms modification discussed in the field by Trinet and discussed with the Design Engineer, SFDPW, and W/O personnel. Trinet's field survey shows the existing 3'x5' brick sewer on First Street to be approximately 11-inches lower than the grade depicted on the drawings. Trinet also checked the elevation of the existing SSMH (10-feet north of MH#501) and confirmed			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Construct MH#502 at First St. STA 4+98 as shown on U-3021 to match the invert elevation of the existing 3'x5' brick sewer, elevation 6.77 as determined in the field by contractor. Construct MH#501 at First St. STA 4+45 as shown on U-3021 with an invert elevation of 7.58 as determined by contractor.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2964 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>that it is approximately 11-inches lower than what is shown on the drawings. Trinet installed MH#502 with invert elevation at 6.77 to match the existing brick sewer at the connection point. The new 24-inch VCP is being installed 11-inches lower than what is shown on the drawings maintaining the design slope of 0.0062. MH#501 will be installed with the invert elevation of 7.58, as shown in the attached sketch.</p> <p>Please confirm that this design is acceptable. Also, please provide a revised grade for the 24-inch VCP run from MH#207 (Minna St.) to MH#501.</p>						
U-0110	Joint Preconstruction Survey Requirement	Closed	03/02/2011	03/12/2011	03/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran		To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Derrick Cooper	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference Specification Section 01 15 40, 1.5							
Singer has been coordinating W/O access to the adjacent properties for W/O's subcontractors to complete their Joint Pre-Construction survey (Spec. 01 15 40, 1.5). Singer has informed W/O that they were instructed by TJPA Representatives to stop scheduling the joint surveys because TJPA will be conducting one overall survey, instead of having each individual contractor do them.							
The surveys are a specification requirement for current and future subcontractors. Please clarify this specification, moving foward.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0111	Minna St. Joint Trench Conflict with (E) 8" elbow and thrust block	Closed	03/04/2011	03/14/2011	03/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference drawing sheet U-3409 and attached sketch.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
During our excavation for the joint trench on the east end of Minna St. (STA 9+29) Trinet encountered the (E) 8" water main in Trinet's trench line, approximately 1 foot from our termination point. The existing alignment is different from what is shown in the contract drawings. The drawings do not show the water line crossing the joint trench. The alignment and grade of the water main changed in Trinet's excavation to avoid the adjacent catch basin. A 22.5 degree elbow is located in the center of the joint trench excavation. The elbow is rolled up to accommodate the grade change and there is a thrust block under the footing. Trinet does not believe that it would be safe to excavate under the water main for Trinet's duct bank without having the line shutoff. Extending the PG&E ducts to FOC will also place the connection point for PG&E's extension of the duct bank directly under the water main fittings and elbows. There is adequate clearance to install the 4" gas line above the water main and extend it out to FOC per contract. The top of the water main is 49" below FG at the south side of the joint trench, at the location of the gas line.					Per request to Jason Dunne (W/O) via email on 3/4/11 please provide the following information for review: Horizontal (from a known point i.e. FOC along First St.) and vertical location of "top of water main". Horizontal (from a known point i.e. FOC along First St.) and vertical location of water line at "22.5 degree elbow". Determine if the water main is mechanically restrained with tie rods at each bend in questions. Approximate size of existing concrete thrust block at the "22.5 degree elbow".		
Trinet proposes to terminate the concrete encased duct bank approximately 5 ft. back from FOC. This would allow adequate room for Trinet to mandrel the ducts after the joint trench is installed without undermining the water main. PG&E could then extend their duct bank under the water main to connect to Trinet's water main. Please advise.							
U-0111.1	Minna St Joint Trench Conflict @ Existing Water Line Elbow	Closed	04/18/2011	04/28/2011	04/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please find the attached as built drawing of the Joint Trench @ the intersection of Minna St. and First St. where the (E) 8" W main elbow was encountered.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Eric Zagol 4/20/2011: Please provide the information requested in RFI U-0111 response or confirm that the existing water line referenced in RFI U-0111 is mechanically restrained.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2966 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0111.2	Minna St Joint Trench Conflict @ Existing Water Line Elbow	Closed	04/25/2011	05/05/2011	04/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Eric Zagol 4/20/2011: Please provide the information requested in RFI U-0111 response or confirm that the existing water line referenced in RFI U-0111 is mechanically restrained. Answer: The waterline is mechanically restrained.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 4/26/2011 Proceed pre RFI U-0111.1 response.		
U-0112	Minna St. Joint Trench, AT&T Vault and Conduit Configuration	Closed	03/08/2011	03/18/2011	03/15/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Reference Sheet U-3408 At the 02/03/2011 Joint Trench Pre-Construction meeting and field walk through, the AT&T inspector expressed concern with the configuration of the AT&T ducts connecting to the AT&T vault at Sta 3+71. The AT&T inspector was specifically concerned with the east side of the vault where all eight 4-inch ducts are shown entering the vault on the one side (north side) of the center line. Trinet would like AT&T to review the duct configuration connection to the vault as depicted in the contract drawings and provide a revised drawing if they wish to make a change.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> AT&T has reviewed the information and has proposed revisions to the Joint Trench to accommodate the following: 1. Revised information from AT&T regarding 555 Mission St. service point of connection, and 2. AT&T preferred Minna St. AT&T vault conduit penetration locations Attached SK-U-0009 is a markup of the AT&T Vault at STA 3+71 butterfly drawing indicating conduit penetrations and schematic diagram of conduit alignments. Revised Minna St. Joint Trench Plans are being prepared as part of ASI#3 to address these revisions as well as changes associated with RFI U-0088.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0113	AWSS Cap on First St. at Howard	Closed	03/08/2011	03/18/2011	03/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference Drawing No. AWSS MA-5			Michael Smith (SFDPW BOE), AWSS Engineer of record, will provide response directly to PMPC/Turner.				
On 03/08/2011, M Squared excavated and exposed the existing AWSS line and gate valve on First St. at Howard. Upon inspection of the existing gate valve, it appears that the gate valve does not have lugs on it. This means that M Squared cannot tie back the proposed 10-inch AWSS cap on the AWSS line.			----- ----- 03/10/2011 - Daphne Faulkner				
Please advise on how you would like M Squared to proceed with the cap installation. An expedited response is requested.			Michael Smith (SFDPW BOE), AWSS Engineer of record provided response via email dated 3/9/11. See attached email, RFI response and AWSS Standard Dwg. III.				
U-0113.1	AWSS Strong Backs	Closed	03/17/2011	03/27/2011	03/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Reference RFI #U-0113			See attached file, "RFI U-0113.1 1490J Phase I First Street RFI No. 113.1 BOE Response 03 22 11," dated 03/22/11 for handwritten response per Michael Smith of SFDPW/BOE/Mechanical. Response below was copied into CW:				
On 3/16/2011, M Squared met with Dan Helminiak from SFWD and Michael Smith from BOE to proceed with the AWSS Cap work at First & Howard. As directed in the response to RFI#U-0013, M Squared installed the strong back provided to them. After the strong back was installed, Dan H. and Michael S. determined that the strong backs would not work due to the diameter of the existing valve bell.			"- Proceed with installation without strong back and tie rods.				
M Squared requests direction on how to proceed.			- A minimum of 100' of out-of-service AWSS main north of cap at First/Howard streets, and south of cap at Mission/First streets shall remain-in-place.				
			- Additionally the specified concrete thrust block shall be increased by 3 times the volume and encompass the existing abandoned-in-place line for a distance of 4' downstream of steel plate.				
			- Strong backs (2) shall be returned to CCSF."				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2968 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0114	PG&E Abandonment Schedule for Natoma St. at Second St.	Closed	03/09/2011	03/19/2011	05/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Reference Sheet U-1110 and U-2010			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
On 03/04/2011, M Squared met with a PG&E representative on site at Natoma and 2nd Street. The PG&E representative confirmed that none of their utilities had been abandoned in the area, and that the PG&E representative would be unable to provide a schedule for this abandonment.			Eric Zagol 3/18/2011 ***5/5/11 UPDATE***				
Per note 2 on sheet U-1110, the services for 77 Natoma and 83 Natoma were to be terminated by Feb 2011. To date, this work does not appear to be completed. In PG&E's letter to the TJPA regarding their schedule, there is no reference to work on Natoma Street at 2nd St.			77 Natoma and 83 Natoma services have been terminated, refer to USR Nos. 11 and 13 as executed by W/O, Turner and PG&E on 4/21/11.				
M Squared is unable to proceed with their sewer and water utility installation on Natoma St. west of shoring wall until PG&E has completed abandonment of their existing utilities.			As of 5/4/11, PG&E estimates that Natoma Street will be de-energized by 5/21/11. Coordinate USRs for the remaining electric ducts with Turner and PG&E.				
Please provide M Squared with an updated schedule for all PG&E's termination/abandonment work at 2nd and Natoma St.			***3/18/11 RESPONSE***				
			Per demolition and construction sequencing shown on sheet U-1110, water and sewer work shall commence after PG&E has completed their Phase I relocations in First St., Natoma St. and existing electric ducts are abandoned by PG&E.				
			PG&E services to 77 Natoma and 83 Natoma have been terminated as part of the Existing Terminal & Ramps Demolition Project. USRs for these services are currently being prepared by the TJPA's Representative (Turner). The USRs shall indicate the service conduits and cables that are abandoned subject to demolition as indicated in sheet U-1110.				
			To facilitate schedule, AECOM has requested PG&E to de-energize Natoma St. to the extent possible in an effort to re-sequence construction of the sewer. PG&E's response and schedule of abandonment is forthcoming.				
			As shown on U-3110 the water line could be constructed prior to PG&E abandoning their facilities. Pothole to confirm the water line can be constructed as shown on U-3110.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2969 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0115	AWSS Cap Work Sequence on First St	Closed	03/07/2011	03/17/2011	03/15/2011	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Refer to Sheets MA-5, MA-8 There are two caps that are required to be installed in order to shutdown the AWSS service on First St between Mission to Howard St. Per the construction schedule, both caps were supposed to be worked on simultaneously. Please confirm per a conversation in the field on 03/07/2011 with inspectors Michael Smith (SFDPW) and Dan Helminak (DPW), only one AWSS cap can be installed at a time.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The below response was copied into Constructware on behalf of Michael B. Smith SFDPW/BOE/Mechanical (see attached, "RFI U-0115 1490J Phase I First Street BOE Response 03 11 11") "Installing/capping of the AWSS lines at two locations in sequence instead of simultaneously was a decision made by the SFWD/CCD together with SFFD. Please contact Dan Helminiak of SFWD/CDD at (415) 420-4821 for further information" - Michael B. Smith SFDPW/BOE/Mechanical dated 03/11/2011 ----- ---- 03/14/2011 - Eric Zagol Michael Smith from SFDPW BOE will respond to this RFI.				
U-0116	Abandoned 6" Fire Water Service Thru 100 First St Basement Wall	Closed	03/18/2011	03/28/2011	03/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Refer to sheets U-1109 and U-3109 An abandoned existing 6" fire water service lateral was discovered while demolishing the old 8" water main running down Minna St. The 6" fire water service lateral was not shown on the plans and there were no existing water valve covers to indicate the existence of this line. The abandoned lateral penetrates the foundation wall entering the basement to 100 First St at Station 7+36. Please provide direction for plugging the void that will be left after 100 First St management removes the 6" water lateral pipe. A roughly 1ft x ft x 1ft deep square opening will remain after the fire water lateral pipe is removed.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor had knowledge of existing abandoned 6-inch fire water service at STA ~7+35. Existing abandoned 6-inch fire water service at STA ~7+36 was exposed and potholed by Trinet on 11/19/2010 and included in Submittal TG0405-024 Item No: UA0000-020630A01.0 as Pot Hole No. 29. Cut and plug abandoned 6-inch fire water service in accordance with specification section 02 41 00 3.6 at face of curb along the North side of Minna St. Please clarify why private property improvements are being requested.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2970 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0117	Natoma St. Future Hydrant Location at Sta 11+79	Closed	03/21/2011	03/31/2011	03/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference Sheet U-3113					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sheet U-3113 shows an 8in x 8in x 6in tee in the new 8-inch water main on Natoma at Sta 11+79. The note on the drawing makes reference to it being used as a future location for a fire hydrant. Sta 11+79 is in front of a loading dock and parking garage on Natoma Street.					As discussed in the field on 3/21/11 with Noel (M Squared) and Dan Helminiack (SFWD), construct tee for future fire hydrant and lateral connection at STA 11+37 (4 ft min. west of existing street light).		
Please confirm that it is intended for M Squared to install the tee in the water main line at this location.							
U-0118	Minna Street Joint Trench, PG&E Duct Routing and Termination Points	Closed	03/24/2011	04/03/2011	04/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please provide a routing drawing or written clarification of the routing for the PG&E Duct stub-outs in the Minna St. Joint Trench, between First St. and Second St. It is not clear from the plans in all cases where all the ducts extending from stub-outs terminate. Please expedite.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Please see the attached sketches clarifying where the ducts extending from stub-outs terminate (/originate).		
					Please note that the 2-2" conduits shown on U-3410 sections C, D, F and G terminate at "stub out reference A".		
U-0119	Minna St. JT_ AT&T Reconfiguration and impact on (E) trees	Closed	03/25/2011	04/04/2011	03/30/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
The revised drawings for the Joint Trench alignment dated 3/16/2011 show the reconfigured AT&T ducts running through an existing tree well on the east side of the AT&T vault at Stn. 3+71. RFI U-0112 (Minna St, Joint Trench, AT&T Vault and Conduit Configuration) also shows the reconfigured AT&T ducts running through an existing tree well on the east side of the vault. This conduit layout in consistent with discussions with the AT&T inspector in the field was reflected in the shop drawings. The revised					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Per discussions on site on 3/28/11 with Jack Kelliher (Trinet), Dave Olsen (AT&T), Dave Gibbons (AT&T) and Colin Azevedo (W/O), provide a 22.5 bend at conduit penetration for the 2-4" conduits on the south side of the east to avoid direct conflict. Remove tree grate and frame as required to construct conduit. Restore tree grate, fame, sidewalk curb and gutter. Protect tree and existing irrigation pipes in place.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2971 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0120	MH601 Locatio	Closed	03/28/2011	04/07/2011	04/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Colin Azevedo	To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Sheet U-3022 shows MH601 @ Sta 0+70 on Fremont Street. This location is also in the middle of the crosswalk on Fremont Street. USA markings show the existing traffic signal conduits crossing thru the center of the manhole. By moving the manhole approx 8' north the conflict with the traffic signal conduits would be avoided and it would also avoid having a manhole cover in a crosswalk. Please advise on how you would like to proceed.			Move proposed sewer MH north to STA 77.56 to avoid existing Traffic Signal conduit conflict as shown in SK-U-013 attached. Construct 10-inch CB culvert lateral as shown SK-U-013 attached.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0121	AWSS Caps at Beale Street	Closed	03/31/2011	04/10/2011	04/06/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith		Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1 - Current bid documents for Trade Group TG04.2R (AWSS system at Mission Street) call for capping of the AWSS system on Beale Street near the intersections with Howard Street and with Mission Street. Because of delays in the bid schedule for TG04.2R, the construction schedule dictates that these caps be completed well before the anticipated start of the TG04.2R field work. Please provide details so as to allow this capping work to be done in advance of the awarding of the TG04.2R scope of work.				Pothole the existing AWSS gate valve at the Beale at Mission street proposed cap location as shown on M-6 (Rev No. 1, 1/31/11) to determine if the existing gate valve has lugs. SFWD to inspect condition of gate valve once excavated, coordinate with SFWD inspector accordingly.			
2 - Please confirm whether the material required to do this work is available at the City of San Francisco.				Details for the capping work at Beale and Mission, and Beale and Howard will be provided following gate valve inspection.			
3 - Please provide direction as to how this scope of work should proceed.							
This capping is near critical path on the current construction schedule. An expedited response is requested.							
<hr/>							
U-0121.1	AWSS Caps at Beale Street	Closed	05/02/2011	05/12/2011	05/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch		Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The AWSS valve at Mission and Beale was potholed on 4/29/2011 per response to RFI#U-0121. It was confirmed that the existing valve does not have lugs.				Eric Zagol 5/4/2011 From Michael Smith (SFDPW BOE);			
Please provide details for capping the AWSS line on Beale.				Refer to attached DWG M-6 Rev 1 with changes made on 05/04/11. Cap is to be tied back to (E) pipe with cast lugs.			
				Eric Zagol 4/5/2011 ***4/19/11 UPDATE***			
				In response to the numbered items above:			
				1. Refer to the attached markups of TG04.2R documents from SFDPW BOE that define the AWSS			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2975 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
TG0404-004 - Precast Concrete TG0404-005 - Precast Concrete Catch Basin Base							
U-0123	Unknown Fire Service @ 85 Natoma	Closed	04/04/2011	04/14/2011	04/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: While Excavating to install the water line on Natoma from the shoring wall to 2nd Street M Squared encountered an existing fire service going to 85 Natoma. This service is not shown on the drawings and is not in the specifications as one of the connections to be made to the new line. (See attached) Please advise on how to proceed.				SFPUC Customer Service Bureau data shows an active Domestic water, an active Fire water service, and 2 "killed" Domestic water services to 85 Natoma Street. Coordinate with SFWD to confirm and locate the active Fire water line to 85 Natoma Street. Provide information on location, size, and material for review.			
<hr/>							
U-0123.1	Fire Service @ 85 Natoma	Closed	04/11/2011	04/21/2011	04/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Please note that on RFI #U-0123 the location of the fire service was incorrectly drawn. The fire service is actually located around Sta 2+35. M Squared potholed at Sta 2+35 and discovered a 4" ductile iron pipe which is believe to be the active fire service for 85 Natoma Street. Please advise.				Eric Zagol 4/15/2011: Per response to RFI U-0123, coordinate with SFWD Inspector to confirm the 4" DIP is the active fire water service to 85 Natoma Street. Once confirmed, provide and install 8"x8"x4" tee and 4" gate valve. Connection to existing 4" DIP fire service by SFWD. Excavate and shore for connection in accordance with the contract documents. Coordinate with SFWD Inspector for connection by SFWD.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0124	Conflict Between New 24" Sewer and existing AWSS Line on Beale	Closed	04/07/2011	04/17/2011	04/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
M Squared has confirmed that the 14" AWSS Line shown on sheet U-3024 is in conflict with the proposed 24" VCP on Beale Street. The AWSS line is shown on the plan view but not on the elevation view on sheet U-3024. M Squared also shot the elevation of the existing sewer manhole. The elevation is 4.60, and not 4.70 as shown on the plans. The invert of the 14" AWSS is 6.2. (See attached) Please advise.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Eric Zagol 4/26/2011: Construct temporary 2-10" VCP and new SMH as shown on revised U-3024 (rev 2 4/26/11) and SK-U-0018. Construct SMH #701 to allow for future 24" VCP connection as indicated.		
					Relocate AWSS line in Howard St., not included in package. Design forthcoming potentially to be included in TG04.2R.		
					Following relocation of the AWSS line, construct 24" VCP sewer per contract documents.		
U-0124.1	Conflict Between 24" Sewer and AWSS Line on Beale	Closed	07/07/2011	07/17/2011	03/27/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Per the response to RFI#U-0124 a design to relocate the AWSS line @ Howard and Beale is forthcoming. Please advise the status of this design.			Eric Zagol 7/20/2011 Design is being performed by SFDPW BOE and will be tracked and issued via a forthcoming ASI. Schedule will be discussed with SFDPW BOE on 7/22/11. An update will be provided in the RUP OAC on 7/26/11.		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					RFIs U-128.2 and U-124.1 were responded to in July of 2011 and provided temporary solutions to utility conflicts with a full resolution planned to come via future ASI. ASI 21, which addresses these issues, was uploaded to Constructware on 3/21/12 by Eric Zagol for design approval. A CR for this work will be issued in the near future.		
U-0125	Precast Catch Basin Bases	Closed	04/08/2011	04/18/2011	04/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
In lieu of a cast in place base per CCSF DPW Standards, M Squared would like to propose the use of a precast catch basin. The catch basin barrel is attached to the precast base and it comes as one single unit. Before installing the precast catch basin base with barrel, M Squared will place a minimum 6" compacted level layer of crushed rock as the sub base. The proposed material					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Eric Zagol 4/12/2011 Precast catchbasin base is approved with conditions specified. The 5 foot catchbasin barrel shall be attached to the base section to form a monolith structure with the same dimensions, compressive strength and reinforcement as the CCSF DPW Standard cast in place base.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0126	Existing Brick Man Hole @ Second and Natoma In Conflict With Joint Trench	Closed	04/11/2011	04/11/2011	04/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
While potholing the Second St. Joint Trench crossing Trinet encountered an existing brick sewer man hole which is in conflict with the joint trench alignment. The manhole is not shown on the plans and had been paved over. The manhole also appears to have been previously abandoned. See the attached sketch and photograph detailing the location of the manhole.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please advise on how to proceed.					Eric Zagol 4/12/2011: Confirm existing abandoned sewer manhole is filled with slurry grout to 4 feet below rim elevation. Demolish and remove existing abandoned sewer manhole as required to construct the Joint Trench to an elevation 1-foot below bottom of Joint Trench. Backfill and restore in accordance with contract documents.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0127	Minna Street Sewer Manhole #201 in Crosswalk	Closed	04/11/2011	04/21/2011	04/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:				
Plan Sheet U-3007 shows MH#201 to be installed in the center of the crosswalk @ Minna and Second Street. The City of San Francisco typically avoids locating manholes in crosswalks, whenever possible, for ADA considerations. Please advise if MH#201 should be installed outside of the crosswalk.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
			Eric Zagol 4/13/2011: Sewer manhole location can not be adjusted due to an existing 8-inch Water and 4-inch HP Gas main. Construct manhole at the location per Plans. In lieu of CCSF DPW Standard MH cover, provide an ADA complainant cover that meets the following specifications: 1. MATERIAL - The cast iron shall be in accordance with ASTM "Standard Specifications for Gray Cast Iron Castings" Designation A 48, Class 30. The tensile strength shall be considered the primary test for qualification. 2. FINISH- STANDARD FINISH SHALL BE RAW, AS CAST, AND YIELD A MINIMUM COEFFICIENT FOR FRICTION OF .6 OR BETTER IN WET OR DRY CONDITIONS. 3. CASTINGS - SHALL BE FREE OF BLOW HOLES, FLASHING, GRIND MARKS, AND OTHER SURFACE BLEMISHES. 4. Cover shall incorporate a "pic-hole" for lifting purposes. 5. ADA COMPLIANCY- CASTINGS SHALL HAVE HOLES NO GREATER THAN 1/2" IN THE DOMINANT DIRECTION OF MOTION, NO VERTICAL RISE OF GREATER THAN 1/4", IF THE RISE IS GREATER THAN 1/4" THE RISE/RUN RATIO NEEDS TO BE 1:2 AND THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT SHALL BE 1/2". 6. Cover shall BE MADE TO FIT EXISTING FRAMES OR be MACHINED to FIT EXISTING FRAMES PER SFDPW STANDARD PLAN 87,190. 7. Cover should be MADE of quality EQUAL TO OR GREATER than THE PRODUCTS MADE BY D&L Foundry or Equal, see attached product data sheet.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0128	AWSS Conflict with Sewer on Fremont	Closed	04/11/2011	04/21/2011	04/19/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
A pothole at Sta 0+52 has confirmed that the existing AWSS line is in direct conflict with the proposed sewer on Fremont Street. The drawings show a 4" HPW line at invert elevation 13.0. Measurements taken in the pothole reveal a 14" HPW line at invert elevation 8.4. At this elevation the HPW line is in direct conflict with the proposed VCP sewer. Please advise.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Eric Zagol 4/19/2011 A temporary connection between MH #601 and (E) MH in Howard Street is being considered as an option. Please confirm the invert elevation of the (E) MH at Howard St. (Fremont St. STA 0+29.5) is EL 6.4 as shown on U-3022.				
<hr/>							
U-0128.1	AWSS Conflict with Sewer on Fremont	Closed	04/11/2011	04/21/2011	04/26/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By:AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
M Squared has confirmed the invert elevation for the existing manhole at station 0+29.5 Fremont St. is EL 6.4 as shown on U-3022.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please advise.					Eric Zagol 4/25/2011: In reference to RFI U-0128 and U-0128.1, construct temporary 15" VCP from SMH #601 to existing SMH at STA 0+29.50 as shown on attached SK-U-0016 and SK-U-0017. Construct SMH #601 to allow for future 30" VCP connection as indicated in SK-U-0016.		
					Relocate AWSS line in Howard St., not included in package. Design forthcoming potentially to be included in TG04.2R.		
					Following relocation of the AWSS line, construct 30" VCP sewer per contract documents.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2980 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0128.2	AWSS Conflict with Sewer on Fremont	Closed	07/07/2011	07/17/2011	03/27/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp, Jeff Thiel	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per the response to RFI#U-0128.1 a design to relocate the AWSS line @ Howard and Fremont is forthcoming. Please advise the status of this design.			SUGGESTION: Eric Zagol 7/20/2011 Design is being performed by SFDPW BOE and will be tracked and issued via a forthcoming ASI. Schedule will be discussed with SFDPW BOE on 7/22/11. An update will be provided in the RUP OAC on 7/26/11.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> RFIs U-128.2 and U-124.1 were responded to in July of 2011 and provided temporary solutions to utility conflicts with a full resolution planned to come via future ASI. ASI 21, which addresses these issues, was uploaded to Constructware on 3/21/12 by Eric Zagol for design approval. A CR for this work will be issued in the near future.	
<hr/>							
U-0129	Sewer Conflicts @ Second and Natoma	Closed	04/13/2011	04/25/2011	04/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo			To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service, Eric Zagol	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: M Squared is unable to excavate/shore/install the 18" VCP from the existing manhole at Sta 0+45 to MH#301 at Sta 0+81 as shown on sheet U-3010. While excavating for the sewer installation M Squared encountered several unknown utilities which were unmarked and not shown on the contract drawings. Also, some of the known utilities are at different locations and elevations than indicated on the drawings. Due to the quantity and proximity of these utilities it is not possible excavate and shore between MH#301 and the existing MH at Sta 0+45. Additionally PGE have yet to relocate their gas and electric utilities out of the area of the proposed MH#301. See attached drawings illustrating M Squared's pothole findings. Please advise on how to proceed.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 4/27/2011: AECOM has reviewed the information provided and requests a meeting with W/O and M Squared to review the data, review the demolition and construction sequencing shown in AECOM plans, and further understand why excavation and shoring is not possible.	
<hr/>							
U-0129.1	Sewer Conflicts @ Second and Natoma	Closed	05/02/2011	05/12/2011	06/03/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service, Eric Zagol	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per response to RFI#U-0129 Webcor/Obayashi, M Squared and AECOM met on 4/29/2011 and discussed why the sewer line between MH#301 and the existing manhole at Sta 0+45 could not be installed with normal			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 6/2/2011 Revised contract documents will be provided via ASI 011 to address conflicts between MH#301 and STA 0+45.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2981 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>means and methods. M Squared remove the plates from their investigative pot hole trench on 5/2/2011 for AECOM to further review and understand the existing conflicts.</p> <p>Please provide AECOM's findings from these meetings and provide direction on how to proceed with the sewer installation in this location.</p>						
U-0130	Sewer Removal On First Street	Closed	04/15/2011	04/25/2011	04/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>During the weekly Utility Relocation OAC meeting on 04/12/2011 Eric Zagol with AECOM informed Webcor/Obayashi that new drawings for the removal of the existing sewer on First street had been issued on 04/08/2011. To date Webcor/Obayashi has not received these drawings.</p> <p>Please advise the status of these drawings.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>		<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Kevin Chiu 4/21/2011: See CR U-022 transmitted on 4/18/2011 to W/O's document control email for ASI No. U-006 which contains the requested information.</p>			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0131	Minna St PG&E Duct Bank Termination Points	Closed	04/19/2011	04/29/2011	04/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Michelle Smith			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
PG&E has confirmed Trinet is to terminate the PG&E duct back 3' outside the east and west walls of manhole 1319. Please confirm that the termination points of the PG&E duct bank as described will fulfill Trinet's scope of work and the future completion of the duct bank will be performed by PG&E.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please note terminating the duct bank 3' outside the west wall of MH 1319 will leave the end of the ducts directly under the 24" high pressure water main. This may create an issue with future access for complete the duct bank by PG&E.					Eric Zagol 4/21/2011: 1 Joint Trench termination points at EMH 1319 and 1318 are as follows:		
					1319 East wall; PG&E would like the conduit capped and left 3 feet short of the vault with concrete encasement 15 feet short of the vault.		
					1319 West wall; PG&E would like the conduit capped and left 6 feet short (or 1-foot clear of existing 24-inch water, whichever is greater) of the vault with concrete encasement 15 feet short of the vault.		
					1318 North wall; PG&E would like the conduit capped and left 3 feet short of the vault with concrete encasement 15 feet short of the vault.		
Please advise.					The new termination points shall be considered as the limit of new conduit installation at EMH 1319 and 1318.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0132	Minna St Sewer Pressure Test	Closed	04/20/2011	04/30/2011	04/27/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
The SFDPW inspector Jason Chin has advised Trinet that he will be requesting a pressure test of the newly installed 18" and 24" VCP sewer main. The contract specification and drawings to do not specify any form of testing for the sewer mains.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please advise if pressure testing of the sewer main will be required.			Eric Zagol 4/26/2011: Test sewers in accordance with the contract documents. See specification sections:				
			034010 3.1 E				
			CCSF DPW Standard Section 319 Low Pressure Testing per 333110 1.2 A.				
			333110 1.4 C				
			333110 3.7				
			333110 3.8 B				
			333110 3.9				
			Provide TJPA Representative and SFDPW inspector 72 hours of advanced notice prior to testing.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2984 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0132.1	Sewer Main Pressure Test	Closed	05/07/2011	05/17/2011	05/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Trinet has been advised by Mission Clay (the VCP manufacture) that the hydrostatic test described in the SF Standard Specification Section 319.02 is primarily for cast iron or ductile iron pipe and is not recommended for clay pipe. The National Institute of Clay Pipe and Mission Clay recommend a low pressure air test in accordance with ASTM C 828. See attached copy of ASTM C 828. Trinet proposes using this low pressure air test in lieu of the 10psi hydrostatic test called for in the standard specifications. The low pressure air test will allow test on pipe runs with no service laterals ie: MH501-502, 206-207, 203-204, 202-201. Please advise if this is acceptable.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
With regards to the three remaining pipe runs that have lateral connections, please provide direction of how to plug the laterals if required to test the main lines.			=====UPDATE 5/23/2011=====				
			Kevin Chiu 5/23/2011 Below are links to devices for testing newly installed sewer pipes, specifically for main lines with active lateral connections that have been suggested within conversations between SFDPW, SFPUC and AECOM				
			http://newsite.cherneind.com/pneumatic/Long_Test_Ball_MS2_Test_Ball/				
			http://www.munipipe.com/chemical_grouting.html				
			http://veoliaes-is.com/Services/Environmental-and-Waste-Management/Total-Sewer-Management/Chemical-Grouting				
			Whether or not the contractors decide to utilize these devices is still up to them, as these are suggestions, not specifically required devices to be used for testing. It is the contractor's responsibility to perform testing on newly installed main lines, laterals, and manholes with their own means and methods while still protecting new and existing utilities.				
			=====				
			Eric Zagol 5/10/2011 ASTM C828 air test is an acceptable method to test sewer pipe in lieu of hydrostatic testing.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0133	Minna St Joint Trench Configuration and Alignment, Sta 2+24 to 1+62	Closed	04/20/2011	04/30/2011	04/26/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
During the installation of the AT&T ducts between Sta 2+24 and 1+62 the AT&T inspector, Juan, instructed Trinet to remove two bends from the duct bank. AECOM was contacted and approved the layout in the field prior to Trinet proceeding. Attached is the revised AT&T duct routing required by the inspector.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm the revised joint trench alignment is acceptable.			Eric Zagol 4/21/2011 Please provide the referenced "attached...revised AT&T duct routing" for review.				
<hr/>							
U-0133.1	Minna St Joint Trench Configuration and Alignment, Sta 2+24	Closed	04/26/2011	05/10/2011	05/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
During the installation of the AT&T ducts between Sta 2+24 and 1+62 the AT&T inspector, Juan, instructed Trinet to remove two bends from the duct bank. AECOM was contacted and approved the layout in the field prior to Trinet proceeding. Attached is the revised AT&T duct routing required by the inspector.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please confirm the revised joint trench alignment is acceptable.			Eric Zagol 5/2/2011 Alignment of the AT&T ducts is acceptable as shown in the sketch provided.				
<hr/>							
U-0134	Water Department Tie In Conflict at Howard and Beale	Closed	04/26/2011	05/06/2011	05/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
The SF Water Department has determined they are unable to perform the water tie in at the south west corner of Howard and Beale because of a conflict with the existing sewer sludge force main. M Squared has potholed the line and confirmed it is the existing 10" concrete encased sewer sludge force main.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please advise.			Eric Zagol 4/29/2011: Cut and remove a section of the existing 10-inch sludge line to allow SFWD to perform the water main connection. Coordinate with SFWD to determine the extent of the existing sludge line to be removed.				
			Plug the ends of the existing 10-inch sludge line with concrete per 02 41 00 3.6 A.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2986 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0135	4" Water Service @ 1st and Natoma	Closed	04/27/2011	05/07/2011	05/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REQUEST: While excavating for the 6" service connection to the new water line on First Street at Sta2+25 M Squared located an additional 4" ductile iron service that is connected to the existing water main. This 4" line is not shown in the contract documents. SFWD records show this to be a live service and would like for this to be tied into the new main. There is now no point of connection on the new water line to receive this 4" service. Please advise.		The existing sludge line to the north will be demolished per TG04.6. The connection of the new sludge line to the existing sludge line (south) per TG04.6, shall be made south of the plug. Eric Zagol 5/2/2011 Retap the existing 4" service to 500 Howard St. Coordinate service location with SFWD inspector. Submit piping plan showing the 4", 6" and 1" services for review. Kevin Chiu 5/4/2011 Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.					



