# Exhibit M

Request and Answers Log

# Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

## *PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG*

## 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

| *Number* | *Subject* | *Status* | *Date Created* | *Date Required* | *Date Answered* | *Cost Impact* | *Proceed* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **T-0001** | **Article 6 Changes in Work - Clarification** | **Closed** | **10/11/2010** | **10/25/2010** | **11/03/2010** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Spec Section 00 07 00, Article 6 - Clarifications and Changes in Work

Article 6 in the General Condition specification section 00 07 00 defines the procedure for changes in work. The procedures defined throughout Article 6 are conflicting. According to section 6.01.A, CM/GC shall promptly comply and proceed with changes issued by the TJPA in the form of a Change Order or Field Order. Section 6.02.B states that the TJPA will respond to RFI's with written Clarification deemed necessary and consistent with the Contract Documents or a Field Order requiring minor changes in work. Per section 6.01.A, the CM/GC is to proceed with the Field Order immediately. However, according to section 6.03.A, CM/GC shall submit a Change Order Request within 21 days of written directive. Please advise if the CM/GC is to proceed with changes promptly and prior to approval or if the CM/GC shall receive approval prior to proceeding with any changed Work.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

00 07 00 - 6.01.A specifies that, "TJPA may..order additions, deletions, or revisions in the Work by Change Order or Field Order, CM/GC shall promptly comply with such orders and proceed with the Work,.." [emphasis added]. Under paragraph 6.02.B, TJPA may issue a Field Order in response to an RFI submitted by CM/GC. Under paragraph 6.03A, the CM/GC must submit a COR within 21 days if in the opinion of the CM/GC, the Field Order is considered to be a Change to the Contract.

Therefore, TJPA expects the CM/GC promptly to proceed with Work as may be clarified or directed through a Field Order, unless instructed otherwise. CM/GC has the recourse of submitting a COR when appropriate to do so, within the time limit stipulated. To avoid confusion, TJPA's Field Orders will clearly state whether the CM/GC is required to carry out the instruction promptly. Nevertheless, the CM/GC shall whenever possible incorporate a Field Order directive into the Work with minimal disruption to the planned sequence of activities.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **T-0002** | **Transit Center Building Address Clarification** | **Closed** | **10/20/2010** | **11/03/2010** | **10/28/2010** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please clarify the building address for the Transbay Transit Center. This is required to complete our site specific Click Safety program, complete insurance documents, etc.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

425 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94105

Answered by Alfred Lau
TJPA (PMPC)
10/28/2010

Constructware RFI #T-0003

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **T-0003** | **301 Mission Wall Specification Format** | **Closed** | **11/17/2010** | **12/01/2010** | **11/23/2010** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet: C-0001 issued 11/04/10; 301 Mission Interim Screen Wall - General Notes

We are in the process of preparing submittals for this project. In doing so we would like to know what specification division format would be most appropriate for us to submit and track these project documents. Please provide us with the desired specification division format as soon as possible so that our submittals can be processed with the proper efficiency.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

All submittals for the 301 Mission Interim Screen Wall shall be submitted
under the new CSI Division, "301 Mission Interim Screen Wall," that has been
created and is available in Constructware under Transit Center Building
(140). Within CSI Division "301 Mission Interim Screen Wall," there is a list
of available "spec sections" that are equal to the drawing sheet number (and
paragraph heading as applicable) that the submittal is called out on.
If there are multiple "spec sections" on one sheet, the suffix ".X" has been
added. For example, "S-0001.5 Concrete and Reinforcing" shall contain all
submittals found on sheet S-0001 under the heading "Concrete and
Reinforcing."
If there is no suffix , the description of the spec is simply the title of the
drawing.

---

**T-0004** **Transbay Project Signs** **Closed** **12/01/2010** **12/15/2010** **12/03/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Spec Section: 01 15 01

Webcor/Obayashi is initiating project sign procurement per Spec 01 15 01 and will require the artwork and locations for four 4x8 post mounted signs. What are required graphics/logo's for sign fabrication and where shall each sign be located.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Graphics for Project ID Signs specified per 01 15 01 will be issued to CMGC as soon as the names for mayor and SFCTA Board members are confirmed in early January, 2011. Information for locations will be issued prior to installation.

---

**T-0004.1** **Transbay Project Signs** **Closed** **04/01/2011** **04/11/2011** **04/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference: RFI T-0004
Spec Section: 01 15 01

Response to RFI T-0004 read "Graphics for Project ID Signs specified per 01 15 01 will be issued to CMGC as soon as the names for mayor and SFCTA Board members are confirmed in early January, 2011. Information for locations will be issued prior to installation."

In a follow up to this RFI, Webcor/Obayashi's is initiating project sign procurement and will require the artwork and locations for four 4x8 post mounted signs. What are required graphics/logo's for sign fabrication and where shall each sign be located.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unfortunately that the name for one of the TJPA Board seat (PJP seat) is still not confirmed at this time, and it may be at least another month before that can be resolved. TJPA/PMPC will ensure this issue is resolved as expedited as possible and inform the Contractor immediately after the information is anounced.

---

**T-0005** **Incorporation of Trade Subcontractor Schedule Submittals** **Closed** **12/03/2010** **12/13/2010** **12/07/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jim Tomaszewski **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Jim Coughlin

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Spec Section: 01 13 10 & 01 1310

For TJPA convenience W/O requests that Trade Subcontractor Schedules (Section 01 13 10, 1.2.B) be incorporated into the Monthly Schedule Report (Section 01 13 10, 1.5.A) for the month following issuance of NTP for the specified trade package. A detailed section of the Narrative will be clearly identified and contain all of the narrative requirements of Section 01 13 10, 1.2.B.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Spec Section 01 13 10, 1.2.B will be revised to relax the requirement to include a schedule narrative in the first schedule submittal that is due 15 days after award. However, the 15 day requirement to submit a construction schedule will remain. Spec Section 01 13 10, 1.5.D will also be revised to clarify the requirements of the schedule narrative

---

**T-0006** **301 Mission Wall Plywood Wall Barrier Proposal** **Closed** **12/08/2010** **12/18/2010** **12/17/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: C-5000 and attached sketch

During the Fremont Shoring/301 Mission Wall Coordination Meeting on 12-7-10, it was proposed that a

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Plywood barrier wall be erected in lieu of the triton barrier as agreed to in the meeting with Millennium Partners. The 8' tall plywood barrier wall shall be constructed in segments such that it can be pushed

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

plywood barrier wall be erected in lieu of the triton barrier shown on sheet C-5000 of the 301 Mission Street Interim Screen Wall drawings. This plywood barrier will block the view of the 301 Mission tenants and will allow for the early demolition of the existing screen wall (prior to the construction of the new "interim" screen wall). By doing this it will enable the demolition contractor to start the removal of the deep footings earlier than currently scheduled.

In addition, the deletion of the triton barrier will provide approximately 2' of additional driveway width for 301 Mission. Please review the attached preliminary sketch of the above mentioned plywood barrier and provide engineering/architectural comments and mark ups.

against the new screen wall at the end of each week to accommodate parking. While in position during working hours it will be mechanically fastened to the pavers and to the structure on the back side in order to prevent it from overturning. The exterior face of the wall will be painted "jet mist" to match the existing wall stone. Pilasters will also be painted on the plywood to match the stucco on the existing wall.

W-O will submit a dimensioned sketch drawing with plan, elevation and bracing details to be submitted by your subcontractor once he has completed design and before he begins construction.

---

**T-0007** **Field Order #2 - Issued for Programwide** **Closed** **12/08/2010** **12/18/2010** **12/13/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

According to today's OAC meeting, the documents issued with FO#W0-002 are intended for project-wide review and not exclusively for the "BSE Contract" as stated in the Field Order. Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

All Field Orders issued by TJPA and TJPA Representative to CM/GC in accordance with 00 07 00 are for the complete scope performed by CM/GC. It is CM/GC¿s responsibility to direct the requirements to the appropriate trade subcontractors. WO-002 has been re-issued as WO-002R1 on 09DEC2010 with appropriate language to clarify this issue.

---

**T-0008** **Specification Section 00 04 82 Cert. of Bidder Regarding Debarment and Suspensi** **Closed** **12/08/2010** **12/18/2010** **12/10/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per the TJPA, specification section 00 04 82, Certification of Bidder Regarding Debarment and Suspension, shall no

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Section 00 04 82 ¿ Certification of Bidder Regarding Debarment and Suspension reflects the City

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

longer be used. Please confirm.

If this is in fact true, please confirm this section will be removed from the project specifications.

procurement requirement. With the current project funding arrangement, meeting USDOT procurement is needed, Section 00 08 13/APA - 25 ¿ Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters will be used in lieu of 00 04 82, and 00 04 82 will be deleted per Field Order WO-01, which is expected to be issued this week.

---

**T-0009** **301 Mission Wall Storage Location for Planter Boxes of 301 Mission Wall** **Closed** **12/10/2010** **12/20/2010** **12/13/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: 301 Mission Interim Screen Wall Drawings Sheet C-1000

On sheet C-1000, there is a note for the (E) Planter boxes that says "(e) precast planter box (typ) to be remove and stored". Please designate a location for storing the (E) planter boxes.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The planter boxes are to be stored for re-use in front of the final screen wall. The timing of construction for the final wall needs to be after the train box is complete, but does not have to wait until the new Transbay Terminal is open for bus operations. Millennium did not agree to providing storage on their property.

Please provide for space on Lot M to store the boxes and inform the contractor accordingly.

---

**T-0009.1** **301 Mission Wall Storage Location for Planter Boxes of 301 Mission Wall** **Closed** **12/17/2010** **12/27/2010** **12/29/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In Transworld's review of the existing planter box condition at the 301 Mission Screen Wall, Transworld's viewpoint after close inspection of the site is that the planter boxes were originally installed with the intent of being permenant fixtures. There are connection points for these planter boxes that appear to be initial anchor points for original

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The intent is to salvage and store these boxes in lieu of replacing them with new ones. Per Contract Drawing C-2000 Contractor is to cut and cap all existing irrigation and electrical lines feeding planter boxes. Contractor can remove plants and dirt if needed to uncover and remove anchorage, then

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

placement of these fixtures and there is concern that these planter boxes were never intended to be reinstalled/relocated after the initial installation. With all do skill and care, Transworld intends to relocate these planter boxes with mininmal damage. As a point of advisement, since these boxes do not appear to be designed for relocation, Transworld is concerned that such action will render these boxes unuseful. Please confirm that the design is to relocate these boxes in lieu of replacing them with new ones.

salvage precast planter boxes.

---

**T-0010** **EPA Permit Number** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/16/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay Joint Powers Au Edmond Sum

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please confirm the EPA permit number is CAR000197558.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed, the EPA identification number to use on waste manifests for the Transit Center construction is CAR 000197558. The site address is 425 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94105. The generator and primary contact is Edmond Sum, Engineering Manager, with the Transbay Joint Powers Authority.

---

**T-0011** **301 Mission Wall Waterproofing Submittal** **Closed** **12/21/2010** **12/31/2010** **12/29/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Regarding the waterproofing submittal, since the driveway is still covered with pavers the existing material and application procedure is unknown to Transworld. Therefore a submittal which matches the existing condition can not be provided until Transworld knows additional information. Please confirm that it is acceptable to defer the waterproofing submittal until after the material is exposed and the existing waterproofing material and application method is determined or provide the specific type of

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed: Webcor-Obayashi/Transworld can defer the waterproofing submittal until after the material is exposed and the existing waterproofing material and application method is determined.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

material and application method required.

---

**T-0012** **301 Mission Wall - Requesting Specifications for Utility Plug** **Closed** **12/21/2010** **12/31/2010** **01/04/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: 301 Mission Wall Drawings sheet C-5000

There is not enough information to determine the material and dimensions for the utility plug at the 301 Mission Wall. Please provide specifications and product data for the "Utility Plug" on sheet C-5000, sheet note 5.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contractor to determine dimensions of temporary plug in the field and propose material appropriate to meet the requirements specified in note 5 on sheet C-5000.

---

**T-0013** **BSE IFC Table of Contents Discrepancy** **Closed** **01/05/2011** **01/15/2011** **01/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref IFC TOC dated 12/15/10 (attached)

We have received the revised Issued for Construction (IFC) drawings and specifications for the BSE package. The table of contents has check marks to indicate added specification sections. Specification section 02 41 19, Pile Removal is not noted with a check mark but a revised specification was issued. The excavation and backfilll (31 23 10) section was not re-issued, however, a check mark is next to it.

Also, the revision logs at the end of each section need to be revised to show only the revision number and dates.

Please advise and re-issue.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

1. 00 01 10 Rev 3 and 00 01 15 were released to W/O on 07JAN2011, rectifying issues cited in the RFI.

2. Since it is TJPA/PMPC's opinion that the formatting of the revision box for the technical sections is adequate and appropriate as is. Change to match the abbreviated version of the Div. 00 and 01 sections should be formally requested by W/O such that Design Team and TJPA/PMPC could fully review that and agreed to from a QA/QC point of view.

---

**T-0014** **TG03 BSE IFC Drawing Set** **Closed** **01/06/2011** **01/16/2011** **01/07/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

We received multiple versions of PDF Drawings G-0000, A-0000, A-0005, and A-0010 (see the attached images) for TG03 IFC Drawing Set.
Please confirm the following answer from PMPC via email on 1/5/2011.
"Use the 1/3/2011 CD for the PDF files. Use the 1/4/2011 CD for the DWG and DWF files. Disregard the PDFs on the 1/4/2011 CD."

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirm that "Use the 1/3/2011 CD for the PDF files. Use the 1/4/2011 CD for
the DWG and DWF files. Disregard the PDFs on the 1/4/2011 CD."

---

**T-0015** **301 Mission Wall - Concrete Mix Design** **Closed** **01/07/2011** **01/17/2011** **01/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached submittal package TG1901-001 review comments and letter from concrete supplier

Per the comments received on the concrete mix design submitted in submittal package TG1901-001, please confirm that the admixture for air entrainment shall be compliant with ASTM C260.

Transworld has been informed by their concrete supplier that ASTM C260 requires a mix of 6% air entrainment and such amounts of air entrainment are specified only in freeze/thaw areas for durability. The Bay Area is generally not considered a freeze/thaw area and therefore a mix with 6% air entrainment is not typically used. The concrete supplier, Bode Concrete, has provided a letter from BASF related to this specific issue.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Comply with contract documents "Concrete and Reinforcing" Note number 6 on Sheet S-0001, which states:

"Maximum water/cement ratio shall not exceed 0.45 by weight, slump shall be two to six (2"-6") inches. A water reducer or superplasticizer may be added on site after the slump is verified by inspector. Entrained Air: 6% +/- 1-1/2% for durability."

---

**T-0016** **BSE - Current Trainbox Structural Drawings** **Closed** **01/14/2011** **01/24/2011** **01/18/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

In order to accurately design and locate elements of the bracing, trestle and bridges, please provide the most up-to-date and reliable architectural and structural drawings

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See Issued for Construction - Buttress/Shoring/Excavation documents dated 12/10/10.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

(including cad files). Also, drawings (including CAD files) of the train box and any other component of the transit center that has the potential to conflict with the BSE scope of work.

---

**T-0017** **BSE - CDSM Wall Alignment** **Closed** **01/14/2011** **01/24/2011** **01/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

The response to pre-bid RFI #177 indicated that the CDSM shoring line alignment is expected to change "prior to installation". We request the revised re-alignment be provided to us as soon as possible. We are currently designing and issuing steel mill orders based on the current alignment. If the revision comes after mill orders are finalized we risk missing our rolling schedule thereby losing our bid date pricing.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per TJPA's direction, the Trainbox plan and extent have been modified at the Southwest corner of the site. See the attached sketch SKGT-0001-R1, that show the revised shoring wall alignment.
For your reference, see the attached structural sketches that indicate the revised in-progress Trainbox structural columns and shearwalls that will be issued for construction in the future. These sketches are: SKS -0088 Foundation Level - Zone 02 Plan Phase 1, SKS- 0089 Foundation Level - Zone 03 Plan Phase 1, SKS-0090 Foundation Level - Zone 07 Plan Phase 1, SKS-0091 Foundation Level - Zone 10 Plan Phase 1, and SKS-0092 Lower Concourse Level - Partial Plans Phase 1.

---

**T-0017.1** **BSE - CDSM South Wall Alignment Construction Drawings** **Closed** **09/22/2011** **10/02/2011** **10/04/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI T-0017 and attached Sketches

Please confirm the attached sketches issued and approved with CR T-005B are "For Construction" and the notes indicating "draft in progress" and "not for regulatory approval, permitting or construction" will be removed on a future issuance of these sheets.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The sketches attached to previous RFI's reflect the confirmed CDSM shoring alignment.

Text indicating "draft in progress" and "not for regulatory approval, permitting or construction" shall not be transferred to revised "Issued for Construction" drawings.

Documents that are included in Change Orders shall

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

be considered a Contract Document.

---

**T-0018** **BSE - Waler to CDSM Wall spacing** **Closed** **01/14/2011** **01/24/2011** **01/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

There may be a potential conflict with the walers and the train box reinforcement. Spec 31-55-00 allows 6" minimum spacing from CDSM Wall to face of waler, but based upon Balfour Beatty past experience with a very similar situation, it is felt that the 6" space is not sufficient because of the following:

1. There does not appear to be enough room between the bottom of the waler and the CJ for a lap splice of the vertical reinforcing as depicted on sheet S -3201. Reference the attached drawing.
2. The 6" gap is difficult to snake reinforcement through without damaging the waterproofing attached to the wall.

BBI recommends making the space between the face of the CDSM wall and the waler equal to the wall thickness. This would eliminate conflicts with the rebar and walers, reduce reinforcement splicing and reinforcing congestion.

Additionally attached is an example where the space behind the waler was equal to the wall thickness.

Please advise whether to continue the design with the current 6" minimum space or advise if the space increases.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Thornton Tomasetti Response: It is permissible to use mechanical couplers for the vertical reinforcement interrupted by the whaler for the condition where whaler is 6" min away from CDSM wall.
The proposed increase in whaler to CDSM wall spacing concept is acceptable by TT regarding the Trainbox wall, pending Arup's evaluation/comments. Submit details of revised scheme for review.
ARUP Response: The design team cannot comment on the impact of the Contractor's proposal, without seeing more details of the shoring wall internal bracing system and associated proposed details.
Adamson Associates Response: The proposal cannot be evaluated based on the limited documents submitted. However, it appears that the bracing and attachments shown in the drawing attached to this RFI will need to be modified to allow for the waterproofing system to be appropriately installed as the Wale system is removed.

---

**T-0019** **301 Mission Wall - Stone Panel Anchorage to 301 Mission's Screen Wall** **Closed** **01/18/2011** **01/28/2011** **01/31/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached pages from the 2008 Building Code

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Proposed anchorage system can not be evaluated

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

After removing stone panels in the demolition of the original 301 Mission Wall, the existing system of the stone panels does not utilize an anchoring system for mounting the stone panels to the wall. In addition, section 6.2.2.4 of the 2008 Building code does not specify mechanical fasteners for masonry less than 2-5/8" thick. The stone thickness used on the new wall will match the thickness of the existing, which is approx 10mm thick. Therefore, according to section 6.3 of the 2008 Building Code, the stone panel system for the Transbay Interim Screen Wall that should be used is the adhesion application.

Please confirm that Transworld can use the adhered method for the stone panels in lieu of mechanical fasteners.

prior to inspection of the retained stone sample.

Please provide retained samples of stone from the demolished 301 Mission Street Screen Wall in order to confirm dimensions of the existing stone and evaluate proposed anchorage system.

---

**T-0019.1** **301 Mission Wall - Stone Panel Anchorage to 301 Mission's Screen Wall** **Closed** **02/07/2011** **02/17/2011** **02/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: RFI T-0019 and attached photos

RFI T-0019 requested samples of stone from the demolished 301 Mission Street Screen Wall in order to verify thickness of the stone that will be used on the wall, and confirm that a mechanical system had not been used to mount the stone. A sample has been shown to URS and pictures of that sample are attached to this RFI. Please confirm that mechanically fastened panels are not necessary and that a thin set adhesive application will be an acceptable means to setting the stone on the new screen wall.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Mechanical fastening of matching stone panels is not required. Location of face of stone as shown on A-6000 detail D is a contract requirement. Please provide complete detailing of proposed attachment of stone and how the location of the face of stone will be achieved using thinset.

---

**T-0020** **BSE - Demo Contract Shoring Wall and Bracing** **Closed** **01/27/2011** **02/07/2011** **02/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2203 and Specification Section 02 41 01

The BSE contract drawings shows a temporary shoring and bracing that is installed by the demo contract and subsequently removed by the BSE contract. In order for Balfour Beatty to properly plan their work, they request the following information:

1 - The shoring design drawings for the shoring wall on the east side of Fremont St. (shown on D-2203) that was submitted by the Demo Contractor.

2 - As-built location of the above mentioned shoring wall.

3 - Bracing drawings and details that submitted for the basement wall rakers that are schematically shown on detail 1 of sheet D-5100 and details 1 & 2 on sheet D-5102

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

1 - Approved Shop Drawings Submital #312000-01.3 - Interim Shoring Wall REV 3 will be transmitted through Constructware today 2/2/11.

2 - Wall is currently being constructed in the location indicated on the approved shop drawings.

3 - Bracing drawings are not currently available for transmission. They will be transmitted to W/O when available.

---

**T-0021** **BSE - Existing Unknown Concrete Wall** **Closed** **01/27/2011** **02/07/2011** **02/04/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**REQUEST:**

Reference Drawing Set D and Specification Section 02 41 01

Based upon Balfour Beatty observations of the site, there appears to be a concrete wall approximately 18in wide that is outside of the existing terminal basement walls adjacent to the 301 Mission Property line and the east side of Fremont St. that is not shown on BSE contract drawings or the existing Terminal drawings.

Does this wall continue around the entire perimeter of the Zone 4 basement?

Will this wall be removed by the demo contract prior to BSE NTP #02?

Please provide as-builts of the wall location if is to remain.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Full extent of unforeseen concrete foundation wall not confirmed.

Existing Terminal and Ramps Demolition Project contractor (EBI) has been directed to remove extents of unforeseen foundation wall that are within limits of removal as shown in contract documents to a depth consistent with removal of adjacent structures (pile caps/footings).

Portion of unforeseen concrete foundation wall within Fremont Street to remain in place. Portions of unforeseen concrete foundation wall that are exposed but that are to remain in place are to be documented via as-builts. As-builts will be provided as completed.

Existence of similar walls in Zone 2 and 3 not

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Does a similar wall exist around the basement walls in Zone 2 and 3?

confirmed. Attached San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, Department of Trinagulation and Surveys, San Francisco Topography Maps dated August 1934 (pages 27-32) are the best available information at this time and have been provided for your information.

---

**T-0021.1** **BSE - As Built Location of Concrete Foundation Wall Along Fremont St.** **Closed** **03/01/2011** **03/11/2011** **03/15/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0021 (BBI #005) and Drawing Set D

Please provide BBII with as-built locations of the unforeseen concrete foundation wall within Fremont Street which is to remain in place. Please also provide as-built locations for the soldier pile & tie back wall which parallels Fremont Street adjacent to the Buttress. BBII and BECHO want to confirm that there is enough room for their equipment to drill the Buttress Shafts along Fremont Street, and to identify any potential conflicts.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Portion of unforeseen concrete foundation wall within Fremont Street to remain in place as shown on attached. The attached San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, Department of Triangulation and Surveys, San Francisco Topography Maps dated August 1934 are the best available information at this time were provided in RFI T-0021 Rev.0. This is believed to be existing concrete full basement wall extending under the sidewalks remaining from pre Transbay factory/businesses.

As-Built Fremont St. Shoring wall installed by Evans Bros/Malcolm Inc. the soldier pile and tie back wall is also attached. Survey points for the I-Beams was previously transmitted to Webcor-Obayashi Transmittal No. 140-00650.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0022 | Quality Management System - Org. Chart | Closed | 01/28/2011 | 02/07/2011 | 02/08/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Jim Coughlin

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref - Attached Org. Chart

Please identify the appropriate personnel associated with the attached org. chart found the in the program Quality Management System.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

A revised PMPC organization chart is with TJPA for review. However, I don't understand why this is an RFI. What W/O activity requires this information? The organization chart in the QMS is deliberately generic (titles only) and we have no intention of changing it.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0023 | Construction Manager Quality Plan | Closed | 01/31/2011 | 02/10/2011 | 02/07/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Bob Garcia **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Page 30 Paragraph 8.5.5 of the QMS manual makes reference to "the construction management consultant's quality plan". Please advise when the Construction Managers Quality Plan for the TTC will be issued?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contractually - the Draft Quality Plan from CMO Construction Manager Oversight is due 2/14/11. Final Quality Plan is due 3/28/11.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0024 | Re-bracing for Revised SW Corner Alignment | Closed | 02/02/2011 | 02/11/2011 | 02/11/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-1112 and Specification Section 31 55 00

The response to RFI T-0017 showed a revised CDSM wall alignment at the SW corner of zone 1 and the addition of the structural shear walls on wall X1-1. The RFI response implied that BBII's cross-lot bracing needed to be re-designed so there are no conflicts with the concrete columns and shear walls. In order to minimize the cost and impacts as a result of this change, BBII suggests using rakers for the re-bracing in this corner.

The cross lot bracing would be installed as specified for the initial excavation (ref stage 10 on GT-1112) similar to the layout shown on the attached sketch #1.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The use of rakers as rebracing is acceptable provided the design criteria specified in the construction

documents is satisfied. This includes, but is not limited to, the bracing stiffness requirements. The

effective stiffness of the rakers will be affected by the stiffness of the permanent train box wall and

mat slab and tiedowns.

The response to this RFI must include input from Thornton Tomasetti regarding the impact on the

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Then for the re-bracing stage 12 and stage 15 rakers could be used in locations shown in attachment sketch #2.

Would a design based on this concept be acceptable?

If not, BBII is available and willing to brainstorm additional ideas.

permanent structural elements.

As discussed at the Feb 9, 2011 TG03 BSE Subcontractor - Design Team Coordination Meeting, it

may be possible to reduce the requirement for rebracing if the permanent trainbox shear walls can

be built sequentially and their construction coordinated with the removal of struts. Arup suggests a

meeting with Arup, the Contractor, and Thornton Tomasetti as this requires an understanding of the

proposed construction sequence and an evaluation of the permanent structural elements.

Thornton Tomasetti (TT) Response: We have review the response by Arup, and found this is consistent with our prior discussion with Arup. No further comment from TT is needed.

---

**T-0025** **BSE - Request for Recent Groundwater Monitoring Data** **Closed** **02/02/2011** **02/12/2011** **02/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 55 00 and GDR Table 7-2 (attached)

The Project GDR table 7-2 shows the last GW level reading in Feb of 2010. Can BBII receive a copy of any readings taken within the last year?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See attached T0025-SK01 for groundwater readings.

---

**T-0026** **301 Mission Wall - Sample chip of paint color for exposed concrete** **Closed** **02/07/2011** **02/17/2011** **02/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference: A-5000 note 6

Note 6 on sheet A-5000 states, "Color of paint for exposed concrete to match sample chip provided by TJPA representative". Please provide color sample chip per this note.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Omit note 6 on sheet A-5000. Color of paint for exposed concrete wall shall match color of paint provided on existing exposed planter boxes.

---

**T-0027** **301 Mission Screen Wall - Dowels for Screen Wall** **Closed** **02/08/2011** **02/18/2011** **02/18/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached pictures

Upon laying out the dowel embedment locations for the new concrete wall, the locations are very close to the edge of the existing manholes and vault lids. Transworld is concerned that the location of the doweling is too close to these existing items and does not believe it to be the intent. Please see attached pictures showing the areas of concern. Please respond ASAP with direction on where to place the dowels, as Transworld has no slack in the schedule to accomodate any stoppage of work.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The final condition for the dowels drilled into the 301 Mission existing basement perimeter wall is shown on attached sketch. Dowels shall be drilled 6 inches from exterior face of existing basement perimeter wall. Verify location of existing basement perimeter wall prior to drilling. These dowels remain within 1 inch of centerline of the new concrete wall.

See attached RFI coordination sketch.

---

**T-0027.1** **301 Mission Screen Wall - Dowels for Concrete Wall: Layout Acceptance** **Closed** **03/29/2011** **04/08/2011** **04/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: RFI T-0027

Please confirm that per site walk on 03/22/11 with Danny Lo and Erik Liu of Transworld, David Hungerford with Webcor-Obayashi, and David Fyfe and Christine Baudier of URS, that the layout of the core holes for the #8 dowels in the concrete wall are acceptable.

RFI T-0027 included a response sketch directing dowels to be in line and set 6" from the south face of the existing

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

It was verified in the field that #8 dowels were drilled approximately 6" from the exterior face of the existing vault wall and that #8 dowels will have a minimum 2" concrete cover.

The layout of the #8 dowels is acceptable.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

wall below. Due to the existing condition of the wall below, which was poured aginst a shoring wall and therefore not exactly straight, the dowels are laid out to be in line with each other and therefore vary in dimension measured off of the south face of the existing basement wall below. Please confirm, as it is understood, that the existing layout is acceptable. Dowels are being set in epoxy today, so an immediate response is requested.

---

**T-0028** **BSE - Bracing Stiffness Calculation Confirmation** **Closed** **02/08/2011** **02/18/2011** **02/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Arup Kevin Clinch

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 55 00 and attached sample calculations

The response to pre-bid RFI #TG0300-058 provided an equation for calculating the stiffness of the bracing system. Attached is BBII's designer's sample "template" calculation for stiffness for the proposed waler and strut bracing system.

BBII requests a confirmation that the designer's interpretation and use of the provided stiffness calculation is correct, prior to progressing further submittal calculations and procuring steel bracing members.

Additionally, BBII requests an expedited response to this RFI.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The methodology shown in these calculations for determining the internal bracing system stiffness is consistent with that shown in response to pre-bid RFI #TG0300-058.

Complete details of the internal bracing system were not included in the RFI. It is therefore not possible to conclude that all elements affecting the stiffness of the internal bracing system have been considered and included in the analysis.

These calculations have not been reviewed for conformance with other design criteria. A more complete review will be undertaken when the calculations are issued as a submittal.

---

**T-0029** **301 Mission Screen Wall - Sub Surface Structure Conflict with New Wall Location** **Closed** **02/09/2011** **02/19/2011** **02/18/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Photograph attachments 1-8

In laying out the location of the new concrete wall,

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

To accommodate unforeseen location of existing structures, new concrete wall to be shifted south so that the south face of new concrete wall is flush with

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Transworld has determined that the new concrete wall will extend over existing sub-surface structures, which is not per the contract documents. Please reference attached photos.

First, there are two manhole covers that are incorporated in concrete rings. These rings conflict with the location of the new wall and are included in photographed attachments. Due to the size of these concrete rings, a portion of the ring will be buried by the new wall. Second, the steel frame of the existing electrical vault doors is of similar condition as the manhole covers; this condition can also be seen in the photographed attachments.

Please confirm that Transworld is to proceed with the plan location of the new concrete wall which will cover and bury a portin of these existing sub-surface structures.

the exterior face of the existing 301 Mission street basement perimeter wall.

Interfering regions of existing sub-surface structures (manhole rings and vault sides) at the base of new concrete wall shall be incorporated into new concrete wall. All surfaces of interfering concrete regions to be incorporated into new concrete wall shall be prepared as bonded construction joints. Verify functioning of manhole and vault lids/openings are not obstructed by new concrete.

Contractor to provide chalk line at updated south and north faces of new concrete wall for verification of updated location in field by TJPA representative prior to construction of new concrete wall.

See attached RFI coordination sketch.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0030 | 301 Mission Screen Wall - Detail required for concrete sleeve installation | Closed | 02/09/2011 | 02/19/2011 | 02/18/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached 1/C-5001 and photo

The existing condition of the manhole covers are not consistent with the contract documents. Detail 1/C - 5001 indicates that the existing manhole sits above an existing concrete slab, to which is to be drilled into with 1 inch embedment. However, please refer to the attached photograph in attachment 1 which shows the manhole cover is actually a part of a subsurface concrete ring assembly, and wrapped with waterproofing. Please provide a new detail and instructions for the installation of the required concrete sleeve and a detail for penetrating the existing waterproofing.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per contract documents;

Remove manhole lid;

Retain existing concrete and steel collar/frame;

Dowel into existing concrete collar/frame (1" max) with #3 hoops @ 10" O.C.;

Prepare existing concrete surfaces to be incorporated into new sleeve as bonded construction joints;

Cast in place 6" thick concrete sleeve directly over manhole (concrete and steel collar/frame);

Provide Kadee SS 1/8" circular grate satin finish.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0030.1 | 301 Mission Screen Wall - Concrete sleeve installation | Closed | 02/24/2011 | 03/06/2011 | 03/03/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: RFI T-0030

The final measurement from the edge of the steel collar/frame at the existing manholes to the face of new wall is (+/-) 4-3/4", this dimension less form material (+/-) 3/4" to 1", results in the new cast in place concrete sleeve to be 4" thick at the point closest to the wall . Response to RFI T-0030 notes that the sleeve is to be 6" thick. Please clarify if the 4" thickness is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

4" minimum thickness acceptable only where new CIP concrete sleeve is in conflict with new interim screen wall. Remaining portions of new CIP concrete sleeve not in conflict with new interim screen wall shall be 6" thick per contract documents.

Contractor shall provide 3/8" expansion joint material between face of new interim screen wall and outside face of new CIP concrete sleeve.

See attached coordination sketch.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0031 | 301 Mission Screen Wall - In-ground lighting | Closed | 02/09/2011 | 02/19/2011 | 02/21/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Note 10 on C-2000

The new in-ground lighting as anticipated in plans and note 10 on page C - 2000 must be substituted because the contract design cannot be accommodated in the new construction. The contract design requires:
1) that the new lighting match the existing with the same model and size.
The issue here is that the existing light fixtures are larger than can be accommodated within the thickness of the new construction.

2) that the existing electrical lines servicing the existing lights be disconnected so that it is reconnected to the new lights.
The issue here is that the electrical lines for the existing light fixtures are embedded in the concrete curb that is to be removed. Upon removal of the existing concrete curb, there will be no existing electrical lines to reconnect for the new lighting power.

Please provide a new detail and instructions for the in-ground lighting.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Additional information is required to understand/interpret existing conditions and facilitate a response to this RFI.

Please provide all available information on existing conditions that pertain to this RFI, including but not limited to the following;

1. type, model, size and manufacturer of existing light fixtures;
2. type and size of existing electrical conduit/conductor;
3. sketch illustrating alignment of existing electrical conduit/conductor, including junction boxes, termination points and power source; and,
4. sketch illustrating thickness of existing/new construction where new lights are to be set/placed.

---

**T-0031.1** **301 Mission Wall - In-ground lighting** **Closed** **03/31/2011** **04/10/2011** **04/06/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached photos and sketch

Response to RFI T-0031 requested additional information.

1. See the attached pictures for the information known about the lights that were removed.
2. The existing conduit is 3/4"
3. Attached is a sketch and a photo showing the approximate location of the existing conduit.

There is one existing conduit on the south side of the wall protruding from the soil coming from the basement wall. The electrical conduit is approximately 6 feet east from the

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

We note that the Contractor has installed new electrical conduit and outlet boxes within the new concrete wall.

To document the as-built conditions of all work and to verify conformance with all applicable codes and standards, Contractor shall submit drawing(s) illustrating full routing of all conduit(s), including alignment, conduit material type, couplings/fittings, outlet boxes, etc. Drawings shall detail the connection between existing electrical line and new electrical line and connection between new electrical line and new lights/fixtures.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

western transformer vault vent opening. Attached you can see the pictures of this conduit that is currently sticking out below the scaffolding planking.

4. Please advise the location and mounting details for the new lights.

Drawings shall be sufficiently detailed to document all electrical work is in conformance with all applicable codes and standards, and shall be sufficient for permitting and/or inspection of electrical work.

All conduit and/or boxes shall be set so as to provide minimum 1¿ clear from all rebar, anchor bolts or other embedded structural steel items. Outlet boxes located in new concrete wall shall be fully coordinated for direct connection with the new light(s)/fixture(s).

It is our understanding that the existing 301 Mission driveway/roadway section (approximately 3¿ paver over 1¿ sand bed over 4¿ to 8¿ concrete topping slab) does not allow use of new lights/fixtures matching original lights/fixtures. It is recommended use of the Ligman Paragon square 186mm (50338-N-35) light/fixture, or approved equal, in lieu of the original light/fixture (Hydrel M9410). The new Ligman Paragon square light fixture (or equivalent fixture) shall be placed adjacent to new concrete wall and shall be mounted exposed above ground (not in ground) with the base of new light fixture located aligned to top of paver(s). See attached coordination sketch.

Please confirm the use of Ligman Paragon square 186mm (50338-N-35) light(s)/fixture(s) can be fully coordinated with all work.

See attached product data for Ligman Paragon square 186mm (50338-N-35) light/fixture.

In addition, in response to item 2 of RFI No.T-0031, Contractor please coordinate with 301 Mission Building management to ensure that the new light shall be connected correctly to the existing power supply.

---

**T-0031.2** **301 Mission Wall - Light Fixtures** **Closed** **06/29/2011** **07/09/2011** **07/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached light specs

Per field conversations with 301 Mission staff, the light fixture proposed in response to RFI T-0031.1 is not acceptable. Webcor-Obayashi has coordinated with 301 Mission management personnel and the lighting attachment to this RFI has been requested by 301 Mission. Confirm that the attached light specs are to be installed at the stucco slot locations.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

URS provided four lighting options to Webcor-Obayashi on April 22, 2011 to coordinate with 301 Mission management personnel. It is noted that the lighting attachment to this RFI (Allscape BL-81) is similar to one of the four lighting options provided by URS (Allscape BL-80).

The Allscape BL-80 model (with 39 watt/240 volt, metal halide lamp and prismatic tempered glass lens) was selected by URS because it provides photometric qualities and operating electrical amperage comparable to the original lighting fixture (Hydrel M9410, 35 watts/277 volt, metal halide lamp).

It is noted that the lighting attachment to this RFI, Allscape BL-81 model (with 150 watt/277 volt, metal halide lamp and prismatic tempered glass lens) may provide photometric qualities and operating electrical amperage not similar to the original lighting fixture. It is also noted that the Allscape BL-81 model luminaire is 14.5" wide, which is greater than the 14" width stucco slot(s) specified in the contract documents.

Prior to order and/or installation of the lighting attachment to this RFI (Allscape BL-81, 150 watt/277 volt metal halide lamp) Contractor to confirm the following;

301 Mission building existing electrical circuit/feed that is to be used is sufficient to handle electrical load required by the Allscape BL-81, 150 watt/277 volt metal halide lamp(s);
14.5" width of the BL-81 luminaire(s) can fit within the stucco slot(s) constructed, note contract documents specify 14" wide stucco slot(s); and
photometric qualities of 150 watt lamp (e.g. lighting intensity/brightness) is acceptable to/preferred by 301 Mission management personnel.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **T-0032** | **301 Mission Screen Wall - Tie Beam Below Grade Conection to Screen Wall** | **Closed** | **02/09/2011** | **02/19/2011** | **02/23/2011** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached photo

See attached picture of 301 Mission Screen Wall construction in progress. This picture was taken Nov of 2008, and shows a lateral support tie beam below grade connected to each vertical steel member of the screen wall. These tie beams are not shown on the plans and need to be cut so that the existing wall can be removed by others, as this scope is below and out of Transworld's contract. Please provide details for this condition.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

RESPONSE 02/16/2011 per David Fyfe

Tie beams shall be saw cut cleanly at exterior face of existing 301 Mission street basement perimeter wall.

Restoration of waterproofing is required.

Detail 1 on attached 301 Mission Street drawing S3-3.13 (rev 6, 04/04/2008) is the best available information at this time and has been provided for your information.

---

RESPONSE 02/23/2011 per Kevin Chiu

Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **T-0033** | **301 Mission Screen Wall - Concrete Demo Scope of Work Clarification** | **Closed** | **02/14/2011** | **02/24/2011** | **02/25/2011** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: attached text document

Please see attached text document explaining Transworld's request.

Transworld Construction requests that TJPA, Turner Construction, and Webcor-Obayashi make a final determination as to work scope based on the documents and discussions provided herein. It is Transworld's contention and belief that the 301 Mission wall relocation work scope does not require Transworld to remove the (e) concrete structure below the dark gray colored curb. For clarity see Exhibit D, page 1 and page 2.

Attached please see text explanation and Exhibits A, B, C, and D.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Response from David Fyfe on 2/23/11:
Removal of element is in scope per contract documents, see detail B on sheet C-5000.

Response from John Adams on 2/24/11:
1. Demolition scope Utility Vault "foundation" to be demolished by Evans Bros see attached sketch C-5000 Detail A.
2. Existing "Concrete Slab" in accord with attached sketch C-5000 Detail B - this element is in scope and is to be removed by Transworld per C-5000 Detail B including concrete as shown.
3. Demolition scope "unforeseen grade beam" to be severed by Evans Bros see attached sketch C-5000

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Detail B.

**T-0034** **301 Mission Screen Wall - Change of walkway from original logistics** **Closed** **02/14/2011** **02/24/2011** **02/22/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The conditions of the worksite have changed significantly from what Transworld originally bid and have changed the entire logistical plan for the execution of this contract work. The original logistics plan, as well as the contract documents, show a walkway along the South side of the original existing screen wall. Now, the entire walkway has been removed and nothing exists except an open pit. Please see all four pages of Exhibit A that is attached to this RFI. This change of condition affects Transworld's ability to execute the contract work. There is no longer available workspace to erect the structural steel and the South side finishes. This condition now requires a modification to our contract such that Transworld may use the parking/driveway on the North side of current barricaded area. The exact impact is not yet fully developed because there are ongoing discussions related to further demolition and removal of concrete structures that currently exist for our construction work. If the current and remaining working areas are further deteriorated by additional demolition, even greater challenges will arise. Transworld Construction requests reasonable accommodations for access to the worksite from the parking/driveway that is North of the currently erected temporary barricade wall.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

301 Mission Street driveway shall remain open to building tenants/occupants for through traffic at all times.

Per 2/17/11 field meeting, if coordinated with and approved by 301 Mission Street property owner in advance, one lane of driveway may be temporarily used short term by contractor for deliveries.

Contractor shall prepare and submit a Logistics Plan to the TJPA Representative and 301 Mission Street property owner for review and approval prior to use of driveway. At a minimum Logistics plan shall include the following;

- scheduled dates and duration of driveway use;
- traffic control plan/sketch (including extent of driveway to be used, proposed/required signs, barricades, flagmen, etc.); and,
- extent of temporary barricade wall dismantling and restoration.

Contractor shall provide all necessary traffic control measures (signs, barricades, fencing, flagmen, etc.) during use of driveway as directed by the TJPA Representative and/or 301 Mission Street property owner.

Contractor shall restore temporary barricade wall at end of each day if dismantled.

**T-0035** **BSE - Additional Trainbox Drawings** **Closed** **02/16/2011** **02/26/2011** **02/22/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet S-3201 and Specification Section 31 55 00

BBII believes that they do not have enough detailed drawings of the Train Box to properly design a conflict-free bracing system. BBII states that the architectural sections A1-6000 through A1-6231 lack detail regarding dimensions of structural components (i.e. beams, walls, ramps and etc.). The only structural section BBII currently has is on S-3201 and there appears to be a beam running along C line, however that beam is not identified in the table.

BBII is requesting additional structural section and elevation drawings, specifically:
- A dimensioned longitudinal elevation of the entire trainbox, showing the most current location and depths of beams.
- Full cross section of typical trainbox as well as any other non typical section. Shown any cross slopes, high and low points of concrete.
- Detailed sections of the SW corner showing dimensions and elevations of any ramps or locations where there are on ground floor slabs.

BBII would prefer CAD files if possible, however hardcopies will work.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The design of the permanent structure inside the shoring wall is in progress and subject to change. At 50% Construction Documents on December 20, 2010 an in-progress 3D REVIT Program Computer Model was issued to TJPA and TJPA shared this model with W/O for informational purposes on the progress of the permanent structure design. We suggest that for reference only, W/O review the possible locations for shoring struts with the in-progress 3D REVIT Program Computer Model. This 3D REVIT Program Computer Model provides more information than you would receive in the limited number of sections requested above.

---

**T-0035.1** **BSE - Request Structure Section Drawings** **Closed** **03/15/2011** **03/25/2011** **03/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached sheet

As discussed in 03/09/11 TG03 Design Team meeting, AAI said they would provide sections of the trainbox structure if BBII indentified where to take the cuts. Below is a list and the attached shows where BBII would like these taken

CUT # - DESCRIPTION

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See the attached in-progress design documents at the requested locations. This information is being provided as reference information for use in determining possible locations for the shoring struts and is not issued as a construction document.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

1.A - Full length section along Grid A
1.E - Full length section along Grid E
1.J - Full length section along Grid J unfolded along wall alignment
2 - Full width section at Column Line 3
3 - Full width section at Column Line 7
4 - Full width section at Column Line 10.5
5 - Full width section at Column Line 18 (CL First St)
6 - Full width section at Column Line 23
7 - Full width section at Column Line 26 (CL Freemont St)
8 - Full width section at Column Line 30
9 - Full width section at Column Line 34.5 (Beale St.)
10 - Section at "flare?"
11 - Section at "flare?"

Please provide either electronic 2D CAD files at for each section where BBII can dimension, or hardcopy drawings that are fully dimensioned.

---

**T-0036** **BSE - Bracing Load Discrepancy** **Closed** **02/16/2011** **02/26/2011** **02/18/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-1110, Specification Section 31 55 00, and attached memo

Please see the attached memo from BBII's bracing design engineer, PB&A.