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2987 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0135.1	4" Water Service at First and Natoma	Closed	05/09/2011	05/19/2011	05/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
In response to RFI #U-0135, see attached piping plan, as requested in RFI response.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Once approved M Squared will coordinate with SFWD to perform the work.					Eric Zagol 5/10/2011 With the understanding that the 12" main, 12" GV, 6" service and 1" service are already installed, furnish and install 4" GV and DIP service and connect to 12" main per piping plan.		
An expedited response is required as this is holding up all other water work on Natoma Street							
U-0136	Existing Water Bypass @ Howard and Fremont	Closed	05/03/2011	05/13/2011	05/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
While planning for the water tie in at Howard and Beale the Water Department discovered that there is an existing bypass line that will connect the existing water system (which is to be abandoned) to the new water system. This bypass is not shown on the plans. The Water department has requested that the existing bypass be excavated and plated so it can be cut and capped while they have the line shut down for the tie in on the new system at Howard and Beale the night of 05/04/2011.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please advise.					Eric Zagol 5/4/2011 RFI is not accurate and locations are incorrect.		
					Based on a field meeting with W/O ,SFWD Inspector and AECOM on 5/3/11, SFWD identified an unforeseen existing bypass pipe and gate valve that connects the existing 8-inch main in Fremont Street (to remain) to the existing 8-inch main in Howard Street (to be abandoned). The existing 8-inch main in Howard Street will be abandoned once the new 12-inch main is Howard is active.		
					Once the new 12-inch main in Howard Street is placed into service and the existing main is abandoned, the existing bypass and gate valve from the existing 8-inch active Fremont main will be connected to the abandoned Howard Street main. To mitigate the situation the SFWD proposes to cut and cap the existing bypass such that the existing Fremont main is not connected the abandoned main in Howard Street.		
					Coordinate with SFWD to locate existing bypass and define the limits of excavation required to cap the existing bypass.		
					Excavate to expose bypass. Shore and plate per specifications. Restore per specifications.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2988 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0137	Verizon Ductbank conflict w/MH 701	Closed	05/03/2011	05/13/2011	05/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: M Squared's sewer potholing on Beale (Sta 0+30) has indicated a conflict between an existing Verizon duct bank and MH# 701 on Howard Street. See attached drawing. The ductbank is approximately 18" wide x 18" deep. It is 2'4" to the top and it is slurry encased. Verizon underground locators have confirmed that this is live and serves Charles Schwabb building south of Howard on Beale Street. Please advise.				Eric Zagol 5/10/2011 Unforeseen condition, Verizon utility not shown in existing utility survey.			
				As suggested by Noel of (M Squared) during a site visit on 5/3/11 with W/O and AECOM, based on Noel's discussions with Mike Roybal (Verizon Field Engineer) and confirmed by AECOM based on follow up discussions with Mike Roybal (Verizon) and Pam Brown (Verizon), coordinate with Verizon and remove existing concrete encasement from existing duct to expose conduit in area of conflict. As directed in the field by Verizon, remove concrete encasement around duct from area in conflict to adjacent Verizon manhole. Move and support exposed Verizon conduit as required and directed by Verizon to construct manhole.			
				Coordinate with Mike Roybal (Verizon) at (415) 716-6736 such that a Verizon representative is present during the Verizon duct concrete encasement removal, moving and support install.			
				Restore Verizon duct to match existing concrete encasement following completion of sewer manhole.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2989 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0138	Temporary Telecom Pole Layout in Lot N and N'	Closed	05/09/2011	05/19/2011	05/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Reference attached layout and submittal package#TG0406-014:					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Due to the future use of lot N and N' prime, the temporary telecom poles must be relocated. The attached sketch indicates the proposed layout of these poles which has been coordinated with AECOM. Submittal Package#TG0406-014 has been submitted for formal approval of the pole locations.					Eric Zagol 5/10/2011 The pole alignment changes requested by CMGC along with additional requests from Telecommunications companies has required a pole and pole placement redesign. An ASI has been generated for the redesign with a CR forthcoming.		
Please confirm relocating the poles is acceptable.							
U-0139	Existing Water Line on Beale in Conflict with New Sewer	Closed	05/09/2011	05/09/2011	05/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Today while trying to execute the USAR for the existing 12" water line on Beale Dan Helminiak with SFWD informed Webcor/Obayashi and M Squared that the existing water line will remain active until the water tie in at First and Natoma is completed and the existing 8" is capped at First and Howard as shown on sheet U-3116.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The water tie in and capping of the existing line on First Street is currently being delayed by separate issues and it is unclear when this work will be completed.					Eric Zagol 5/10/2011 Please clarify the question(s).		
Dan Helminiak suggested that the existing 8" water line running down Howard could be capped by the water department at one of the existing tees which would allow the decommissioning of the existing line on Beale.					Subject states "Existing Water Line on Beale in Conflict with New Sewer". Per U-1124 Demolition and Construction Sequence order, Beale Street sewer is to commence after existing water main in Beale Street is abandoned. Please clarify where and what the conflict is.		
Please advise.					Also, please confirm the following:		
					1. Is the new 12" main along Howard Street between First and Main streets active?		
					2. Is the new 12" main along Beale Street north of Howard Street active?		
					3. Is the new 12" main along Beale Street south of Mission Street active?		
U-0139.1	Cap (E) Water on Howard @ Beale	Closed	05/16/2011	05/26/2011	05/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0140	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>-New 12" water main along Howard between First and Main is active. -New 12" water main along Beale Street North of Howard is active. -New 12" water main along Beale Street South of Mission is active.</p> <p>Per U-1124 Demolition and Construction Sequence order, Beale Street sewer is to commence after existing water main on Beale is abandoned. - The old water line on Howard Streets and Beale Streets is currently not active because the valves on the line at First and Howard are currently shutdown. Dan from the water department has expressed his concern that anyone can just open these valves and fill the old line along Howard Street. He is also concerned that the valve is not 100% closed and that the SFWD cannot get a complete shutdown on the old line. This means when M Squared removes the old water line on Beale Street in order to install the new sewer, it is possible that there will be a constant flow of water in the old line.</p> <p>The suggestion from Dan is to cap the old water line on Howard Street so that When M Squared removes the old line on Beale Street there will be no possibility of water flow. A cap on the line at Howard would also confirm for definite that the old line on Howard and Beale Street is "abandoned".</p> <p>Please provide direction for capping the existing water line on Howard so the sewer installation on Beale can proceed.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Eric Zagol 5/23/2011 Coordinate construction of the cap on the old Howard St. main at the intersection of Main St. with SFWD as shown on U-3119.</p> <p>Coordinate construction of the cap on the old Howard St. main at the intersection of First St. with SFWD as shown on U-3116 (latest rev per SK-U-0003 1/28/11).</p> <p>Per discussions with SFWD inspector, the old Howard St. main has been capped at Main St, Beale St. (south of the cross) and at the Fremont St. by-pass connection by SFWD. Additionally, the two line gates at First and Fremont streets are closed and have been filled with concrete.</p> <p>The caps at Main, Beale, Fremont in combination with the closed line gates at First St. will allow sewer installation on Beale St. to proceed.</p>			
U-0140	<p>Proposed Changes by BLHP to S/L Conduit Run @ 2nd & Minna</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author:</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>05/11/2011</p>	<p>05/21/2011</p>	<p>05/20/2011</p>	<p>Potentially <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol</p>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>During a field meeting on 5/10/2011 with Eric Zagol, AECOM and Robert Kawano, BLHP to discuss the alignment of the conduit run from 2nd St to the relocated S/L pole @ Stn 2+89, Robert Kawano asked that a splice</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p>	<p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Eric Zagol 5/19/2011 Per BLHP's request, furnish and install a CCSF DPW precast pullbox, cover, and lid per CCSF DPW Standard Plans and Specifications between the PG&E supply point and the relocated</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2991 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	box be installed in the sidewalk downstream from the connection point to PG&E's manhole. The box would serve as the connection point for BLHP to PG&E's power supply from 2nd St for the street light. Because of an existing sidewalk basement, which is located along the north side of Minna, east of 2nd St., it was agreed in the field that the splice box should be placed in the sidewalk just west of the new fire hydrant located @ Stn 0+93. There is already a pocket constructed in the sidewalk basement to accommodate the fire hydrant and Trinet will locate the splice box within this pocket structure. A sketch is attached depicting the proposed alignment of the conduit run and the additional splice box as discussed in the field. Please confirm this is acceptable.						
						street light pullbox along Minna Street east of Second Street.	
						Location; confirm that a sidewalk pullbox will fit in the knock out space above the 121-123 Second St. sidewalk basement adjacent to the newly installed fire hydrant prior to construction.	
						Maintain minimum bends in conduit run per Specification 33 71 00.	