PB&A are finding more than a slight discrepancy between the bracing loads given in the tables of GT-1110 when compared to loads they calculated using the "design profile" earth pressured diagram as shown on the same sheet.

As required by note 6 on GT-1110, BBII is continuing their design with the forces given in the tables, however BBII feels it is prudent to note the variances.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See the attached reply.
---
Attached Response from ARUP - 02/18/2011 Kevin Clinch

The internal bracing system shall be designed to satisfy the criteria specified in the contract documents including the strut loads given in the tables on GT-1110.

Our review of the calculations included with the RFI was limited to that necessary to understand the Contractor¿s questions. The calculations have not been reviewed for conformance with the contract documents. A more complete review will be undertaken when the calculations are issued as a

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

BBII requests confirmation that the forces given in the tables of GT-1110 are correct.

submittal. Additional calculation documentation and / or a meeting with the Contractor¿s engineer will be required for us to interpret the software output and to facilitate our review.

---

**T-0037** **BSE - Request for Utility As-Builts** **Closed** **02/17/2011** **02/28/2011** **03/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheets U-2021 to U-2023, U-4005

BBII is requesting as-built data for the phase 1 electrical ductbanks at First St. and Fremont St. BBII is particularly interested in receiving the coordinates, elevations, width and depths of the ductbank where they intersect the CDSM wall as shown on utility drawings U-2021 through U-2023

Additionally, BBII would like to receive more info on the phase 2 utilities shown in section X&Y on U-4005:
- What material are these ducts and are they encased?
- Can the spacing shown on U-4005 be shifted to accommodate bridge girder spacing?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Phase I electrical ducts as shown on the AECOM Relocation of Utilities Project (RUP) Plans sheets U-2020, U-2021, U-2022 and U-2023 on First and Fremont streets have been constructed or will be constructed by PG&E. AECOM has requested as-built information from PG&E on what has been constructed to date and will provide upon receipt.

Sections X and Y on RUP sheet U-4005 shows utilities in the proposed final locations following construction of the Transit Center substructure and permanent utility corridors on First and Fremont streets. Not all utilities shown need to be incorporated and supported by the interim bridge structures on First and Fremont streets.

Only PG&E and Verizon Phase II utilities need to be incorporated and supported from the interim bridge structure. The remaining utilities i.e. AT&T, TCG and PG&E "NIP" (PG&E New Bushiness) indicated in section, will be constructed following construction of the Transit Center substructure and permanent utility corridors.

PG&E has proposed steel conduit for the ducts to be supported by the interim bridge structures. Verizon has proposed PVC conduits.

Proposed modifications to utility alignments (horizontal and vertical) and conduit configuration may be acceptable upon review and acceptance by AECOM and the private utility. AECOM suggests a coordination meeting between BBII, AECOM and the

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

private utilities to help facilitate the interim bridge and utilities support design.

---

**T-0037.1** **BSE - Request for Utility As-Builts** **Closed** **03/24/2011** **04/04/2011** **04/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0037 and Sheets U-2020, U-2021, U-2022 and U-2023

Please provide BBI with as-built information from PG&E on what has been constructed to date, as mentioned in the response to RFI #T-0037

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

PG&E's substructure work on First and Fremont Streets is scheduled to be complete by April 28, 2011. PG&E will provide as-built drawings following completion of their work.

---

**T-0037.2** **BSE - Request for Utility As-Builts** **Closed** **03/24/2011** **04/28/2011** **04/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0037.1

Please provide BBI with as-built information from PG&E on what has been constructed to date, as mentioned in the response to RFI #T-0037 and RFI#T-0037.1

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Please see response to RFI #T0037.1. Asbuilts will be available once received from PGE. This issue has being denoted in the open issues log and does not require an open RFI to track the issuance of the asbuilts.

---

**T-0038** **BSE - Shear Walls for Rebracing** **Closed** **02/17/2011** **02/27/2011** **02/22/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference response to RFI #T-0024, Sheet GT-1112, and attached drawing

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Thornton Tomasetti Response:

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

The response to RFI #T-0024 noted discussions that took place during the TG03 BSE Trade Subcontractor - Design Team Coordination Meeting, about utilizing the permanent shear wall as re-bracing during the train box build out.

Attached is a sketch showing a staged wall construction and strut removal sequence that BBII believes would eliminate the need for re-bracing along the SW Wall.

Is this sequence acceptable?

The conditions depicted in Stage 12 & 13 of sketch GT-1112 for shearwalls to be used as re-brace elements will cause overstressing of the mat slab and excessive movement of the Trainbox wall, and therefore, is not acceptable. Note however, that once the Lower Concourse slab is constructed and develops the design strength, the upper portion of the shearwall above the Lower Concourse slab can be used as re-braces. See attached SKS-0101 that illustrates the load path of the shearwall.

ARUP Response:

The use of the permanent concrete shearwalls as bracing is acceptable provided the design criteria specified in the construction documents is satisfied. This includes, but is not limited to, the bracing stiffness requirements. The effective stiffness of the shear walls will be affected by the stiffness of the permanent train box wall and mat slab and tiedowns.

The response to this RFI must include input from Thornton Tomasetti regarding the impact on the permanent structural elements.

---

**T-0039** **301 Mission Screen Wall - Base Plate Dimensions** **Closed** **02/17/2011** **02/27/2011** **02/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: 2/S-5000, D/S-5000, attached sketches

See the 301 Mission Screen Wall drawings, specifically details 2 and D/S-5000. Is it acceptable to use a base plate with dimensions 14" x 14", in lieu of the 14" x 18" per plan below the HSS 10" x 10"? See attached sketches of proposed anchor bolt mounting options A and B. If acceptable, please choose the detail you prefer.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Neither options A nor B are acceptable for the anchor bolt mounting system. Provide a base plate as detailed on S-5000 that has the dimensions of 14" by 18".

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0040 | BSE - Proposed Bracing Removal Sequence | Closed | 02/22/2011 | 03/04/2011 | 02/23/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-1112 and attached proposal

Attached is a proposed sequence for bracing removal that involves removing the two lower layers of bracing after the structural slab and fillets are poured. BBII's shoring designer has done analysis at each stage of construction (see attached). The results show that removal of the two lower levels after the slab has been poured produces less deflection than the fully excavated condition. The results are summarized for case west and case east on page 18 and 36 respectively.

BBII believes this proposed sequence provides a tremendous value to the overall project by:
- Eliminating the coordination between the bracing and concrete trade subcontractors during the construction of the lower walls and concourse slab
- Eliminates a horizontal construction joint in the lower wall which significantly reduces construction cost and duration.
- Allows for better waterproofing product, by eliminating a construction joint and reduces patching of the membrane around shoring elements
- Allows for unobstructed construction of the lower walls and soffit shoring of the concourse level slab, which also reduces construction cost and duration

BBII is requesting evaluation by TJPA's design team to determine if this sequence is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The question in this RFI is a substitution request and should be submitted following the appropriate procedures outlined in the specifications.

Considerable time and coordination between the design team members is required to properly evaluate the suggestion. Arup will continue to study the issue. We understand it will be a topic of discussion at the March 1 TG03 BSE Subcontractor - Design Team Coordination Meeting.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0041 | BSE - COR and PCO Forms | Closed | 02/23/2011 | 03/05/2011 | 03/16/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Spec. Section 00 07 00, 6.03E,

Per section 00 07 00, 6.03E, BBII requests for the form as mentioned to be supplied by TJPA, preferably in editable electronic format.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

There are no forms provided by TJPA. Webcor/Obayashi has established an acceptable summary cover sheet for change proposals.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0042 | 301 Mission Screen Wall - Elevation of concrete wall | Closed | 02/24/2011 | 03/06/2011 | 03/10/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please clarify the following information regarding the field elevation of the new concrete wall. Detail A/S-4000 indicates that the concrete foundation wall height shall be +/- 2'- 2" to 2'- 8". Based on this reference the tallest part of the concrete wall will be the East point of the wall. The height of the wall will then decrease as the wall moves west towards Fremont St. (the west side). If we use a wall height of 2'- 8" at its tallest point (the east side), that would result in a wall height of 20.5 inches at Fremont Street (the west end). This is less than 2'-2" as indicated in the contract drawings; therefore please confirm that Transworld will be building a concrete wall height between 20.5 inches to 2'- 8". As a point of comparison, the original existing screen wall had this exact same dimension of 20.5 inches at the low and 2'- 8" at the high.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

New concrete wall height of 20.5" above the existing embed plate on west end is not acceptable.

Contract documents show the new concrete wall height varies from 2'-2" +/- to 2'-8" +/-. This is based on the driveway elevations shown on the existing plans provided by Millennium Partners, developer for 301 Mission Street, and allowing for a code required minimum 18" high concrete wall from top of paver/driving surface for vehicle safety. As noted on A/S-4000, "Top of (E) Vault Wall Elevation may Vary, Contractor to VIF, Adjust Concrete Wall Accordingly", please adjust top of concrete wall to be minimum 18" above top of paver/driving surface (approximately 2'-4" +/- to 3'-4" +/- in wall height).

See attached coordination sketch.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0043 | 301 Mission Screen Wall - Temporary Vault Plug at Utility Vault Opening | Closed | 02/25/2011 | 03/07/2011 | 03/23/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Regarding the transformer vault plug as shown on page C-5000; Transworld has been asked to submit some proposals as to how a plug should be installed. The original existing ventilation for the vault was open to the air at the original planters. This original ventilation was completely open and secured only by a metal grate to prevent access, but not water or air. As located on page C-5000, Transworld construction proposes to install 2 x 4 backing studs attached to the left and right vertical walls of the existing opening. These 2 x 4 backing studs will be adhered with powder actuated nails. Spanning across the backing studs Transworld construction proposes to install two 2 x 4 crossmembers which will be nailed to the 2 x 4 backing studs. This assembly can be seen in the attached pictures pages 1 and 2.

The assemblly noted above is option 1.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contractor shall provide the transformer vault plug based on the Option 4 solution with the following amendments;

1. Provide 2x4 cross members at max. 12" o.c. spacing;
2. Face of all 2x4 members shall be flush with outside face of existing vault wall to facilitate extension of plywood sheet beyond ventilation opening (see number 5 below);
3. Plywood sheet shall be two layers of 5/8" for a total of 1.25" thick, laminate plywood layers with waterproof adhesives;
4. Secure plywood to 2x4 members with galvanized nails or screws at min. 6" spacing;
5. Extend plywood sheet min. 6" beyond edge of ventilation opening (all four sides); and,

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Option 2- Added additionall 2x4 crossmembers which would further restrict air flow to the (e) vault.
Option 3- Nail on a plywood sheet that would enclose the entire vault vent opening.
Option 4 - Nail on a plywood sheet and waterproof the plywood to prevent water intrusion as well.

Note: Transworld Construction is concerned about restricting airflow into a vault that originally was designed to have this open vent. We are not familiar with any impact sealing this vent will have on the existing equipment.

6. Seal perimeter of plywood sheet and existing concrete vault wall with appropriate sealant to ensure weather tightness (all four sides).

In addition, Contractor is required to ensure sufficient air flow is provided to existing underground vault/electrical equipment at all times. Existing ventilation openings (one per vault) shall not be plugged until new ventilated manhole covers per C-5000/C-5001 are installed. The new ventilated manhole covers must be protected from damage and/or soiling from concreting activities of the adjacent stem wall. The existing ventilation openings must be plugged prior to start of BSE activities to restrict entry of water and/or construction debris into the existing underground vault/transformer spaces.

---

**T-0044** **BSE - Pile Mat Slab Connection** **Closed** **02/25/2011** **03/07/2011** **03/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet S-3003

Reference Detail 2 on S-3003 - "Slip Detail @ Trestle Pile Mat Connection"
Please confirm that this detail only applies to the trestle and not the bridge as stated.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TT Reply: The trestle supports the bridge, therefore detail 2/S-3003 does apply to the bridge.

---

**T-0045** **301 Mission Screen Wall - Void Below Existing Embed** **Closed** **03/02/2011** **03/12/2011** **03/17/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached pictures

The new 301 Mission screen wall location is to be laid out

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Voids below the existing embed plate shall be filled by use of grouting applied by use of low pressure grouting methods to deliver grout into void spaces.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

over an existing embed plate. At that plate #8 rebars are to be epoxied per RFI T-0027. Currently in the field the embed has been cut where the dowels are to be installed and holes are being drilled to the required 30" depth. It has been discovered that there are voids below the exitsing embed plate of up to 1.5". See attached pictures for some locations where this condition occurs. Please advise if this void is to be filled.

The result following grouting shall be that all voids are fully grouted. All grout materials shall be non-shrink grout. Pressure grouting shall be performed by qualified personnel who have experience in low pressure grouting steel plates. Contractor shall submit qualifications in the form of resumes identifying project experience utilizing low pressure grouting for personnel performing the work.

The Contractor shall provide a submittal identifying the non-shrink grout mix proposed for use and a narrative providing a full description of the means and methods proposed to result in grout flow from input point to output point including methods to result in prevention of trapped air (air is to be displaced by grout flow). A narrative describing means and methods shall specifically include identification of proposed equipment and the proposed porting and venting to allow installation of non-shrink grout and displacement of trapped air.

Where the embedded plate is not continuous (where the plate is not provided), the existing concrete surface shall be prepared meeting all requirements of a bonded construction joint.
- David Fyfe 03/16/2011

==========Additional Response==========
Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.
- Kevin Chiu 03/17/2011

---

**T-0046** **BSE - CLSM Slump** **Closed** **03/03/2011** **03/13/2011** **03/07/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 03 30 01

The CLSM slump range for the Buttress Shoring Excavation Work is listed between 10" to 12". BBII has

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

03/03/2011 Kevin Clinch

ARUP Response - A CLSM mix with a slump range of 7" +/- 1" is acceptable pending our review of the

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

concerns about the CLSM mix segregating during placement with such a high slump. Please confirm if it is acceptable to provide a CLSM mix with a slump range of 7" +/- 1" in lieu of the 10" to 12" called for in the Specification.

Contractor's mix design. Arup will work with the Owner's Testing Agency to refine the Field Quality Control procedures for checking slump and segregation of the CLSM.

---

**T-0047** **BSE - Joint Preconstruction Survey** **Closed** **03/03/2011** **03/13/2011** **03/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 15 40 and attached list

Attached is the list of buildings that BBI has identified for joint survey, in accordance with specification section 01 15 40. BBI requests confirmation of this list.

Please provide BBI a contact for coordinating the joint survey effort. BBI would like to do this work on the week of March 14, 2011.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Arup has been, and will continue, performing interior preconstruction surveys at the properties listed by BBI. Arup will share the information with contractors as it becomes available. A representative from BBI may accompany Arup at the remaining site surveys. Contact Stephanie Reichin 415.227.9700 for a schedule of the remaining site visits.

---

**T-0047.1** **BSE - Preconstruction Joint Survey Exteriors of Buildings** **Closed** **03/21/2011** **03/31/2011** **03/28/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0047 and attached email

Please confirm the exterior of the building, in accordance with item 1.5 D in the specification 01 15 40 Joint Survey, is also covered by the response of RFI T-0047 as well as the interior of the building.

If not, please contact "property owners within 25 feet of the construction excavation" and arrange the joint survey immediately.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Response to RFI T-0047 was specific to the query posed relating to the preconstruction survey of adjacent building interiors (basements) that Arup is conducting and the feasibility for the contractor joining Arup for any future visits.

For the pre-construction joint-examination and photographing of adjacent building exteriors per 01 15 40 - 1.5.D, please coordinate with Turner (CMO), who will coordinate with Singer Assoc, TJPA's outreach consultant, to invite and/or coordinate the possible attendance of adjacent property owners. Please

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

submit a list of properties and planned schedule of the examination/photography activities ASAP for record and for coordination.

---

**T-0048** **BSE - Building Demolition in Zone 1** **Closed** **03/03/2011** **03/13/2011** **03/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference CR-T-005 and Sheet SKGT-0001-R1

CR T-005 appears to require additional building demolition. Please provide a schedule for this demolition work and an estimated completion date as this will potentially impact BBI's schedule and work sequence.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The "Eminent Domain" legal process is incomplete at this time - estimated completion date is 5/29/11. Therefore the demolition contract for 60 Tehama, 85 Natoma, 564 Howard and 568 Howard has not been issued and a schedule cannot be provided. The estimated demolition completion date is between 7/29/11 and 8/29/11.

---

**T-0049** **BSE - Constructware** **Closed** **03/03/2011** **03/13/2011** **03/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 10 40

Specification Section 01 10 40 Article 1.6 B4 states: "TJPA will provide Trade Subcontractors with the necessary training and access to Constructware"

BBI would like to schedule this training and make arrangements for access. Please provide a contact to get this process started.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Trade contractors will be given "View Only" access to Constructware. Contact Turner to schedule access and training. W/O is still responsible for managing the information flow to and from their trade contractors. TJPA will not accept information entered by trade contractors. All trade RFIs and submittals are to be reviewed by W/O prior to submission to TJPA.

---

**T-0050** **BSE - Revised Plans for CR T-005B** **Closed** **03/07/2011** **03/17/2011** **03/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner

**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**REQUEST:**

Reference CR T-005B

As BBII has explained at the TG03 Trade Subcontractor - Design Team Coordination Meeting No. 3, held on February 23, 2011, in order for BBII to provide meaningful pricing and make preparations to order materials that will be required for the changed work, BBII is respectfully requesting revised contract documents for all work that is impacted by this change, specifically including, but not limited to, geotechnical and demolition drawings.

These drawings will allow BBII to accurately identify the changes and provide pricing that complies with Section 6 of the General Conditions.

In addition, due to increasing steel prices and long lead times, BBII proposes a revision to CR T-005B to allow for the ordering of additional shoring wall beams prior to the rest of the Change Order being negotiated. BBII believes this will reduce the overall cost of this change. Upon receipt of the revised drawings that include the new shoring wall beam table (GT-5101), BBII will be able to receive quotes for this work and finalize an order.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

URS will issue a revised D-2200 drawing this week.

---

03/10/2011 - George Metzger

Some parts of the question need to be answered by URS/PMPC/TJPA/Turner.

ARUP Response:

Arup's response regarding the request for geotechnical drawings and the soldier pile schedule is as follows: the "CDSM Shoring Wall Schedule" on GT-5101 does not change. The wall segments shown on the plan were simply extended to include the increased wall length. It is possible that the top of wall elevation may change +/- 1 ft once the finish grade is established following demolition of the buildings. The length of the soldier pile and the depth of the drilled hole from the ground surface will not change from that shown on the schedule.

In addition to GT-2101 which was issued as SKGT-0001-R1 in response to RFI-017, the change order will include the following drawings: GT-0000 (the drawing index will be clouded to show the affected drawings); GT-0100, GT-1110, GT-2000 (the shoring wall layout will be revised as shown and detailed on SKGT-0001-R1); and GT-5105 (the sections at 564 and 568 Howard will be deleted as these buildings will be demolished; a section will be added at 580 Howard showing the approximate distance to the building corner). Aside from the changes to GT-2101 which have been issued as SKGT-0001-R1, We consider the above described drawing changes to have no cost impact and therefor have not yet been issued.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0051 | Returned Submittal Comments | Closed | 02/16/2011 | 02/26/2011 | 03/10/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner

**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref Spec section 01 13 10

According to the Action and Distribution (section 1.11) of the submittal specifications, Submittals shall be returned indicating one of the following:

No Exceptions Taken

Make Corrections Noted

Revise and Resubmit

Rejected

We have received submittals back as "Not Reviewed" or "For Record Only". Please confirm these responses are acceptable and should be incorporated into the specifications.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

These responses are acceptable and will be incorporated into a revised specification section 01 13 10 to be issued in the future.

---

**T-0052** **BSE - P Parcel** **Closed** **03/09/2011** **03/19/2011** **03/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner

**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 14 19, 1.4

According to the referenced specification section, Parcel P is available as of November 1, 2010 and will be available until 2013. BBI was informed that this parcel will not be available for this contract.

Please confirm.

If this parcel is not available, are there any alternative parcels that will be available for construction staging?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Parcel P is available for Webcor-Obayashi use in accord with Spec. 01-14-19 - see attached sketch for shared use with TJPA.

---

**T-0053** **BSE - Waler Standoff** **Closed** **03/09/2011** **03/19/2011** **03/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner

**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-1110, RFI #T-0018, and attached photos and drawings

Previous RFI #T-0018 - BSE - Waler to CDSM Wall spacing addressed BBI's concern with only having 6" clear between the face of the CDSM Wall and the Waler. Conversations in the weekly TG03 BSE Design Team Coordination meetings have re-raised the issue and BBI believes it requires additional consideration. The response in RFI #T-0018 said that rebar couplers in the wall verticals (in the next contract) would be used to eliminate the conflict. BBI believes that this seems to be impractical and not cost effective for over 3000 lf feet of wall and 4 levels of walers. Providing a standoff equal to the wall thickness would be an additional cost to the BSE contract, but BBI believes it would be minor compared to dealing with the cost to deal with the conflict later.

BBI is requesting to please re-evaluate and provide direction.

Attached is a suggested detail as well as examples where it has been used before, for your consideration.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Provided the criteria shown in the Contact Documents is satisfied, the proposal is acceptable.

Additionally:

Provided this proposal is acceptable to the TJPA, the internal bracing design submittal shall include the details and calculations associated with this proposal.

The soldier piles shall be checked for the increased moment due to the eccentric strut reaction. This check shall be reported in the internal bracing submittal.

No increase in torsional loading on the soldier pile is permitted.

End of Comments

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0053.1 | BSE - Waler Standoff | Closed | 03/09/2011 | 03/19/2011 | 03/22/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner

**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-1110, RFI #T-0018, and attached photos and drawings

Previous RFI #T-0018 - BSE - Waler to CDSM Wall spacing addressed BBI's concern with only having 6" clear between the face of the CDSM Wall and the Waler. Conversations in the weekly TG03 BSE Design Team Coordination meetings have re-raised the issue and BBI believes it requires additional consideration. The response in RFI #T-0018 said that rebar couplers in the wall verticals (in the next contract) would be used to eliminate the conflict. BBI believes that this seems to be impractical and not cost effective for over 3000 lf feet of wall and 4

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

REVISED RESPONSE TO RFI #T-0053

TJPA revises response to as follows:

The W/O and BBI proposal to increase the spacing between the waler and CDSM wall is acceptable to TJPA since it meets the requirements in 31 55 00 1.5 DESIGN subsections I, J, K, L, and M. This design is for Contractor use. This proposal from the Contractor creates multiple benefits for W/O and BBI including The waler is out of the way of the rebar and this will help W/O with their coordination with the Train Box concrete work subcontractor.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

levels of walers. Providing a standoff equal to the wall thickness would be an additional cost to the BSE contract, but BBI believes it would be minor compared to dealing with the cost to deal with the conflict later.

BBI is requesting to please re-evaluate and provide direction.

Attached is a suggested detail as well as examples where it has been used before, for your consideration.

W/O benefits since more rebar can be installed with this increased spacing which saves time to the schedule and costs associated with the waterproofing and rebar installations.
BB benefits because it appears that there is a decrease to the number of times that struts and walers must be moved.
BB benefits in that strut length remains essentially the same when restrutting after Train Box wall sections are completed.

TJPA and the Program Management Team suggest that W/O and BB proceed with a 3' - 6" spacing or whatever dimension is necessary to insure that the walers are not within the Train Box Wall profile. If the walers position requires rework, the Contractor and SubContractor take full responsibility to meet design requirements with no change to contract cost.
TJPA agrees to this suggestion from the Contractor to offset the waler from the CDSM wall to allow for the construction of the Train Box wall. TJPA requests that the Contractor proceed on this issue as a no-cost resolution to these RFIs. If W/O finds that this Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall design does have an additional cost to TJPA, the funds will come from the CM/GC Contingency Fund.

---

**T-0053.2** **BSE - Waler Standoff** **Closed** **03/09/2011** **03/19/2011** **03/28/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Douglas Jacobson
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-1110, RFI #T-0018, and attached photos and drawings

Previous RFI #T-0018 - BSE - Waler to CDSM Wall spacing addressed BBI's concern with only having 6" clear between the face of the CDSM Wall and the Waler. Conversations in the weekly TG03 BSE Design Team Coordination meetings have re-raised the issue and BBI believes it requires additional consideration. The response in RFI #T-0018 said that rebar couplers in the wall

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TJPA and Program Management Team expect that the Contractor and Sub-Contractor meet the design requirements for the Design/Build of the Internal Bracing as specified in 31 55 00 INTERNAL BRACING FOR SHORING WALL and per the Contract Drawings. As subsection 1.8 M. states,

"Walers are to be placed against the shoring wall on spacers to provide a minimum of 6 inches of clearance between the waler and the shoring wall.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

verticals (in the next contract) would be used to eliminate the conflict. BBI believes that this seems to be impractical and not cost effective for over 3000 lf feet of wall and 4 levels of walers. Providing a standoff equal to the wall thickness would be an additional cost to the BSE contract, but BBI believes it would be minor compared to dealing with the cost to deal with the conflict later.

BBI is requesting to please re-evaluate and provide direction.

Attached is a suggested detail as well as examples where it has been used before, for your consideration.

The 6 inch clearance is to provide a continuous path to allow the outboard curtain of reinforcement of the permanent wall to be routed through this space without requiring use of couplers or added lap splices at walers..."

The Submittal for Internal Bracing needs to address the concerns expressed by the reviewers including Arup in their response to RFI T-0053 which states:

"Provided the criteria shown in the Contact Documents is satisfied, the proposal is acceptable.

Additionally:

Provided this proposal is acceptable to the TJPA, the internal bracing design submittal shall include the details and calculations associated with this proposal.

The soldier piles shall be checked for the increased moment due to the eccentric strut reaction. This check shall be reported in the internal bracing submittal.

No increase in torsional loading on the soldier pile is permitted."

---

**T-0054** **BSE - AC Overlay at Temporary Bridges** **Closed** **03/09/2011** **03/19/2011** **03/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 53 13, 1.3.A.6 and attached material information

For the temporary bridges, BBII will be using the attached structural bridge deck material from Big R Bridge. The troughs are filled completely with AC to the top of the decking, and an overlay will be applied over the top. BBII would like to use a 2" minimum overlay, resulting in an overall cross section with an average 4" thickness. Bridge geometry requirements specified in section 01 53 13 - 1.3.A.6 will be met without reducing the overlay thickness

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

2" minimum asphalt concrete (AC) overlay not acceptable. Provide minimum of 4" asphalt concrete (AC) overlay per contract documents (specification section 01 53 13, 1.3.B.3).

below the 2" minimum.

Please confirm this is acceptable.

---

**T-0055** **BSE - Request for Soil Parameters** **Closed** **03/09/2011** **03/19/2011** **03/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-1110 and Specification Section 31 55 00

In the TG03 BSE Design Team Coordination meeting held on 03/09/2011, Arup said they would provide BBII with soil input parameters for use in BBI's model.

Please provide BBI with this information.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Summary tables of the soil properties used in Arup's PLAXIS analysis are attached.

---

**T-0056** **BSE - CR T-006** **Closed** **03/09/2011** **03/19/2011** **03/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference CR T-006

The Change Request documents do not indicate who will have the maintenance responsibility for the AC walkway.

BBII has the following questions:
1. Should BBII include pricing for maintenance? If this walkway is going to get placed on top of the 3" minus rubble, a fair amount of maintenance would be required.
2. When is this walkway scheduled to be constructed? And if maintenance is needed, when would it start?
3. Are the typical fence and K-rail shown in the section the same ones that are protecting the perimeter, or an additional row that creates a walkway that has both sides fenced, protecting the public from construction and vehicle

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

This is not an RFI. W/O has control of the site and is to coordinate maintenance duration with their subcontractor for pricing.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

traffic?

BBII needs to have this information in order to provide accurate pricing for this Change Request T-006. Please advise.

---

**T-0056.1** **BSE - CR T-006** **Closed** **03/24/2011** **04/03/2011** **04/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI T-0056 and CR T-006

Please confirm that any necessary repairs of the AC overlay are excluded from CR T-006 scope as discussed at the TG03 BSE - Design Coordination Meeting on 3/23/2011. Also, please provided additional sketches we discussed at the meeting as well. Finally, please provide a complete copy of Demo Contractor¿s change order related to CR T-006 to fully understand the limits of their responsibility.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

CM/GC is responsible for maintenance of site - including these sidewalks- debris, cleaning, graffiti etc. as specified in contract documents.

The AC overlay was installed by Demolition Contractor per RFI 24.2. The basements were filled per contract using crushed concrete, compaction methods were used by EBi and verified by ISI Special Inspector. The AC overlay was installed per RFI 24.2 with asphalt applied no less than 3" thick.

However, the CM/GC's concern is related to the required repair if there is a failure of this asphalt. If there is a failure of the AC overlay (if caused by pedestrian traffic on this sidewalks- not construction equipment), then this should be brought to the attention of TJPA Rep at that time in accord with contract.

Demo RFI 24.2, EBi Proposal drawings and Change Order attached.

---

**T-0057** **BSE - Verticality and Sonic Testing on Drilled Piers and Shafts** **Closed** **03/10/2011** **03/20/2011** **03/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-5202 and Specification Section 31

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

63 29

Specification Section 31 63 29, 3.8.I.3 states "The contractor shall perform a test to determine verticality of the steel tubes, or drilled holes, that are going to be used for the sonic tests."

BBII has been advised by a number of testing firms that verticality tests cannot be performed on steel tubes or PVC tubes tied to steel cages. Detail 12 on Drawing GT-5202 shows 4 equally spaced PVC or steel tubes tied to reinforcing steel cage. BBII has also been informed that, as of now, there is not a specification in existence that mentions vertical tolerances of CSL tubes.

BBII is proposing to do the following in lieu of formally testing the CSL tubes for verticality:
1. BBII will make sure that the tubes are parallel and symmetrically placed. The cages and tubes will be properly inspected for positioning, spacing, parallelism prior to placing the cages into the hole. This is the most important inspection to ensure accurate CSL results.
2. Since the tubes are tied directly to a vertical cage, and the cages and casings are tested for verticality anyway, BBII will do a visual inspection to ensure that the tubes are sufficiently "vertical" for CSL testing purposes prior to placement of tremie concrete.
3. BBII will make sure that the cages are carefully lifted in a manner that limits the deflections of the cage to ensure that the CSL tubes do not fail at the joints.

Please confirm if this is acceptable.

The verticality of the holes / tubes must be checked to properly interpret the CSL test results. If verticality tests cannot be performed on steel tubes, consider using PVC tubes. The integrity of the PVC tubes can be maintained by filling them with water and inserting alignment bars into them prior to concrete pouring.

---

**T-0058** **BSE - Underground Utilities Removal on Beale Street** **Closed** **03/11/2011** **03/21/2011** **03/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2230

Per Drawing D-2230 Note 2, "Unless specified otherwise all utilities to be removed have already been cut and

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Beale Street Utilities PGE and ATT. Substructure installation and work is incomplete. Work is scheduled to complete by 5/30/11. Cabling/cutovers & pressurizing gas pipe forecasted to be complete by

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

capped outside limits of work by Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project including future utilities installed by the Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project. Contractor to coordinate removal of utilities with TJPA representative."
Please confirm that the work described in Note 2 has been completed for all underground utilities on Beale St.
If work has not yet been completed, please provide a list of utilities not yet abandoned and dates when the said utilities are to be cut and capped.

6/30/11. ATT will finish in this window also.

***** These dates are subject to change due to weather, operational issues and any conflicts outside the control of PG&E******

Beale St. Webcor-Obayashi: Relocation of Utilities project will provide the completion dates for utilities on Beale St.

---

**T-0059** **BSE - Underground Utilities Removal on Fremont Street** **Closed** **03/11/2011** **03/21/2011** **03/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2230

Per Drawing D-2230 Note 2, "Unless specified otherwise all utilities to be removed have already been cut and capped outside limits of work by Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project including future utilities installed by the Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project. Contractor to coordinate removal of utilities with TJPA representative."
Please confirm that the work described in Note 2 has been completed for all underground utilities on Fremont St.
If work has not yet been completed, please provide a list of utilities not yet abandoned and dates when the said utilities are to be cut and capped.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Fremont Street PGE Final conduit installation scheduled to be complete 4/11/11. Cabling and cutovers forecasted to be complete by 6/4/11.

***** These dates are subject to change due to weather, operational issues and any conflicts outside the control of PG&E******

Fremont St. Webcor-Obayashi: Relocation of Utilities project will provide the completion dates for utilities on Fremont St.

---

**T-0060** **BSE - Underground Utilities Removal on 1st Street** **Closed** **03/11/2011** **03/21/2011** **03/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2230

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

First Street - Substructure installation scheduled to complete by 4/30/11. Cabling and cutovers forecasted

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Per Drawing D-2230 Note 2, "Unless specified otherwise all utilities to be removed have already been cut and capped outside limits of work by Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project including future utilities installed by the Transbay Transit Center Program Relocation of Utilities Project. Contractor to coordinate removal of utilities with TJPA representative."
Please confirm that the work described in Note 2 has been completed for all underground utilities on 1st St.
If work has not yet been completed, please provide a list of utilities not yet abandoned and dates when the said utilities are to be cut and capped.

to be complete by 6/24/11

***** These dates are subject to change due to weather, operational issues and any conflicts outside the control of PG&E******

First St. Webcor-Obayashi: Relocation of Utilities project will provide the completion dates for utilities on First St.

---

**T-0061** **BSE - Concerns About Pile To Mat Slab Connection** **Closed** **03/15/2011** **03/25/2011** **03/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet S-3003 and attached detail

BBII has concerns that the trestle pile to mat slab slip connection as shown in detail 2 on S-3003 will not work as intended. Based on BBII's understanding that this joint is intended to allow the mat slab to deflect upward and our limited knowledge of the permanent structure design, BBII has listed some concerns with this connection below:
1. BBII does not think the sleeve will be able to slide with the bolts and slotted holes completely encased in concrete. (see attached)
2. If the slab does deflect upwards and the lower section of pile is no longer in contact with the bearing plate, then the mat slab is carrying the entire load on the pile.
3. Any upward movements of the slab will affect the trestle supper structure framing. Differential upward deflections could cause damage depending on severity.

BBII does wish to bear the risk of re-designing this joint due to the interaction with the permanent structure, however BBII has attached a suggestion that they feel would eliminate some of their concerns listed above.

Please provide a revised detail or rebut BBII concerns if

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Thornton Tomasetti response:

Comments in response to BBII concerns:

1. Bolts/slotted holes could be isolated from the concrete via styrofoam blocks.

2. Anticipated slab movement upward is due to rise of groundwater pressure after the dewatering pumps are turned off - which is after structure is completed and trestle work is completed.

Comments regarding proposed alternate detail:

1. Proposed detail does not address waterproofing at bottom of mat and allows water infiltration into the mat as currently presented.

AAI Response: Alternate detail will not satisfy waterproofing requirements.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

you still believe the detailed connection is the best suited for this application.

---

**T-0062** **BSE - Concrete Submittals** **Closed** **03/16/2011** **03/26/2011** **03/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 03 30 00

BBII believes a number of the submittals listed under the Cast In Place concrete spec section are not applicable to the BSE package.
- 03 30 00-1.6.A.5 Joint Locations for Concrete Slabs to receive a terrazzo finish ¿ None of the concrete work in this package is to receive flooring.
- 03 30 00-1.6A.6 Preconstruction Survey - This is intended for locations where concrete interfaces with existing construction. The mud slab does not interface with existing concrete, and BBII is not anticipating using concrete at the temporary bridges.
- 03 30 00-1.6.A.7 Survey of Flat Plate or Flat Slab Concrete Floors - No flat plates included in the BSE package.
- 03 30 00-1.6.A.8 Survey of as-built floor conditions - This is applicable to finish floors only, which are not included in the BSE package.
- 03 30 00-1.6.A.8 Structural Repairs - BBII does not believe there is any structural concrete requiring repair procedures in the BSE package.
- 03 30 00-1.6.A.10 Patching defective concrete finishes - The concrete work in the BSE package is not finished or exposed concrete, so BBII does not believe patching procedures are necessary.

Please confirm that the above submittals are not necessary for the BSE contract.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Thornton Tomasetti response:

Confirmed that the submittals listed in the RFI are not applicable for the BSE contract.

---

**T-0063** **BSE - Request for Final EIS/EIR for Mitigation and Monitoring** **Closed** **03/16/2011** **03/26/2011** **03/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 35 65

BBII has been unable to obtain the report titled "Final EIS/EIR" dated November 29, 2007, as described in specification section 01 35 65, 1.1.A. The report requires the contractor to be responsible for mitigation measures and monitoring requirements that are included in the specification section.

Please provide BBII with this report.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

A copy of Final EIS/EIR as referred in 01 35 65 is available in Constructware at the following location:

File Director - Programwide - 5 Program Coord - 10 Environmental - 11 EIS/EIR - EIS/EIS Transit Center - 2004 EIS - Original

A Constructware screenshot is attached for your information.

---

**T-0064** **BSE - Demolition Contract Backfill Material** **Closed** **03/16/2011** **03/26/2011** **03/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference photos (attached)

It appears that the demolition contractor is leaving large unprocessed rubble along the backside of some of the basement walls (See attached photos). Per the demolition drawings included in BBII's contract, all of the material in this area should be crushed/processed concrete at 3" minus. Handling material that does not meet these requirements will be considered a changed condition. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The site Parcel E is in progress. The basement will be filled in accord with the contract drawings with crushed/processed concrete at 3" minus upon completion of work by the demolition contractor - contract completion date 4/7/11.

Please do not use RFI to ask a question of an area not yet completed by the Demolition contractor. Webcor-Obayashi the CM/GC or Turner Construction CMO can easily answer these questions over the telephone or via e-mail.

---

**T-0065** **301 Mission Wall - Length of dowels in concrete wall** **Closed** **03/17/2011** **03/27/2011** **03/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet S-5000, RFI T-0042

The response to RFI T-0042 specifies for the new concrete wall height to be exposed above the existing pavers a minimum 18". To achieve this requirement, the overall concrete wall height must be increased 8",

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Use of fabricated #8 bars with lenton terminator acceptable. #8 embedment bars shall be dowelled 30" into existing concrete vault wall per RFI T-0027.

Resulting distance from top of #8 embedment bars with lenton terminator to top of new concrete wall will

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

therefore also increasing the length of the dowels that are to be installed.
The #8 embedment bars have already been purchased and fabricated. To achieve the higher wall height per response to RFI #T-0042, 90% of these fabricated #8 bars will have to be scrapped and new bars with the longer length must be made.
As an alternative, would it be acceptable to still use the fabricated #8 embedment bars dowelled 30" into the wall per RFI T-0027, with the lenton terminator which would be set 32" above the (E) steel plate?

vary between approximately 3" - 9", verify in field. If resulting distance from top of #8 embedment bars with lenton terminator to top of new concrete wall is greater than 6", contractor shall install #4 U-bars at 12" on center. #4 U-bars shall be centered between the #4 ties on both sides of the #8 bar(s). #4 U-bar legs shall be 22" long.

See attached coordination sketch.

TJPA Representative to field verify all rebar placement prior to Contractor placing concrete.

---

**T-0066** **BSE - Pile Survey for Buttress Area** **Closed** **03/21/2011** **03/31/2011** **04/04/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

It is BBII's understanding that EBI has completed their survey of the existing timber piles in the buttress area, including the area that was previously missed.

Please provide BBII with the remaining timber pile survey information, as indicated at the TG03 BSE Design Coordination Meeting.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Here is the remaining timber pile survey information.

It is expected that BBII will provide the TJPA a Credit since this survey scope was in contract Spec. 02-41-19 Para 1.4E

---

**T-0067** **BSE - Joint Preconstruction Survey** **Closed** **03/21/2011** **03/31/2011** **03/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI T-0047

Based on recent discussions, BBII is requesting confirmation of their understanding of Specification Section 01 15 40:

1. The inside survey of the adjacent buildings will be performed by ARUP and ARUP is in the process of

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

1. Correct.

2. The 19 buildings listed by ASC for BBI are all included in the pre-construction survey list prepared by Arup (copy attached).

(note the 101 1st Street address listed by ASC should be corrected to 100 1st & 533 Mission)

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

performing these surveys. BBII will attend these surveys to the extent possible. ARUP will also provide monitoring of these buildings, including but not limited to, active crack monitoring. ARUP will make the initial survey and subsequent monitoring information available to BBII. BBII reserves its right to review this information and request to perform its own indoor survey at any of the surveyed buildings. ARUP is solely responsible for the accuracy of the information provided and the continuation of the monitoring effort. ARUP is also responsible for ensuring that the property owners concur with the surveying methods and the results.
2. The list of 19 buildings previously provided by BBII is accurate and is in conformance with ARUP's list.
3. The TJPA will arrange for a survey of the outside of these buildings with the attendance of the property owners. BBII will attend with its professional photographer as required by the Specifications.

3. Correct.

---

**T-0067.1** **BSE - Joint Preconstruction Survey Follow-Up** **Closed** **02/06/2012** **02/16/2012** **02/15/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields **To:** Arup Kevin Clinch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per 01 15 40 and confirmed within RFI #T-067: ARUP is to provide monitoring information from adjacent buildings including but not limited to, active crack monitoring. ARUP will make the initial survey and subsequent monitoring information available to BBII. Please provide this information.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Arup has provided the pre-construction surveys to the TJPA via the Architect. The Contractor's request will be addressed by the TJPA.

---

**T-0067.2** **BSE - Monitoring Information for 545 Mission** **Closed** **02/13/2012** **02/13/2012** **02/16/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Ref RFI T-0067 and T-0067.1

Please provide the monitoring information from 3/23/2011 through 11/01/2011 as agreed to in response to RFI T-0067.

George Metzger - ARUP Response: Arup has provided the TJPA, via the Architect, the reports and photographs documenting our visits which have been made at the request of the TJPA. The Contractor's request will be addressed by the TJPA.

Per Jack Adams of Turner Construction:

Contractor is directed to fulfill their contractual obligations and perform the work described in Specification Section 01 15 40 PROTECTION OF PROPERTY for all buildings adjacent to the Project.

Contractor will coordinate the Joint Survey to establish authenticity of claims by coordinating access and access dates with TJPA Representatives (Singer Associates).

---

**T-0068** **BSE - Soil Encountered During Installation of Pile Removal Instrumentation** **Closed** **03/22/2011** **04/01/2011** **03/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

When ARUP was installing their pile removal instrumentation, they recorded the depths of the various soil layers they encountered.

Please provide BBII these depths for the pile extraction work.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Soil log attached.

---

**T-0069** **BSE - Revised Shoring Wall Layout Clarification** **Closed** **03/23/2011** **04/02/2011** **03/28/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

BBII believes there is an issue with some of the information provided regarding the revised shoring wall

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

layout.

The following information was provided on drawing SKGT-0001-R1:

- The (x, y) distances of the intersection of the LOL's of segments X1-1 and R2-1 (Point P on attached sketch) from the intersection of 1-line and J-line: (x, y) = (73'-2 1/4", 166'-4").
- The (x, y) distances of the radial center of segment R2-1 (Point C on attached sketch) from the intersection of 1-line and J-line: (x, y) = (490'-7 1/4", 640'-10 1/4").
 The radius of the LOL of segment R2-1 as 633'-6".

The distance between the point P and point C can be calculated with the above information:
 ΔX = 490'-7¼" minus 73'-2¼" = 417'-5" = 417.417
 ΔY = 640'-10¼" minus 166'-4" = 474'-6¼" = 474.521
 D = (ΔX2 + ΔY2)1/2 = (417.4172 + 474.5212)1/2 = 632.053'

Using the distances provided on SKGT-0001-R1 gives a distance of 632.053' between point P and C. This distance must be 633'-6" because it lies along segment R2-1 and the radius of the arc is given. There must be an error in either the radius or one of the other given dimensions. BBII requests an expedited response as this information is critical to our work.

The dimensions to the corner of the LOL where segment X1-1 and R2-1 meet have been revised.

See the attached SKGT-0001-R2.

---

**T-0070** **BSE - Excavation Permit for Pre-trenching in the Public Right of Way** **Closed** **03/24/2011** **04/04/2011** **03/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 14 10 and attached sheet

BBII would like to confirm the following:

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

For pre-trenching work, Contractor is expected to acquire excavation permit from DPW. Permit fee is reimbursable by TJPA.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

- BBII is responsible for applying for Excavation Permits from the San Francisco Department of Public Works for all of the pre-trench excavations in the public right-of-way.
- Per Specification Section 01 14 10 Appendix (attached), TJPA will compensate BBII for the excavation permit costs.

In addition to the excavation permit, please note the the pre-trenching activity may need to obtain street space permit from DPW for work in Minna, Natoma, Fremont, Beale, and 1st (fee also reimbursed by TJPA), and Special Traffic Permit (as required) from DPT (or Sustainable Streets Division, SFMTA).

---

**T-0071** **RFI T-0071 - 301 Mission Screen Wall - Waterproofing at South face** **Closed** **03/25/2011** **04/04/2011** **04/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached letter

Please see the attached letter dated March 16, 2011 by Erik Liu of Transworld.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Please clarify this RFI.

It is not clear what information/clarification (if any) is being requested, nor is it clear if a specific recommendation is being proposed/submitted for acceptance.

---

**T-0072** **BSE - Concrete Sidewalk and SD Removal in Zone 4** **Closed** **03/30/2011** **04/09/2011** **04/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached photos showing concrete sidewalk and sewer manhole in Zone 4, adjacent to 301 Mission building

The sidewalk and sewer manhole (as seen in the photos) is not in the BSE contract work and will need to be removed prior to pre-trenching. BBI is scheduled to start their pre-trenching activities on 04/11/2011.

Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition Drawings D-1014, D1060, D-1063, D-1072, D1076, D-1202, D-1206 , D-1215 define extent of demolition contract.