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0141	Street Light Connection Point at Second and Minna	Closed	05/16/2011	05/26/2011	05/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
In the response to our RFI # U-0016, Trinet was directed to connect the street lighting conduit on the west end of Minna into PG&E MH #1319 on 2nd St. At a field meeting on 5/10/11 with Eric Zagol and Robert Kawano, to discuss the alignment of the street lighting run for the relocated light on the west end of Minna, Eric advised that PG&E was contemplating a change in the connection point for this conduit run from MH 1319 to MH 1320. MH #1320 is located to the south of 1319 and further west towards the middle of 2nd St. Please confirm the connection point on 2nd St for the street lighting conduit.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					5/26/11 UPDATE		
					Supply point has been confirmed as PG&E EMH 1320. Coordinate connection location with PG&E Field Engineer.		
					Eric Zagol 5/19/2011 Related to Joint Trench changes and PG&E's de-energization of Minna Street after the response to RFI U-0016 was provided, PG&E has revised their electrical plans with respect to EMH 1319 and has indicated that the preferred location for new street light power would be EMH 1320.		
					In accordance with U-3201 Note 7, AECOM considers this RFI as the request to coordinate connections with BLHP and PG&E through the TJPAs representative for new street light circuit connections. AECOM and the TJPAs Representative are in the process of coordinating Street Light Service Orders with BLHP and PG&E. Once the Service Order is processed the final connection point will be provided.		
U-0142	Concrete Specifications for Sidewalk Replacement @ 555 Mission	Closed	05/16/2011	05/26/2011	05/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
The sidewalk concrete @ 555 Mission (on Minna) is not the typical San Francisco sidewalk mix design. It is a colored concrete with what appears to be a sandblasted finish. Please provide the concrete specifications for repair and/or replacement of the sidewalk in this area.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Kevin Chiu 5/18/2011 Sidewalks shall be constructed of a dark gray, Hi-con @ 5 lbs. per cubic yard carbon black based concrete finish, with 25 to 30 lbs. per 100 square feet of silicon carbide sparkle grains. The surface of the concrete shall be washed and rinsed using a stiff brush, and if necessary shall be sandblasted to remove the concrete surrounding the aggregate to minimum depth of 1/8 inch.		
U-0143	Demolition of PG&E Duct Bank Alongside (N) 18" Sewer Main on Minna	Closed	05/16/2011	05/26/2011	05/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
<hr/>								
From: Webcor Construction LP		Colin Azevedo	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
During excavation and shoring for installation of the 18" Sewer main along Minna St., between the (E) electrical vault @ Stn 1+80 (demolished) and (N) manhole # 201, Trinet was unable to save the entire length of the existing PG&E duct bank (currently abandoned), which runs along the south side of the sewer trench. Between stations Stn 0+95 and 1+25 (approx.) the duct bank had veered into the sewer trench and had to be demolished - see attached sketch. Please review and advise.				Eric Zagol 5/19/2011 U-1107 (rev 2 3/16/11) indicates that the existing 6-4" PG&E duct is to be protected in place.				
				2 of the 6 existing 4" conduits will be utilized by PG&E to provide temporary construction power to W/O Skids 1 and 2 along Minna Street.				
				Mandrel existing conduits east of STA 1+25 to STA 1+70 (where new conduit caps were to be installed per contract) to confirm that the existing conduits that were to be protected in place have no blockages.				
				Coordinate with PG&E as STA 0+95 is exposed to determine which 2 of existing 4" conduits will be utilized for temporary construction power.				
				Furnish and install 2-4" conduits concrete encased to replace those that were removed during sewer construction. Connect new conduits to existing that will remain to provide temporary construction power.				
<hr/>								
U-0143.1	(E) PG&E Duct Bank from EMH #1320 to Demolished EMH #1355	Closed	06/14/2011	06/24/2011	06/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	
From: Webcor Construction LP		Colin Azevedo	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:								
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
After further investigation of the existing PG&E duct bank between EMH #1320 and demolished EMH # 1355 (@ Anchor & Hope), Trinet found that there is only one unobstructed conduit between the two manholes. The unobstructed conduit is the one that already had a pull rope in place. Trinet had demolished a section of this conduit during excavation for sewer MH # 201 because it was in conflict with the shoring. Trinet replaced the damaged section (approx. 8 LF) on Saturday 6/1, and reconnected the pull rope in the conduit run. A sketch of the conduit run, depicting the section replaced, is attached. Please review and advise if one 4" conduit will be adequate from EMH #1320 to the west end of				Eric Zagol 6/14/2011 PG&E plans to use the existing conduit package to provide temp power to Skids 1 and 2. Mike Balmy of PG&E was notified and has confirmed that only 1-4" unobstructed conduit is required between EMH1320 and the cap at demolished EMH1355 for future temp power service.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2994 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	demolished EMH #1355.						
U-0144	PGE Vault conflict with 24" VCP on Beale	Closed	05/17/2011	05/27/2011	05/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
PG&E confirmed the location of the inside of the east wall of PG&E manhole 1702 at Howard and Beale Street. Allowing for a 12" thick wall, the vault will be in conflict with the proposed alignment of the future 24" VCP, even with moving the alignment 1' further east as directed in RFI U-0124. The conflict could be avoided by moving the alignment another 6" further east. However this will cause a conflict between manhole #701 and the existing 14" AWSS. Additionally the Verizon duct bank conflict increases(RFI#U-0137). Please advise.			Eric Zagol 5/19/2011 As discussed in the field on 5/18/11 with Jason Dunne (W/O) and Noel McCarthy (MSquared) the exact location of the existing PG&E MH outside wall and the existing AWSS is currently unknown.				
			Adjust locations of MH#701, MH#702, MH#704 and sewer alignment east as required (~6" as mentioned) for the 24" VCP installation (new and future) to avoid the existing PG&E MH however not in conflict in conflict with the existing 14" AWSS line.				
			Note, the existing AWSS line will be abandoned North of Beale Street STA 1+10.				
			Confirm alignment (2-10" VCP and future 24" VCP) will clear existing AWSS valve at STA 0+70.				
<hr/>							
U-0144.1	PG&E Vault conflict with 24" VCP on Beale	Closed	06/30/2011	07/10/2011	07/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
In response to RFI U-0144, please note that M Squared confirms the following:			Kevin Chiu 7/1/2011 RFI does not request additional information.				
2-10inch VCP and future 24inch VCP will clear existing AWSS Valve at Sta 0+70.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2995 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0145	Sludge Main Conflicts with Existing Utilities	Closed	05/17/2011	05/27/2011	05/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please see attached pothole results for the new sludge main on Mission Street. Due to the quantity and location of existing utilities, and utility vaults/manholes it will not be possible to install the new 12" sludge main on Mission Street as shown on the contract drawings.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please advise.			Eric Zagol 5/18/2011 Please indicate which utilities were marked via the USA ticket and or those identified by other means.				
<hr/>							
U-0145.1	Sludge Main Conflicts with existing utilities	Closed	05/18/2011	05/28/2011	06/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
In response to RFI# U-0145, see attached with notes. M Squared has marked what utilities were located via USA markings and what ones have been located via the contract drawings. There are also several unknowns that could not be identified.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Eric Zagol 6/7/2011 Revised contract documents will be provided via ASI 012 to address sludge line conflicts in Mission St.				
<hr/>							
U-0146	Proposed Pavement Reconstruction Plan for Minna Street	Closed	05/17/2011	05/27/2011	05/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please find the attached sketch detailing Trinet's proposed pavement reconstruction plan for Minna St., between 1St to 2nd Streets. Please review and advise.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Eric Zagol 5/23/2011 AECOM has reviewed the sketch provided and has the following comments in accordance with Contract requirements:				
			Confirm existing utilities to be demolished as shown on Demolition Plans have been demolished per Plans prior to final street restoration. Provide FULL street restoration, curb to curb, in Minna St. West of the CDSM shoring wall (~STA 2+25) to Second Street in accordance with Contract requirements (DPW ORDER NO. 178,940 [superseding DPW ORDER 176,707] per specification SECTION 32 12 17) Construct Curbs in accordance with DPW Std. Plan 87,169				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0146.1	Proposed Pavement Reconstruction	Plan for Minna Street	Closed	05/27/2011	06/06/2011	05/27/2011	Potentially <input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Colin Azevedo	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: <input type="checkbox"/> Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Attached, please find a sketch detailing Trinet's revised pavement reconstruction plan for Minna St., between 1St to 2nd Streets, which incorporates Balfour Beatty's request that Trinet stop the new pavement section 5' north of centerline of the CDSM shoring wall (2' north of demarcation line).				*** 5/31/11 Revision ***			
				Restore entire width of Minna street using concrete road base and ACWS curb to curb in accordance with Contract drawings and DPW Order No. 176,707 (and latest revision 178,940) Section 11.			
				5/27/11 Response:			
				Please provide BBIs traffic control plan and construction logistics plan for Minna St. during pre-trenching and CDSM shoring wall construction.			
				AECOM's specific questions are as follows:			
				1. What portion of Minna St. will be maintained for vehicular traffic during pre-trenching and CDSM wall construction? Please provide dimensions from face of north curb along Minna St.			
				2. Is a traffic barrier (k-rail or other) planned to be installed along Minna St. during pre-trenching and CDSM wall construction? Provide location, dimension from face of north cur along Minna St.			
				3. If a traffic barrier is planned, what is the schedule for the installation?			
				4. Once pre-trenching is complete will any of the pretrenching trench area be restored and used for vehicular traffic?			
				5. Once the CDSM shoring wall is constructed will the traffic barrier move south and the vehicular area be widened? If so by how much? Please provide a dimension from the face of north curb along Minna St.			
				This information is critical in order to provide a responses to this RFI as well as RFI U-147 and U-148 in an effort to determine how RUP will restore Minna St.; crowned or sloped, and how the Minna St. restoration conforms to the future Transit Center Minna St. design.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0146.2	Pavement Reconstruction Plan for Minna Rev 2	Closed	06/02/2011	06/12/2011	06/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please find attached a revised (Rev2) pavement Reconstruction Cross Section drawing for Minna St., which details Trinets understanding of the Engineer's latest response to RFI#U-0146.1 and RFI#U-0147. Please confirm pavement reconstruction can proceed per the attached detail..					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
			Eric Zagol 6/7/2011 Street restoration detail is acceptable with the following corrections:				
			1. The southern extent (limit) of concrete base and ACWS between STA 2+30 and First Street shall be based on U-5101 Detail 6 and the limit of excavation required to do perform the Demolition and New utilities work in Minna Street. Conform to final saw cut lines as indicated in Detail 6.				
<hr/>							
U-0147	Existing Top-Of-Curb Grades @ Minna Driveways for 575 Mission Building	Closed	05/27/2011	06/06/2011	06/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
The existing driveways entering the 575 Mission St building, are depressed between 2 ½" to 3" below the adjacent top-of-curb and sidewalk grades - see attached drawing depicting the driveways. This condition seems to be a consequence of repeated overlaying of Minna street, which has resulted in a curb height in many areas far less than the City standard of 6 inches. The street grade along the north side of Minna along the 575 Mission building ranges from 3 ½ to 4 ½ inches below top-of-curb grade.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Trinet has been directed in the field by Jason Chin, and by the Engineer in RFI #U-0146, to construct the new roadway with finish grade at curb line 6" below top-of-curb grade. This is consistent with City standard plan # 87,169. The new roadway grades will result in 3" to 3 ½" of exposed curb height at the driveways to 575 Mission, which is considerably deeper than the 1" called for in the San Francisco standard plans for driveway construction (plan # 87,171). It will also not be possible to raise the street grade at the driveways without impeding road runoff drainage and causing ponding.					Eric Zagol 5/31/2011 Restore pavement along existing curbs and driveways along the north side of Minna St. in accordance with Contract drawings and DPW Order No. 176,707 (and latest revision 178,940) Section 12 to match existing flow line elevations at curbs and driveways shown on U-1001. 6-inch curb and driveways along Minna St. will be reconstructed at a later date as part of the Transit Center Project.		
Please review and advise.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 2999 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0148	Pavement Reconstruction Plan for West End of Minna Street - Stn 2+15 to 2nd St	Closed	05/27/2011	06/06/2011	06/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please provide a pavement reconstruction drawing, or typical cross section detail, for the west end of Minna St from Stn 2+15 to 2nd St. Trinet had planned to reconstruct the street in this area from curb to curb. We find however, that there is a grade difference of approximately 6 inches between top-of-curb on the north side of the street and the south side, with the south side being at the higher grade. The construction detail approved in RFI #U-0146 (Trinet #094) cannot be utilized in this area, because the street already has a cross slope of approx. 2% from south to north.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 6/7/2011 See response to RFI 146.2		
U-0149	MH#701 Conflicts with existing utilities	Closed	05/27/2011	06/06/2011	06/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
The 14" AWSS line west of MH#701 was found to be constructed thru the roof of the existing 3x5 sewer. Several bends were used in the AWSS line construction and these bends included lugs and tie rods. As a result of the presence of these tie rods and fittings we can now not move MH#701 any further west. To install the new 24" VCP in a straight line (perpendicular to MH wall), and in order to get by the existing PGE MH we will have to pour the pipe wall and 2" of the internal diameter of the pipe into the west wall of MH 701. Please advise on how to proceed.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 6/8/2011 Deflect VCP pipe joints in accordance with ASTM C425 (max 1.8 degrees per joint) to allow for 6" of deflection to avoid the existing PG&E MH and connect to MH#701 as shown in the attached SK-U-0019. Confirm in the field that 6" deflection will allow the 24" VCP to be clear of the MH wall.		
U-0149.1	MH#701 Conflicts with existing utilities	Closed	06/30/2011	07/10/2011	07/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
In response to RFI U-0149, please note the following: M Squared confirms that 6inch deflection of the VCP will allow the 24inch pipe to be clear of the manhole wall.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Kevin Chiu 7/1/2011 RFI does not request additional information.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3000 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0150	Proposed Correction to Field Condition Report 40C	Closed	05/31/2011	06/10/2011	06/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please see the attached detail from Trinet Construction Inc for their proposed solution to mitigate the incorrect installation of CB203 identified in Field Condition Report 40C.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please advise if the proposed solution is acceptable.					Eric Zagol 6/1/2011 The proposed solution has been reviewed and approved by SFDPW BOE and is acceptable. Construct catch basin as shown in the Trinet proposed construction detail attached to CR40C. Construct the clean out on the cast iron trap such that it is accessible from above for maintenance via removal of the grate. Coordinate inspection during installation with DPW BCM inspector through the TJPA's Representative.		
U-0151	Additional Sewer Lateral Connection for 100 1st Street	Closed	06/02/2011	06/12/2011	06/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Trinet has discovered an additional sewer lateral for the 100 1st Street building which was not connected to the new 24" sewer main - see attached sketch. The lateral is located at sta. 7+09 and services a single toilet and the rear of the building. This lateral was not shown on the plans and there was no vent in the sidewalk to indicate the existence of a lateral. Trinet potholed the lateral in the sidewalk and a 4" cast iron lateral, a 4" cast iron trap and a 4" cast iron vent pipe capped 2' below grade. Please confirm Trinet is to tie the lateral into the new 24" sewer main on Minna. Also, please advise what is to be done with existing cast iron trap and vent pipe assembly which are not up to current DPW standards.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Eric Zagol 6/8/2011 In accordance with U-3000 General Note 12, contractor was to verify that there are no active sewer lateral connections to the existing sewer prior to sewer demolition.		
					Please provide the elevation of the existing sewer lateral and the location of existing 4" cast iron vent pipe for review.		
					Renewal of this lateral will be discussed with TJPA and 100 First St. property owner, final direction forthcoming.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3001 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0151.1	Additional Sewer Lateral Connection	Closed	06/29/2011	07/09/2011	07/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: This is a follow-up to the request by the Engineer in his response to W/O RFI #U-0151 (Trinet RFI #097) for additional information relating to the 2nd sewer lateral connection for the 100 1st St building. Trinet also clarifies the issue of the existing 4" trap on the line, which was raised in the original RFI. The sewer lateral is located @ Stn. 7+09 and the invert elevation of the 4" cast iron sewer lateral pipe at face-of-curb is 14.6'. The elevation for the top of the new concrete encased ductbank @ Stn 7+09 is 13.85'. The sewer lateral was therefore not in conflict with the new joint trench utilities. With regards to the existing 4" trap on the line, Trinet checked with the SF Plumbing department which advised that a 4" cast iron trap was adequate for a 4" sewer lateral. The existing trap was therefore in compliance with the SF plumbing code. Trinet advised Jason Chin of this in the field and he agreed that the trap did not need to be replaced. The 4" cast iron vent pipe for the trap did not extend to street level but was capped-off approximately 18" below grade. Per field discussions with Jason Chin, Trinet extended the trap vent piping to grade and installed a street vent frame & cover in the sidewalk.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 7/5/2011 In reference to RFI-151 and 151.1: 1. Reconnect existing lateral to new 24" Minna St. sewer in accordance with SFDPW Standard Plan 87,196. 2. Extend fresh air inlet and air inlet cover to existing sidewalk grade.	

U-0152	Alternate Manhole Testing Method	Closed	06/02/2011	06/12/2011	06/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Spec section 03 40 10 3.1 E directs the contractor to test all manholes hydraulically by exfiltration testing. M Squared proposes the use of the vacuum method of testing manhole sections instead of the above method (See attached) This vacuum method is in accordance with ASTM C1244.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 6/7/2011 Vacuum method in accordance with ASTM C1244 is acceptable for testing of sewer manholes.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3002 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please advise if this is acceptable.							
U-0153	Concrete Slab and Rail Ties Conflict with Sludge Line on Howard	Closed	06/03/2011	06/13/2011	06/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Colin Azevedo	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
While potholing for the sludge line alignment along Howard Street between Beale and Main at Sta 18+00 and Sta 19+42 M Squared discovered the presence of wooden rail ties and concrete slab (see attached photos). These are possibly the same ties and slab that M Squared encountered while installing the water line on TG04.3. They are in direct conflict with the proposed location of the new sludge line along Howard Street. Please advise.				Eric Zagol 6/21/2011			
				*** 6/21/11 Update ***			
				Based on follow up discussions with W/O and M2, and further understanding of the extents of the concrete slab and wooden rails ties found further West (Howard and Fremont streets TG04.3), remove and dispose of concrete and wooden rail ties as required to construct 12" sludge line.			
				Eric Zagol 6/8/2011 Pothole at STA 18+00 to determine the extents (southern and northern) of the concrete slab and wooden rail ties. Submit pothole data for review.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3003 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0154	Electrical Service for Street Lights on Natoma	Closed	06/08/2011	06/18/2011	09/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Chris Lotti				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Per Sheet U-1120 the electrical service feeding the street lights on Natoma is to be demolished, see attached. This conduit has been exposed through the investigative trenching process on First, confirmed dead and remove. As a result the existing street lights on Natoma are without power. There are no details provided in the plans for reestablishing power to these street lights now that the demo is complete. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: Eric Zagol 6/20/2011 Natoma Street street light power renewal to be addressed via ASI 014 forthcoming.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Change Request No. U-043R1 -Renew Natoma Street Light Power Supply (ASI No. 014) [30100.03] - Force Account issued 9/13/2011.		
U-0155	AWSS Cast In Place Concrete Testing	Closed	06/20/2011	06/30/2011	06/28/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The AWSS Specification section 03300-2, Cast-In-Place Concrete 1.5 C (Quality Assurance) states that the concrete testing will be performed by an agency employed by the TJPA. However, 03300-10, 3.9 B (Field Quality Control) states that the concrete testing will be performed by the City Testing and Inspection Agency. Please advise who will be performing the cast in place concrete testing.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Kevin Chiu 6/28/2011 The TJPA employed testing agency will provide concrete testing per 03300-2, 1.5C. Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "TJPA can have testing performed or set funding in place for testing by SFDPW's testing lab," dated and signed on 6/27/11 (see attached).		
U-0156	Sink Hole under road base at MH#701	Closed	06/21/2011	07/01/2011	06/22/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: While excavating for MH#701 M Squared discovered what appears to be a large void under the street base adjacent to the west wall of the MH#701. We estimate the void to be approximately 3' wide and 12' long. This may be a hazard as the street base may collapse at some point in			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 6/22/2011 Unforeseen existing condition not clear if directly related to the Relocation of Utilities Project work. AECOM suggests that the existing pavement be		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3004 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

the future.

Please advise how you would like to proceed.

removed over the area of the sink hole and conditions be evaluated.

Once existing utilities are determined to be secure, backfill with a sand cement slurry and restore pavement in accordance with SFDPW Standard Plans and Specifications.

Kevin Chiu 6/22/2011 Coordinate repair of sink hole with TJPA representative. Repair work to be paid under CR U-039



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3005 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0157	Pressure Testing for Sewer Manhole #'s 501 & 502 on 1st St.	Closed	06/28/2011	07/08/2011	07/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
This RFI is a follow-up to discussions in the field with AECOM and the SFDPW Inspector and Trinet, regarding Trinet's inability to perform a pressure test on sewer manholes 501 & 502 on 1st St. due to field conditions. MH #502 is constructed around the existing 3x5 brick sewer on one side (per SF Standard Plan #87,184) and Trinet has no means of plugging the brick sewer effectively to withstand a pressure test.					Eric Zagol 7/8/2011 Confirmed. Pressure tests for sewer manholes #501 and #502 are not required due to the restrictive conditions.		
In the case of sewer MH #501, the original design was similar to MH #502 and a pressure test would not have been possible. The revised design (see attached drawing) includes a temporary 24" corrugated PVC pipe stub extending south from the manhole and connecting to the existing 3x5 brick sewer. The inside of the temporary 24" pipe stub is also corrugated, and therefore cannot be sealed with an inflatable pipe plug, as would be required to perform a pressure test of the manhole structure.							
Please confirm that a pressure test will not be required for sewer manholes 501 & 502 on 1st St.							
U-0158	MH #301 Location	Closed	07/15/2011	07/25/2011	07/20/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
During our sewer work at 2nd and Natoma M Squared discovered that the Telecom Vault shown on the drawings is in fact significantly larger in the field than is shown on the plans. In order to be able to shore for MH#301 construction M Squared has had to move the location of MH four (4) feet east along Natoma. As a result the jack and bore alignment is now a few inches south of what is shown on the plans.					Eric Zagol 7/20/2011 Adjustments proposed are acceptable.		
Please confirm that these adjustments are acceptable.					Since the adjustment pushes the MH and cover into the crosswalk path of travel, in lieu of CCSF DPW Standard MH cover, provide an ADA complainant cover that meets the following specifications:		
					1. MATERIAL - The cast iron shall be in accordance with ASTM "Standard Specifications for Gray Cast Iron Castings" Designation A 48, Class 30. The tensile strength shall be considered the primary test for qualification.		
					2. FINISH- STANDARD FINISH SHALL BE RAW, AS		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3006 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0159	Unknown Concrete Structure In Conflict with Sludge Line on Mission	Closed	07/28/2011	08/07/2011	08/16/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
REQUEST:			Eric Zagol 8/16/2011 In accordance with specification sections 000810 and 020630, please submit for review locations and findings for all potholes performed along Mission Street associated with the Sludge FM.				
While potholing at the locations shown on the attached drawing M Squared discovered what appears to be a concrete wall under the parking strip. M Squared excavated both potholes 7' deep and at that depth the wall appeared to be continuing deeper. This concrete structure is in direct conflict with the proposed location of the new sludge main on Mission Street. The concrete curb on the north side of Mission St also extends 7' deep.							
See attached pothole findings.							
Please advise on how you would like to proceed.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3007 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0159.1	Conflict with Sludge Line Conflict on Mission	Closed	08/26/2011	09/05/2011	09/13/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jacob Giannandrea To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: In response to RFI U-159. See attached pothole findings from remaining potholes on Mission street. Also included is pothole data for Sta 17+28 and Sta 17+50.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					In response to RFI U-159 and 159.1:		
					For 12" Sludge FM on Mission at Beale St., information provided shows an existing unforeseen concrete wall 23" from the face of curb, the proposed 12" Sludge FM is shown 1' from the curb. Construct 12" Sludge FM between face of curb and existing concrete wall.		
U-0159.2	Unknown Concrete Structure Sludge Line Conflict	Closed	09/15/2011	09/15/2011	09/21/2011	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: In response to RFI U-159.1 There is not adequate space between the face of curb and the unknown concrete structure in order for a welder to be able to weld the bells of each piece of pipe. Please advise on how to proceed.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Eric Zagol 9/18/2011 Demolish existing unknown concrete structure south of proposed alignment between STAs 17+25 to 17+75 as required at joints to facilitate welding. Expose unknown structure at joints, identify sections to be demolished and coordinate with TJPA Representative prior to structure demolition.		
					Jeff Thiel 9/21/2011 Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.		
U-0160	Location of Existing Sludge Force Main on Beale Street	Closed	07/29/2011	08/08/2011	08/02/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: M Squared has potholed for the sludge line on Mission Street at Beale at the location shown on the attached drawing. They have been unable to locate the existing 10" FM that they are to tie the new 12" sludge main into. The (E) Force Main is not in the location shown on the contract			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					Eric Zagol 8/2/2011 The existing 10" sludge FM in the vicinity bends down (~45+) to get under the existing 3'x5' sewer in Mission St. Record drawings show the depth of the 10" sludge FM where potholed at around 5', north of the 45 degree vertical bend.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3008 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	drawings. See attached pothole findings. Please advise on how you would like to proceed.						