Refer to Contract and BSE Drawings D-0001 and D1001 Notes for BSE Demolition scope.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0073 | BSE - Request for Response Spectra | Closed | 03/30/2011 | 04/09/2011 | 04/07/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 53 13

During a meeting with the San Francisco DBI & DPW, it was expressed that BBII must use response spectra generated by ARUP in the design of the temporary bridges. It was also noted that if the bridges are going to be in place for over 5 years, the design must be for a permanent structure and the specified ground motion may not be suitable. Therefore, BBII requests response spectra for a ground motion with a 10% probability of exceedence in 50 years as specified, as well as for a ground motion with a 7.5% probability of exceedence in 75 years.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

This request needs to be discussed in more detail. We will provide this in time for Tuesday's meeting.

Adamson Comment:

The meeting referenced will be held on April 12, 2011. The purpose of delivering the information in the meeting is to confirm that the Contractor and Arup have a common understanding of the requested information and the data being transmitted.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0073.1 | BSE - Request for Response Spectra | Closed | 03/30/2011 | 04/09/2011 | 04/14/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Response to RFI#T-0073

During a meeting with the San Francisco DBI & DPW, it was expressed that BBII must use response spectra generated by ARUP in the design of the temporary bridges. It was also noted that if the bridges are going to be in place for over 5 years, the design must be for a permanent structure and the specified ground motion may not be suitable. Therefore, BBII requests response spectra for a ground motion with a 10% probability of exceedence in 50 years as specified, as well as for a ground motion with a 7.5% probability of exceedence in 75 years.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Attached are:

1. Arup Amec (2010) report Tables 3-3(bedrock), 3-7a ( base of structure West end of box), 3-7b (base of structure East end of box), 3-9 (ratio vertical to horizontal spectral acceleration ratios) and Table 3-4 giving scale factors for near-fault effects. Note that these spectra exclude structural interaction effects and do not include the progressive softening effects that will occur progressively in the Old Bay Clay.

2. Output from LS Dyna dynamic analyses of the temporary (1 in 100 year return period) condition at 301 Mission, adjacent Fremont Street abutment, using the Kobe bedrock and far-field motions to generate the horizontal acceleration spectrum at the top of the shoring wall. This produces increased spectral accelerations at the fundamental period ( understood to be 0.8s) of the Contractor's bridge structure.

Arup recommends that a meeting be held to review

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

and discuss these after the Contractor's engineer has examined them.

---

**T-0074** **301 Mission Wall - Nelson Stud and Stirrup Locations** **Closed** **04/01/2011** **04/11/2011** **04/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: RFI T-0027

Per field conversation, please confirm that it is acceptable to install/weld nelson studs at 9" on center at locations in front of the vault intrusions into the concrete stem wall, where the #8 size dowels are also spaced at 9" on center, per RFI T-0027. The Nelson Stud spacing will match dowel embeddment locations. This spacing also facilitates the installation of rebar stirrups and provides two tie points, one being the dowel, and the other the nelson stud.

This work is currently ongoing and immediate confirmation is requested. Please confirm this layout is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Industry standard practice is to use miscellaneous added tie rebar (e.g. #3 or #4 bar) to provide for requirements to tie reinforcement bars as required. This RFI is a request to change spacing of nelson stud bars from 12" o.c. to 9" o.c. (where #8 dowels are spaced at 9" o.c.) in lieu of use of added tie bars.

We note this request is for convenience of the Contractor and on this basis take no exception to reducing the spacing of the nelson stud bars from 12" o.c. to 9" o.c. (where #8 dowels are spaced at 9" o.c.). Accordingly, no change in contract and/or extension in schedule will be provided to accommodate this Contractor request. All impacts including cost and schedule associated with reducing spacing of nelson stud bars shall be borne solely by the Contractor.

David Fyfe, 04/01/2011

---

No CR will be issued for work associated with the change in nelson stud spacing from 12" o.c. to 9" o.c. (where #8 dowels are spaced at 9" o.c.).

Kevin Chiu, 04/01/2011

---

**T-0075** **BSE - Specification Section 32 12 17 and 32 12 18** **Closed** **04/04/2011** **04/14/2011** **04/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

We noticed that the Specification 32 12 17 at the bid has been revised to 32 12 18 in the IFC Document.
1. Please confirm that the content of the specification "STREET EXCAVATION AND RESTORATION" was unchanged between pre-bid and post-bid.
2. Please confirm that the Trade Subcontractor shall continue to use the Specification Number 32 12 18 and TJPA shall revise the Table of Contents and other specification sections referring to "32 12 17."

1. Confirmed. Street Excavation and Restoration specification was issued as 32 12 17 in the IFB set, and issued as 32 12 18 to avoid duplication with the Pavement Restoration specification for the Utilities trade packages.

2. Confirmed. As stated above, 32 12 17 is for Pavement Restoration section for the Utilities trade packages, and is not applicable for TG03 Work.

---

**T-0076** **BSE - Footing and Pile Removal at Bent 59 - 61** **Closed** **04/04/2011** **04/14/2011** **04/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-1072, D-1030, D-1046, and D-5103 and Spec Section 01 35 65

Please advise the following as discussed with BBII on 03-28-2011 have been completed per the Demolition Contract:
- Bent 59-61 - Removal of columns, footings and timber piles as required to complete 4'x4' x13' excavation below grade complete and backfilled. (Refer to drawings D-1072, D-1030, D-1046).

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition of both Bent 59 and 61 was completed per Demolition Contract Drawing D-1046 Rev.0 Dated 01/04/10 and Drawing CL-17456 Rev.1 dated 8/10/09.

Bent footings were demolished to the minimum 3 feet below grade per drawing D-1046 and applicable notes. Locations of these Utility Pole Foundations were determined by SFMTA (MUNI) and BLHP (Street Lighting).

The three (3) locations total for the new Utility Pole Foundations had the bent footings removed and were excavated to a depth of 13' (+/-). Wood piles were not "pulled." Pile removal consisted of removing the top of pile as required to install the pole foundations to depth.

---

**T-0077** **BSE - Monitoring Plans and Data for Zone 4 and Lot N** **Closed** **04/04/2011** **04/14/2011** **04/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 35 65

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Project "110 - Existing Terminal Building & Ramps Project" in Constructware contains the following

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

As discussed at the site walk through meeting on 03-28-2011 with BBII, BBII requests a copy of the demolition contract monitoring plan and any data in relation to demolition contract mitigation monitoring of Lot N and Zone 4.

submittals with the monitoring data requested-

1. 011540-02.0 Pre-Construction Survey - 181 Fremont St
2. 011540-04.0 Pre-Construction Survey - 199 Fremont St

Note: 301 Mission did not provide the demo contactor access therefore data is not available for this property.

---

**T-0078** **BSE - Timber Piles Not Yet Surveyed by EBI** **Closed** **04/04/2011** **04/14/2011** **04/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached photos and sketch

While BBII was excavating the trial pile extraction area and exposing the timber piles on 03/31/11, piles that were not surveyed by EBI were discovered on the eastern side of the TPE area close to pile 215053. Please advise on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition Contractor exposed tops of wooden piles as part of demolition and was not required to survey wooden piles.

BBII should follow contract Spec 02-41-19 Pile Removal Para 1.4 and provide existing timber pile documentation.

Each pile over contract quantity will be reimbursed as force account (unless parties can agree on a unit rate) in accord with CCO no. T-001 Rev 2 dated 4/8/11.

---

**T-0079** **BSE - Existing Street Light Footing Locations** **Closed** **04/04/2011** **04/14/2011** **04/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 02 41 01

As discussed at the site walk through meeting 03-28-2011 with BBII, the pre-existing street light poles were relocated per demo contract. BBII was told the foundations and timber piles for the pre-existing street lights have not been removed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Spec 02-41-00 is the Spec for Demolition Contractor and Demolition Drawing D-1084 scopes the Lighting Removal and Replacement Plan.

All Pre-existing street lights scoped in the Demolition Contract Drawings were demolished and removed. There are no pre-existing lights, street light

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please provide BBII with as-built drawings indicating the pre-existing street light locations. Pre-existing streetlight foundations will need to be removed before CDSM wall installation, if a conflict is identified.

foundations or OCS pole foundations remaining installed that were contracted for demolition by Demolition Contractor.

The (3) three Light Poles and Light Pole Foundations located at Fremont St. per Demolition Drawing D-1084 are on "Portable Foundations" (versus poured concrete foundations).

The (3) three Light Poles and Light Pole Foundations located on First St. per Demolition Drawing D-1084 are on poured underground foundations anchored to basement floor.

This is less scope for BSE Contractor who will not have to disconnect and demolish pole foundations that were located in the Frmont St. excavations. Locations of these Portable Light Poles at Fremont and underground foundation Light/OCS Poles on First St. were determined by SFMTA (MUNI) and BLHP (Street Lighting).

---

**T-0080** **BSE - Additional Timber Piles Not Surveyed by EBI** **Closed** **04/04/2011** **04/14/2011** **04/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0078 and attached photos and sketch

While BBII was excavating the trial pile extraction area and exposing the timber piles on 04/01/2011, piles that were not surveyed by EBI were discovered on the southern side of the TPE area close to piles 215044, 215043 and in the centre of the TPE area at 215054, as shown in the attached drawing. The pile next to 215054 was extracted due to its proximity to 215054. A total of 7 additional piles have now been discovered to date. Please advise BBII on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

BBII should follow contract Spec 02-41-19 Pile Removal Para 1.4 and provide existing timber pile documentation.

Each pile over contract quantity will be reimbursed as force account (unless parties can agree on a unit rate) in accord with CCO no. T-001 Rev 2 dated 4/8/11.

---

**T-0081** **BSE - Revised Shoring Wall Alignment Dimension** **Closed** **04/05/2011** **04/15/2011** **04/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached sheet SKGT-0001-R1

The dimension from gridline J to the intersection of wall segments 1-1 and X1-1 was not updated for the revised shoring wall alignment - see attached drawing for reference. Please provide the correct dimension.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The dimensions have been revised. See the attached SKGT-0001-R3.

---

**T-0082** **BSE - Hazardous Material Removed From Site** **Closed** **04/05/2011** **04/15/2011** **04/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 00 03 35

Please confirm that all hazardous material has been removed from site per the extent of demolition contract drawings for Zone 4 and Lot N.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Above ground structures and foundations were demolished at Parcel N, including footings to minus 3 feet. Demolition contract Hazardous materials scope was completed including 133 Beale st. Bar and Grille.

Refer to Demolition Drawings D-1011, D-1012, D-1013, D-1029, D1030, D1044-1046 and D-1252 for extent of removal of structures and hazardous material.

---

**T-0083** **BSE - Existing Utilities Decommissioning Lot N and Zone 4** **Closed** **04/05/2011** **04/15/2011** **04/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2230 and Specification Section 02 41 01

Please provide as built drawings for all decommissioned utilities in Lot N and Zone 4 to BBII.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Parcel N: Exisiting Utilities were decommissioned (e.g. cut and cap) in accord with Contract Drawings which only is 133 Beale st. Bar and Grille per D-1252.

Parcel D Zone 4 : Exisiting Utilities were decommissioned (e.g. cut and cap) in accord with Contract Demolition Drawings D-1202, D-1203, D-1206, D-1207, D-1210, D-1215

However: Two (2) locations of Existing Combined Sewer Connections ("SEWER") shown on D-1202 and D-1206 were as left unplugged to assist BBII with

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Dewatering discharge pipes. Locations are identified as follows: "3/D-1210 SEWER" on sheets D-1202, D-1206 and "-/- SEWER" on sheets D-1202, D-1206 (NE Corner of Lot D; no detail number provided).

Demolition Contractor has not completed their scope of Contract and therefore has not submiited their final as-built drawings in Constructware. However, they are available in Demolition Contractor's trailer office for your viewing.

---

**T-0083.1** **BSE - Existing Utilities Decommissioning Lot N and Zone 4** **Closed** **04/05/2011** **04/15/2011** **05/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Response to RFI#T-0083, Sheet D-2230 and Specification Section 02 41 01

The following response of RFI T-0083 is not acceptable and will become out of control of the RFI documentation process: "they are available in Demolition Contractor's trailer office for your viewing."

Please provide BBI with as built drawings for all utilities which has been decommissioned to date in Lot N and Zone 4 to BBII.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition Contractor has no Utility Demolition scope at Parcel N.

Demolition Contractor has completed Utility Demolition scope at Parcel D (Zone 4) per contract drawings except where agreed by BBIi.

These as-built Utility Demolition Drawings are currently under review by the Engineer of Record and will be issued to Webcor/Obayashi for their use after this review is complete.

---

**T-0084** **BSE - Existing Storm Drains Decommissioning in Lot N** **Closed** **04/05/2011** **04/15/2011** **04/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2230 and Specification Section 02 41 01

There are 2 existing storm drain basins in Lot N not yet decommissioned. Please provide BBII the status of

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Parcel N: Existing Utilities were decommissioned (e.g. cut and cap) in accord with Contract Drawings which only is 133 Beale St. Bar and Grille per D-1252.

There are two Storm Drain outlets on parcel N and

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

decommissioning or modification of these lines.

their status' are unknown because they are outside the scope of the demolition contractor. Unforeseen Catch Basin at Beale Street Bar & Grill is identified under Demolition Contractor RFI -00058. These have been observed draining the water from parcel N during the rainy season.

---

**T-0084.1** **BSE - Existing Storm Drains Decommissioning in Lot N** **Closed** **04/21/2011** **05/01/2011** **05/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0084, Drawing Sheet D-2230, and Specification Section 02 41 01

RFI response T-0084 has not provided clear direction for decommissioning these SD lines. The drawings indicate that the SD drain flows towards Beale Street and will conflict with the CDSM wall. Please advise on status for decommissioning the above SD lines.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

As stated in response to RFI T-0084 there are two Storm Drain outlets on Parcel N and their status' are unknown because they are outside the scope of the demolition contractor. Unforeseen Catch Basin at Beale Street Bar & Grill is identified under Demolition Contractor RFI -00058.

This is outside the scope of the Demolition and the BSE contract. Webcor-Obayashi RUP relocation of Utilities Project Manager will be contacted for reroute or decommissioning these Parcel N parking lot storm drain lines.

---

**T-0085** **BSE - Existing Site Conditions Lot N** **Closed** **04/05/2011** **04/15/2011** **04/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 15 40

Prior to demolition work Lot N surface consisted of asphalt paving, however a majority of the Lot is not currently paved. BBII assumes that the lot will be restored to its original condition. Please confirm

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition Contractor was not required to restore areas specified for demolition with asphalt paving (areas such as Parcel N). This was not specified for in the demolition Contract drawings or Spec. The demolition contractor is required to backfill after removal of below grade structures with recycled crushed/processed demolition concrete. For Parcel N - Refer to drawing D-1029 Note 9.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0086 | BSE - Clean Debris From Adjacent Buildings To Lot N and Zone 4 | Closed | 04/05/2011 | 04/15/2011 | 04/11/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 15 40

Please confirm that demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners, and BBII will only be responsible for cleaning dust and debris generated by BBII during its own operations, after the turnover of these are completed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed. Demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners to date. This was confirmed through conversation with both EBi and Singer Associates.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0087 | BSE - Zone 4 Gate | Closed | 04/05/2011 | 04/15/2011 | 04/11/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Demo Contract Drawings

Per note 5 on drawing D-1006 of the demolition contract, each discreet fenced area shall have a minimum of two 16ft gates at the conclusion of demolition work. Currently, zone 4 only has one gate in place. BBII requests an additional gate be provided on the Fremont St. side of zone 4. BBII is available to meet and coordinate an ideal location.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition Contractor second 16 foot gate eliminated due to Fremont Shoring wall. Demolition contractor used alternate means and methods for truck traffic to-from parcel D Zone 4.

That said, Demolition contractor has offered gate credit which could be used to install a 16 wide gate either at SW corner near 181 Fremont St. or on the Beale St. fence line. However- Demolition contractor would not be responsible for curb cut, removal of parking meters or other ancillary scope if Beale St. gate is chosen - that would be the responsibility of BSE Contractor. BBII can use/modify and relocate barrier fence and gates as needed per your contract. A field coordination meeting after the Monday 4/11/11 Street Coordination meeting is recommended.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0088 | BSE - Temporary Shoring Wall and Buttress Conflict | Closed | 04/06/2011 | 04/16/2011 | 04/08/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

This issue was discussed at yesterday's (4/6/11) BSE

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

The temporary shoring wall installed under the demolition contract was moved East away from Fremont St. to avoid an unknown existing concrete wall. The as-built alignment of the wall now falls along the edge of the third column (C) of buttress shafts. In an effort to avoid conflicts with column C shafts generated by the revised temporary shoring wall alignment, BBII suggests that the buttress formation be moved 12'' East.

meeting. The information which will be included in the Contractor's drilled shaft work plan is needed by Arup to evaluate the feasibility of the proposed shift and to consider other options.

---

**T-0088.1** **BSE - Temporary Shoring Wall and Buttress Conflict** **Closed** **04/06/2011** **04/16/2011** **04/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

The response for RFI #T-0088 was not an answer to the question
Please provide an appropriate direction to start preparing the submittal and the work as soon as possible.

---

Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29

The temporary shoring wall installed under the demolition contract was moved East away from Fremont St. to avoid an unknown existing concrete wall. The as-built alignment of the wall now falls along the edge of the third column (C) of buttress shafts. In an effort to avoid conflicts with column C shafts generated by the revised temporary shoring wall alignment, BBII suggests that the buttress formation be moved 12'' East.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The contractor may relocate the entire buttress structure up to 12 inches east of the design location in order to clear any conflict with the Fremont Street shoring wall. Contractor is requested to identify the new layout and any impacts prior to start of buttress construction.

---

**T-0088.2** **BSE - Temporary shoring wall and buttress conflict** **Closed** **04/06/2011** **04/27/2011** **04/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

The response for RFI #T-0088.1 was not an acceptable

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

answer to the question.

Please provide exact revised layout as required.

The Buttresses have exact Coordinate Locations to define the layout, as shown on GT-2201.

The existing coordinates must be changed to reflect the new layout the TJPA desires.

History

_____

Information from RFI#T-0088.1

The response for RFI #T-0088 was not an answer to the question
Please provide an appropriate direction to start preparing the submittal and the work as soon as possible.
Answered By: George Metzger
Answered On: 20-Apr-2011
Answer:
The contractor may relocate the entire buttress structure up to 12 inches east of the design location in order to clear any conflict with the Fremont Street shoring wall. Contractor is requested to identify the new layout and any impacts prior to start of buttress construction.

---

Information from RFI#T-0088

Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29

The temporary shoring wall installed under the demolition contract was moved East away from Fremont St. to avoid an unknown existing concrete wall. The as-built alignment of the wall now falls along the edge of the third column (C) of buttress shafts. In an effort to avoid conflicts with column C shafts generated by the revised temporary shoring wall alignment, BBII suggests that the buttress formation be moved 12'' East.
Suggestion
Cost Impact Potentially Cost Amount
Schedule Impact Potentially Days

The Contractor's cover sheet describes this as RFI 0088.2, but the correct number is 0088.3.

See attached SKGT-0002.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Answered By George Metzger
Date Answered 2011-04-20
Answer The contractor may relocate the entire buttress structure up to 12 inches east of the design location in order to clear any conflict with the Fremont Street shoring wall. Contractor is requested to identify the new layout and any impacts prior to start of buttress construction.

---

**T-0088.3** **BSE - Temporary shoring wall and buttress conflict** **Closed** **04/06/2011** **04/27/2011** **04/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

The response for RFI #T-0088.1 was not an acceptable answer to the question.

Please provide exact revised layout as required.

The Buttresses have exact Coordinate Locations to define the layout, as shown on GT-2201.

The existing coordinates must be changed to reflect the new layout the TJPA desires.

History

_____

Information from RFI#T-0088.1

The response for RFI #T-0088 was not an answer to the question
Please provide an appropriate direction to start preparing the submittal and the work as soon as possible.
Answered By: George Metzger
Answered On: 20-Apr-2011
Answer:
The contractor may relocate the entire buttress structure up to 12 inches east of the design location in order to clear any conflict with the Fremont Street shoring wall.
Contractor is requested to identify the new layout and any impacts prior to start of buttress construction.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The Contractor's cover sheet describes this as RFI 0088.2, but the correct number is 0088.3.

See attached SKGT-0002.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

---
---
Information from RFI#T-0088

Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29

The temporary shoring wall installed under the demolition contract was moved East away from Fremont St. to avoid an unknown existing concrete wall. The as-built alignment of the wall now falls along the edge of the third column (C) of buttress shafts. In an effort to avoid conflicts with column C shafts generated by the revised temporary shoring wall alignment, BBII suggests that the buttress formation be moved 12'' East.
Suggestion
Cost Impact Potentially Cost Amount
Schedule Impact Potentially Days
Answered By George Metzger
Date Answered 2011-04-20
Answer The contractor may relocate the entire buttress structure up to 12 inches east of the design location in order to clear any conflict with the Fremont Street shoring wall. Contractor is requested to identify the new layout and any impacts prior to start of buttress construction.

---

**T-0089** **BSE - Existing Asphalt and Concrete Removed Zone 4** **Closed** **04/06/2011** **04/16/2011** **04/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-1001 and Demo Contract Dwgs D-1060, D-1072 and attached photos

Please see attached photos showing asphalt pavement at the entrance to zone 4 on the northeast corner. The referenced asphalt driveway is not in the BSE contract work and will need to be removed. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The asphalt pavement at the entrance to zone 4 on the northeast corner is not in demolition contract scope. Contract scope included concrete columns, footings and mat slab to be removed as defined in contract drawings. Refer to demolition drawing D-1058 for best depiction of extent of demolition.

Refer also to D-1014, D-1030, D-1058, D-1060, D-1063 and D-1072

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0090 | BSE - Timber Piles Not Surveyed By EBI 04/04/11 | Closed | 04/06/2011 | 04/16/2011 | 04/13/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Jack Adams
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached photos and sketch

While BBII were excavating the trial pile extraction area and exposing the timber piles on 04/04/2011, piles that were not surveyed by EBI were discovered on the eastern side of the TPE area close to pile 215053 and in the western side of the TPE area at 215055 as shown in the attached drawing. The pile next to 215055 was extracted due to its proximity to 215055. A total of 10 additional piles have now been discovered to date. Please advise on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

BBII should follow contract Spec 02-41-19 Pile Removal Para 1.4 and provide existing timber pile documentation.