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0160.2	Location of FM on Beale Street	Closed	08/11/2011	08/21/2011	08/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:AECOM Technical ServiceEric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
M Squared potholed the location of the existing FM to the limits in the drawing provided in the response to RFI U-0160.1. M Squared located the FM within this pothole.				Unforeseen condition, location of existing Sludge FM in the field varied from that shown on the drawings. Refer to SK-U-0021 and SK-U-0022 attached showing the revised horizontal and vertical alignment to accommodate connection to Sludge FM as located in the field.			
See attached pothole findings.							
Please direct M Squared how to proceed.							
<hr/>							
U-0161	Unknown Concrete Structure in Investigative Trench	Closed	07/29/2011	08/08/2011	08/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:AECOM Technical ServiceEric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
M Squared discovered an obstruction in the Beale Street investigative trench on station 2+55 approximately 25' west of centerline. The obstruction appears to be a 2'-3' thick concrete wall starting directly below the street base and extending down to an unknown depth. M Squared began demoing the obstruction yesterday believing it was part of a concrete encased PG&E trench. It is now known it is not part of any duct package. Please advise on how you would like to proceed.				Eric Zagol 8/1/2011 Unknown non utility structure. A similar structure was found in AECOM's subsurface investigation trench at Beale Street Station 2+80.52 as shown in Specification Section 020630 Appendix A.			
				Protect in place. Non utility structures (i.e. walls) within zone of CDSM shoring wall and Transit Center footprint are to be removed by Buttress/Shoring/Excavation (BSE) contractor.			
<hr/>							
U-0162	Manhole #602 Orientation	Closed	08/03/2011	08/13/2011	08/09/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By:AECOM Technical ServiceEric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
The PG&E manhole at Station 2+55 is actually further south than is shown on the drawings. As a result of this the new water main on Natoma Street was installed in a different alignment than shown on the drawings. In order to excavate and shore for the new Manhole #602, without damaging the new water main M Squared will have to install the manhole at a different alignment than what is shown on the plans. M Squared will maintain the correct internal manhole dimensions per DPW standard drawings.				Eric Zagol 8/9/2011 Construct sewer MH #602 to avoid existing water main as shown in the sketch provided. Maintain internal manhole dimensions, wall thickness, and steel reinforcement per DPW Standard Plans #87,182.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3010 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Please confirm this is acceptable.							
U-0163	Utilities Demolition Plan	Closed	08/04/2011	08/14/2011	08/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The submittal TG04.4 - UG1020-024100B01 Utilities Demolition Plan was returned to M Squared marked "Revise & Resubmit". The review note was: Please provide demo and sequencing plan per specification 02 41 00 Part 1.3A. M Squared is unable to acquire the necessary utility abandonment schedules from the utility companies concerned. Please provide us with a schedule showing when each of the utilities is to be abandoned by the relevant agencies. Once this has been provided M Squared will be able to provide the sequencing plan per the specifications.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The intent of the submittal comment was to reference specification section 024100 1.3A requiring the contractor to submit a utilities demolition and construction sequencing plan showing commencement, order, sequence and completion dates for approval prior to commencing with the demolition of existing utilities. The schedule submitted didn't include sequencing of the new work.				
U-0164	Beale Investigative Trench Limits	Closed	08/09/2011	08/19/2011	08/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Sheet U-1008 shows the limits of the investigative trench on Beale Street (south of Mission St) to be 56' in total. 41.1' from center going west and 14.9' from center going east. By going 14.9' from center with the eastern portion of the investigative trench M Squared will not encompass the existing water line and the existing AWSS line as they are outside the limits of the 14.9'. Please direct M Squared how to proceed.		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 8/9/2011 Excavate investigative trench in accordance with contract documents as shown on U-1008. Demolish, cap and plug existing 12-inch water and 10-inch HPW (AWSS) as shown on Sheet U-1125.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3011 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0165	Sewer Lateral to 92 Natoma	Closed	08/09/2011	08/19/2011	08/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: While installing the new sewer on Natoma Street from 2nd to the shoring wall M Squared noticed that the sewer lateral to 92 Natoma is a new VCP lateral and has been installed in the last 12 months. The contract drawings show M Squared replacing all sewer laterals on Natoma from 2nd to the shoring wall, however this lateral appears like it does not require replacing. Jason Chin (BCM) has been made aware of this issue. Please confirm it is acceptable to leave this lateral in place and perform permanent connection to the new 24" VCP main.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 8/10/2011 It is acceptable to protect existing lateral and provide a permanent connection to the new 24-inch VCP main in lieu of replacing the lateral as shown on Plans. Notes Please provide credit for contract work not completed.		
U-0166	Broken Culvert Pipe Encountered in Utility Demolition Trench on Fremont St.	Closed	08/19/2011	08/29/2011	08/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: During trenching for demolition of the electrical ductbank along the east side of Fremont St Trinet crossed a 10" culvert pipe (@ Stn 5+05) from the existing catch basin on the east side of the street at Stn 5+05. The section of clay pipe exposed is cracked in several places and half the bell of an exposed joint is missing. Please advise if the owner will need the broken pipe section replaced before the trench is backfilled.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Replace damaged pipe section per direction of SFPUC inspector prior to trench backfill.		
U-0167	Culvert Run to MH#306	Closed	08/22/2011	09/01/2011	08/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jacob Giannandrea To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: See attached sketch. Please confirm that it is acceptable to tie the 10" culvert run into the new MH#306 instead of running the culvert to the existing MH.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Connect new 10" SD culvert from CB#306 to SMH#306. It is no longer necessary to connect existing 3'x5' brick sewer to SMH#306 as shown on U-5001 Detail 6. Abandon in place existing 3'x5' sewer and existing		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
</							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3013 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Note: Please do not open files while logged in the FTP							
U-0169	CB#703 Location	Closed	09/01/2011	09/01/2011	09/07/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP		Colin Azevedo	To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol		
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:				
See attached photo showing conflict with location of new CB#703 and unknown underground concrete structures. They appear to be the same structures discovered in the investigative trenches on Beale Street.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please confirm that it is acceptable to put the new CB in the same location as the existing CB which has been removed.			It is acceptable to construct CB#703 in the same location as existing.				
			Please coordinate the depth of the sewer culvert with proposed PG&E Phase II work as shown on U-2037. Submit proposed culvert profile with elevations of the existing PG&E electrical ducts as pot holed that are to be capped in Phase I (U-1125) and connected to in Phase II (U-2037).				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0169.1	CB#703 Location	Closed	11/15/2011	11/25/2011	11/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
- CB#703 was constructed in the location of the existing catch basin. - See attached profile with culvert elevations. Culvert was installed deeper as several utilities were lower than shown on the drawings. - Per M Squared's response to comments made in the RFI #U-0181, one of the duct banks shown on the drawings could not be located and was not as shown on the drawings. The alignment of the other duct bank is also different than what is shown on the drawings. (See attached) The depth of this duct bank at the point where M Squared capped it (3' south of the unknown concrete structure) was 6' 8" to the top. Its location/alignment beyond that point are unknown.				Please provide the invert elevation of constructed 10" culvert at CB#703. Based on the sketch provided in the RFI169.1, the 10" culvert was reversed slope. A culvert with reversed slope is not acceptable.			
<hr/>							
U-0170	Duct bank Demo on Natoma	Closed	09/15/2011	09/25/2011	09/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: AECOM Technical Services Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
M Squared has determined in the field that the duct bank highlighted which is to be demolished, is in fact underneath the curb and gutter. In order to demolish it per the plans M Squared will have to remove the curb and gutter and possibly a portion of sidewalk. See attached. Please confirm whether you would like the duct bank removed and repour the curb and gutter after demo, or leave the duct bank in place and repair the portion of curb and gutter damaged while locating the duct bank.		Eric Zagol 9/18/2011 U-1110 indicates removal of existing PG&E duct to facilitate construction of the 8-inch Water and Sewer MH #301 . If existing duct as highlighted is not in conflict with new utilities then the existing duct may be abandoned in place. Cap existing duct at RUP/BSE demarcation line per ASI 15. Provide photos showing location of duct, duct, and curb and gutter damaged at the area indicated for repair for review. Jeff Thiel 9/19/2011 Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.		U-1110 indicates removal of existing PG&E duct to facilitate construction of the 8-inch Water and Sewer MH #301 . If existing duct as highlighted is not in conflict with new utilities then the existing duct may be abandoned in place. Cap existing duct at RUP/BSE demarcation line per ASI 15. Provide photos showing location of duct, duct, and curb and gutter damaged at the area indicated for repair for review.			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3015 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0170.1	Duct Bank Demo on Natoma	Closed	09/21/2011	10/01/2011	10/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: In response to RFI #U-0170, see attached photos. Approx 20' of curb and gutter to be repaired. Sidewalk remained undamaged and does not require repair. Please advise if M Squared is to repair this portion of curb and gutter.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 9/27/2011 Per response to RFI 170, please provide data (i.e. photos, survey and etc.) that supports the statement that the existing duct bank was found beneath the existing curb and gutter. Contract plans show the existing duct south of the curb and gutter. The curb and gutter should have been protected in place during excavation. If curb and gutter to be protected in place was damage during the course of work please restore to match existing per 01 15 40 and contract documents.			
<hr/>							
U-0170.2	Duct bank Demo on Natoma	Closed	11/18/2011	11/28/2011	12/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: M Squard has reviewed their photo logs and were unable to locate any photos showing the duckbank running under the curb and gutter. M Squared will proceed with providing a credit per CR U-027.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> ***12/1/11 UPDATED RESPONSE*** Corresponding CR for this work is CR U-050. Proceed with providing credit per CR U-050. ***11/22/11 ORIGINAL RESPONSE*** RFI does not pose a question and will be considered closed. M Squared shall proceed with providing a credit per CR U-027.			
<hr/>							
U-0171	AWSS Ductile Iron Pipe	Closed	09/15/2011	09/25/2011	09/19/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3016 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0172	City Furnished Gate Valves	Closed	09/20/2011	09/30/2011	10/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST: Specifications direct the contractor to provide a clear distance between the pipe flanges that consists of the gate valves laying length plus ½" not including the thickness of the gaskets to be installed. In order to do this M Squared will need the dimensions of all City furnished gate valves. Please provide cut sheets for all valves provided by SFWD for this project.				Jeff Thiel 9/19/2011 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "Use at contractor's discretion. Contractor will be responsible for pipe being inserted into pipe bell ends, AWSS fittings, etc. and passing hydrostatic tests," dated and signed on 9/19/11 (see attached).			
				Jeff Thiel 10/4/2011 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "Please refer to attached manufacturer's drawings for laying lengths of gate valves. These laying length dimensions were confirmed on 10/04/2011." dated and signed on 10/04/11 (see attached).			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3017 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0173	Valve control panel pick-up	Closed	09/24/2011	10/04/2011	10/05/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: M Squared's supplier, Control Systems West, have been coordinating with SFWD regarding which of the City's panels will be used for the TG04.2 project. Tom Reid with SFWD has designated 3 panels to be used for this project. These panels are to be picked up at SFWD, transported to Control Systems West for testing, programming etc and then returned to the job for use at 3 of the valve locations. As the panels have been selected M Squared would like to begin the process of getting the panels to their supplier so they can begin the work. Please provide the name and contact information for the person with whom M Squared can coordinate the pick up of the 3 units.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 9/26/2011 Contact Bill Gunn at (415) 706 0688 or W.Gunn@sfwater.org Per Section 01 10 40, Coordination, Article 1.6 C, this RFI does not fall under the acceptable uses for an RFI as it is not being used for an interpretation of the Contract Documents. RFIs used for questions regarding coordination will be rejected in the future.		
U-0174	AWSS Antenna location at Location 1	Closed	09/27/2011	10/07/2011	10/11/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: On drawing MA-20 regarding location 1 the antenna is shown to be mounted on a street light. However, on drawing MA-29 the same antenna is shown to be mounted on the enclosure. Early conversations between Dick Borders (Control Systems West) and Kenny Chin (DPW) confirm that mounting the antenna on the enclosure is the preferred option. Please confirm the antenna mounting location.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 10/11/2011 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response: "The antenna shall be mounted on the controller cabinet for location No. 1. Disregard any reference to the mounting of the antenna on the (E) light post as shown on drawing MA-20. Mounting of antenna on to the controller cabinet shall be performed by the controller cabinet manufacturer." Dated and signed on 10/11/11 (see attached).		
U-0175	Sludge line layout	Closed	09/27/2011	10/07/2011	11/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3018 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<hr/>							
REQUEST: The 12" sludge line cannot be installed along Mission Street as shown on the revised drawings due to the elevation and location of existing utilities and other unknown subsurface obstacles. Please see attached pothole information. Please advise how you would like to proceed.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 11/7/2011 Modifications to the 12" Sludge FM are currently being evaluated under ASI-018. Revised plans and specifications forthcoming following redesign and execution of ASI-018.			
U-0176	AWSS Conflict @ Location 7	Closed	09/28/2011	09/28/2011	10/17/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: City and County of San Fr Michael Smith			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Due to the location of existing utilities it will not be possible to install the AWSS valve vault at the location shown on sheet MA 18 of the AWSS drawings. See attached pothole drawings from 09/26/11 and 09/27/11. Please advise how you would like to proceed.		SUGGESTION: Follow up response recieved 10-19-2011: ****10/19/11 UPDATE**** Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "Meeting with M Squared, SFWD, and SFDPW on 10/18/11. Contractor to have area from intersection of First/Howard Streets to 100 feet West on Howard Street marked for utilities (USA). We will then meet at site to determine clear area over AWSS main to pot hole for valve vault." Dated 10/19/11 (see attached) initial response received 10-17-2011: SFDPW to meet in the field with contractor and SFWD inspector to determine method to proceed. Will provide response with direction at this time. NOTE: RB issued email 10-18-2011 requesting meeting.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0176.1	AWSS Conflicts at Location #7	Closed	11/18/2011	11/28/2011	11/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy				

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Per the response to RFI #U-0176 a field meeting was attended by Michael Smith and M Squared. M Squared received direction to perform additional potholes further west of First St on Howard St. Please see attached pothole findings. Please advise how you would like to proceed.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "Please refer to comments on attached sheet. SFDPW Response: This conflict between the existing AWSS line and utilities at the original design location are unforeseen field conditions due to incorrect information being furnished to the City. Thus the motorized gate valve vault is being relocated west of the original location. The contractor shall pothole 10-feet west of Pothole No. 1B and 10-feet east of Pothole No. 1A to verify that there is adequate clearance for installing a horizontal offset and motorized gate valve vault the approximate location of Pothole No. 1A. Please notify the engineer of the potholing schedule in order that we can request the major utilities to attempt to identify the 4-inch steel pipe running parallel on Howard Street." Signed and Dated 11/18/11 (see attached)



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0176.2	AWSS Conflicts @ Location 7	Closed	01/18/2012	01/28/2012	02/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Per response to RFI#U-0176.1 M Squared performed additional potholing at Location 7.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please see the attached pothole findings.			Jeff Thiel 2/15/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) Response.				
Please advise how you would like to proceed.			"Furnish and install horizontal offset as shown on the attached drawing in order to locate the proposed concrete valve vault with minimum 6-inches clearance to the existing electrical duct bank running on the North side of Howard Street. Adjust nipple lengths as required between elbows and to connect into the ends of the existing cast iron pipes. Concrete valve vault and placement of motorized gate valve shall otherwise be shown on drawings MA-22 and MA-25.				
Note: The 4" Unknown Utility was confirmed to be an abandoned PG&E gas main. On 1/10/12 PG&E drilled the line and confirmed it to be abandoned.			Work for installation of new concrete valve vault and gate as show on Drawing MA-18 shall be deleted from the scope pending installation of the new valve vault as shown on the attached drawing."				
			Signed and dated 2/13/12.				
			Christina Young 2/15/2012 Pending TJPA approval, a CR will be issued.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3021 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0177	Ductbank Demo on Fremont St	Closed	10/04/2011	10/14/2011	10/10/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached sketch. The duct bank shown on Fremont Street to be demolished is in fact underneath the curb and gutter and portion of the sidewalk on Fremont St. In order for M Squared to remove this duct bank it will require us to close the west sidewalk on Fremont St, demo and remove the sidewalk, remove the ductbank and then replace the sidewalk. Currently the east sidewalk is closed also due to BBI activity. Please advise how you would like to proceed.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 10/6/2011 Coordinate with PG&E to confirm the duct indicated in the M2 sketch is PG&E's 6-6" duct from PG&E's EMH 7605. Demolish and remove the 6-6" duct segment between STA ~2+40 (at the gutter) and the demarcation line south of shoring wall. The intent is to remove the segment within Natoma Street. The segment south of STA 2+40 (STA 2+40 to STA 1+85) can be abandoned in place. Provide cap at STA 2+40 instead of STA 1+85 shown in the plans. PG&E will break in and connect to the existing 6-6" duct at STA 1+85 as part of PG&E's Phase II relocations.				
U-0178	Sludge line layout on Mission between Beale and Main	Closed	10/04/2011	10/04/2011	11/08/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Continued potholing on Mission Street between Beale and Main has revealed additional grade conflicts on the proposed alignment for the new 12" steel sludge line. Some of the utilities are not as shown on the drawings nor marked in the field by USAN. See attached sketches. Please advise if M Squared is to continue potholing on Mission Street as it may be necessary to excavate the entire length of the trench between Beale and Main to locate and map all conflicts.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Eric Zagol 11/7/2011 Modifications to the 12" Sludge FM are currently being evaluated under ASI-018. Revised plans and specifications forthcoming following redesign and execution of ASI-018.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3022 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0179	AWSS Main line conflicts at Location 7	Closed	10/05/2011	10/15/2011	11/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Some of the existing utilities are not shown on the drawings and have been installed on top of the existing 12" AWSS line. Due to the proximity and volume of these utilities it is not possible to even hand excavate down to the existing AWSS line to verify its location and depth. Please see attached pothole information. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: the following response received 10-17-2011 does provide direction in this matter: It shall be the contractor's responsibility per the Contract Documents to perform the required potholing in order to identify the existing AWSS facilities prior to actual excavation. Background utility information was provided by TJPA/consultatns and shall be verified in the field by contacting Underground Service Alert (USA). Direct conflicts oted during potholing shall be directed to the utility owner(s) for relocation/removal as required to perform the contract work. NOTE: email from Rick Buellesbach 10-18-2011 requests an answer to the question.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> UPDATED RESPONSE (11/18/11) Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, Refer to comments on attached sheet. These comments supercede response provided on 10/17/11. SFDPW Response: This conflict between the existing AWSS line and utilities are unforeseen field conditions due to incorrect information being furnished to the City. There are no design alternates at this location due to the necessity of removing the existing cross that was capped on the First Street side outlet to accommodate the utility relocation work for the proposed transit center. The engineer will contact the owners of the utilities in conflict with the AWSS facility for resolution." Dated 11/18/11 (see attached)	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3023 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0180	Conflict with CB 305	Closed	10/10/2011	10/20/2011	10/17/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Richard Buellesbach				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
While excavating to install CB305 M Squared encountered a large unknown concrete structure. The concrete structure is in conflict with CB305. CB305 cannot be installed as planned. See attached photo.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Tsu-Ling with AECOM and Alberto with SFDPW reviewed the situation in the field and agreed the solution was to salvage the existing CB where CB 305 was to be installed. This work was performed on 10/7/2011 under the inspection of SFDPW.					As determined during a site visit on 10/7/11 with M Squared, AECOM, SFDPW and W/O; the existing unforeseen condition, a large concrete structure, is in conflict with CB 305 and the installation of a new catch basin would require an extensive amount of unforeseen demotion.		
Please confirm.					In lieu of installing a new catch basin barrel to replace existing, modify the existing catch basin as follows:		
					1. Clean interior walls and bottom. 2. Apply 1/2" thick uniform layer of mortar on interior walls and bottom. 3. Install cast iron trap. 4. Install pipe culvert and connect to MH#305 as shown in Plans.		
					New culvert size and invert shall match existing culvert at catch basin. Use ductile iron pipe if depth of cover is less than 3 feet.		
U-0181	Unknown subsurface structure on Beale	Closed	10/13/2011	10/23/2011	10/24/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
During M Squared's demo work on the West side of Beale Street at Sta 4+70 they uncovered an unknown subsurface structure. This structure appears to be an abandoned vault that has been filled with concrete. Please see attached photo.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
M Squared ceased work on the removal of the six 6" electric duct banks 6' south of this structure. If they are to continue with the removal of this abandoned duct bank per sheet U-1125 of the contract drawings they will be forced to remove the subsurface structure.					Eric Zagol 10/24/2011 Please provide a plan showing the location and extent of unknown structure identified. Also indicate what portions of the existing PG&E electrical duct has been demolished to date.		
Please advise.							
U-0181.1	Unknown subsurface structure at 301 Mission	Closed	11/18/2011	11/28/2011	11/23/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST: See attached information as requested in response to RFI #U-0181.</p>	<p>Colin Azevedo</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham</p> <p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Subsurface structure to remain. Cap locations as shown are acceptable. Please mark on as-built drawing as required by the contract documents.</p>	<p>Answered By:AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol</p>				
<p>U-0182</p> <p>From: Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST: On the north east side of the Mission Street and 2nd intersection the existing AWSS line is running through the floor of the AT&T vault. The removal of the existing 12" pipe and installation of the new 16" AWSS pipe will require the floor vault to be demolished and re-poured.</p> <p>Please provide a detail for this work or a new alignment for the AWSS line so as to avoid this vault.</p>	<p>AWSS Conflict with AT&T Vault at Location 2</p> <p>Jason Dunne</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham</p> <p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,</p> <p>"SFDPW Response:</p> <p>This conflict between the existing AWSS line and utility vault are unforeseen field conditions due to incorrect information being furnished to the City.</p> <p>The contractor shall pothole the alternate pipe alignment as shown on the attached sketch due to the existing conflict with the AT&T vault over/within the present alignment of the AWSS pipe.</p> <p>Notify engineer of pothole results for the proposed alternate pipe alignment."</p> <p>Signed and Dated 11/18/11 (see attached)</p>	<p>Closed</p> <p>10/24/2011</p> <p>11/03/2011</p> <p>11/21/2011</p> <p>Potentially <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Answered By:Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3025 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0182.1	AWSS Conflict with AT&T Vault at Location 2	Closed	03/28/2012	04/07/2012	05/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The sketch provided in response to RFI U-0182 does not provide adequate information to perform additional potholing. Please provide additional information.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 3/29/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "Please refer to the attached sketch dated 3/16/12 for potholing the location shown in order to verify the existing AWSS main and that there there are no utility conflicts in the proposed vault location. The original loaction for the vault is impacted by utilites." Signed and Dated (3/29/12)		
<hr/>							
U-0182.2	AWSS - Conflict with AT&T Vault at Location 2	Closed	07/31/2012	07/31/2012	08/14/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Per the response to U-0182.1, M Squared potholed the locations shown. See attached pothole data. - The pothole 24' north of Mission appears to have a substructure underneath PGE duct banks. - The pothole 12' north of Mission St had several utilities in them that have since been confirmed abandoned.			SUGGESTION: Relocate the street light/ traffic signal conduits and shift the vault location 3 feet north away from the 12inch gas main. In doing so, this could potentially be the location for a cast in place concrete valve vault.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, - Proceed as per Contractor's recommendation for locating motorized gate valve vault. - Contractor shall field verify alignment of pipe North/South of proposed vault location for connection into (E) lines. Signed and dated 8/9/12. (See attached) Per discussions between TCCo/PMPC/SFDPW, Contractor to trench the Second Street AWSS alignment per the attached sketch. Upon completion of trenching advise TJPA if there will need to be a change in material/fittings required to complete the AWSS installation work.		
<hr/>							
U-0182.3	AWSS - Design Route at 2nd Street Intersection	Closed	02/06/2013	02/16/2013	02/28/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3026 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>	
U-0182.4	<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc.</div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Per the response to RFI U-0182.2, M Squared has field verified a new alignment for the 16" AWSS at 2nd & Mission St. (See attached drawing).</div><div>Due to several PG&E conflicts this is the only available route capable of accepting a 16" pipe; M Squared is unable to locate an alignment per the sketch attached to the response to RFI U-0182.2. By proceeding with this alignment M Squared will again return the AWSS pipe through the structure of an AT&T vault and a PG&E Vault. It does not appear from our field work that there are other options for a workaround.</div><div>Based on information M Squared currently have attained from the trenching; restraining each joint, per the original contract will require the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- 4 additional 16-inch 45deg bends- 2 additional 16-inch 90deg bends- 1 additional 16-inch bell collar- 15 additional stop collars- 4 additional kickers/thrust blocks.</div><div>Please confirm the proposed route and additional fittings and restraints are acceptable.</div></div>	<div>Jackson Tukuafu</div> <div>Aidan Foley</div>	<div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div> <div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>Answered By:Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel</div> <div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Jeff Thiel 2/12/2013 Response per Michael Smith, (SFDPW)</div> <div>"Proceed as stated above due to existing conflicting utilities impacting original vault location."</div> <div>Signed and dated 2/8/13 (See Attached). Contractor to verify material quantities required for the revised alignment once the proposed route is fully exposed. Pending TJPA approval, a CR will be issued for this work.</div>				
				03/14/2013	03/24/2013	03/21/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<div><div>From: Webcor Construction LP</div><div>Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc.</div><div>REQUEST:</div><div>Refer to drawing MA-3 and MA-13</div><div>Please refer to previous RFI 182 series for history.</div><div>As M Squared must connect to an existing 16" line at 2nd & Mission Street, M Squared performed additional trenching which has now opened up the possibility of a different and more straight forward alignment for 2nd Street piping.</div><div>This new alignment shall replace the alignment sent in the previous RFI-0182.3.</div></div>	<div>Jackson Tukuafu</div> <div>Aidan Foley</div>	<div>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</div> <div>SUGGESTION:</div>	<div>Answered By:Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jackson Tukuafu</div> <div>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Michael Smith's (SFDPW) Response,</div> <div>"The suggested pipe layout based on recent excavations is acceptable.</div> <div>-Locate the 16" x 12" reducer North of the 16" tee and as close as possible to the tee."</div> <div>Signed and Dated 3/18/13. (See Attached)</div>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3027 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<div>1. Please confirm the new alignment shown in the attached M Squared sketch SK-008.3 is acceptable.</div> <div>2. Please confirm where the 16" to 12" reducer is to be located. The location of this reducer will decide whether M Squared will need to purchase two (2) more 16" 45-deg elbows or 12" 45-deg elbows.</div>						
U-0183	AWSS Valve Vault Conflict at Location 1	Closed	10/24/2011	11/03/2011	10/26/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: City and County of San Fr Michael Smith			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The proposed valve vault at location 1 cannot be installed as per the plans due to utility conflicts encountered during potholing. See attached pothole info. These utilities are not shown on the contract drawings. Please advise.		SUGGESTION: Jeff Thiel 10/27/2011 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "Per your preliminary excavation results, please schedule a site visit with SFDPW and SFWD at site. At site visit, we will provide direction for vault installation." Signed and Dated 10/26/11 (see attached) Kevin Chiu 10/27/2011 When final direction is provided via on site meeting per the RFI response, please submit a follow up RFI to confirm direction provided in the meeting.		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3028 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0183.1	AWSS Valve Vault Conflict at Location 1	Closed	11/16/2011	11/26/2011	11/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Per the response to RFI#U-0183 a site visit was held with SFDPW and SFWD on 11/2/2011 to review the conflicts at location 1. Please provide direction based on this meeting.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "Refer to comments on attached sheets. These comments supercede comments provided on 10/26/11 for RFI U-0183. SFDPW Response: Motorized gate valve vault: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 2 and the provided information, verify 2 1/2-inch steel for ownership and request owner should there not be adequate space to install vault due to the existing electrical duct bank shown in Pothole No. 3 drawing. Notify engineer to provide revised drawing(s) for AWSS fittings should vault need to be moved west. Notify engineer should vault interior dimensions need to be reduced after providing a minimum of 3-inches clearance with other utilities and the vault constructed with 12-inch thick walls. Controller cabinet: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 7 and the provided information, install the controller cabinet concrete foundation at this site. Notify MCI that either their conduit can remain with the controller foundation installed over the conduit with 4-inches clearance or that they can relocate their conduit as required. Modify bottom of controller foundation to accommodate a clearance of 4-inches should the conduit not be relocated. Battery vault: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No.6 and the provided information, field verify the installation of the battery vault by locating the northern edge of the vault 2-feet towards the curb." Signed and Dated 11/15/11 (see attached)				
U-0183.2	AWSS Valve Vault Location 1	Closed	12/02/2011	12/12/2011	12/15/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp. Jeff Thiel				



Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
<p>Co-Author:</p> <div> <div> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please see the attached letter regarding the response to RFI#U-0183.1.</p> <p>Please provide direction.</p> </div> <div> <p>SUGGESTION:</p> </div> <div> <p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,</p> <p>"Please see attached for revised response - U-183.2.</p> <p>SFDPW Response:</p> <p>Motorized Gate Valve Vault: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 2 and the provided information, verify 2 ½ inch steel for ownership and request owner to relocate the line outside of the valve vault footprint with 12-inches clearance. Should the valve vault still be in conflict with the existing electrical duct bank shown in Pothole No. 3, move vault location West along Market Street until valve vault has a minimum 12-inches clearance with the existing electrical duct bank.</p> <p>Notify engineer to provide revised drawing(s) for AWSS fittings should valve vault need to be moved West.</p> <p>Notify engineer should vault interior dimensions need to be reduced after providing a minimum of 3 inches clearance with other utilities and the vault constructed with 12-inch thick walls."</p> <p>Signed and dated 12/14/11 (see attached)</p> <p>Turner will verify 2 1/2 steel for ownership.</p> </div> </div>							
U-0183.3	Valve Vault Conflict at Location 1	Closed	01/23/2012	02/02/2012	02/08/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP</p> <p>Co-Author:</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Per the response to RFI #U-0183.2, M Squared Construction performed further potholing on the valve vault location on Market Street.</p> <p>Please see attached findings of these potholes.</p> <p>Please advise on how you would like M Squared to proceed with the vault construction/installation.</p>		<p>To: Turner Construction Company</p> <p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>Answered By: Turner Construction Company</p> <p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Jeff Thiel 2/6/2012</p> <p>Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,</p> <p>"-Install concrete valve vault in locations as show on pothole No. 3A. Relocate 1 1/4" copper pipe as necessary during vault placement.</p> <p>-Resubmit concrete vault drawings with dimensions to suite location and 9" thick walls for walls adjacent to</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0183.4	AWSS - Valve Vault Conflict at Location 1 for Trade Package	Closed	07/05/2012	07/15/2012	07/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: While excavating for the MGV at location 1 it was discovered that the existing 16" water main has restraints installed on it. These restraints are in conflict with the excavation and shoring for the removal of the existing valve vault and the installation of the new cast in place vault at this location. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 7/19/2012 Installation of shoring is considered the contractor's means and methods.				
U-0184	AWSS Connection Point at Location 2.	Closed	10/24/2011	11/03/2011	11/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The existing AWSS line at the connection point on 2nd Street north of Mission is a 10" pipe not a 12" as shown on drawing MA-13. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 10/27/2011 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "The line on Second Street North of Mission Street is a 10" CI line. Please update drawings. Drawing MA-21 in the contract package indicates the line as a 10" line." Signed and Dated 10/26/11 (see attached)				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3031 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0184.1	AWSS Connection Point at Location #2	Closed	12/02/2011	12/12/2011	12/14/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please see the attached letter regarding the response to RFI#U-0184.			Per Michael Smith's response to RFI U-0188 SFDPW is preparing revised AWSS drawings to include stationing information provided by AECOM. These revised drawings will address the issue raised in RFI U-0184 and provide clear direction. The drawings will be issued in the near future packaged with other revisions.				
Please provide direction.			Jeff Thiel 3/22/2012 - RFI U-184.1: The response on 12/14/11 indicated that resolution would be provided via a revised AWSS drawing. This change was included on the stationed drawings provided under ASI 19.				
U-0185	Existing Lateral to CB701	Closed	10/28/2011	11/07/2011	11/01/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Sheet U-3024 shows and existing storm drain lateral connecting the back side of the existing catch basin which was replaced by CB #701. The details for CB #701, C/U-3033, do not show this existing lateral to be connected to CB #701. CB #701 has been installed per plan and the existing lateral was abandoned in place. It has been discovered that the abandon lateral in servicing an active catch basin in Lot N. See attached sketch.			Eric Zagol 10/31/2011 Lateral connections to CCSF catch basin barrels from property outside of the public right of way are prohibited . Owner/occupant of Parcel shall manage runoff in parcel and discharge to main sewer in accordance with CCSF regulations.				
Please advise.			Coordinate with TJPA's field representative and occupant of Parcel.				
U-0186	AWSS Conflict with Elec. Duct Banks & Vault @ Location 2	Closed	11/01/2011	11/01/2011	11/18/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Due to the proximity of the electrical vault and the electrical concrete duct banks it is not possible to remove the existing 18" AWSS line and reconnect to the existing tee as shown on drawings MA-3 and MA-13. Please see			Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "SFDPW Response: This conflict between the existing AWSS line and utility vault/duct bank are unforeseen field conditions				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0187	Conflicts with Controller Cabinet Foundation & Battery Enclosure at Location 1	Closed	11/18/2011	11/28/2011	11/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Please confirm that M Squared it to install the control cabinet enclosure foundation (3'W x 3'L x 2'D) on top of the existing 10" and 8" steel lines shown on the attached sketch of pothole #6.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please confirm that M Squared is to install the fiberglass battery enclosure on top of the utilities shown on the attached sketch of pothole #7. It will be necessary to hand dig around the existing utilities to install drain rock beneath the enclosure per the specifications.			Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "Refer to SFDPW response provided on 11/16/11 to RFI U-0183.(1)."				
			Signed and Dated 11/18/11 (see attached)				
			RFI U-0183.1 Response included below-				
			"SFDPW Response:				
			Motorized gate valve vault: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 2 and the provided information, verify 2 1/2-inch steel for ownership and request owner should there not be adequate space to install vault due to the existing electrical duct bank shown in Pothole No. 3 drawing. Notify engineer to provide revised drawing(s) for AWSS fittings should vault need to be moved west. Notify engineer should vault interior dimensions need to be reduced after providing a minimum of 3-inches clearance with other utilities and the vault constructed with 12-inch thick walls.				
			Controller cabinet: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 7 and the provided information, install the controller cabinet concrete foundation at this site. Notify MCI that either their conduit can remain with the controller foundation installed over the conduit with 4-inches clearance or that they can relocate their conduit as required. Modify bottom of controller foundation to accommodate a clearance of				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0187.1	Conflicts with Controller Cabinet Foundation and Battery Enclosure at Location # Closed		12/02/2011	12/12/2011	12/15/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Please see the attached letter regarding the response to RFI#U-0187.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please provide direction.			Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,				
			"Please see attached for revised response - U-187.1.				
			SFDPW Response:				
			Controller Cabinet: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 7 and the provided information, install the controller cabinet and the concrete foundation at this site instead of the battery vault assembly that was shown here originally in the Contract Documents.				
			Notify MCI that either their conduit can remain with the controller foundation installed over the conduit or MCI has the option to relocate their conduits away from the concrete foundation footprint. Should MCI not want to relocate, reduce thickness of concrete foundation over MCI conduit to provide a minimum of 4-inches clearance between the conduit outside diameter and the bottom of the foundation.				
			Battery Vault: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 6 and the provided information, install the battery vault at this site instead of the controller cabinet that was shown here originally in the Contract Documents.				
			Field verify (pothole) 2-feet from face of existing curb to determine if the Northern edge of the battery vault can be installed approximately 2-feet from curb				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3034 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0187.2	Conflicts with Controller Cabinet and Battery @ Location 1	Closed	01/23/2012	02/02/2012	03/21/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Steve Cunningham				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
In response to RFI # U-0187.1 (Revised Response to RFI# U-0187 ON 12/14/11)					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
- See attached pothole data from additional potholing at this location.					Jeff Thiel 3/16/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,		
- During initial discussions with MCI/Verizon M Squared informed them of the intent to install units on their utility. They requested a letter from the owner highlighting the intent. Please confirm if it is acceptable to install a unit on their utility.					"Please see attached wording for letter to owner of utility.		
Please provide direction on the locations of the battery vault and controller cabinet taking into consideration all current utilities in place.					Locate North most edge of battery vault cover 24" from face of curb or back from face of curb to remain in "brick" area."		
					Signed and Dated 2/14/12 (Letter Wording) and 3/15/12 (Battery Placement)		
					The attached letter addressed to MCI/Verizon was sent to Pam Brown on 3/14/12.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3035 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0188	Control Stations on AWSS Drawings	Closed	11/18/2011	11/28/2011	11/21/2011	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Kevin Chiu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: At present M Squared has set up control points along Mission Street. These stations were based on a continuation of survey points used on Mission Street for the TG04.6-Sludge Line Project. The City designed AWSS Drawings do not have these stations on them. Please provide an updated set of AWSS Drawings with the project stations marked on them so it will allow M Squared to accurately document field conditions and as built the necessary information.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "SFDPW is currently preparing revised AWSS DWGS with stationing information as provided by AECOM. We anticipate the final set of stamped/signed DWGS prior to the end of November 2011." Signed and Dated 11/18/11 (see attached) Jeff Thiel 3/22/2012: RFI U-188 included a request for stationed drawings. It was responded to on 11/18/11 and resolved by ASI 19 when the stationed drawings were provided.		
U-0189	First & Howard Utility Conflicts, Location 7 Complete Pothole Data	Closed	12/02/2011	12/12/2011	07/03/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: While potholes #2 & #3 have been addressed in a previous RFI (RFI#U-0176), other potholes carried out in Location 7 exposed various utilities that are not shown on the contract documents. Other utilities were not in the locations indicated on the contract documents. See attached pothole data from potholes #1 through #11 at location 7. Please clarify if the utilities will be removed, protected in place or relocated.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The issues outlined in the attached pothole data have been addressed and resolved via coordination meetings, CRs, and other RFI responses. The CRs include U-080R1, U-088, and U-088A as well as RFIs U-0176, U-0176.1, U-0176.2, U-0179, U-0197, U-0197.1, U-0197.2, U-0199, U-0200, and U-0200.1.		
U-0190	Fire Hydrant Location on Mission @ First	Closed	01/10/2012	01/20/2012	01/19/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: While potholing for the new Hydrant and associated piping in the sidewalk on Mission Street (see attached), M Squared's crews damaged the roof of the basement to Portico Restaurant, 88 First Street (see attached photos).			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, -Repair of sidewalk at pothole location: Refer to attached directions from William Liang- SFDPW/EST		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>This basement structure was not noted on the plans and is a differing site condition.</p> <p>The roof of the basement will now need to be repaired. Please provide direction and repair details for this work.</p> <p>It is not possible to locate the fire hydrant in this area due to the presence of the basement. The existing hydrant has a column poured into the structure of the basement (see attached).</p> <p>Please advise on how you would like to proceed.</p>			<p>for repair method.</p> <p>-New Hydrant lateral shall be located in the (E) hydrant alignment. (E) Hydrant is located in an areaway. Refer to AWSS standard drawings for details. SFDPW will provide revised drawing for (N) lateral prior to construction.</p> <p>Signed and Dated 01/18/12</p> <p>Response for Concrete Repair per William Liang (SFDPW) .</p> <p>Chip out concrete inside of saw-cut area; do not damage (E) rebars.</p> <p>If (E) rebars are found to have been cut during the saw-cutting process, chip out enough concrete around the cut rebars for installation of Lenton Quick-Wedge Splicing system at both ends; splice new rebars with size to match (E). If (E) rebars are found to be intact, proceed to Step 3.</p> <p>Install keyway around perimeter of opening (keyway shall be a minimum 1.5 (below top of slab), install swellable water stop (Greenstreak Hydrotite CJ -0725) in keyway.</p> <p>Form and pour with Emaco S66 CI by BASF. Perform surface preparation and provide curing in accordance with manufacturers recommendations. Note: continuous special inspection shall be provided for the concrete pour."</p>			
U-0190.1	Fire Hydrant Location on Mission @ First	Closed	01/25/2012	02/04/2012	01/26/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By:Turner Construction Comç Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
On 1/24/2012 M Squared began repairing the basement roof per the response to RFI U-0190. SFDPW engineer William Liang came out and review the progress that day				No alternate direction was given at 1/24/12 site visit by SFDPW engineer. SFDPW provided information and direction to supplement the direction given in response			

*PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG*

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i><u>Number</u></i>	<i><u>Subject</u></i>	<i><u>Status</u></i>	<i><u>Date Created</u></i>	<i><u>Date Required</u></i>	<i><u>Date Answered</u></i>	<i><u>Cost Impact</u></i>	<i><u>Proceed</u></i>
-----------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------

size to match (E). If (E) rebars are found to be intact, proceed to Step 3.

3. Install keyway around perimeter of opening (keyway shall be a minimum 1.5" below top of slab), install swellable water stop (Greenstreak Hydrotite CJ -0725) in keyway.

4. Form and pour with Emaco S66 CI by BASF. Perform surface preparation and provide curing in accordance with manufacturers recommendations.

Note: continuous special inspection shall be provided for the concrete pour."



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3039 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0190.2	AWSS - High Pressure Fire Hydrant Location on Mission @ First Street	Closed	11/21/2012	12/01/2012	11/26/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Please refer to drawing MA-15 and response to RFI U-0190.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
As a result of differing site conditions between Sta 8+50 and 9+00, the new location of the HP fire hydrant shown on drawing MA-15 is to remain in the existing location per response to RFI U-0190.			Jeff Thiel 11/21/2012 Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW),				
Please provide a detail drawing showing the new hydrant lateral with all SFDPW requirements for HP hydrants in an areaway.			"Please find attached a sketch for changing the design for replacing the existing HP hydrant at the above location.				
			The existing hydrant is in an "areaway" since the property at this location has a basement that extends under the sidewalk.				
			The proposed new hydrant off the proposed 16" DI main will be replaced in this "areaway" structure. Please see attached sketch. The originally proposed hydrant lateral that bends 90-degrees as shown in the contract documents drawing MA-15 will be deleted from the work scope. There is no change in work for drawing MA-5. The attached drawing HPL-5142.1 is also shown on the AWSS standard drawings which are part of the contract work.				
			The contractor is cautioned to use extreme care in this area due to the basement below and to prevent issues with water leakage from the street/sidewalk."				
			See attached.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3040 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0191	Power Source at Location #1, #2 & #7	Closed	01/16/2012	01/26/2012	02/27/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
In order for the controller enclosures for the motorized gate valves at Location #1, #2 and #7 to be operational a power source will need to be provided at each enclosure location.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please confirm that the owner has applied to PG&E for the power sources at these locations and advise on the status of these connections.			Revised Responce 2/27/2012				
SUGGESTION:			Jeff Thiel 2/23/2012 The TJPA has completed its application to SFPUC for power to AWSS facilities. The SFPUC has requested a minimum of four (4) weeks to make these connections. Sub contractor to coordinate meeting with SFPUC and PG&E prior to start of work.				
			Below is the MOP for coordinating power source connection as confirmed by Mathew Ho of the SFPUC.				
			1. Contractor to schedule coordination meeting with PG&E, PUC (Mathew Ho or Michael Mack) and Turner. Contractor to provide a construction schedule and set up Pre-con with PG&E (Per SFPUC request to inform them when Contractor expects to trench for electrical service and have the power pedestals installed)				
			2. Contractor to schedule PG&E trench inspection which is needed after contractor installs conduit but before closing the trench so that PG&E can prove the conduit via mandrel test (30days notice needed, Call PG&E inspection # 415-695-7519 and provide PM# located on drawing and provide PG&E job owner contact as Matt Herron)				
			3. PG&E to pull cables				
			4. Schedule a DBI inspection of the meter pedestal (Dave Green DBI 415-558-6654, forward PG&E a copy of the DBI green tag)				
			5. Once green tag is applied, PG&E to set up meter and then energize.				
			=====				
			Original Response 1/26/2012				
			The TJPA has completed its application to SFPUC for power to AWSS facilities. The SFPUC has requested a minimum of four (4) weeks to make these connections. Sub contractor to coordinate meeting with SFPUC and PG&E prior to start of work.				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0191.1	Power Source at Location #1, #2 & #7	Closed	03/21/2012	03/31/2012	05/01/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Cory Traylor	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Recent meeting on the AWSS project resulted in the response to RFI#U-0191 being revised to include a procedure to be followed once the controller cabinets were ready to accept power. However, what was sent in the revised response was a new scope of work followed by the mentioned procedure.				Cory Traylor 5/1/2012 In accordance with PG&E Greenbook standards and practices, power connections for motorized gate valve equipment shall be installed at the referenced locations per the attached PG&E sketches, directions and requested equipment requirements. Work not outlined in the attached documents shall take place per contract drawings.			
The contract drawings show M Squared's work beginning at pull boxes and going to the controllers. M Squared's interpretation of the drawings sent in the revised response to RFI#U-0191 is the scope of work that goes from the pull boxes to PG&E manholes. This is unclear because the PG&E drawings are not comparable with the contract drawings.				Final coordination for connections shall take place in the field per note 7 on drawings MA-29 and MA-31.			
Please clarify the intent and scope of the PG&E drawings. Please clarify how the PG&E drawings correlate with the contract drawings.				Connecting for power per the attached PG&E sketches/direction has been approved by SFDPW-Bureau of Engineering.			
U-0191.2	Amperes Interrupting Capacity (AIC) at AWSS Location #1 (Market St.)	Closed	05/23/2012	06/02/2012	06/21/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Transbay PMPC		Cory Traylor	
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please refer to RFI U0191.1 and the attached drawings MA-1, MA-29 and MA-31.				Request 1. - Please see attached file for Location 1 labeled "555 Market St. AIC.pdf" letter.			
1. As per response to RFI U-0191.1, the SFDPW-Bureau of Engineering sketches and letter for the AIC only addresses the motorized gate valve number 21 at Location #7. As new power service will be required at gate valve number 2, Location 1, please provide an AIC letter for this location.				Request 2. - Please see attached PDF file "comments_transbay.pdf" containing comments from Matt Herron of PG&E clarifying the scope of work for the PG&E power connection points at locations #1 and #7.			
2. Please provide a conformed drawing of the the PG&E clarification sketches provided in RFI U-0191.1 by revising the drawing sheet MA-29 and MA-31, respectively. It is unclear from the PG&E sketches whether the scope from the original contract drawings (MA-29 and MA-31) have changed.				Also, please see information on location of manhole #5414 below per PG&E Matt Herron below;"The Vault 5414 is in the South Side, sidewalk of Market St. about 10' East of the West Property of 555 Market St. There are large vaults IFO 555 Market St. identified as 7300-P/7301-P/7302-P, Vault 5414 is roughly 30' West of those vaults."			
				Please contact Matt Herron of PG&E when sub-contractor is ready for a PG&E crew to mark the location for the core. Also, Please give Matt Herron			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0191.3	Amperes Interrupting Capacity (AIC) at AWSS Location #1 (Market St.)	Closed	06/28/2012	07/08/2012	07/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: The response to RFI #U-0191.2 does not answer the question posed in the RFI.			ANSWER: 7/16/2012 Kenny Chin's (SFDPW) response,				
As mentioned in the previous RFI there appears to be a difference in the PG&E drawings provided in the original response and the contract drawings.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
See attached M Squared's interpretation of these PG&E drawings. Please confirm if this interpretation is correct.			"The interpretation of MA-31 is correct. The contractor shall route the conduit from the meter enclosure to vault 1813. The interpretation of MA-29 is correct. The contractor shall route the conduit from meter enclosure to vault 5414 but the contractor shall find out with PG&E which one is the exact vault 5414."				
SUGGESTION:							
two weeks notice when sub-contractor would like to core drill into the vault. This two weeks notice is to allow PG&E to set up and schedule a crew to standby for the core.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3043 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0192	AWSS Strong Backs	Closed	01/18/2012	01/28/2012	02/08/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Current project drawings show that this project requires two (2) 14" Strong Backs and two (2) 10" Strong Backs to be used at different locations. Olympic Foundry does not produce strong backs and were unable to include them in the order to M Squared. M Squared has contacted several sources trying to locate the strong backs but have yet to find a supplier. Please advise if it is possible to purchase these from the City stock. If this is not possible M Squared will have no other option but to have them manufactured at a steel mill and this may take a considerably long time due to the lead time in the specialized steel.				Jeff Thiel 2/3/2012 Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW), -"We have been advised that the SFWD does not have the requested strong backs in their inventory." -Typically strong backs were torch cut at local machine shops that handle larger fittings. Suggest contacting other contractors who have performed AWSS work for sources." Signed and dated 02/01/12			
<hr/>							
U-0193	2nd to 1st St - Various Conflicts	Closed	03/08/2012	03/18/2012	03/21/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
See attached sheet which details the conditions discovered in the potholing operations between 2nd Street and 1st Street. Please use Submittal TG04.2-024.1 for reference. Please provide direction on how to proceed at each location.				Jeff Thiel 3/20/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "Please see response on attached sheets for conflicts at particular station numbers as listed in this RFI." Signed and Dated (3/20/12)			
<hr/>							
U-0194	AWSS Strong Back Dimensions	Closed	03/13/2012	03/23/2012	03/21/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3044 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>On the detail for the strong backs on the San Francisco Standard AWSS Plans M Squared has discovered an error in the dimensions for the 14" strong back. Dimension C (outside diameter) is smaller than dimension B (inside diameter). See attached.</p> <p>M Squared believes the OD should be 27.37". Please confirm.</p>		Jeff Thiel	3/14/2012	Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,		
					"M Squared is correct. Thank you for pointing this out. We will update our drawing."		
					Signed and dated 3/14/12. (See Attached)		
U-0195	Parking Sensors on Mission	Closed	03/13/2012	03/23/2012	04/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By:Turner Construction Comp; Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:		Jeff Thiel 4/12/2012 Per email conversation with Alex Demisch of the SFpark Project (SFMTA), any parking sensors found on Mission Street from 2nd Street to Main Street are inactive. SFPark's vendor plans to remove these parking sensors late April or early May of this year 2012. SFPark realizes TJPA plans to conduct AWSS construction work in the upcoming months and has asked if it was possible to for the TJPA sub-contractor, once AWSS construction begins, to separate the parking sensor equipment from other construction debris so that SFPark may dispose electronic waste properly if there are any parking sensors still remaining. However, if the parking sensors cannot be separated then SFPark understands they will end up being demolished from TJPA AWSS construction work.					
M Squared has discovered that either SF Park or MUNI have installed what appear to be sensors in the street surface along Mission Street. See photo attached.							
They existing between Fremont and Beale in particular.							
As the AWSS line is installed along Mission St from 2nd to Main these sensors will be in conflict. Please confirm these sensors will be removed prior to trenching.							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3045 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0196	AWSS Pipe Bedding Material	Closed	04/02/2012	04/12/2012	04/09/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: Section 02225-2 2.2 specifies that the bedding material for the new AWSS piping shall be crushed rock, however section 02723-18 2.12 contradicts this by specifying the bedding shall be pea gravel. Please clarify.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 4/9/2012 Refer to submittal package TG0402-029 - Pipe Bedding Pea Gravel for approved AWSS pipe bedding material.			
<hr/>							
U-0197	AWSS/PG&E Phase 2 Duct Conflict	Closed	04/05/2012	04/16/2012	04/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: See attached photo. M Squared discovered a conflict on 4/4/12 at 11.10am while excavating to remove the existing AWSS Main at Howard and First. PGE's new Phase 2 duct package is sitting directly on top of the existing AWSS main at First and Howard intersection. The top and sides of the duct bank are encased in concrete however the PVC conduits are not encased on the bottom and the PVC Conduits are currently touching the AWSS Main at this location. As a result M Squared is unable to remove the existing AWSS main from this point east. Please advise on how you would like to proceed.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 4/12/2012 Please confirm that the Phase 2 PG&E duct package that is in conflict with the AWSS main was installed at the correct elevation per the approved Phase 2 Utility plans.			
<hr/>							
U-0197.1	AWSS/PG&E Phase 2 Duct Conflict Location 7	Closed	04/16/2012	04/26/2012	04/17/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST: The Phase 2 PG&E plans only provide minimum depths and clearances. It appears the Phase 2 ducts were installed in accordance with the minimum depth requirement but not the minimum clearance requirement. Please confirm this with PG&E. Regardless, the AWSS main can not be reinstalled per		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "Per a site inspection this morning with SFWD, M2, Turner, and Webcor/Obayashi, the clearance conflict between the recently installed PG&E duct bank and the existing 12-inch cast iron AWSS main was confirmed. The duct bank conduits are in direct			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	plan and maintain minimum clearance required in the AWSS specification. Please advise how M Squared is to proceed.						
					contact with the existing AWSS pipe.		
					The two options to rectify this situation include:		
					1.) Request that PG&E or their contractor vertically relocate the recently installed duct bank in order that there is the required 12-inch clearance between the two utilities.		
					2.) Realign the proposed replacement AWSS main either over or under the PG&E duct bank by the installation of a vertical offset.		
					Should option No. 2 be selected, please advise as soon as possible since revision drawing(s) for the vertical offset will need to be prepared prior to the installation of the vertical offset."		
					Signed and Dated 4/11/12.		
					The phase two duct bank was not installed per PG&E Green Book requirements for minimum clearance between utility services, and the contractor failed to properly coordinate utility installation.		
					Work related to this RFI response shall be performed at no additional cost to the owner.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3047 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0197.2	AWSS-PG&E Phase 2 Duct Conflict	Closed	04/23/2012	05/03/2012	05/02/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Through detailed analysis and discussions with PG&E during the weekly AWSS coordination meetings it has been determined that it would be infeasible to relocate the PG&E duct bank as requested in option one in the response to RFI#U-0197.1.				Jeff Thiel 4/23/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,			
Please provide details for realigning the AWSS main referenced in option two in the response to RFI#U-0197.1.				"The contractor shall install a vertical offset under the PG&E duct bank using four (4) 22 ½ - degree elbows as required to maintain a minimum 16-inches vertical clearance between the new 12-inch ductile iron AWSS main and the recently installed PG&E duct bank. Please refer to the attached sketch."			
				Signed and dated 4/16/12			
				This work shall be performed at no additional cost to the TJPA.			