Each pile over contract quantity will be reimbursed as force account (unless parties can agree on a unit rate) in accord with CCO no. T-001 Rev 2 dated 4/8/11.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0091 | Reciept of Construction Documents | Closed | 04/06/2011 | 04/16/2011 | 04/08/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — David Hungerford
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC — Alfred Lau
**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per the 110325_MSTR_CD_Work_Plan schedule, transmitted to Webcor/Obayashi on March 28, 2011 and discussed in the OAC Meeting on April 6, 2011; confirm the following dates should be implemented in the next monthly schedule update:

1. Webcor/Obayashi will receive the 90% CD documents on August 24, 2011

2. Webcor/Obayashi will receive the 100% CD documents on December 2, 2011

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirm. These are the current scheduled dates provided by the Design Team.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0092 | BSE - Timber Piles Not Surveyed By EBI 4/5/11 | Closed | 04/06/2011 | 04/16/2011 | 04/13/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Jack Adams
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached photos and sketch

While BBII was excavating the trial pile extraction area and exposing the timber piles on 4/5/11, two further piles

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

BBII should follow contract Spec 02-41-19 Pile Removal Para 1.4 and provide existing timber pile documentation.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

that were not surveyed by EBI were discovered on the southern side of the TPE area close to piles 215043 and 215044. Following this, four additional piles to the north west of the area adjacent to 215067 and 215068 as shown in the attached drawing were discovered. A total of 16 additional piles have now been discovered to date. Please advise on how to proceed.

Each pile over contract quantity will be reimbursed as force account (unless parties can agree on a unit rate) in accord with CCO no. T-001 Rev 2 dated 4/8/11.

---

**T-0093** **BSE - CDSM Wall Segment 35-1 Spacing Confirmation** **Closed** **04/07/2011** **04/17/2011** **04/08/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheets GT-2103, GT-5101 and Specification Section 31 56 13

In drawing GT-5101, the spacing of all shoring wall beams is specified as 4'-0". This is reflected in the drawings for all sections of the CDSM shoring wall except the east wall (Wall Segment 35-1). The beam spacing of this Segment (measured in AutoCad) is 3.94728'. This creates a dimension bust of approximately 2.4' over the length of the wall and significant problems based on the auger spacing. Please verify the spacing of beams in Wall Segment 35-1.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The spacing of the soldier piles shall be the stated dimension in the documents (4'-0", unless otherwise noted). The Contractor is reminded to not scale the drawings. Additionaly, the AutoCad dwg files are not part of the contract documents and the Contractor is not to obtain dimensions off the electronic files.

---

**T-0094** **BSE - Timber Piles Not Surveyed By EBI 04-06-11** **Closed** **04/08/2011** **04/18/2011** **04/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached photo and sketch

While BBII were excavating the trial pile extraction area and exposing the timber piles on 4/6/11, an additional pile was found close to 215068 as shown on the attached drawing and photos. A total of 17 additional piles have now been discovered to date. Please advise on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

BBII should follow contract Spec 02-41-19 Pile Removal Para 1.4 and provide existing timber pile documentation.

Each pile over contract quantity will be reimbursed as force account (unless parties can agree on a unit rate) in accord with CCO no. T-001 Rev 2 dated 4/8/11.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0095 | BSE - Zone 1 CDSM Test Section Relocation | Closed | 04/11/2011 | 04/21/2011 | 04/14/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc — George Metzger
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-2101, Specification Section 31 56 13 and attached drawing

Per discussion with ARUP at the Wednesday April 06, 2011 Design Coordination Meeting, the Engineer was willing to consider relocating the Zone 1 CDSM test panel as shown on Dwg. GT-2101 from Zone 1 and into Zone 2. BBII and DND Construction are therefore proposing to relocate the Zone 1 CDSM test panel to the location shown on the attached drawing, near gridline 10. Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:
This is acceptable.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0096 | BSE - Old Existing Footing Along 301 Mission in Zone 4 | Closed | 04/11/2011 | 04/21/2011 | 04/12/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Jack Adams
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 02 41 01

During Pre-Trench BBII found an existing footing along the Low Rise 301 Mission wall. The footing consists of bricks and concrete. It also has a perpendicular footing that come out from footing that is parallel to the 301 Mission building wall. BBII has exposed a 20 to 30ft section of this footing (approximately on Grid Line "A" between 30 and 32).

Please advise BBII as to how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per Contract Spec. 31-56-13 Shoring wall by CDSM Method Para 3.2 Pretrenching and removal of Obstructions, Contractor is to " remove any obstructions that might be encountered along the alignment of the walls. The depth and width of trench shall be that required to remove the obsructions from the path of the shoring wall."

The Archaeologist was contacted and viewed the exposed section of wall and brick debris on 4/11/11. Further archeological investigation will folllow as pre-trenching continues and areas are exposed - Ref: Spec. 00-08-12 for Archaeological conditions in Zone 4.

Demolition of underground obstructions shall be per Spec 02-41-01 and Demolition Debris shall be handled in accord with Spec. 01-74-00.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0096.1 | BSE - Old Existing Footing Along 301 Mission in Zone 4 | Closed | 04/20/2011 | 04/30/2011 | 05/02/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Jack Adams
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference response to RFI T-0096 and Specification Section 02 41 01

BBII interprets the Response to RFI T-0096 (BBI 0067) as TJPA's approval for the removal of this unforeseen structure. Please confirm.

BBII proposes to follow the method outlined below for the removal of this unforeseen structure. Please confirm in writing that the removal of this unforeseen structure is approved and that provided that it is performed with the method outlined below, no damage to adjacent buildings will occur.

Pre Trench Obstruction Removal Method

Location:
Parallel along the 301 Mission St. Low Rise (Grid line A, approximately between lines 29 & 34).

Obstructions:
The footing consists of bricks and concrete. It also has a perpendicular footing that comes out from the footing that is parallel to the 301 Mission building wall.

Method:
BBII will first expose the obstructions and use an excavator mounted and hand held jackhammer to demolish the large masses into smaller more manageable sizes. An excavator with a bucket will then clear the debris, until the debris is removed from the area of the CDSM Wall location. BBII will chase the obstruction as deep as it goes in order to remove all debris necessary for a clean location to construct the CDSM Wall. Due to the unknown depth of the obstruction, at BBII discretion Sheet Piles or trench boxes may be used to support trench walls. All OSHA approved, safe practices will be used by BBII employees during the Demolition.

Additional Details:
As noted in the RFI response, the Archeologist has already examined the site. BBII (W/O) will notify the TJPA if additional structures or items are encountered.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Construction means and methods are the contractor's responsibility exclusively. RFI response are not authorization of any change in contract sum or contract time.

We take no exception to above method for the removal of structure. This work will be tracked in accord with CR T-0010.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0097 | BSE - Protective Material Along 301 Mission St Wall | Closed | 04/20/2011 | 04/30/2011 | 05/06/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached photos

BBII has encountered a drainage material along the 301 Mission wall while pretrenching. During pretrenching, this drainage material has been removed because it was not affixed to the structure. The wall does not have any exterior waterproofing system.

Upon installation of the CDSM shoring system, the cementious material will be against this wall. The existing wall is a 5' deep cantilevered beam on the backside of the existing garage shaft for 301 Mission. Does TJPA plan to install any waterproofing along this wall that can tolerate the installation of a CDSM shoring system?

Please advise BBII of the TJPA's plan for waterproofing of this building.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Drainage material encountered is to be removed from the 301 Mission Wall as it was a temporary measure installed at the time of 301 Mission building construction. No waterproofing is required at this location. See attached email response from R. Rothenburger at PMPC.

---

04/19/2011 - George Metzger

TJPA to provide direction to GC.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0098 | 301 Mission Wall - Tube Steel Alignment | Closed | 04/12/2011 | 04/22/2011 | 04/21/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: B/S-5000 and D/A-6000

Detail B on sheet S-5000 shows the 10" tube steel centered on the 14" concrete wall below, however this is in conflict with D/A-6000 which shows the steel tube off set from the center of the wall. Please confirm per the 301 Mission subcontractor meeting conversation yesterday, that the tube steel is to be centered on the center of the wall as dimensioned in B/S-5000.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

"Confirmed. The 10"x10"x5/8" HSS section shall be erected on the center line of the concrete wall as dimensioned in Section B on S-5000."

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0099 | BSE - Depth of Fremont Street Shoring Wall in Zone 4 | Closed | 04/12/2011 | 04/22/2011 | 04/14/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2203 and attached as-built, photos,

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The temporary Fremont St. shoring wall was

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

and document
CPM Activity Impacted - SX-BB42640

While excavating adjacent to the existing Fremont street shoring wall as shown on contract drawing D-2203, BBII has found the existing shoring wall's height to be approximately 2' shorter than the 14 feet depth indicated in the as-builts (attached). This wall does not provide adequate shoring height for BBII to excavate and expose the timber piles prior to extraction. (See attached photo for illustration)

The contract documents D-2203 and pre-bid Q&A response #182 (also attached) indicate this wall would accommodate the buttress area pile removal, however actual existing field conditions do not provide adequate shored depth

Please provide direction.

constructed to support Fremont St. and facilitate removal of Terminal basement slab, walls, and pile caps/footings. The temporary Fremont St. shoring wall was not intended nor constructed to facilitate pile removal activities.
BSE sheet D-2203 only specifies removal of the temporary Fremont St. shoring wall. Sheet D-2203 does not specify nor imply that the temporary Fremont St. shoring wall shall be used or is sufficient to be used for pile removal activities.
Response to QBD 182 was provided to bidders to enable bidders to form a basis for pricing removal of the temporary Fremont St. shoring wall.
If the Contractor is undertaking excavation activities which jeopardize the stability of the Fremont St. roadway/foundation, then Contractor shall take any and all necessary actions to protect Fremont St. roadway/foundation.

---

**T-0100** **BSE - Slurry Wall Along 301 Mission St Garage** **Closed** **04/13/2011** **04/23/2011** **04/18/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0096, Specification Section 02 41 00, and attached photos

Please reference from RFI#T-0096 (BBI RFI #67): "During Pre Trench BBII found an existing footing along the Low Rise 301 Mission wall. The footing consists of bricks and concrete. It also has a perpendicular footing that come out from footing that is parallel to the 301 Mission building wall. We have exposed a 20 to 30ft section of this footing (Approximately on Grid Line "A" between 30 and 32)."

After the Concrete and Brick Footing was discovered, a very large mass of slurry was discovered in the same area, and continues where the RFI#T-0096 (BBI RFI# 67) Concrete Footing" stopped. ***Please See Attached Photos***

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per Contract Spec. 31-56-13 Shoring wall by CDSM Method Para 3.2 Pretrenching and removal of Obstructions, Contractor is to " remove any obstructions that might be encountered along the alignment of the walls. The depth and width of trench shall be that required to remove the obsructions from the path of the shoring wall."

The Archaeologist was contacted and viewed the exposed section of wall and brick debris on 4/11/11. Further archeological investigation will folllow as pre-trenching continues and areas are exposed - Ref: Spec. 00-08-12 for Archaeological conditions in Zone 4.

Demolition of underground obstructions shall be per

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

This slurry wall seems to continue into the future location of the Pre-Trench, and was not in the contract drawings.

Please Advise BBII as to how to proceed.

Spec 02-41-01 and Demolition Debris shall be handled in accord with Spec. 01-74-00.

---

**T-0100.1** **BSE - Slurry Wall Along 301 Mission St Garage** **Closed** **04/20/2011** **04/30/2011** **05/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference response to RFI T-0100 and Specification Section 02 41 01

BBII interprets the Response to RFI#T-0100 (BBI 0070) as TJPA's approval for the removal of this unforeseen structure. Please confirm.

BBII proposes to follow the method outlined below for the removal of this unforeseen structure. Please confirm in writing that the removal of this unforeseen structure is approved and that provided that it is performed with the method outlined below, no damage to adjacent buildings will occur.

Pre Trench Obstruction Removal Method

Location:
Parallel along the 301 Mission St. Low Rise (Grid line A, approximately between lines 30 & 34).

Obstructions:
A very large mass of slurry.

Method:
BBII will first expose the obstructions and use an excavator mounted and hand held jackhammer to demolish the large masses into smaller more manageable sizes. An excavator with a bucket will then clear the debris, until the debris is removed from the area of the CDSM Wall location. BBII will chase the obstruction as deep as it goes in order to remove all debris necessary for

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Construction means and methods are the contractor's responsibility exclusively. RFI response are not authorization of any change in contract sum or contract time.

We take no exception to above method for the removal of structure. This work will be tracked in accord with CR T-0010.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

a clean location to construct the CDSM Wall. Due to the unknown depth of the obstruction, at BBII discretion Sheet Piles or trench boxes may be used to support trench walls. All OSHA approved, safe practices will be used by BBII employees during the Demolition.

Additional Details:
As noted in the RFI response, the Archeologist has already examined the site. BBII (W/O) will notify the TJPA if additional structures or items are encountered.

---

**T-0101** **BSE - Pile Extraction Procedure Modification** **Closed** **04/14/2011** **04/24/2011** **04/15/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 02 41 19 and attached response for TG0300-310 Production Extraction Plan

BBII proposes to eliminate the "stroking" of the steel casing right before the CLSM is placed.
Upon removal of the steel casing, BBII proposes to "stroke" the steel casing after the CLSM is placed.
BBII believes the same effect of filling the void will be achieved, and this procedure will help to expedite the Project schedule.
Please kindly review our proposal. Your prompt response is appreciated.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:
This is not acceptable. The proposed procedure does not allow the volume of placed CLSM to be measured after the stroking of the casing.

---

**T-0102** **BSE - Confirm Project Coordinates** **Closed** **04/15/2011** **04/25/2011** **04/19/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Drawings U-0100 and GT-0100

BBII's surveyor, KCA Engineers, has noticed some slight variations in bearings between the Utility drawings and the BSE drawings. Please see the following of KCA's

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response: The Building Grid and bearing has been established to best-fit the numerous constraints on the project. It is coincidental that the street control lines (note, these are not necessarily in the center of the Right-of-Way and should not be construed as

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

observations and confirm coordinates provided on drawing GT-0100.

Drawings U-0100 has coordinates along the center lines of various streets. The result of those coordinates put a bearing on the center line of Mission Street and Minna Street at North 46° 18 ' 19.6" East and the center line of First Street at North 43° 41 ' 39.0" West. This results in those streets not being at right angles to each other.

Drawings GT-0100 has coordinates on Column Line E. The result of those coordinates puts a bearing of North 46° 18' 09.7" East on the terminal Tills is 00° 00' 10" off from being parallel with Mission and Minna Streets.
Is this correct or should Column Line E be parallel with Mission and Minna Streets?

The numerical column lines are shown at right angles to Column Line E, which gives them a bearing of North 43° 41 ' 50.3" West. It was observed that Column Line 18 appeared to be in almost the same location as the center line of First Street, but First Street has a bearing of North 43° 41 ' 39.0" West which is 00° 00' 11" different than Column Line 18. Is it just a coincidence that the center line and column line are almost exactly in the same location or should something be adjusted to make the two lines identical?

Please advise if the bearings of the terminal should remain or be changed.

Center Lines) are very close, but at slightly different bearings. The building elements are constructed based on the building grid, whereas the utilities and subsequent street level improvements will be constructed based on the street control lines. The Numerical Bearings of the North South Grid lines appear to be correct. A follow-up survey control meeting should take place to ensure the shoring wall layout is performed as intended.

---

**T-0103** **BSE - Existing Concrete Footing Gridline J between Gridline 26.5-30** **Closed** **04/15/2011** **04/25/2011** **04/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Drawings D-5103, D-2203 and GT-5104

Please see attached photos showing an unknown concrete structure discovered on the south side of zone 4. This structure is located between gridline 26.5-30 along gridline J. BBII is not aware of the purpose for this

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per Contract Spec. 31-56-13 Shoring wall by CDSM Method Para 3.2 Pretrenching and removal of Obstructions, Contractor is to " remove any obstructions that might be encountered along the alignment of the walls. The depth and width of trench shall be that required to remove the obstructions from

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

structure, or if it has any affect on the stability of the adjacent structures (177/181 Fremont street).

The unknown structure was not present in the BSE contract drawings and is in direct conflict with the CDSM wall alignment, Please advise BBII how to proceed.

the path of the shoring wall."

The Archaeologist was contacted and viewed the exposed section of wall and brick debris on 4/11/11. Further archeological investigation will follow as pretrenching continues and areas are exposed - Ref: Spec. 00-08-12 for Archaeological conditions in Zone 4.

Demolition of underground obstructions shall be per Spec 02-41-01 and Demolition Debris shall be handled in accord with Spec. 01-74-00.

---

**T-0103.1** **BSE - Existing Concrete Footing Gridline J Between Gridline 26.5-30** **Closed** **04/27/2011** **05/07/2011** **05/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0103 and Specification Section 02 41 01

BBII interprets the Response to RFI T-0103 (BBI 0074) as TJPA's approval for the removal of this unforeseen structure. Please confirm.

BBII proposes to follow the method outlined below for the removal of this unforeseen structure. Please confirm in writing that the removal of this unforeseen structure is approved and that provided that it is performed with the method outlined below, no damage to adjacent buildings will occur.

Pre Trench Obstruction Removal Method

Location:
Parallel along the 177/181 Fremont Street (Grid line J, approximately between lines 26.5-30).

Obstructions:
A large concrete structure.

Method:
BBII will first expose the obstructions and use an

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Construction means and methods are the contractor's responsibility exclusively. RFI response are not authorization of any change in contract sum or contract time.

We take no exception to above method for the removal of structure. This work will be tracked in accord with CR T-0010.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

excavator mounted and hand held jackhammer to demolish the large masses into smaller more manageable sizes. An excavator with a bucket will then clear the debris, until the debris is removed from the area of the CDSM Wall location. BBII will chase the obstruction as deep as it goes in order to remove all debris necessary for a clean location to construct the CDSM Wall. Due to the unknown depth of the obstruction, at BBII discretion Sheet Piles or trench boxes may be used to support trench walls. All OSHA approved, safe practices will be used by BBII employees during the Demolition.

Additional Details:
As noted in the RFI response, the Archeologist has already examined the site. BBII (W/O) will notify the TJPA if additional structures or items are encountered.

---

**T-0104** **BSE - Request for Report (PSI for Caltrans)** **Closed** **04/18/2011** **04/28/2011** **04/18/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification 01 13 50 and 00 03 35

The Site Mitigation Plan in Spec section 01 13 50 of Volume 1, References the report "PSI for Caltrans, 1999." After looking through the contract documents for the Analytical back-up, BBII, Treadwell & Rollo, and Republic Services, have not been able to find it. It is necessary to have this information to properly dispose of the Hazardous Materials.
To Complete the Profile of the work site, the Disposal facility, Republic Services, BBII need the Lab Data/Analytical Data from the report.
At this time, the lack of information is halting the process of Material Off-Haul.
Please Advise, or supply the Needed Report Information.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Caltrans' Site Investigation Report for SFOBB West Approach, prepared by PSI in 1999 can be assessed from Constructware or from ftp site as below:

ftp://ftp.tjpa.org/Document%20Control/1104168/

Log In Instructions

1. Enter case-sensitive Username (public) and Password (PublicFTP1)

2. Select View\Open FTP Site in Windows Explorer

3. Drag file(s) to your desktop

Please contact PMPC Document Control should there is problem of accessing the information.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0105 | BSE - Train Box Beam Sizes | Closed | 04/20/2011 | 05/02/2011 | 04/22/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached sketches and Sheet S1-3201

Drawing S1-3201 provides information on beam sizing in the permanent concrete structure. BBII was recently provided additional structure sections in response to T-0035.1, and a number of the beams appear to have changed in size. Beams at gridlines 18, 26, 34, & 35 should be 5' wide according to schedule A on drawing S1-3201. However, from the section provided at gridline A, these all appear to be sized at 7' wide. The sizes of these beams are critical in determining the final geometry and location of our temporary bridges. BBII acknowledges that the structural drawings are not to be scaled, so please advise if these beams are to be 60" wide as indicated in schedule A, or if they have increased in size to 84" wide.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Thornton Tomasetti Reply:

The concrete beams at gridlines 18, 26, 34, & 35 at Ground Level have increased to 84" wide. The design is "in-progress".

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0106 | 301 Mission Wall - Connection from Metal Stud to Tube Steel | Closed | 04/20/2011 | 04/30/2011 | 04/27/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: E & C/S-5000

Please see E & C/S-5000. Transworld has attempted in their shop to set #10 SMS through the structural tube steel, as per plan. The attempt was unsuccessful, therefore Transworld tried the use of a Hilti X-U fastener into the structural steel. Attached are Hilti spec sheets for the X-U Universal Knurled Shank Fastener as well as a photo showing the X-U fastener through the structural steel. Welding is another option for connection to the tube steel. Please advise how Transworld is to fasten the metal stud to the structural tube steel.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The proposed Hilti X-U fasteners are for interior use only and are not acceptable for use on the 301 Mission exterior screen wall. Welding will damage the structural steel paint and light gauge steel galvanized coating and is not an acceptable means of connection.

To fasten metal stud to structural tube steel contractor may: 1) Use shot pins rated for exterior use (i.e. Hilti X-CR fastener - ESR 1663); or 2) Pre-drill holes and tap stainless steel machine screws.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0107 | BSE - Visual Test in Lieu of Formally Testing for Verticality in CSL Tubes | Closed | 04/20/2011 | 04/30/2011 | 04/22/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Reference RFI#T-0057, Sheet GT-5202, Specification Section 31 63 29, and attached documents
CPM Activity Impacted - Buttress Wall

Below are three cases (A, B, and C) in which formally testing for verticality on CSL tubes, BBII argues would prove to be highly unusual and counter-productive:

A. Specification Section 31.63.29.I.3 states "The contractor shall perform a test to determine verticality of the steel tubes, or drilled holes, that are going to be used for the sonic tests." Balfour Beatty has been advised by a number of testing firms that verticality tests cannot be performed on steel access tubes as well as piles reinforced with steel. Magnetic interference from steel reinforcement and steel tubes will cause the instrument to not function properly. BBII has also been advised by Terracon (please see attached email from Dextra), a reputable CSL testing firm that there are currently no known cases in the US where verticality of CSL tubes in steel reinforced piles have been formally tested.

B. Attached is a case study that details the investigation of debonding that occurs when using PVC as CSL access tubes. The results of this study clearly show the use of steel tubes (BBII is proposing to use Sonitec tubes) should be preferred over PVC.

C. After doing some research, the closest we came to find any mention of verticality in CSL tubes was this excerpt from EPA's website which states, "If the CSL access tubes are not installed in a near-vertical position and/or the distance between them varies significantly along the length of the shaft, errors in velocity calculations may occur." Judging by this approach to verticality in CSL tubes in most specs, BBII concludes that parallelism and symmetry between tubes are more important factors in ensuring accurate CSL test readings.

In summary, BBII in lieu of formally testing the CSL tubes for verticality will perform a visual test making sure that the tubes are symmetrical (equally spaced) in a circle and parallel. This is the most important inspection to ensure accurate pulse readings.

ARUP Response:

This is acceptable.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please confirm that this is acceptable.

---

**T-0108** **BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demoli** **Closed** **04/20/2011** **04/30/2011** **04/29/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 15 40

Please confirm that the demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners, and BBII will only be responsible for cleaning dust and debris generated by BBII during its own operations, after the turnover of these are completed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed. Demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners to date. This was confirmed through conversation with both EBi and Singer Associates.

---

**T-0108.1** **BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demoli** **Closed** **05/04/2011** **05/14/2011** **05/18/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference response to RFI#T-0108 and Specification Section 01 15 40

W/O requests information on the measures used to clean the adjacent structures

---

RFI#T-0108 - BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demolition Work

Question -
Reference Specification Section 01 15 40
Please confirm that the demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners, and BBII will only be responsible for cleaning

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition Contractor ceased dust generating activities and turned over Zone 3 for BBIi use on 4-13-11.