U-0198	Vault Drainage	Closed	04/09/2012	04/09/2012	04/16/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo		To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
1. On sheet MA-26 the 1" discharge piping inside the manhole is labeled as stainless steel in the detail drawings but is described as type K copper tube in the manhole construction note #7. Please confirm what type of material is required.				Jeff Thiel 4/11/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,			
2. Spec Section 02728-23 Paragraph E. calls for the use of ball float valves as shown on the construction drawings. However the float valves are not shown on the drawings. Please confirm if these ball float valves are required.				1.) The piping within the sewer manhole shall be Type 304 stainless steel.			
				2.) The contractor shall disregard the installation of the ball float valves for the three (3) concrete motorized gate valve vaults in this contract due to the installation of electrical sump pumps to be installed at all three (3) locations.			
				Signed and Dated 4/10/12			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0199	PG&E Vault Conflict with North East Tie In @ Location 7	Closed	04/16/2012	04/26/2012	04/23/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			ANSWER:				
Today while setting up to remove and cast the new lead joint at the North East tie in at location 7 it was discovered that the existing PG&E vault adjacent to the tie in is too close and E. Mitchell would not be able to properly caulk the lead joint. Please advise how M Squared is to proceed.			Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 4/20/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) repsonse, "The contractor shall request PG&E to relocate their facilities in order that there is the required 12-inches minimum clearance between the AWSS main and the PG&E electrical vault. Should PG&E not be able to relocate their facilities, the contractor shall excavate approximately 12-feet east on Howard Street to the next existing pipe joint (GHB joint from the 12"x10" cast iron GHBxGH spigot reducing adaptor for the 10-inch gate valve) in order to connect the new ductile iron AWSS main to the existing cast iron main. The contractor shall locate any new bell and spigot pipe joints before after the concrete vault wall." Signed and dated 4/16/12				
SUGGESTION:							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0200	AT&T Vault Conflict at Location 7	Closed	04/16/2012	04/26/2012	04/23/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo			To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
It has been discovered that the AT&T vault near the North West tie in of Location 7 is in conflict with the new AWSS pipe and tie rods to be installed at this location.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Please advise how M Squared is to proceed.					Jeff Thiel 4/20/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,		
					"The contractor shall request ATT to relocate their electrical vault or remove portion of the vault wall as required in order that there is the required 12-inches minimum clearance between the AWSS main and the ATT electrical vault. "		
					Signed and dated 4/16/12 (see attached)		
					Contractor to document all coordination with AT&T regarding this conflict.		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0200.1	AT&T Vault Conflict at Location 7	Closed	04/24/2012	05/04/2012	04/24/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo To: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
The response to RFI#U-0200 did not properly document the coordination efforts and course of action. Please provide a revised response.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
See attached email chain for additional information.					Jeff Thiel 4/24/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) original response to RFI U-0200,		
					"The contractor shall request ATT to relocate their electrical vault or remove a portion of the vault wall as required in order that there is the required 12-inches minimum clearance between the AWSS main and the ATT electrical vault"		
					Signed and Dated 4/16/12 (See attached)		
					A Coordination meeting was held on 4/18/12 with ATT, MSquared, W/O and Turner. It was agreed that MSquared would attempt to deal directly with the utility company. If an agreement could not be made the TJPA would be notified.		
U-0201	AWSS - Countersunk Bolts in 14-Inch Ductile Iron Pipe Strong Back Plate	Closed	05/04/2012	05/14/2012	05/08/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Please reference attached excerpt from the AWSS STANDARD DRAWING III, drawing No. AWSS 3.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
The sizing chart for 14" diameter pipe require the use of Strong Back Type B. The Type B Strong Back configuration requires the use of a countersunk bolt and nut to adjoin connecting DI pipe. The countersunk bolts are a special order product and will have to be fabricated specifically for each piece.					Jeff Thiel 5/7/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,		
Please confirm it is acceptable to use the typical 316 Stainless Steel bolt and nut without the countersink, similar to what is used and shown in Type A for all 14" diameter DI pipe.					"-The proposed change is acceptable. -The Contractor shall field verify the actual pipe outside diameter at each location prior to having strong back fabricated due to differing pipe diameters in use."		
					Signed and date 5/7/12 (See Attached)		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0202	SLUDGE LINE - Unknown Subsurface Structure at 301 Mission	Closed	06/07/2012	06/17/2012	06/12/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Please refer to attached detail 3/U-5001.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Detail 3 on sheet U-5001 which shows the connection detail for 12" HDPE to existing 10" steel, uses a 10" steel to 12" sleet reducer and then using a 12" steel to 12" HDPE Coupling in order to connect new sludge main to existing sludge main.</p> <p>Our preference is to use a 10" steel to 10" HDPE coupling and then install a 10" HDPE to 12" HDPE Reducer. As the O.D of the existing sludge is unknown it will cause significant delay in the ordering of the 10" steel to 12" steel reducer as we will have to get the OD at the connection point and then order the material. Even with this piece of material, it will be extremely difficult to get a welder into the trench to weld the reducer on to the exiting pipe as a result of the amount of utilities which were discovered in potholing.</p> <p>The use of the 12" HDPE to 10" HDPE reducer eliminates the need for a welder in the trench.</p>				Proposed modification is acceptable.			
<hr/>							
U-0203	AWSS - Compaction Method for Trade Package TG04.2	Closed	06/08/2012	06/18/2012	06/11/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Steve Cunningham			Answered By: City and County of San Fr Michael Smith				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:			
Specification section 02225 Section 3.7 C forbids the use of flooding or jetting in order to gain the necessary levels of compaction in the AWSS pipe trench.				Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>However due to the amount of utilities and duct packages in the trenches it will not be possible to gain the necessary levels of compaction under and around these utilities by utilizing the methods referenced in the specifications. By not gaining the necessary compaction around utilities it is possible that voids will occur over time causing the utility to be come unsupported and the street surface to sink.</p> <p>We are requesting the use of jetting (as described in Section 703.08 of the City and County of San Francisco Standard Specifications) as a method to gain the</p>				6/11/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response: "Water jetting to compact soil will be approved for locations where there are adjacent utilities that prevent compaction by vibratory methods. Use vibratory compaction once the backfill is clear of utilities and up to finish grade under road base/paving."			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0204	SLUDGE LINE - Compaction Method for Trade Package TG04.66	Closed	06/22/2012	07/02/2012	06/22/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
Co-Author:							
REQUEST:			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		
Specification section 33 34 10 (3.1, C ₂]7) forbids the use of flooding or jetting in order to gain the necessary levels of compaction in the HDPE pipe trench. However due to the amount of utilities and duct packages in the trenches it will not be possible to gain the necessary levels of compaction under and around these utilities by utilizing the methods referenced in the specifications. By not gaining the necessary compaction around utilities it is possible that voids will occur over time causing the utility to be come unsupported and the street surface to sink.					Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
M Squared is requesting the use of jetting (as described in Section 703.08 of the City and County of San Francisco Standard Specifications) as a method to gain the necessary levels of compaction for the AWSS trenches.					Void. See RFI U-0206 for response.		
Jetting has previously been utilized as a successful method of gaining compaction levels on several other Transit Center Utility Relocation packages (see RFI0203).							
Please confirm that this proposed method is acceptable for use on this trade package. If not, please provide an alternative method for gaining the necessary compaction.							
U-0205	SLUDGE LINE - HDPE Hydrostatic Testing	Closed	06/22/2012	07/02/2012	07/05/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3053 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Please refer to spec section 33 34 10-3.1 H

The method of HDPE pipe testing listed in the contract documents differ from the testing methods provided by the pipe manufacturer: The specifications call for the pipe to be filled 24hrs in advance and then the pipe pressurized to 115psi for a duration of 4hrs, The manufacturer's method involved filling the line with pressure for 3 hrs to allow expansion etc. in the pipe and then adding additional water, per Table 2 of the attached document. Once this additional water has been added the pressure can hold for the duration listed. Or alternatively allowing a 5% fluctuation in the pressure target for the test over 1 hour.

Please see attached pipe manufacturer's data attached and provide direction. M Squared believe that the testing method in the specifications is not suitable for HDPE due to its flexibility and would be more suited to steel pipe.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Eric Zagol 7/3/2012 It is acceptable to perform HDPE Hydrostatic Testing per HDPE pipe manufacturer's recommendations. The test phase shall be performed based on the specified "Test Phase - Alternate 2" in manufacturer's data sheet for 3-hour test.

U-0206 SLUDGE LINE - Compaction Method for Trade Package TG04.6

Closed

06/22/2012 07/02/2012 07/05/2012 Potentially ☐

From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch

Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

Co-Author:

REQUEST:

Specification section 33 34 10 (3.1, C-7) forbids the use of flooding or jetting in order to gain the necessary levels of compaction in the HDPE pipe trench. However due to the amount of utilities and duct packages in the trenches it will not be possible to gain the necessary levels of compaction under and around these utilities by utilizing the methods referenced in the specifications. By not gaining the necessary compaction around utilities it is possible that voids will occur over time causing the utility to be come unsupported and the street surface to sink.

M Squared is requesting the use of jetting (as described in Section 703.08 of the City and County of San Francisco Standard Specifications) as a method to gain the necessary levels of compaction for the Sludge Line trenches.

SUGGESTION:

ANSWER:

Accept Suggestion: ☐

Zagol 7/5/2012 Flooding or water jetting is not an acceptable method of compaction for HDPE pipe trench backfill.

In limited areas, under and around adjacent utilities, consider using a low strength, low water content concrete fill material. Submit proposed alternate backfill material and mix design for review.



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3054 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Jetting has previously been utilized as a successful method of gaining compaction levels on several other Transit Center Utility Relocation packages (see RFI0203).</p> <p>Please confirm that this proposed method is acceptable for use on this trade package. If not, please provide an alternative method for gaining the necessary compaction.</p>						
U-0206.01	SLUDGE LINE - Compaction Method for Trade Package TG04.6	Closed	07/05/2012	07/15/2012	07/17/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: <p>See attached previously approved backfill mix designs in submittal package TG0434-006.</p> <p>Please clarify if either of these can be used as a backfill material mentioned in the response to RFI U-0206.</p>		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> <p>Eric Zagol 7/17/2012 Provide mix design with 28-day compressive strength no greater than 100 psi.</p> <p>Jeff Thiel 7/17/2012 If a concrete fill material is to be used, submit mix design for approval.</p>			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3055 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0207	AWSS - Connection on Market Street	Closed	07/10/2012	07/20/2012	07/11/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Jennifer Tongson				
REQUEST: While excavating to expose the existing AWSS Main on Market Street M Squared's crew discovered that a portion of the existing cast iron main had already been abandoned in place. They then discovered a ductile iron main that is running parallel to the cast iron pipe. The ductile iron main is the portion of pipe that is live and this is the line we should now be connecting to in order to proceed with the work. See attached photos. Please note that additional costs will be incurred, as a result of this unforeseen condition. Please advise on how M Squared is to proceed.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 7/11/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "-The contractor shall connect the new 14" DI pipe to the (E) 14" DI pipe on the East end of the excavation to the nearest pipe joint to the original CTCL location. -Where possible, please deflect new pipe joints 1 degree to compensate for (E) joint deflection at CTCL joint." Signed and dated 7/11/12. (See Attached) Pending TJPA approval, a CR for additional cost is forthcoming.				
U-0208	AWSS - Clearance Issues with Domestic Water Line on Market Street	Closed	07/10/2012	07/20/2012	07/11/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Kruttsch Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley			Answered By: Transbay Joint Powers Au Jennifer Tongson				
REQUEST: While excavating west of the gate valve vault location on Market Street M Squared's crew discovered an 8-inch cast iron water line sitting on top of the existing AWSS main to be removed. This 8-inch line also appears to be leaking slightly. 1. As a result of this line M Squared is unable to install the new AWSS with the necessary clearances. Aside from the clearance issues M Squared can no longer install the 14-inch reducer where it is required. M Squared will be able to relocate the reducer which will then require a longer spool piece. Please advise how M Squared is to proceed. 2. This 8-inch line also has three concrete kickers on the pipe that make it impossible to install the pipe and fittings at this vault location. Please confirm that it is acceptable to remove these kickers temporarily, as they are already restrained with tie rods, for construction purposes. The			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> 7/11/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "-The Contractor shall request the SFPUC SFWD relocate their (E) 8" low pressure water piping in order to maintain a 12" clearance between their own two utilities. -Please coordinate with SFWD prior to removing the (E) concrete thrust blocks on the SFWD line. Support SFWD line as required to prevent movement." Signed and Dated 7/11/12 (See Attached) Pending TJPA approval, a CR for additional cost is forthcoming.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3056 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
<div>kickers can be reinstalled once the work in this location has been completed.</div>							
U-0208.01	AWSS - Clearance Issues with Domestic Water Line on Market Street	Closed	07/24/2012	08/03/2012	08/03/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Per the response to RFI # U-]0208, M Squared met with SFWD engineers on site to discuss the relocation of the domestic 8-inch line. As a result of this coordination, SFWD agreed that relocating the 8-inch line was the best possible resolution to this issue. M Squared has excavated and shored for SFWD crews to perform the repairs. As of 7/23/12 no relocation work has been performed by SFWD. Please provide M Squared with a schedule for this relocation.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 8/2/2012 Per Dan Helminiak of the SFWD, the SFWD is scheduled to relocate the 8" water line on the morning of Monday 8/6/12.			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0209	AWSS - Misison and Anthony Valve Vault	Closed	07/26/2012	08/05/2012	08/07/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: See attached documents and photos. M Squared has potholed this location for the AWSS valve vault. It has been confirmed that the gas line is abandoned and can be removed and that the 12" water is also abandoned. In order for the vault to be constructed here M Squared will need to remove the abandoned 12" line; however, removing the 12" line will significantly weaken the live 8" line that runs on Anthony as the 90 degree bend on the 8" line is supported by a redwood block resting against the abandoned line. Please advise on how M Squared is to proceed.			SUGGESTION: Have SFWD restrain the existing 90 degree bend so that the abandoned lines and redwood plug can be removed. UPon completion of the valve vault M Squared can our a new concrete kicker if required by SFWD.				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 7/30/2012 Response per Chi Yu of SFWD, " The redwood plug is for the abandoned line to stop any residual water in the pipe and does not serve as a kicker. The live 8" main was built quite recently using a field-lok gasket restraint joint. No kicker is required. Remove the 12" and 8" abandoned lines together with the redwood plug. Provide adequate vertical support for the live 8" main." See attached email from Chi Yu dated 7/30/12.				
U-0210	AWSS - 12" Water Conflict at 1st and Mission Street	Closed	07/26/2012	08/05/2012	08/10/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: While performing the preliminary excavation across 1st and Mission street Intersection, M Squared's crew exposed a 12" water line that is running on top of the AWSS line for approx half of the intersection. Due to other utilities being present we are unable to excavate down to the AWSS main. M Squared met with SFWD crews on site and they have confirmed that the line is active, despite them agreeing with M Squared that the line sounded very hollow (an indication that it may be dead) M Squared believes that despite the presence of many unknown utilities they will still be able to remove and replace the existing AWSS main if this 12" water line can be abandoned or relocated. Please advise on how M Squared is to proceed.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 8/10/2012 Chi Yu's (SFWD) response, "SFWD will cut and cap both ends of the 12" line that is on top of the AWSS Main and restore the 12" main at the same location after the new AWSS line is in place." SFWD will require two weeks advance notice prior to starting this work.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0213	AWSS - Antenna At Location #7	Closed	09/11/2012	09/21/2012	09/12/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
REQUEST: Sheet MA - 22 of the contract drawings shows the antenna for location #7 being mounted on the existing street light pole. Sheet MA - 31 shows that the antenna is mounted on an antenna pole in the sidewalk. Please clarify where the antenna pole is to be located.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 9/12/2012 Response per Kenny Chin, (SFDPW) "What is showing on Sheet MA-31 is correct. The contractor shall provide antenna pole and antenna shall be mounted to this antenna pole."				
U-0213.01	AWSS - Antenna at Location #7	Closed	09/13/2012	09/23/2012	09/20/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please refer to RFI U-0213 and SFDPW drawing File No. 87,208 and 87,212.		Yes, the standard Detail for San Fransisco light pole is acceptable foundaiton of the antenna pole.					
As no detail for the antenna pole foundation is provided in the contract documents, please advise if the standard detail for San Francisco Light Poles is an acceptable foundation of the antenna pole indicated on drawing MA-31.		Kenny Chin 9-17-12					
U-0214	SLUDGE LINE - Air Release Valve at Sta 17+25	Closed	09/28/2012	10/08/2012	11/09/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP	Jackson Tukuafu	To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch	Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST:	SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The air release valve (ARV) installed on Mission St. at Sta 17+25 is currently only accessible via 12" ductile iron pipe with a 12" cap. M Squared is unable to construct the air release valve manhole per detail #1 on Sheet U-5001 due to the presence of the concrete wall that is in place.		Construct the ARV vault at the location shown on the attached drawing "U-3005 markup.pdf" & the sketch "proposed ARV vault in Mission St.pdf" after the new AWSS HPW constructed and existing 12" AWSS HPW ben demolished.					
1. Please advise if it is acceptable to leave the 12" ductile iron in place or install a larger diameter ductile pipe (possibly 16") and customize a cap for the ARV		Coordinate with SFDPW for schedule.					
2. Alternatively please provide a detail for the air release valve manhole							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3061 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0214.1	SLUDGE LINE - Air Release Valve at Sta 17+25	Open	02/07/2014	02/17/2014	02/21/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Judith Long				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Chris Wallace							
REQUEST: RFI U-0214 directs M Squared to install the modified ARV manhole after the new 16-inch AWSS has been installed. However, the AWSS main was installed further north than was shown in the plans due to utilities and tie-in to existing alignments. 1. Please advise if the ARV is to be installed directly over the new AWSS main. 2. In addition to this issue the new 16" Gate Valve vault location will also be in conflict with the ARV manhole. Please provide a new location for the ARV Manhole, bearing in mind that the existing concrete wall in in conflict and will require demolition. (See attached sketch)			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Judy Long 2/19/2014 RESPONSE: Due to the required relocation of the (N) 16" AWSS main north of the (e) location, and the requirement to install an air valve for SFPUC's sludge line at this location, the contractor shall locate the air valve as shown. Coordinate the air valve placement with the AWSS valve vault, with the AWSS valve having first priority in location along Mission Street Michael B. Smith SFDPW/IDC/EME on 2/19/14		
<hr/>							
U-0215	AWSS - Hetch Hetchy Duct Bank Conflict	Closed	09/28/2012	10/08/2012	10/12/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: At Sta 2+40 on Mission St (Anthony St intersection) the existing AWSS Main runs through a Hetch Hetchy duct bank. There are several concrete encased ducts on top of the AWSS Main and several concrete encased ducts under the AWSS main. On Friday 28th September, M Squared met with MUNI Underground Services and they have requested that the AWSS be abandon 1-ft on each side of the duct bank and install the new AWSS Main over or under this Hetch Hetchy duct bank. Please advise how you would like M Squared to proceed with this conflict.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW), "-Abandon (E) 12" AWSS Main as described above. -F/I vertical offset over HHWP Duct Bank as shown on the attached sheet." Signed and Dated 10/11/12. (See attached) A formal Cadd drawing is forthcoming. Pending TJPA approval, a CR for additional cost is forthcoming.		
<hr/>							
U-0216	AWSS - Gate Valve at Station 1+09	Closed	10/04/2012	10/14/2012	10/15/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
	REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing MA-13. Due to the location of existing utilities M Squared is unable to install the gate valve at Sta 0+90, as shown on sheet MA-13. Please confirm it is acceptable for M Squared to install the valve at Sta 1+90. M Squared has confirmed there are no conflicts at Sta 1+90.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 10/11/2012 Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW), "This gate valve location is acceptable per our discussion in the field last week. Please note that the two flanged x MJB adaptors will require stop collars/collar stops on the connecting D.I. Pipe." Signed and Dated 10/10/12. (See attached)		
U-0217	AWSS - 16" Gate Valve at Sta 5+00	Closed	10/12/2012	10/22/2012	10/15/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:							
	REQUEST: Drawing Reference: MA-14 Please confirm that the 16" gate valve at Sta 5+00 can be deleted and is not required.	SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 10/15/2012 Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW): "This gate valve and concrete valve vault can be deleted from the scope of work." Signed and Dated 10/15/12. (See Attached) Pending TJPA approval, a deductive CR may be issued.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3063 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0218	AWSS - PG&E Duct Bank Conflict at Sta.6+05 to Sta. 6+25	Closed	11/06/2012	11/06/2012	11/15/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Between Sta 6+05 and Sta 6+25 there is a PGE duct bank sitting on top of the AWSS pipe; as a result, M Squared is unable to install the new AWSS main at this location. See attached photo. The pipe cannot be lowered due to the AWSS penetrating PGE Vault #1302. In order for M Squared to be able to install the new AWSS main through PGE vault #1302, the PGE duct bank needs to be raised up. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: PG&E remove concrete encasement from ducts and lift the PVC conduits up so that M Squared can install the pipe at the existing alignment.				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> - SFDPW accepts M Squared's suggested solution for this utility conflict. - Coordinate with PG&E for removing concrete and raising conduits in order to install AWSS facilities and provide 6-9" clearance. Michael Smith SFDPW/IDC/EME - 11/09/12				

U-0219	AWSS - PG&E Vault #1313 Conflict with 4x4 Support Post	Closed	11/06/2012	11/16/2012	11/29/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: On 10/26, PGE completed work on Vault #1313 on Mission Street. The existing AWSS pipe has been removed and M Squared is ready to install the new AWSS Main per the attached sketch (current condition). In order for M Squared to install the AWSS pipe, the five 4"x4" supports installed by ARB crews require removal. As a result, a portion of the vault wall will overhang the pipe, with no support. . Please advise if this is acceptable.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 11/9/2012 Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW) "Per field meeting today, support AWSS pipe through cut in (E) PG&E vault as follows: -Support (N) 16" AWSS pipe over vault under hang with a CDF "cradle" for the length of the vault. Pour CDF to 5 and 7 O'clock pipe positions. - Backfill pipe with jetted sand to vault overhang. -Fill vault concave spaces with CDF over sand backfill through (N) 8" Diameter holes chipped into the top of the vault." Signed and dated 11/20/12. (See Attached) Per meetings with PG&E, M Squared to perform this work.				