BBIi did occupy the site and did commence work activities, and is responsible for dust control in accord with Mitigation and Monitoring Specifications from 4-13-11 until completion of BBii work activities.

BBII is only responsible for cleaning dust and debris generated from Zone 3 during BBII operations from 4-13-11 going forward.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

dust and debris generated by BBII during its own operations, after the turnover of these are completed.

Response -
Confirmed. Demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition
contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners to date. This was confirmed through conversation with both
EBi and Singer Associates.

---

**T-0108.2** **BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demoli** **Closed** **05/04/2011** **05/14/2011** **05/27/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference response to RFI#T-0108, RFI#T-0108.1 and Specification Section 01 15 40

The response to RFI#T-0108.1 did not provide the requested information.

W/O requests information on the measures used to clean the adjacent structures

---

RFI#T-0108.1 - BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demolition Work

W/O requests information on the measures used to clean the adjacent structures

---

RFI#T-0108 - BSE - Building Adjacent Zone 3 Clean From Dust and Debris Generated By Demolition Work

Question -
Reference Specification Section 01 15 40
Please confirm that the demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

There are no prescribed measures. The cleanliness of the adjacent buildings is subjective. Cleanliness is discussed with building owners requesting cleaning of their property upon completion of demolition work and initiated by the adjacent property owner/manager. Discussion with adjacent property owners is coordinated through TJPA Representative and Singer Associates.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

building owners, and BBII will only be responsible for cleaning
dust and debris generated by BBII during its own operations, after the turnover of these are completed.

Response -
Confirmed. Demolition contractor has satisfied the requirement to clean all dust and debris generated by demolition
contract to the satisfaction of the adjacent building owners to date. This was confirmed through conversation with both
EBi and Singer Associates.

---

**T-0109** **BSE - Existing Drains & SD Basin Clear Of Debris Generated By Demo Contract W** **Closed** **04/21/2011** **05/01/2011** **05/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 15 40

Please confirm per the site walkthrough on 04-18-2011 that all active SD and sewer have been cleared of all debris generated by the demolition contract work.
BBII is requesting as-builts to confirm the above.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition Contractor has continuously covered the Catch Basins and inlets to storm sewers and occasionally has cleared debris generated by others outside of the demolition contract work. Demolition contractor will provide per Demolition Spec. 02-41-13 at conclusion of their work which is scheduled for June 2011.

---

**T-0110** **BSE - Existing Utility Decommissioning Zone 4** **Closed** **04/22/2011** **05/02/2011** **05/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0083, Drawing Sheet D-2230, and Specification Section 02 41 01

RFI response to RFI#T-0083 issued on 4-15-2011 has not provided direction for decommissioning or abandoning these utilities per BBII drawing # D-2230 Note 2

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Parcel D Zone 4 : Demolition of the Zone 4 sewer/storm drain piping after dewatering work has been completed is BBIi contract scope. The best examples are BSE Drawings D-2230, D-2231, D-5100 through D-5103. Beale St. Zone 4 sewer/storm drain piping decommissioning/abandoning scope is defined in the Webcor-Obayashi RUP Relocation of Utilities

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please advise on decommissioning the utilities after dewatering work has been completed.

Project . Coordinate Beale St. Zone 4 sewer/storm drain piping decommissioning/abandonment with the Webcor-Obayashi RUP Relocation of Utilities Project Manager.

Parcel N Zone 4 :Refer to RFI 84.1 for Parcel N: The decommissioning or abandoning these Parcel N utilities which is outside the scope of the Demolition, BSE contract and the RUP contract. Webcor-Obayashi RUP Relocation of Utilities Project Manager will be contacted for reroute decommissioning, or abandonment of these Parcel N parking lot storm drain lines.

---

**T-0111** **301 Mission Wall - Torque Spec** **Closed** **04/22/2011** **05/02/2011** **04/28/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: S-5000

In regards to the structural steel bolts at the 301 Mission Wall, please confirm that the torque spec is 150 ft-lbs, per attached email.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed, structural steel anchor bolts shall be installed snug tight to a torque of 150 ft-lbs.

---

**T-0112** **BSE - Project Control** **Closed** **04/22/2011** **05/02/2011** **05/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-0100 and Specification Section 01 10 50

Drawing GT-0100 shows four control points. BBII's surveyor, KCA Engineers, have surveyed their locations and found the following:
1) Survey Control Point #101: This point has been damaged - the brass disk is missing, though the rivet remains in the concrete sidewalk. There are score lines in

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Response provided by PMPC.

RFI T-0112 is a Survey and Control issue. Webcor/Obayashi is responsible for coordination with their subcontractors and this RFI lies within their domain of responsibility. Please ask W/O to coordinate their Survey Subcontractor (Contract T05.1 Chaudhary & Associates) provide a response to their BSE Subcontractor (Contract TG03 - Balfour Beatty).

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

the concrete BBII assumes would intersect on the brass disk.
2) Project Benchmark Point #54: KCA was able to locate this point. Please confirm that it is acceptable to use the coordinates of this point for horizontal control, even though it is listed as a benchmark.
3) Survey Control Point #106: KCA was unable to locate this point.
4) Survey Control Point #105: KCA was able to locate this point.

With the current condition of the provided control points, KCA is not able to do a hard check on their survey work.

Please confirm that all the control points above may be used for the TG03 BSE Trade Package. Please reset the damaged or missing points for KCA's use.

1) Regarding Control Point #101 by Martin M. Ron (Drawing GT-0100), TJPA is requesting a meeting with Martin M. Ron (DPW). In the meantime W/O surveyors should assume that the riven and cross marks constitute the mark on Drawing GT-0100 and to submit the results of their check survey against the other remaining points to see if the given coordinates match those given on Drawing GT-0100. W/O should consult with Chaudhary & Associates now under subcontract to W/O, as to how Chaudhary & Associates used this point and whether it was damaged then. TJPA will set up a meeting with Martin M. Ron, Chaudhary & Associates, W/O and TJPA representatives.

2) Regarding Project "Benchmark" Point #54, the coordinates of this point given on Drawing GT-0100 are given for use as line survey control as well as elevation.

3) Regarding Control Point #106 (Drawing GT-0100), W/O is to consult with DPW and Chaudhary & Associates as to their knowledge of the last time this point was located. This can be done by W/O alone or in the meeting the TJPA representative will set up. With the 3 remaining Control Points #101, #054, #105 (Drawing GT-0100), W/O should use the given position of Control Point#106. If this has already been done TJPA will re-establish this Control Point.

4) No action requires.

TJPA requests that the BBI and W/O surveyor submit their notes on what they have completed and verified to date.

---

**T-0112.1** **BSE - Project Control** **Closed** **05/20/2011** **05/30/2011** **05/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0112, Transmittal No. 140-01593, Sheet

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Adopting Chaudhary's survey grid control document is

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

GT-0100, Specification Section 01 10 50, and attached document

Chaudhary's Transbay "Survey Grid Control Document" was transmitted to Ed Sum (TJPA) and Agnes Katanics (URS) on 5/18/11 (transmittal #140-01593, attached) following a meeting which took place on 5/17/11 with URS, F3, DPA and TJPA. In an effort to confirm the four survey control points shown on GT-0100, Chaudhary discovered that Point #101 and Point #106 were missing.

Due to the missing points, W/O requests TJPA to either approve Chaudhary's Survey Grid Control Document included as part of transmittal #140-01593, or have the monuments missing from GT-0100 replaced.

acceptable.

---

**T-0112.2** **BSE - Project Control** **Closed** **07/14/2011** **07/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:**

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0112.1 and attached drawing

Last month Webcor/Obayashi was requested to mark an alleged property line @ 199 Fremont between Beale and Fremont streets per the 12-10-2008 CAD file data provided by the Bruce Storrs of DPW. Chaudhary & Associates completed the task and the results were forwarded for TJPA review on June 20, 2011 via Transmittal # 140-01864. In that transmittal it was recommended that alleged Property Line (PL) data points as indicated within the attached (coordinates added) be presented to Bruce Storrs of DPW for verification of PL data accuracy. Has this been accomplished and, if so, what was the outcome?

Be advised that as previously confirmed in RFI #T- 112.1 Webcor/Obayashi is ONLY using Grid Control for construction reference, layout and staking.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0113 | BSE - Unforeseen Object - Metal Casing In Production Pile Extraction Area | Closed | 04/22/2011 | 05/02/2011 | 04/25/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Jack Adams
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached sketch and photo

While BBII was excavating the production pile extraction area and exposing the timber piles on 4/19/11, a metal casing was discovered close to pile 302050.
Please advise on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

This metal casing is to be removed per Spec. 02-41-01 "Demolition - Existing Underground Structures". If the casing is over an existing wood pile - notify the TJPA Rep/Geotech Engineer prior to removal - refer to Spec. 02-41-19..

Demolition of underground obstructions shall be per Spec 02-41-01 and Demolition Debris shall be handled in accord with Spec. 01-74-00.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0114 | BSE - Monitoring Plans and Data for Zone 3 | Closed | 04/27/2011 | 05/07/2011 | 05/12/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Daphne Faulkner
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 35 65

As discussed at the site walk through meeting 4-18-2011; BBII requests a copy of the demolition contract monitoring plan and any data in relation to demolition contract mitigation monitoring of Zone 3.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Please clarify specifically what mitigation monitoring data you are requesting. Specification Section 01 35 65 is comprised of many different required submittals so we need a clarification on which one you are requesting

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0115 | BSE - Hazardous Material Removed From Site in Zone 3 | Closed | 04/27/2011 | 05/07/2011 | 05/02/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Jack Adams
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 00 03 35

Please confirm that all hazardous material has been removed from site per the extent of demolition contract drawings for zones 3.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Hazardous material has been removed from site per the extent of demolition contract drawings for zones 3. Zone 3 above ground structures and foundations were demolished to extent shown on Demolition contract drawings and Demolition Spec. 02-41-00. Hazardous materials abatement scope was completed within the scope of demolition only. Refer to Demolition Drawings D-1050, D-1051 and D-1073 and D-1074 for representation of limits of structures demolished and hazardous material abatement. Utilities were cut/capped and were demolished to extent shown on Demolition contract drawings and Demolition Spec.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

02-41-00. Refer to drawings D-1202-1207 and 1210-1215 inclusive for representation of limits of extent of removal of utilities.

BSE Contractor to handle remaining Hazardous Materials in accord with their contract documents. Ref: BSE Drawings D-5101 and D-5102 for extent of BSE Demolition.

BSE Contractor to handle remaining demolition and abatement in accord with BSE Spec 00-08-14 Health and Safety Criteria Para 1.2 and 1.3 Lead hazards, BSE Spec. 02-41-01 "Demolition" and BSE Spec. 01-13-50 "Hazardous Materials Procedures".

---

**T-0116** **BSE - Demolition Contract Drawings** **Closed** **04/27/2011** **05/07/2011** **05/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Please supply BBII with an electronic copy (PDF), of the 'issued for construction' drawings for the demolition contract (EBI).

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

BBII should contract Webcor-Obayashi for an electronic copy (PDF), of the 'issued for construction' drawings for the demolition contract.

---

**T-0116.1** **BSE - Demolition Contract Drawings** **Closed** **05/03/2011** **05/13/2011** **05/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference response to RFI#T-0116

Webcor-Obayashi cannot verify "issued for construction drawings" in PDF format for the demolition contract in the past communications.
If the confirmed drawing set was sent to Webcor-Obayashi before, please let us know the transmittal number and the date.
If not, please send us the drawing set immediately.
---

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition Issued for Construction drawings were issued to W/O on 12/8/2010 via Transmittal #110-00076 in Project (110) in Constructware. Please find a copy of the transmittal attached for your use.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

---

Please supply BBII with an electronic copy (PDF), of the 'issued for construction' drawings for the demolition contract (EBI).

---

**T-0117** **BSE - As-built Drawings for Utility Decommissioning in Zone 3** **Closed** **04/27/2011** **05/07/2011** **05/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Demo Contract Drawing Sheets D-1202,D-1203, D-1204, D1205, D1206 and Specification Section 02 41 01

Please provide as-built drawings for all utilities that have been decommissioned, or cut and capped per the demolition contract for Zone 3.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition as-built drawings for Zone 3 utilities that have been decommissioned, or cut and capped per the demolition contract are attached. Drawing D-1202-1207 and D1210 through D1215 inclusive.

NOTE: Demolition contractor is not contractually responsible for submitting their As-Built drawings until completion of their contract which is June 2011 ref. Spec. 01-17-00 for Demolition Contractor.

---

**T-0118** **BSE - Crash Cushion Modules on Natoma & Minna Street** **Closed** **04/27/2011** **05/07/2011** **05/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Demo Contract Drawing Sheet D-1007 - Note 5

Currently the crash cushion or k-rail as specified in the Demo Drawing D-1007 note 5 has not been installed. Please confirm the above will be installed by the demo contractor.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed. Demolition Contractor will install Crash Cushion modules at K -Rails installed on Fremont St (east), Natoma St. and Minna St. in accord with Demolition Drawing D-1007.

---

**T-0119** **301 Mission Wall - Metal Stud Layout Alignment** **Closed** **04/28/2011** **05/08/2011** **05/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: RFI T-0098, Sheet A-6000

Per response to RFI T-0098, the 10" x 10" tube steel columns are to be set in the center of the 14" concrete wall. The architectural drawings (sheet A-6000 dated 11/04/10) show 10" metal studs aligning with the 10" tube steel, however, per response to RFI T-0098, the tube steel is to shift in the architectural drawings 1/2" and align in the center of the concrete wall. Please confirm that the metal studs will remain per plan, and not shift as the steel tube has.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The light gauge steel studs will remain per plan as shown in Section B on S-5000. The light gauge steel studs shall be placed on both sides of the tube steel as shown on the contract documents.

Per direction provided at 5/2 weekly coordination meeting, 1 - 5/8" light gauge studs shown on Detail A, Sheet A-6000 shall be in line with 10" light gauge steel stud (i.e. both sides of tube steel).

---

**T-0120** **301 Mission Wall - Stone Panel Layout** **Closed** **04/27/2011** **05/07/2011** **05/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: RFI T-0042

Per RFI T-0042, the concrete wall height increased to achieve a min 18" above the finished paver surface. Please clarify if the exposed concrete areas shown on A-5000 are to to be min 18" above the pavers. If so, the 1st stone above the exposed concrete would have to be trimmed. Please clarify.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per contract documents, at exposed concrete wall sections, full height of concrete wall above finished top of paver (and finished concrete walks at east and west ends) shall be exposed.

Cutting of stone panel(s) to a height of approximately 6.84" and cutting of stone panels in an "L" shape as shown in attached sketches, "Attachment for RFI T-0120" and "Part of Sheet A-5000" transmitted/emailed to URS from Webcor-Obayashi on 5/19/2011 is acceptable.

Per contract documents, at east end of wall (east of east most section of exposed concrete wall) stone panels shall extend down to finished top of paver/concrete walk. See annotation by URS on attached sketch, "Part of Sheet A-5000_Annotated by URS."

(Answered by: David Fyfe on 05/20/11)
(Response forwarded to Webcor-Obayashi on 05/22/11)

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0121 | 301 Mission Wall - Aluminum Panel Layout | Closed | 04/27/2011 | 05/07/2011 | 05/10/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: A-5000

Regarding the aluminum panels on the 301 Mission wall, bottom panel at each end of the wall will need to be trimmed. The standard panel is 2-11 1/2" tall, but the bottom panel measures out to be 2'-1"+/- on the west end and 2'-9"+/- on the east. Please confirm that this is acceptable. If not, please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per contract documents aluminum panels shall match original aluminum panels. Existing bottom aluminum panel(s), as shown in photos on sheet C-5010, have an approximate 1" gap between the bottom of panel and top of existing grade.

Contractor shall place bottom aluminum panel(s) to provide an approximate 1" gap between bottom of panel and top of finished/existing grade. It is acceptable to provide bottom panel(s) that are less than 2' - 11-1/2" tall to provide an approximate 1" gap between bottom of panel(s) and top of finished/existing grade.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0122 | BSE - Hazardous Material Removed From Zone 3 (Potential Contaminated Material | Closed | 04/29/2011 | 05/09/2011 | 05/02/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 00 03 35, 1.2

During Investigation of Zone 3, BBII discovered potential lead based material existing on site. The specific area of concern is the pedestals on Fremont Street.

Please confirm that all contaminated material (specifically the referenced pedestals) as specified in the specification section 00 03 35, Article 1.2 has been removed and abated by the Demolition Contractor.

BBII is scheduled to remove these pedestals next week and cannot proceed with this critical work until it is confirmed that the site is cleared of lead based materials as required by the Specifications.

The TJPA's attention is directed to the following Section of the Specifications:

SECTION 00 03 35 ¿ EXISTING CONDITIONS:
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

"1.2 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS REPORTS

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Hazardous material has been removed from site per the extent of demolition contract drawings for zones 3 - this does not include the "pedestals" in Zone 3. The building and above ground structures were demolished to the extent shown on Demolition contract drawings. Hazardous materials abatement scope was completed within the scope of demolition only. Refer to Demolition Drawings D-1050, D-1051 and D-1073 for representation of limits of structures (specifically the referenced pedestals) demolished and hazardous material abatement.

BSE Contractor to handle remaining demolition and abatement in accord with BSE Spec 00-08-14 Health and Safety Criteria Para 1.2 and 1.3 Lead hazards, BSE Spec. 02-41-01 "Demolition" and BSE Spec. 01-13-50 "Hazardous Materials Procedures".

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

A. The TJPA's environmental consultants have surveyed the facility for the presence of various hazardous materials. Materials investigated may include asbestos, lead, PCB ballasts, mercury containing lamps, contaminated soils, underground storage tanks, and other hazardous materials. The demolition contractor for the Demolition project (Evans Brothers Inc.) is responsible for removing and abating products containing asbestos, lead, or PCB ballast, and mercury-containing lamps."

---

**T-0123** **301 Mission Wall - SASM and Insulation Tape Materials** **Closed** **04/29/2011** **05/09/2011** **05/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: S-0002, A-6000

Clarification is requested regarding the notes and details on Sheet S-0002, and A-6000 (see attached marked up sheets). Note 1 within the "WALL FINISH" section of the notes on page S-0002 says to use insulation separation tape between treated wood surfaces and steel framing. In note 2 on page S-0002, SASM is specfied as a different material, but on the details of page A-6000 SASM is shown to be used in the same areas as is described for the insulation tape. It is the interpretation of Transworld that the insulation tape is to be used at all locations referenced on sheet A-6000 as "SASM". Please clarify if these two different materials are to be applied in the same areas.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Insulation tape shall be used between all treated wood and metal surfaces. SASM shall be used as a waterproofing barrier around the entire wall as shown on the contract documents.

These two materials (SASM and insulation tape) may overlap in certain locations where insulation tape is provided between treated wood and metal surfaces and where waterproofing is also required.

---

**T-0123.1** **301 Mission Wall - SASM and Insulation Tape Materials** **Closed** **05/06/2011** **05/16/2011** **05/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: RFI T-0123, A-6000, S-0002

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

This is not a new contract requirement. SASM is referred to on A-6000 in two different instances. It is

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

The response provided to RFI T-0123 is in conflict with the contract documents. The response requires the contractor to create a waterproofing barrier for the entire length of the wall; however, the contract documents do not indicate a complete waterproofing barrier. References to SASM on page A-6000 instructs the application of SASM at all points where pressure-treated or moisture resistant wood comes in contact with metal. This application instruction, therefore, would not result in a waterproof barrier along the entire length of the wall. Please clarify if on the details "SASM" was intended to read "insulation tape", because the application locations of the SASM, as per A-6000, are called out and described to be at all locations of the insulation tape defined on S-0002.

In the alternative, is it the intention of the design team to apply additional waterproofing not shown on the contract documents?

referred to when there is treated wood blocking/ elements. At these locations, the insulation tape shall be used. There is also SASM shown on the front and back face of the wall as shown on Detail D, A-6000. Contractor shall provide SASM as shown.

---

**T-0124** **301 Mission Wall - Dimension Between Screen Wall and Existing Garage Wall** **Closed** **05/02/2011** **05/12/2011** **05/31/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: C-2000

The dimension between the new location of the 301 Wall and the existing garage wall is approx 8". Please advise as to how this gap is to be closed off.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Gap shall be closed for the full height of the new interim screen wall and width of gap. The closure of this gap must meet ADA handrail loading requirements as well as the wind and seismic loading requirements. See attached Figures 1, 2, and 3 for recommended details of gap closure.

Per discussions at weekly meeting on 5/23/2011, Contractor may provide suggested alternatives to address the 8-inch gap for URS to review.

---

**T-0124.1** **301 Mission Wall Enclosure Panel Method of Connection** **Closed** **09/01/2011** **09/16/2011** **09/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Michael Constable **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference: RFI T- 0124, URS response to RFI T- 0124

Per recent Change Order negotiations for the required 301 Mission Wall end panel per RFI # T-0124, the panel detail is now being revised to a two-piece, glued enclosure panel. Please confirm the method of two-piece panel attachment to the existing wall is the same as that indicated in RFI # T-0124.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Material substitution (two 1/8" thick aluminum panels glued together in lieu of a single 3/16" thick aluminum panel), "Proposed gap closure per RFI #T-0124-Option3" provided in attached Change Request No. 10C from Transworld Construction Inc. to Webcor/Obayashi dated 7/26/2011 is acceptable, provided aluminum panels are fastened to metal stud with rivets or sheet metal screws at 24" o.c.

---

**T-0125** **BSE - CDSM Corner Overlap** **Closed** **05/02/2011** **05/12/2011** **05/06/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheets GT-2101-2103, GT-5101 and Specification Section 31 56 13

In the Owner's preferred method of soil mixing, the triple auger method, a continuous wall is formed by drilling adjacent sets of columns with a 100% overlap of the outer columns (see 2/GT-5101). A CDSM wall's strength, permeability, and homogeneity is largely contingent upon this remixing action. This overlap also helps ensure the verticality and alignment, as the augers in the secondary panels tend to follow the path of the outer columns of the primary panels. Based upon the beam and column layout shown in GT-2101-2013, the corners formed by Wall Segment A/33.5-35 & 35-1 and R2-1 & X1-1 do not receive the complete remixing obtained by the typical 100% outer column overlap. These corner details are atypical compared to industry standards, and will lead to permeability issues. Is it acceptable to move a small number of beams slightly closer together (~0.1') near those corners, such that the panel layout is shifted enough to have a 100% column overlap at the corners?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Arup received from DND the two sketches attached to this response at the BSE meeting on May 4, 2011 as further clarification of the Contractor's proposal. The Contractor's proposal is acceptable.