U-0220	AWSS - MultiQuip Sump Pump	Closed	01/23/2013	02/02/2013	01/29/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	----------------------------	--------	------------	------------	------------	-------------	--------------------------



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3064 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel		
REQUEST: Please refer to the attached excerpt from spec section 02728 AWSS Motorized Gate Valve Equipment and product data for the MultiQuip Sump Pump: ST2037. As per coordination between Aidan Foley and Michael Smith, please confirm the attached MultiQuip Sump Pump: ST2037 is an acceptable alternate to the specified manufacturer Flygt, Model 2610 in specification section 02728- 2.13,A. Please note the MultiQuip Sump Pump: ST2037 is being submitted for approval in WOJV submittal package TG04.2-031 - AWSS - MultiQuip Sump Pump.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Per SFPUC, only the contract specified submersible pump will be accepted for installation in the AWSS motorized gate valve vaults. Michael B. Smith SFDPQ/IDC/EME on 01/29/13		
U-0221	AWSS - Pipe Joints in Utility Vaults	Closed	01/31/2013	02/10/2013	02/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel		
REQUEST: Per recent field direction provided by the City inspector to M Squared Construction, where possible no joints are permitted inside utility vaults (i.e PGE, ATT) This will require an additional restraint joint at each vault location. Please confirm this is the intent.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 2/5/2013 Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW), "This is the intent of both SFWD and SFDPW due to utilities constructing their facilities over/around the pre-existing AWSS lines. Please notify engineer in advance should joints be required to be placed in vaults due to the length of vaults. (16'+)" Signed and Dated 2/1/13. (See Attached)		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3065 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0222	AWSS - Flanged Spools for Hydrants	Closed	01/31/2013	02/10/2013	02/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel	
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: MA-14 & MA-15 Hydrant at Sta 6+30 Contract drawings show the 45deg bend being connected directly to the rolled down tee. However the hydrant lateral is much lower than the main and it will not be possible to connect them directly together. Hydrant at Sta 9+00 Due to the changes per RFI U-190 M Squared are to install the new fire hydrant in the same location as the existing, in the breezeway. As a result the new hydrant lateral will be higher than the newly installed main (the grade of the main being dictated by various utility conflicts). Please confirm M squared's suggested mediation is how M squared is to proceed			SUGGESTION: Hydrant at Sta 6+30 Suggestion - custom fabricate a HPW flanged x flanged spool for to connect to the tee and the 45deg bend. Hydrant at Sta 9+00 Suggestion - In order to connect the tee to the 90deg bend a HPW flanged x flanged spool, custom fabricated will be necessary.			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 2/5/2013 Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW), "-Hydrant at station 6+30 - Proceed as required due to unforeseen field conditions. -Hydrant at station 9+00 - Per field / phone conversations with M2, Pipe spool is no longer required at this location." Signed and Dated 2/1/13. (See Attached)	
U-0223	AWSS - Electrical Sevice at 2nd Street Intersection	Closed	02/06/2013	02/16/2013	05/20/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel	
REQUEST: The contract drawings show M Squared replacing the existing 10" gate valve on Mission at 2nd St with a new 16" gate valve. Due to a PG&E conflict M Squared will have to now move the valve location north onto 2nd Street. In moving the vault M Squared will now have to relocate the existing electrical service to the new vault location. M Squared will need the service disconnected so that all existing electrical cable and conduits can be removed. Once the new vault has been constructed M Squared can reestablish the service to the new vault location. These were previously thought to be street lighting conduits as mentioned in RFI U-182.2 and will need to be removed for the construction of the new vault anyway.			SUGGESTION:			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 5/20/2013 Existing PG&E service has been disconnected and removed. See attached drawing for new routing of PG&E power service connection from existing PG&E connection point to a new PG&E meter enclosure. Please provide pricing proposal for work associated with installing a new connection from PG&E connection point to new meter enclosure as show on the attached drawing. Do not proceed with this work until pricing has been agreed to. Reconnection for service at this location has been acknowledged from SFPUC (via PG&E) to be about 5 to 6 weeks out.	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3066 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0223.1	AWSS - Electrical Service at 2nd Street	Closed	07/17/2013	07/27/2013	07/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
REQUEST:				Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW),			
Reference: Attached Drawing				"The proposed drain line routing is acceptable provided that the line slopes to the catch basin per the specs. The proposed electrical conduit shall be acceptable provided that it's installation shall conform to PG&Es guidelines."			
Per the response to RFI U-0223 a new electrical service, a new PGE meter pedestal, and a new drain line was to be installed at 2nd and Mission.				Signed and Dated (see attached)			
However the drawing provided in the response showed the old AWSS vault location. See attached drawing prepared by M Squared showing the new vault location.							
We have established conduit routes for both the new electrical service to PGE vault #1316 and also the drain line to the catch basin.							
Please confirm that this acceptable.							



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0224	AWSS - Pipe Alignment between Fremont to Beale	Closed	02/06/2013	02/16/2013	02/11/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: The existing AWSS main on Mission Street between Fremont St & Beale St is running through three (3) PGE vaults. By upsizing the AWSS main to 16" there is a possibility that the pipe will not fit back through the structures. By having PGE move/alter their facilities M Squared believes there will be significant project delays. M Squared will also inevitably have to install the new main within PGE structures, something the SFPUC prefers to avoid. M Squared believes it is possible to shift the alignment of the new 16" main further north to avoid all of these PGE vaults. See attached potholing results from potholing further north than the existing main. M Squared does not know yet if additional fittings will be needed to shift the alignment north, and then realign it back south at Beale Street. This will not be known until the trench has been excavated. Please confirm it is acceptable for the AWSS alignment to shift north as currently coordinated to avoid the delay impacts and vault conflicts.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 2/8/2013 Response per Michael Smith, (SFPDW) "Shifting the proposed AWSS alignment North is acceptable provided that there are no utility conflicts and the gate valve frames/covers do not end up directly in the gutter due to potential flooding of the vaults." Signed and Dated 2/8/13. (See Attached				
U-0225	AWSS - Lead Joint Clearances at Sta 6+30	Closed	02/08/2013	02/18/2013	02/13/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Stewart Mitchell							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached W/O Sketch SK-U-0225 and drawing MA-4. The newly installed fire hydrant lateral at station 6+30 is to connect to the existing AWSS main; however, the existing main pipe is "oval" shaped and the new pipe is circular. As a result of the differing pipe shapes, the minimum clearances for inserting the "hokum" to draw the lead in when heated are not achieved. The minimum clearance around the pipe required is 1/4". The existing fitting is part of a series of fittings needed to raise the fire hydrant lateral up in elevation to avoid a			SUGGESTION: Field conditions appear to indicate that where the existing laterals clear over the sewer, at the next joint there is a possibility of a full length pipe (12'-0") which takes you closer to the curb. There is a possibility to switch out the entire lateral to the fire hydrant. ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 2/13/2013 Response per Michael Smith (SFPDW), "Due to the unforeseen conflict between the existing AT&T duct bank which was poured directly onto the AWSS Hydrant lateral pipe, blocking access to the next two downstream lead joints, the contractor shall locate a lead joint South of the conflicting duct bank that is readily accessible for their plumber to melt the existing lead joint. The contractor shall then furnish and install ductile iron pipe and fittings to this accessible location in order to connect to the existing cast iron line. The alternate is for AT&T to relocate				



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>conflict with an existing sewer line. Moreover, there is a duct bank over the sewer and it was poured over the next fitting only compounding the conflict.</p> <p>Please advise.</p>			<p>their duct bank in order that there is a minimum 12" clearance between the duct bank and the existing AWSS pipe.</p> <p>Should the duct bank not be relocated, and due to the fact that there will be a minimum amount of cast iron pipe remaining in the hydrant lateral run, the contractor shall provide a cost for removing the remainder of the cast iron hydrant lateral and for replacing with ductile iron pipe and fittings.</p> <p>Replacing this remaining section of cast iron pipe and hydrant will be an improvement to the SFWD's facilities."</p> <p>Signed and Dated (See Attached)</p>			
U-0225.1	<p>AWSS - Lead Joint Clearances at Sta 6+30: SFWD Decision to Replace Full Lateral Closed</p> <p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley</p> <p>REQUEST:</p> <p>As a result of several coordination efforts to discuss potential options, AT&T has chosen not to relocate their duct bank that is in conflict with the hydrant lateral at Sta 6+30. Instead they have agreed to compensate M Squared for the costs to connect to the next most southern joint.</p> <p>1. Please confirm that this is acceptable, as the response to the previous RFI U-0225 mentioned the possibility of replacing the full lateral including the hydrant.</p> <p>2. Please advise whether the SFWD want to replace the full lateral. M Squared need to know so an agreement can be reached on materials etc.</p>				<p>03/11/2013 03/21/2013 03/28/2013 Potentially <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Jeff Thiel 3/26/2013 Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW),</p> <p>"CCSF SFWD (Dan Helminiak 420-4521) will coordinate with contractor to provide funding / materials to replace the remaining cast iron portion of the hydrant lateral."</p> <p>Signed and Dated 3/19/13. (See Attached)</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3070 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3071 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0228	AWSS - Sidewalk Expansion Evaluation between First Street and Beale Street	Closed	05/31/2013	06/10/2013	10/18/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Per the attached email it appears that the City's intent to is to move the curb lines south between First St & Fremont by 3' and also between Fremont & Beale Street by 4'. First to Fremont St - In moving out the curb line by 3' the AWSS Line on this block will be pretty close to being under the new curb line, therefore making any maintenance of the AWSS line in the future very difficult. There would also be an impact to the gate valve location on the east side of the 1st and Mission intersection and the west side of Fremont & Mission due to the new curb coming south. It is possible a modified roof to the vault would be required as half of the vault would be in the street and another half would be in the sidewalk (judging from rough field measurements). The AWSS Fire hydrant would also need to be relocated as it would now be in the middle of a widened sidewalk, whereas the distance acceptable is 24" to 26" from FOC. Fremont to Beale Street - The current alignment for the AWSS along Mission between Fremont & Beale is close to the curb on the north side (in order to avoid 3 PG&E utility vaults). By moving the curb 4' south the AWSS line will now be underneath the sidewalk on this block. Similar to above the gate valve vaults would be partially under the sidewalk here and modifications/relocations may be required. Please advise if M Squared is to continue with the AWSS install per plan. Alternatively please provide direction on the conflicts that moving the sidewalk creates for the main.			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Judy Long 10/16/2013 RESPONSE: - TJPA has not received confirmation from the SFPUC that the new AWSS service can be installed per the contract drawings. As discussed in our weekly coordination meeting after completing the paving in the intersection at First and Mission, M2 is directed to jump to the intersection at Main and Mission and proceed westward towards Beale Street. - Submit RFI#U-0228.1 once work is complete in the Main Street intersection and request SFPUC's approval to proceed with the original AWSS alignment per contract drawings between Beale and First streets.				
U-0228.1	AWSS - Sidewalk Expansion between First Street and Beale Street	Closed	02/07/2014	02/17/2014	02/24/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Judith Long				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Chris Wallace							
REQUEST: As per RFI response to U-0228, the "TJPA has not received confirmation from the SFPUC that the new AWSS service can be installed per the contract drawings," due to the following purported sidewalk expansion between			SUGGESTION:				
			ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please see attached email from Eugene Shu of SFWD and dated 02/20/14. The SFPUC has given their approval to install the new AWSS pipe in the original AWSS pipe				

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>First Street and Beale Street:</p> <p>"Per the attached email it appears that the City's intent to is to move the curb lines south between First St & Fremont by 3' and also between Fremont & Beale Street by 4'.</p> <p>First to Fremont St - In moving out the curb line by 3' the AWSS Line on this block will be pretty close to being under the new curb line, therefore making any maintenance of the AWSS line in the future very difficult. There would also be an impact to the gate valve location on the east side of the 1st and Mission intersection and the west side of Fremont & Mission due to the new curb coming south. It is possible a modified roof to the vault would be required as half of the vault would be in the street and another half would be in the sidewalk (judging from rough field measurements). The AWSS Fire hydrant would also need to be relocated as it would now be in the middle of a widened sidewalk, whereas the distance acceptable is 24" to 26" from FOC.</p> <p>Fremont to Beale Street - The current alignment for the AWSS along Mission between Fremont & Beale is close to the curb on the north side (in order to avoid 3 PG&E utility vaults). By moving the curb 4' south the AWSS line will now be underneath the sidewalk on this block. Similar to above the gate valve vaults would be partially under the sidewalk here and modifications/relocations may be required.</p> <p>Please confirm it is acceptable for M Squared to proceed with AWSS alignment as shown on drawings MA-15 and MA-16.</p>						<p>alignment on Mission Street between First and Beale Streets knowing that portions of the AWSS pipe alignment will be under either the street gutter or partially under the sidewalk curb due to planned future sidewalk widening work on the north side of Mission Street. The SFPUC has required that all of the 16-inch gate valve vaults are to be located outside the planned future sidewalk boundaries. The Contractor shall coordinate with the SFPDW EOR regarding the locations of the valve vaults prior to beginning work to install the pipe. The chosen locations will be confirmed with SFPUC for their approval. Based on the above approval by SFPUC, the Contractor shall proceed with installing the AWSS piping as shown on drawings MA-15 and MA-16 after the gate valve vaults are located outside the sidewalk. The AWSS hydrant lateral shown on the drawing MA-15 to be located on Mission Street west of the Fremont Street west property line has been relocated to the west side of Fremont Street due to conflicts with the future sidewalk widening work. Please see our response regarding the hydrant lateral in RFI Nq. U-0241. Michael B. Smith (415) 558-4536 SFPDW /IDC/EME 02/20/14</p>



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3073 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0229	AWSS Main @ PGE Vault #1329	Closed	06/12/2013	06/22/2013	06/17/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Reference: Attached Photo Please confirmin that the new 16" AWSS is acceptable to be in the position shown as there is not the required clearance with the PGE vault #1329		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response per Michael Smith, (SFDPW) "Per a site visit on 6/11/13 with M Squared, the current alignment of the AWSS pipe against the PG&E electrical vault is unacceptable. The AWSS contract documents require a minimum clearance of 12" between AWSS facilities and adjacent utilities. Exceptions shall be made by the engineer on a case-by-case basis per field conditions to decrease the clearance to 6" where required." Signed and dated 6/17/13. (See Attached)			
<hr/>							
U-0230	AWSS - AWSS Vault at 2nd Street	Closed	07/18/2013	07/28/2013	07/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Due to the grade of the 16" AWSS gate valve, combined with the valve actuators the roof of the AWSS valve vault at 2nd Street will not be under the surface of the street. Previous AWSS valve vaults have 2" AC/8" concrete street base on top of the roof of the vault. If M Squared installs the vault roof and then covers it with 2" AC then there is a danger that future contractors will saw cut through the roof of the vault while cutting out their trenches. Our suggestion is to pour the vault roof to the same grade as the current street surface on 2nd Street. There does not appear to be any room for adjustment here and we are unaware of any other options in this case. Please confirm it is acceptable to construct the vault roof in this manner, with a concrete broom finish.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW), "M Squared shall proceed with constructing the valve box cover in a manner such that the portion to be located in the parking strip shall be flush with the surrounding concrete. For the portion of the cover to be located in the paved traffic lane, reduce top surface by 2". Place a sheet of 10 gauge galvanized sheet steel on recessed area of concrete cover. When repaving street, extend A/C paving over vault to provide paving flush with concrete portion of cover/manhole lid. Signed and dated. (see attached)			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3074 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0231	AWSS - Concrete Sampling for Kickers	Closed	07/25/2013	08/04/2013	08/02/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: The contract specifications require concrete sampling of all cast in place concrete on the AWSS project. However in the pre-construction QC meeting the City confirmed that the SFWD Inspector - Dan Helminiak is permitted to inspect all concrete thrust blocks. Due to the small size of the thrust blocks it is not practical for concrete samples to be provided to an inspection agency. Please confirm that per the agreement SFWD inspector can inspect all concrete used in the AWSS thrust blocks and that no concrete sampling is required.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW), "It is acceptable to the City for thrust blocks to be visually inspected by the SFWD inspector for compliance with the contract documents. No concrete sampling is required." Signed and dated. (See attached) (Jack Adams) Although the contract specifications require concrete sampling and testing of all cast in place concrete on the AWSS project, the City of SF Engineer of record has allowed visual inspection only by City SFPUC (SFWD) of these concrete thrust blocks. See attached from M. Smith CCSF PUC.				
U-0232	AWSS - Schedule Change of AWSS Install	Closed	07/30/2013	08/09/2013	08/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Per our recent AWSS meetings M Squared had been directed by the owners' representative to complete the AWSS install at 1st & Mission intersection and then mobilize to Main Street intersection to begin work down there. IF M Squared is to begin work at Main St then there will be no connection made on the east side of 1st and Mission. The new 16" line will be installed up to the 16"X10" tee and the 10" connection will be done heading North on 1st. We can see 3 options that would allow us to proceed to Main Street. 1. Cap the new 16" Tee on the east side of the tee. This would allow the AWSS system to be in service from 2nd Street all the way to the east side of 1st Street, including 1st Street heading towards Market. 2. Perform a connection from the new 16" Tee to the			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response per Michael Smith, (SFDPW) "Please proceed with Option No. 1 - Capping of the East end of the (N) 16"x16"x12" tee installed at Mission and First Streets. The concrete thrust block to be installed behind the 16" cap shall be poured with 3x the concrete as a typical thrust block for a 16" AWSS fitting. Pour thrust blocks against 12" CI pipe and 16"x16"x1" Steel plate. Option No. 2 is not approved due to unavailability of fittings for 4-6 months and the vertical/horizontal alignments between (N) and (E) pipes. Bill Gunn of SFWD approved option No. 1 based on the above issues for implementing option No. 2" Signed and Dated. (See attached)				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3075 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>existing 12" AWSS main on Mission east of 1st Street. This would allow the AWSS system to be fully operational from 2nd all the way to Main. This would be temporary as M Squared would presumably return to complete the 16" install here.</p> <p>3. Leave the new and existing pipe as is. The AWSS main would be operational from 2nd Street all the way to the gate valve on Mission west of 1st Street. The main would remain shut off on the 1st and Mission intersection, and also 1st Street heading towares Market as the new 16" AWSS line would be open at the tee (not capped/connected) and the exisiting 12" would not be connected to anything.</p> <p>Please provide an option to M Squared to allow us to proceed.</p>						
U-0233	AWSS - 16" GV @ sta 9+00	Closed	08/14/2013	08/24/2013	08/14/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By:Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel			
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reference: Attached Photos		Install an 8" pipe into the roof of the vault and put an 8" valve cover in the street as an access point to the by pass. The main operating nut on the gate calve would accessible from the 24" cover in the street per plan.		Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW),			
Technically the 2 operating nuts should be on the same side. That way you can operate the nut on both the valve and the by pass from the 24"x24" valve cover in the street. Now that the nut on the valve is facing a different way there is no possibility that you can access both nuts from the valve cover.				"Our understanding is that the concrete valve vault lid has been fabricated and installed. Please provide an as-built drawing of the placement of the covers and rebar layout."			
				Signed and Dated. (See Attached)			



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0234	AWSS - Valve Vault Wiring Clarification	Closed	10/17/2013	10/27/2013	11/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing sheets MA-29, MA-30 and MA-31. The above referenced drawings show conduit and conductors required for vault wiring. The sheet note number 1 on these drawings refer to Limitorque drawings. These Limitorque drawings show additional (54 #14 gauge) conductors in each of the three locations. Please clarify the total number of conductors and corresponding conduits..			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Judy Long 11/5/2013 RESPONSE: This wiring issue for the AWSS Motorized gate valve actuator has been addressed and resolved between Thomas Reid of SFPUC and the contractor. Please see attached email dated 11/1/13. per Michael B. Smith SFDPW/ICD/EME on 11/5/13				
U-0235	RUP - Missing Fittings at Main Street Intersection per Drawing MA-17	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing MA-17 and specification section 00 70 00, 1.05 - B4. Per the General Conditions, 00 70 00, 1.05 B4, the parts list takes precedence over the drawing details. The attached excerpt from drawing MA-17 identifies fittings that are not shown on the material list. Please confirm the following fittings are required to complete the AWSS new install: 1. Three (3) 14" stop collar. 2. A 14" bell collar			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Judy Long Michael Smith 12/18/2013 RESPONSE: The three (3) 14" stop collars and one (1) 14" bell collar are required to restrain the new piping.				
U-0236	RUP - AWSS Pipe Configuration at PG&E Vault #1722	Closed	12/10/2013	12/20/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: See attached sketches. Due to the proximity of PGE's Vault #1722 to the new AWSS line M Squared believes the following changes are needed to keep all pipe joints and fittings outside the limits			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Judy Long 12/18/2013 RESPONSE: The proposed AWSS piping configuration is acceptable.				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3077 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>of existing utility vaults.</p> <p>M Squared proposes installing the 14" x 12" reducer further east, until we are outside the limits of the vault. The pipe between the new cross piece and the new reducer will be 14-inch pipe, rather than the 12-inch shown on the plans. M Squared will be able to eliminate the need for the 12-inch sleeve here and tie 12-inch pipe into the existing main from the reducer. All joints will be restrained using stop collars.</p> <p>Please confirm that this configuration is preferred to in lieu having fittings and joints within the limits of the PGE Vault. Please advise.</p>						
U-0237	RUP - Location of Valve Vault at Main Street Phase	Closed	12/13/2013	12/23/2013	12/19/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p> <p>Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley</p>			<p>Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please refer to drawing MA-17.</p> <p>Due to the location of several utilities it is not possible to install the gate valve and valve vault at Sta 19+85 as shown on sheet MA-17. The closest possible location with adequate space for a concrete vault is at Sta 19+50. See attached M Squared sketch SK-TG04.2-059.</p> <p>Please confirm that this location is acceptable as the location for the gate valve and the valve vault. If this is an acceptable location, please clarify if 2 joints west of the new valve location are required to be restrained.</p>		<p>SUGGESTION:</p>	<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>Judy Long 12/18/2013</p> <p>Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>The proposed location at Station 19 = 50 for the 16" gate valve vault is acceptable.</p> <p>All joints between the gate valve and cross, and two joints west of the gate valve, shall be restrained.</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3078 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0238	RUP - Catch Basin at Sta. 18+75	Closed	12/17/2013	12/27/2013	12/23/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: The existing catch basin at Sta 18+75, mid-block between Main and Beale on Mission Street is 3.5-inches higher than the surrounding concrete and asphalt. The catch basin itself is only 16-inches deep and does not appear to be active on account of the grate being higher than the surrounding areas. In order for this catch basin to be utilized the grate would need to be dropped approx 5inches, leaving a catch basin less than a foot deep. Please advise what steps are required to be taken before M Squared restores the concrete bus lane.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Judy Long 12/20/2013 RESPONSE: Please revise request per discussion in meeting held 12/20/13 JT/WOJV 12/23/2013 - Please revise to RFI to request abandoning the catch basin.				
U-0238.1	AWSS - Abandoned Catch Basin at Sta. 18+75	Closed	01/07/2014	01/17/2014	02/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Judith Long				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: The existing catch basin at Sta 18+75, mid block between Main and Beale on Mission Street is 3.5-inches higher than the surrounding concrete and asphalt. The catch basin itself is only 16inches deep and does not appear to be active on account of the grate being higher than the surrounding areas. In order for this catch basin to be utilized the grate would need to be dropped approx. 5-inches, leaving a catch basin less than a foot deep. It is not possible to install a standard SF catch basin is this location and therefore M Squared suggest abandoning this CB. Alternatively, please provide grades for the restoration of the concrete bus lane to create necessary slopes to this catch basin. Please advise.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> SFDPW Response This catch basin is to be maintained at its current location. Slope concrete bus lane to catch basin or pour concrete flat in area. The concrete at the catch basin frame casting shall be finished flush with both surfaces. Michael B. Smith SFDPW/IDC/EME 02/04/14				
U-0239	AWSS - The Use of Sand Slurry Backfill at Mission and Main Street Phase	Closed	01/16/2014	01/26/2014	02/04/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Company Judith Long				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3079 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Please refer to drawing MA-17.</p> <p>Due to the high number of utility duct banks on Main Street & Mission Street Intersection M Squared's crews effectively tunneled under sections of the street in order to install the new AWSS main. Where possible M Squared removed the street base and excavated as much as we could. The remainder of the trench was tunneled under duct banks and under the street, with the street base remaining in place.</p> <p>Now that all the AWSS main has been installed M Squared will shortly be faced with backfilling this intersection. There is currently only a small portion of trench that can be backfilled using conventional methods i.e ram compactor etc. The remainder of the trench will also not be suitable for backfilling using the jetting method as there will be no way to compact the area directly underneath the street base.</p> <p>M Squared is requesting permission to create several small holes (approx. 6" dia) in the street base, between some of the utilities and backfill the AWSS trench using a sand cement slurry backfill. See attached submittal sheets. This mix design is effectively sand and water, with just a minor amount of cement included to allow the sand to reach 95% compaction.</p> <p>If this is not acceptable please provide direction.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This is acceptable provided that the dried sand/cement mixture has a minimum density of 120 lb/ft3. Please provide test verification of this density with site test as continued from previous sheet: "witnessed by SFWD Inspector". Test can be performed at contractor's yard. Answered by: Michael B Smith SFDPW/IDC/EME Answered on: 1/31/14</p>		
U-0240	AWSS - Concrete Mix and Slump at Parking Strip Placement	Closed	01/16/2014	01/26/2014	03/05/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Turner Construction Comp. Judith Long			
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
	<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>Prior to replacing the 6ft wide parking strip on Mission Street at 1st Street it became apparent to us that the articulated semi trucks, buses and other larger vehicles would be unable to a make the turn from southbound 1st Street onto Mission Street if the 6ft wide parking strip was barricaded in order to let the concrete set.</p>	<p>SUGGESTION:</p>			<p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Michael Smith 3/3/2014 RESPONSE: The 8" slump for the Bode Mix 604cc is acceptable. Michael B. Smith SFDPW/IDC/EME on 3/3/14</p>		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Number	Subject	Status	Date Created	Date Required	Date Answered	Cost Impact	Proceed
U-0241	<p>City standards call for the concrete to be poured with a 4inch slump, and that no traffic drive on the concrete for a period of 10 days. M Squared made the decision to add 2% calcium to the concrete mix to speed up the concrete setting process. M Squared used the same mix design as is used for the street base:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Bode Concrete Mix Design 604 - sidewalk, curb and gutter and parking strip.- Bode Concrete Mix Design 604CC - Street base <p>The only difference between the 2 concrete designs is the added 2% calcium.</p> <p>The concrete was poured with an 8inch slump in order to allow the crew enough time to satisfactorily finish the concrete to the required surface. M Squared acknowledge that this is out of spec, however the concrete still reached over 4000psi, when specs required only 3000psi. M Squared believes that this will be required in the future on other portions of Mission Street on account of Mission St. being MUNI's busiest route. SFMTA have asked that M Squared minimize lane closures where possible.</p> <p>Please confirm that this 8inch slump is acceptable on Bode Mix 604CC (attached).</p>	Closed	01/21/2014	01/31/2014	02/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu</p> <p>To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello</p> <p>Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley</p>			<p>Answered By: Turner Construction Company Judith Long</p>				
<p>REQUEST:</p> <p>As per AWSS Coordination Meeting on 01/17/2014, the location of this fire hydrant near the intersection of Fremont and Mission is potentially going to need to be moved to accommodate the new sidewalk expansion. The purpose of the RFI is for Michael Smith with SFWD to analyze, consider and direct the feasibility of relocating the fire hydrant further north.</p> <p>If the hydrant is to be located somewhere other than is shown on the drawing please provide a detail for this work as additional fittings may need to be ordered.</p>			<p>SUGGESTION:</p> <p>ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Per our site visit with M2 on 02/11/14, the proposed hydrant lateral shall be relocated to the west side of Fremont Street, north of Mission Street, barring any conflicting utilities. The hydrant shall be located immediately north of the replacement 10" gate valve. M2 shall verify the availability of a 10" hydrant tee with SFWD.</p> <p>Michael B. Smith SFDPW/IDC/EME 02/12/14</p>				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3081 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0242	AWSS - Hydrant Lateral Connection Conclt at Sta. 17+20	Closed	01/21/2014	01/31/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By:				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Sheet MA-16 shows that the hydrant tee is to be rolled down 45-degrees in order to tie in to the lateral piping. However, when M Squared excavated this section, they discovered that the hydrant lateral piping is shallow and the main is approx. 2-feet deeper. In order to install the piping, the hydrant tee will need to be rolled UP 45 degrees. In addition to this M Squared will need to order a customized 8-inch DIP flanged spool to join the tee to the flanged 45-degree elbow. Please confirm it is acceptable to proceed with the customized flange or provide direction.			SUGGESTION: Roll the tee upward 45-degrees as required to suit field conditions. F/J pipe spool between TEE and flanged 45-degree elbow. Spool length shall be determine dint he field to suit existing pipe alignments Michael B. Smith SFPDW/JDC/EME - 01/22/14. See attache hand written response.jt/WOVJ		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
U-0243	AWSS - Culvert at North West Corner of Beale and Mission Street	Closed	02/04/2014	02/14/2014	02/13/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: Turner Construction Com; Phil Militello				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Please refer to attached drawing MA-16 and attached photos. After trenching to remove the AWSS, M Squared exposed the 12-inch VCP sewer culvert on the NW corner of Beale & Mission street spanning from the catch basin to the sewer main. The joint was open by 4-inches and was covered in cardboard and duct tape. There was also a reverse flow on the pipe by 15 degrees. See attached photos and please advise.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please have M2 provide a quote to repair culvert break and to adjust pipe in order that there is a 1/4" per foot positive slope to the sewer main. The quote will be forwarded to SFPUC. Micahel B. Smith SFPDW/IDC/EME Answered on 02/12/14		
U-0244	AWSS - Gate Valve Vault at Sta 16+40 (West of Beale Street)	Closed	02/07/2014	02/17/2014	02/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: City and County of San Fr Michael Smith				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Chris Wallace							
REQUEST: See attached photos of conflicts with gate valve vault at Sta 16+40.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> This is Acceptable. Please coordinate site visit with Engineer and Bill		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3082 of 3091

Date: 06/17/2015

Time: 02:27 PM

Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>Due to the unforeseen utilities in place, M Squared cannot install the concrete vault around the gate valve at STA 16+40. In order to avoid delays to the project M Squared reached out to the engineer of record to bring this issue to his attention. See attached email chain.</p> <p>As it appears M Squared is directed to return to 1st Street and work east again; M Squared will be unable to build any structure around the gate valve at Sta 16+40. Due to the flip flop of the schedule we will not be able to tie in at this point for several months so we suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Install the gate valve at Sta 16+40 and direct bury the valve, leaving access to the gates with ductile risers and valve caps. FYI - these gates should not be opened anyway as the line will be out of commission during construction.- Re-excavate this gate valve when M Squared installs the pipe from Fremont St heading east and tie in the pipe to it then. In the interim M Squared will drive a sheet pile behind the gate valve and support it with a 1.5ton concrete block. This will prevent any gate valve movement.- As M Squared will be working their way from 1st St towards Beale Street, they should have several weeks in which to design some sort of modified manhole, custom sized vault in which to encase the valve. <p>Please advise if this is acceptable.</p>						
U-0245	AWSS - 1st Street Fire Hydrant Lateral Conflicts at Sta. 10+05	Closed	03/27/2014	04/06/2014	04/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Judith Long			
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST:		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Please refer to drawing MA-15 and attached M Squared sketch SK-TG04.2-069.				1. Please coordinate with the SFWD inspector to identify if the (e) SFWD line is abandoned. If abandoned, cut line as required.			
According to the plans the tee is to be rolled down, however the existing tee is rolled out flat and there are 2 x 45 degree elbows installed to raise the line over the existing brick sewer.				2. Furnish/Install 45 degree elbows as required to match (e) horizontal alignment.			
1. Due to existing utilities, the area is congested and has				3. Proceed as required following lateral South to identify usable lead joint to connect to (e) line. We			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3083 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	<p>very minimal access. M Squared will need SFWD to determine which water line is live and allow M Squared to remove the abandoned water main to provide more space here.</p> <p>M Squared is also unable to find a lead joint to connect the new pipe. M Squared has found, what appears to be some form of a repair coupling or sleeve on the existing line. There is one either side of the existing brick sewer main.</p> <p>2. Please advise how you would like M Squared to proceed. M Squared has already trenched 7-feet further south than is shown on the drawings.</p>						
U-0246	AWSS - Gate Valve Vault Locations at 1st Street and Fremont Street	Closed	03/27/2014	04/06/2014	04/01/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
	From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello					Answered By: Turner Construction Company Judith Long	
	Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley						
	REQUEST: Please refer to drawing MA-15, MA-16 and attached M Squared sketch SK-TG04.2-070.	SUGGESTION:	ANSWER:	Accept Suggestion:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<p>First Street:</p> <p>1. M Squared is able to install the gate valve and gate valve vault at the west side of 1st Street on Mission Street without impacting the new sidewalk expansion. The valve vault will be in the street and outside any sidewalk limits. The vault can be constructed once the street light conduit has been relocated. This work has already been coordinated with the City Street Lighting Division. Please advise on when the City will remove the conflict to install the gate valve/vault.</p> <p>Fremont Street (east side):</p> <p>2. See attached sketch. Due to the amount and location of existing utilities M Squared will be unable to install a gate valve vault of any kind at this location. It is also looking highly unlikely that M Squared will be able to install any gate valve at this location due to the utilities in the</p>						
						Response by Judy Long 3/28/2014	
						The contractor shall field investigate installing the 16" gate valve and reducers directly east of the tee serving Fremont Street. Install riser and 23 1/2" square AWSS manhole cover above gate valve operating nuts similar to 10" AWSS gate valve. Notify engineer of any conflicts to performing the above work, and for direction for riser and manhole support.	
						Michael B. Smith SFDPW/IDC/EME 03/28/14 Judy Long 3/28/2014	
						REVISED 4/1/2014:	
						Per Yesterday's coordination meeting with PG&E and Last night's site investigation by M2, there currently is no space to install a gate valve east of the main line tee at Fremont Street. In order to maintain water	



supply for SFFD, the contractor shall temporarily cap 16" tee on the east side until PG&E relocates conflicting duct banks. The contractor shall install 16" diam. nipple, 16" DI AWSS MJB flat cap and tie rods. Use steel spacers up against (e) 12" CI AWSS line. Have SFWD test completed line and place back into service.

Per Michael B. Smith SFDPW/IDC/EME on
04/01/2014

U-0247	AWSS - PG&E Utility Conflicts at Fremont Intersection	Closed	03/27/2014	04/06/2014	04/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc.		Jackson Tukuafu Aidan Foley	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Judith Long		
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing MA-16 and attached M Squared sketch SK-TG04.2-071. There are 3 duct banks exiting out of PG&E Vault #1669: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PG&E Duct bank #1 runs from 1st Street down Mission to Fremont Street and has been in our trench all that time. It has not encroached on the AWSS Main alignment and there is enough clearance from AWSS main most of that time. It has impacted excavation but should not pose too much of a problem for pipe installation. 2. PG&E Duct bank #2 sits on top of the existing 12" AWSS Main and runs directly on top of the AWSS Main for a large portion of the intersection. Due to this duct bank we are unable to excavate down to the AWSS Main, unable to remove pipe and will be unable to install new 16-inch AWSS. 3. PG&E Duct bank #3 runs underneath the existing 12" AWSS main, it is concrete encased and part of the concrete encasement encroaches onto the existing 12" AWSS Main. This duct bank appears to leave our trench after 10ft or so. Where duct bank #2 and duct bank #3 cross each other there is only 11-inch between the two duct banks. Not		SUGGESTION:	ANSWER: Judy Long 4/1/2014		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>		
					PG&E shall remove/relocate conflicting duct bank(s) as identified by the contractor in order to obtain the necessary working space and clearance as required to remove the (e) AWSS pipe and install the (n) pipe. PG&E shall demo portions of their electrical vaults that were constructed on the (e) AWSS pipe.		
					Currently should the (e) CI AWSS be compromised, the SFWD would not be able to even access the fire fighting line due to the three conflicting PG&E duct banks surrounding the AWSS pipe. City Standards call for a minimum 12" separation for utilities being installed in the proximity of the AWSS line.		
					Michael Smith 4/1/2014		
					Response by Judy Long		



<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0248	AWSS - Restraints at the Intersection of Mission and Fremont St.	Open	06/04/2014	06/14/2014		Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc.		Lynn Kowallis Aidan Foley		To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By:	
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing MA-16 and M Squared Sketch-TG04.2-072.1 and TG04.2-072.2. Question #1 - Does every joint between the new GV west of Fremont Street, and the new 16"x10" tee in Fremont Street intersection need to be restrained with bell & stop collars? This distance is approx. 50ft. Question #2 - Currently there does not appear to be enough space to install the new 16" pipe WITH bell & stop collars through the utilities in the Fremont St intersection. There does appear to be space to install 16" pipe without the stop/bell collars on. - Our suggestion would be to install the 16"x10" tee and restrain that tee on one joint heading east. Install piping across the Fremont St intersection without stop/bell collars, delete the 16" GV at that location (we believe we will not be able to fit one anyway), and tie off the last piece of pipe coming into the hydrant tee east of Fremont Street. Please clarify if this is acceptable.		SUGGESTION:		ANSWER:		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3086 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0249	AWSS - Hydrant Location at Fremont St.	Closed	06/23/2014	07/03/2014	07/10/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Judith Long				
REQUEST: Please refer to drawing MA-15 and attached M2 sketch SK-TG04.2-073. 1. Please confirm that it is acceptable to install the new hydrant at Fremont St. (Location #4, STA 12+50), 31" from face of concrete (FOC) at approx. STA. 7+15 on drawing MA-16. The revised location is a result of various conflict in the vicinity that prevent the hydrant from being installed as shown on MA-15. 2. Due to the 10" main being relatively deep, additional fittings will be required to install the hydrant at the revised location (STA 7+15). Please confirm it is acceptable to install the hydrant as shown in the attached sketch SK-TG04.2-073.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Judy Long 7/7/2014 Per our conversation on 7/7/14 with M2, the contractor shall investigate the use of using a hydrant riser and no elevation changes for lateral piping. by: Michael B. Smith SFDPW/IDC/EME, dated 7/7/14		
U-0249.1	AWSS - Hydrant on Fremont Street	Closed	09/10/2014	09/20/2014	09/11/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Judith Long				
REQUEST: Per response to RFI U-0249, M Squared last night investigated the use of a hydrant riser. It appears that a 24" hydrant riser will be possible in this situation. Please confirm the use of the 24" riser.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> The installation of a 24" hydrant riser is acceptable to set the hydrant at the required elevation. Michael B. Smith SFDPW/IDC/EME dated 9/11/14		
U-0250	AWSS - Hydrant Lateral Connection at STA 13+75 (MA-16)	Closed	06/23/2014	07/03/2014	07/08/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Judith Long				
REQUEST: Please refer to attached excerpt drawing MA-16 and M2 sketch SK-TG04.2-074. The piping on this lateral is partially encased in the 3x5 sewer and appears to be ductile iron from 5 ft north of the 3x5 sewer heading south to the hydrant location. Please confirm that it is acceptable to weld lugs on the			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Judy Long 7/7/2014 This piping layout for the AWSS Hydrant lateral to suit field conditions is acceptable. By: Michael B. Smith SFDPW/ICD/EME, dated 7/7/14		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG
30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3087 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-0251	AWSS - Valve Vault Conflict at Fremont Street	Closed	09/16/2014	09/26/2014	09/18/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc.		Claude Titche Aidan Foley	To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello		Answered By: Turner Construction Company Judith Long		
REQUEST: See attached photos. The location for the gate valve on Mission Street, east of Fremont Street is in conflict with the piping on the hydrant lateral. The valve cannot be placed any further west due to the street light and traffic signal conduits. Moving it further west would also put the vault within the new curb return that is planned as part of the previously discussed sidewalk expansions project on Mission Street.		SUGGESTION: Relocate the hydrant lateral piping away from the vault location. Domestic fire hydrant location to remain the same.		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Relocate SFWD low pressure fire hydrant lateral piping as required to install new SFWD AWSS gate valve and valve vault. The contractor shall coordinate with SFWD and perform relocation work as approved by SFWD. Michael B. Smith SFDPW/IDC/EME dated: 9/18/14			



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3088 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<i>Number</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Created</i>	<i>Date Required</i>	<i>Date Answered</i>	<i>Cost Impact</i>	<i>Proceed</i>
U-0252	AWSS - 10inch Lead Joint on Fremont St	Closed	10/03/2014	10/13/2014	10/06/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: City and County of San Fr Michael Smith				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: See attached sketch. The existing lead joint (outside contract scope) is leaking. It appears that the pressure of the string back pulling on the lead has caused the lead to leak. Our crews have excavated further north and exposed more of the existing main to allow our plumber to repack the lead joint. In doing so we discovered ears on the existing pipe approx. 3ft north of the lead joint. Our suggestion is to repack the lead joint and tie back the adaptor to the ears on the existing pipe. In eliminating the strong back we will be eliminating the pressure on the repacked joint. Please confirm you are in agreement with our suggestion.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please proceed as suggested above. Spare strong back shall be delivered to the San Francisco Water Department at the close of the project.		
U-0253	AWSS - Valve Vault West of Fremont St	Closed	10/10/2014	10/20/2014	10/14/2014	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Claude Titcher To: Turner Construction Company Phil Militello			Answered By: City and County of San Fr Michael Smith				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Following on from [previous discussion and previous correspondence, M Squared would like to clarify the issue with the gate valve vault on Mission St west of Fremont St. Due to the presence of 2 duct banks and a gas main, no vault will be possible at this gate valve location. M Squared proposes to perform the same modifications as was performed west of Beale St. See attached Please confirm that this is how we are to proceed.			SUGGESTION:		ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Please proceed with the construction of valve boxes for the main/bypass valves for this particular location due to adjacent utility conflicts.		



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3089 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
U-182.5	Tie Back Requirements on 2nd Street	Closed	06/21/2013	07/01/2013	06/27/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
REQUEST: See attached email from EOR. M Squared has returned the 45deg bends to SFWD, and in turn we have procured 22deg bends for this location. As a result we must now replace and tie back a minimum of 18ft of new 10" Ductile Iron Pipe. As the existing 10" pipes are 12ft lengths we will have to remove 24ft (2 lengths) of pipe to expose the closest possible bell. Please confirm this is the intention.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW) "Our response followed standard design practices for restraining AWSS pipe at elbows." Signed and Dated (see attached)				
U-204	AWSS - Compromised Lead Joint on Howard Street	Closed	06/15/2012	06/25/2012	06/18/2012	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author:			Answered By: Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel				
REQUEST: Please reference the attached COMM0999 provided to TCCO on Friday, June 6, 2012. As outlined in M Squared's letter dated 6/8/12, M Squared realigned the AWSS main on Howard Street and repacked the lead joints (time card attached for reference). During the Hydrostatic Test by SFWD, the lead joint leaked and failed to hold the test eventhough it was repacked. As a result, it has become apparent that the AWSS joints have been compromised. Please provide direction on how M Squared is to proceed the with next course of action.			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Thiel 6/18/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "The Contractor shall remove two (2) additional 12' sections of (E) cast iron pipe on the East end of the horizontal offset. F/I ductile iron pipe with restraints at all joints except for the MJxGH adaptor fitting. Pour new lead joint at Ctel." Signed and Dated 6/18/12.				
U-221	AWSS - Pipe Joints in Utility Vaults	Void	01/31/2013	02/10/2013	02/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome			To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch				
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley			Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu				
REQUEST: Per recent field direction provided by the City inspector to M Squared Construction, where possible no joints are permitted inside utility vaults (i.e PGE, ATT) This will require an additional restraint joint at each vault			SUGGESTION: ANSWER: Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/> See U-0221				



Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

Page: 3090 of 3091
Date: 06/17/2015
Time: 02:27 PM
Job: 30100

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
	location.						
	Please confirm this is the intent.						
U-222	AWSS - Flanged Spools for Hydrants	Void	01/31/2013	02/10/2013	02/06/2013	Potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>
From: Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome		To: Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch		Answered By: Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu			
Co-Author: M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley							
REQUEST: Reference Drawings: MA-14 & MA-15 Hydrant at Sta 6+30 Contract drawings show the 45deg bend being connected directly to the rolled down tee. However the hydrant lateral is much lower than the main and it will not be possible to connect them directly together. Hydrant at Sta 9+00 Due to the changes per RFI U-190 M Squared are to install the new fire hydrant in the same location as the existing, in the breezeway. As a result the new hydrant lateral will be higher than the newly installed main (the grade of the main being dictated by various utility conflicts). Please confirm M squared's suggested mediation is how M squared is to proceed.		SUGGESTION: Hydrant at Sta 6+30 Suggestion - custom fabricate a HPW flanged x flanged spool for to connect to the tee and the 45deg bend. Hydrant at Sta 9+00 Suggestion - In order to connect the tee to the 90deg bend a HPW flanged x flanged spool, custom fabricated will be necessary.		ANSWER: see U-0222		Accept Suggestion: <input type="checkbox"/>	

*PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG*

30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

<u>Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date Created</u>	<u>Date Required</u>	<u>Date Answered</u>	<u>Cost Impact</u>	<u>Proceed</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------

END OF REPORT

Report Parameters

Project:	30100	Status Class:	
Sent To:		Run Date:	06/17/2015
Restrict Value of:	C	Run Time:	02:27 PM
From Date:	01/01/2009	Operator:	JNELSON
To Date:	06/17/2015	Report Code:	PM3012
Status:			