---

**T-0126** **BSE - Confirmation of Utility Abandonment on Fremont St, East side of Phase 1 El** **Closed** **05/02/2011** **05/12/2011** **05/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Douglas Jacobson

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

In order to drive sheet piles for the hammer head wall location along Fremont St and the North West Corner of Zone 4, BBII requests confirmation of the abandonment of all utilities east of the PG&E electrical duct bank. BBII also will need the As-Build drawing of the PG&E duct bank location.

BBI needs this information to proceed on the extra unforeseen concrete wall in the hammer head area of the buttress wall.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Today, 5/11, BBI has sawcut AC and removed one lane-width and two laborers have exposed the utility lines in the street east of the PG&E duct bank. Verizon came and cut two of their 4" ducts. The remaining lines will be identified by the utility subcontractors in the next day or two. Please contact Jason Dunne (W/O) for the field conditions of abandoned utilities.

---

**T-0127** **BSE - Openings Below Screen Wall at 301 Mission Building** **Closed** **05/04/2011** **05/14/2011** **05/16/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheets GT-2201, GT-5102 Sec. 10, and attached photos

In the northwest corner of Zone 4, BBII has exposed 2 openings below the screen wall in the 301 Mission structure. The first opening is located approximately 6 feet east of gridline 27 and the second opening is located approximately 8 feet east of gridline 29. These openings are approximately 18" x 36" in size. (See attached pictures).

These openings are not shown on construction documents. Please advise how to proceed. BBII requests an expedited response prior to the end of this week, as this matter is pertinent to backfill operation.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Plugging of existing ventilation shafts/openings below screen wall is specified in the 301 Mission Interim Screen Wall contract documents. Webcor-Obayashi to coordinate all work amongst tradegroup packages/subcontractors.

---

**T-0128** **BSE - Old Existing Concrete Floor Along 301 Mission in Zone 4** **Closed** **05/05/2011** **05/15/2011** **05/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Douglas Jacobson

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 02 41 01

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The obstruction was removed by BBI. Remove pre-trench obstructions per contract requirements and

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

During pre-trenching, BBII found an existing concrete floor along the 301 Mission St garage wall. It is located between the 301 Mission building wall and the buttress area between Grid Line 29 and 30. BBII has exposed a 20ft-30ft section of this floor (approximately on Grid Line A between Grid Lines 29 and 30), and have demolished the slab within the pre-trench area that has been exposed. It appears to BBI that this unforeseen obstruction continues further into the buttress area. If this unforeseen obstruction continues further into the buttress area, it would have to be removed so the buttress construction can continue.

Please advise on how to proceed.

Force Account agreement with TJPA.

---

**T-0129** **BSE - Unforeseen Timber Pile in Pre-Trench Along 301 Mission in Zone 4** **Closed** **05/05/2011** **05/15/2011** **05/06/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 02 41 01 and attached photo

During pre-trenching, BBI discovered existing timber piles along the 301 Mission St garage wall between Grid Lines 29 and 30. These piles are less than 1foot away from the 301 Mission St garage wall and within the CDSM shoring wall limits. These unforeseen piles need to be removed as soon as possible. Please advise on how to proceed.

W/O requests that the Engineer Of Record (Arup) review this on site with BBII prior to responding.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Arup Response:

1. For the westernmost 3 timber piles along the line of piles 16 to 18'' from the face of the 301 Mission wall: in order to minimize ground loss at 20 to 30 ft depth beneath the PG+E vault and adjacent corridor, BBI needs to use best endeavors to carry out the pile removal using the method agreed following the initial trials. This means vibrating in the casing in advance of removing any of those piles.
2. For the remaining timber piles along this line, the piles are anticipated to be 30' long and will thus lie within the influence of the c. 70' deep shoring wall for the 301 Mission Low-rise parking garage. Each pile can be removed without casing, working from east to west. Concrete to be placed in the remnant pile hole as rapidly as possible after pile removal and before removal of the adjacent pile.

---

**T-0130** **301 Mission Wall - FCR 043 Concrete Wall Crack** **Closed** **05/06/2011** **05/16/2011** **05/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Field Condition Report No. 043

See attached FCR No. 043. The east end of the 301 Mission concrete wall has cracks and also spalled in one corner. This had been discussed on 05/02/11, in Transworld's subcontractor meeting with Turner, URS, TJPA, Webcor-Obayashi, and Transworld. Please advise as to how Transworld is to repair the spallled corner and cracks.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Defective concrete shall be removed and concrete shall be restored in accordance with ACI 301 Section 5.3.7.3. An epoxy bonding agent shall be used in lieu of bonding grout where new concrete and existing concrete interface. After removal of the defective concrete and prior to restoration, contractor shall contact engineer to inspect the removal areas in field.

If crack(s) go beyond/into the anchor bolts and reinforcement, the concrete shall be removed minimum of 1" around the reinforcement and anchor bolts. Contractor shall shore/support the existing structural steel as necessary in order to prevent damage to other areas of existing concrete.

---

**T-0130.1** **301 Mission Wall - FCR 043 Concrete Wall Patch Material** **Closed** **06/09/2011** **06/19/2011** **06/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: FCR #043, RFI T-0130, and attached product data

Response to RFI T-0130 directs Transworld to repair the damaged concrete at the 301 Mission Wall, as described in Field Condition Report 043. Attached are product data sheets which satisfy the requirements noted in response to RFI T-0130. Please review and confirm that the attached materials are acceptable to patch the damaged concrete.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The submitted materials are acceptable to patch the damaged concrete. All materials shall be prepared, mixed and placed in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations.

---

**T-0131** **301 Mission Wall - Framing Modifications and Base Plate Conflict** **Closed** **05/06/2011** **05/16/2011** **05/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: C/S-5000, B/A-6000, attached sketches, and referenced RFI's

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Item/Issue 1) Contractor shall cut base plate neat, flush with stucco slot/face of concrete. Extent of cut(s) shall not exceed dimension(s) shown in attached

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Field verified measurements and layout for the location of the structural steel does not coordinate with the stucco inset locations as shown on detail C/S-5000. In addition framing around the perimeter of the wall (aluminum panel locations) had to be modified due to assembly and installation methods. (See attached pictures and sketches. This RFI addresses three framing issues. All issues have been discussed in the weekly 301 Mission Wall subcontractor meeting with URS, Turner, Transworld, TJPA and Webcor-Obayashi.

1.) In two of the four stucco slot locations, field conditions show that a portion of the base plate conflicts with the stucco slot. This base plate encroaches into the stucco panel per dimensions shown on the attached sketch. Please advise.

2.) The structural steel had been relocated to CL of the wall (per RFI T-0098) and therefore studs around the steel per B/A-6000 could not be set per plan. Transworld has installed hat channel metal framing to the face of the structural steel tube using fasteners into the structural steel as per RFI T-0106 as well as modified the boxed framing per attached sketches around the perimeter of the wall. Sizes of metal framing were used to align with adjacent framing per plan. This work is currently installed, please confirm framing modifications per attached marked up details are acceptable.

3.) Blocking a the top of the wall at the north side (between the framing and 8"x 8" tube steel) was not installed, as there was no room between the framing and steel. Framing was attached directly to the tube steel. See attached.

Please confirm that the framing modifications in item 2 and 3 are acceptable and provide direction at the base plate conflict per item 1.

sketch, "RFI T-0131: (Item 1) Base Plate conflict with slot locations" provided by WO/Transworld. Contractor shall field apply complete paint system as stated in contract documents following cutting procedures. Any damage to non-shink grout and/or concrete below shall be repaired. All architectural wall finishes (SASM, cement board, stone panels, aluminum panels, 3-coat stucco, etc.) shall be installed as shown on contract documents.

Item/Issue 2) We note this request is for convenience of the Contractor and on this basis take no exception to the framing modifications as shown in attached sketches, "RFI T-0131: (Item 2) Metal Stud Framing Modification at Perimeter of Wall (Aluminum Panel locations)" and "RFI T-0131: (Item 2) Metal Stud Framing Modification Surrounding Structural Steel (Slot locations)" provided by WO/Transworld. Accordingly, no change in contract and/or extension in schedule will be provided to accommodate this Contractor request. All impacts associated with proposed framing modifications, including installation of all architectural wall finishes (SASM, cement board, stone panels, aluminum panels, 3-coat stucco, etc.) as shown on contracts documents, cost and schedule shall be borne solely by the Contractor.

Item/Issue 3) Intention of wood blocking is to provide spacing and allow fastening of aluminum panels. If there is not sufficient space to provide wood blocking, it is acceptable to fasten aluminum panels directly to tube steel members and omit wood blocking on north side of wall as shown in attached sketch, "RFI T-0131: (Item 3) Omission of Blocking Between 8" x 8" Tube Steel and Framing (North Side Only). Accordingly, prior to deletion of wood blocking Contractor shall ensure all architectural wall finishes (SASM, cement board, stone panels, aluminum panels, 3-coat stucco, etc.) can and will be installed as shown on contract documents.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0132 | BSE - Lead Based Paint On Bent Pedestals | Closed | 05/06/2011 | 05/16/2011 | 05/09/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture — Masashi Kojima
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructu — Ural Yal
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Please see information attached regarding the paint on the old bent Pedestals existing along Fremont Street. The information provided indicates the level of lead is above the permissible level. This area is now considered part of the lead abatement program; this work will be commencing on Saturday 5/7/2011. Cost of this Lead abatement will be charged to the owner.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Voided. See the attached email on 05/09/2011.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0133 | BSE - CDSM Test Section & Start of Work | Closed | 05/09/2011 | 05/19/2011 | 05/10/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc — George Metzger
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, 1.6. F. 1-2

Please confirm that the acceptance of Zone 4 Test Section strength and permeability results is the prerequisite to begin Zone 4 & 3 shoring work, and acceptance of the Zone 1/2 Test Section results is the prerequisite to begin work Zones 1 & 2.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The acceptance of Zone 4 Test Section strength and permeability results is the prerequisite to begin Zone 4 & 3 shoring work, and acceptance of the Zone 1/2 Test Section results is the prerequisite to begin work Zones 1 & 2.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0134 | BSE - 301 Mission Guide Wall | Closed | 05/09/2011 | 05/19/2011 | 05/12/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC — Douglas Jacobson
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-2103, Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached sketch

Typically in CDSM shoring, a guide frame constructed from steel beams is used, which straddles the CDSM wall. The guide frame is used to align the augers, align and place beams, and expand/collapse the drill rods. The existing 301 Mission building wall is approximately 5-6" away from the outside of the CDSM shoring wall. As such it will not permit placement of a standard steel beam guide frame. Is it acceptable to construct a temporary concrete/rebar guide wall on the outside of the CDSM wall and adjacent to the existing 301 Mission footing wall? See

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

This guide wall proposal is for Contractor convenience.

Please submit more information for this proposal, e.g., spacing, depth, and diameter of anchors/studs, discuss means and methods, and describe condition that contractor will leave the CMU wall when finished.

Once the above information is returned, TJPA will meet with 301 Mission to negotiate authorization for this proposal.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

attached sketch details of the proposed guide wall.

---

**T-0135** **BSE - Unforeseen Timber Piles in Pre-Trench Along 301 Mission St. in Zone 4** **Closed** **05/10/2011** **05/20/2011** **05/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0129 and Specification Section 02 41 01

The response to BBII RFI 094 [RFI #T-0129] regarding the unforeseen timber piles along 301 Mission Street, "Concrete to be placed in the remnant pile hole as rapidly as possible after pile removal of the adjacent pile."

Per DND Construction, concrete backfill is incompatible with soil mixing methods. Please provide clarification on what material will be placed within the CDSM wall limits that will not conflict with the mixing of the CDSM wall.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The material for filling the void left by the extracted timber pile needs to be filled by a material which can be drilled by the CDSM shoring equipment.

Kevin Clinch

12 May 2011

---

**T-0136** **301 Mission Wall - Manhole Vents** **Closed** **05/10/2011** **05/20/2011** **05/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: A/C-5000,

Per Justin Burke of Turner Construction, the 3' tall sleeves on the north side of the 301 Mission Screen Wall are per PG&E preference. At Turner's request, please review the design for the sleeves as shown on C-5000 and consider a grated cover over the manholes at grade, as opposed to the 3' tall sleeves per the documents.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

5/23/11 UPDATED RESPONSE from Kevin Chiu:
Pending approval by TJPA, a CR may be issued.
==========
5/20/11 Response per Kevin Chiu:
Contractor is to eliminate the referenced "(N) 3'-0" HIGH CIP CONCRETE SLEEVE OVER MANHOLE WITH (N) KADEE S.S. CIRCULAR GRATE SATIN FINISH (TWO LOCATIONS)" per C-5000. Elimination of sleeves was agreed upon by TJPA (Brian Dykes), PG&E (Mike Balmy) and Mission Street Development (Steve Hood).

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

5/13/11 Response per URS' David Fyfe:
3' tall concrete sleeves are required per the Easement Agreement between the TJPA and Mission Street Development, LLC (MSD). Eliminating use of 3' tall concrete sleeve(s) and providing grated PG&E manhole lid(s) at existing grade elevation must be approved by TJPA, MSD, and PG&E.

---

**T-0137** **BSE - Unforeseen Obstruction - Concrete Lip Off 301 Mission St Garage Footing** **Closed** **05/10/2011** **05/20/2011** **05/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 02 41 01 and attached photo

During Pre-Trench, BBII found an existing concrete lip/shelf footing along the low-rise 301 Mission St. garage wall. The footing consists of reinforced concrete, and is a part of the 301 Mission St. garage structure. It is not a separate structure, and it protrudes into the CDSM wall location in multiple places and does not allow enough room for the drill rig to construct the CDSM wall. The lip/shelf protrudes out at the western corner of the 301 Mission St. garage and goes to the east 81-feet. The footing is then flush with the 301 Mission St garage wall for 67-feet.

This is a potential delay in pre-trenching and the installation of the CDSM wall. It is a part of the 301 Mission St garage, and will need to be removed flush with the 301 Mission St. wall.

Please see photo attached.

Please advise BBII as to how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Previously a much larger section of concete footing within the TJPA limits was removed with a breaker.

The BSE Contractor BBII should determine the property line and the extent that this protrusion from 301 Mission is within the TJPA limits.

If the 3" protrusion is within the TJPA construction limits beyond the property line of 301 Mission the "3-inch lip" should be removed with smaller breaking tools and concrete chipping tools back to the property line limits.

---

**T-0138** **BSE - Unforeseen Timber Pile in Pre Trench Along 301 Mission St. in Zone 4 - Con** **Closed** **05/10/2011** **05/20/2011** **05/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Response to RFI #T-0129 [BBI RFI 094] and Specification Section 02 41 01

Using the current, approved means & methods set forth in RFI Response #T-0129, there is an extremely high probability that the vibratory hammer or casing will come into contact with the existing 301 Mission wall. Despite multiple tag lines and attempts to swing away from the wall, BBII cannot guarantee the equipment will not contact the wall.

BBII requests a revised methodology to extract the unforeseen timber piles or to protect the existing wall which will reduce the of damaging the wall at 301 Mission. BBII is willing to meet with the Engineer to discuss and develop this method.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

As discussed in the May 11, 2011 BSE meeting, Arup, in our response to RFI T-0129, is seeking the Contractor's "best endeavors" at using the casing on the three (3) timber piles furthest west. The remaining seven (7) or so piles to the east of these piles may be pulled directly without casing as long as there is replacement filling of the timber pile void as soon as it is pulled.

The Contractor, TJPA and Arup will observe the Contractor's "best endeavors" to install casing and pull each of the 3 western-most timber piles at a date and time (Friday May 13, 2011 mentioned as the earliest) chosen by the Contractor. Mechanical methods to control and hold the vibratory pile puller away from the wall, as well as any method of pre-protection of the aluminum panel clad corner, are suggested.

---

5/11/2011 Roger Rothenburger

As discussed in the Wednesday May 11, 2011 BSE meeting, the Engineer (Arup) is seeking (response to RFI T-0129) "best endeavors" to use the casing on the three (3) timber piles furthest west. The remaining seven (7) or so piles to the east of these piles may be pulled directly withou using casing as long as there is replacement filling of the timber pile void as soon as it is pulled.

TJPA is aware of the risk of exterior damage to the 301 Mission Parking Struture at the corner and sides, but weighs the potential for more serious structural damage in the basement around the PG&E vault to be greater risk than the exterior damage.

The work is in accordance with the force account directive CRT-010 for removal of obstructions so the risk becomes part of the cost which TJPA is willing to bear for avoiding potential greater risk of basement structural damage.

(1) At a date and time (Frday May 13, 2011 mentioned

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

as the earliest) chose by the BSE Subcontractor, BBII, TJPA representatives including the Engineer (Arup), Architect (AAI) will observe the BBII "best efforts" to install casing and pull each of the 3 wesrtn most timber piles. Mechanical methods with the excavators or other equipment to control and hold the vibratory pile hammer away from the wall are suggested as well as any method the experienced work crews suggest. An attempt to protect the aluminum panel clad corner by any means is also advisable.

(2) The material for filling the void left by the extracted timber pile needs to be filled by a material which can be drilled by the CDSM shoring equipment. A sand-water solution with some light bonding material (bentonite, 1/8 +/- bag of cement or other suggested material) that is drillable should be submitted by BBII. The CDSM shoring contractor suggestion would be helpful. A strength of 50psi was mentioned in the meeting but the choice belongs to BBII fo their CDSM equipment.

Please determine a date and time for the trial casing installation and to determine the desired CDSM "drillable mix"

---

**T-0138.1** **BSE - Unforeseen Timber Piles in Pre Trench Along 301 Mission St. in Zone 4 - Co** **Closed** **05/20/2011** **05/30/2011** **05/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference response to RFI#T-0129, RFI#T-0138, Specification Section 02 41 01 and attached documents

The response to BBII RFI 094 [RFI#T-0129] regarding the unforeseen timber piles along 301 Mission Street, "Concrete to be placed in the remnant pile hole as rapidly as possible after pile removal of the adjacent pile." Concrete is not compatible with CDSM mixing.

After clarification on the issue in RFI Response #T-0138,

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Mix FOA100CX is acceptable. Contractor shall verify that this mix is acceptable to the CDSM shoring wall installer.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

BBII proposed and furnished Central Concrete Sand Slurry Mix FOA100CX under the direction of the Engineer. The Engineer of Record's field engineer reviewed, approved and observed the installation of this mix in the pile voids along 301 Mission Street. The mix was recommended by ARUP Field Engineer prior to placement in the field, please confirm that this mix design meets the field engineer¿s requirements.

Attachments: Mix as requested is being submitted for record.

---

**T-0139** **BSE - Unforeseen Timber Pile in Pre Trench Along 301 Mission St. in Zone 4 - CR 1** **Closed** **05/10/2011** **05/20/2011** **05/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Response to RFI #T-0129 [BBI RFI 094] and Specification Section 02 41 01

Please clarify if the removal of the unforeseen timber piles along 301 Mission Street will be reimbursed by CR T-010.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

As discussed in the BSE meeting of Wednesday, May 11, 2011 the removal of the unforseen piles in the CDSM shoring wall pre-trenching along 301 Mission is paid under CRT-010.

---

**T-0140** **BSE - Bridges Submittals** **Closed** **05/12/2011** **05/22/2011** **05/27/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 53 13

BBII proposes breaking up the bridge submittals to allow submittal fundamental structural drawings and calculations for the bridge, independent of accessories and specialized components necessary for a complete bridge package.

Specifically, the first set of submittals would include Structural drawings and calculations for the bridge structure from the pavement and decking down - piers, cap beams, girders, abutments, and associated

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The approval to split the temporary bridge submittal into two submissions is provided subject to the following conditions:

1. Items which are provided in the initial submission shall be designed for all loading to support all features which are deferred. This includes loading attributable to but not limited to the following: operable gates; vehicle barriers; required thickness of pavement for all purposes, added thickness of paving for pedestrian areas, curbs and provisions for slope inducement for

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

connections. Additionally, it will include standard edge railing/barriers.

Follow on coordination submittals will include traffic coordination components, gates, hardware, locking mechanisms, fences, Muni OCS components, utility support details, surface grading and drainage.

BBII believes that it will take some time to finalize a complete bridge package that satisfies all interested parties. Isolating the core bridge structure into it's own submittals will ensure that detailing and fabrication of the main components of the bridge will not be held up while working out the details.

Please confirm this is acceptable

handling of surface water; support for utilities; lighting poles/standards; OCS poles/wires; and any other items specifically required to meet city of SF requirements brought to the attention of the contractor team by review meetings with city staff.

2. Items deferred to the second submission shall be in full conformance with specifications requirements.

3. Any items for which a deviation from the specifications is sought shall be fully identified in the first submission.

---

**T-0141** **BSE - Inclinometers IW-5 to IW-8 Install Locations** **Closed** **05/12/2011** **05/22/2011** **05/16/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheets GT-1301, GT-1302, GT-2201 & 13/GT-5101 and Specification Section 31 56 13

Please clarify if locations IW-5 to IW-8 exist. They are not shown on GT-1301 and GT-1302.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Inclinometers IW-5 to IW-8 do not exist.

---

**T-0142** **BSE - Instruments I-104 to I-107** **Closed** **05/13/2011** **05/23/2011** **05/16/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheets GT-1301, GT-1302, GT-2201, & 13/GT-5101 and Specification Section 31 56 13

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Instruments I-104 to I-107 require detail 13/GT-5101.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

On Sheet GT-2201, please confirm that Instrument I-104 to I-107 is detail 13/GT-5101.

---

**T-0143** **BSE - Confirmation of Utility Decommissioning and As-Builts for Fremont Street** **Closed** **05/16/2011** **05/26/2011** **05/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2230 and attached sketch

During BBII potholing work on the Fremont street hammer head, BBII exposed the existing live PG&E concrete duct bank. The duct bank is located under BBII Buttress drill pad (see attached sketch), the drill pad is scheduled to be poured 5-26-2011/5-27-2011. BBII has concerns that the duct bank will not be able to support the load for the drilling equipment. The concrete duct bank will need to be removed prior to drill pad installation. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Removal of existing duct bank is in RUP scope, see U-1123. Coordinate BSE work activities with RUP scope. Target date given by PG&E to have duct bank decommissioned is 6/24/11. If RUP's removal of duck bank is not complete prior to drill pad installation, BBI is to protect the existing utilities.

---

**T-0144** **BSE - Unknown Concrete Structure along 199 Fremont St in Zone 4** **Closed** **05/18/2011** **05/28/2011** **05/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13

BBII discovered the unforeseen concrete structure in the attached photo. TIlls concrete mass is unknown and is in direct conflict with the BSE CDSM wall.
The concrete mass is approx 2ft wide and extends 8ft depth the entire between GL J 30-33.5 adjacent 199 Fremont Street building. During the excavation at 8ft there was water egress into the excavation from underneath the concrete structure see photos attached.
BBII requests immediate direction from the TJPA on this issue.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition of underground obstructions shall be per Spec 02-41-01 and Demolition Debris shall be handled in accord with Spec 01-74-00.

---

5/20/2011 - George Metzger

ARUP Response:

If the CDSM shoring wall is to be installed in the location shown, then the material which is in the way, including any rubble which will interfere with the soil mixing for the CDSM wall, will need to be removed.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Arup requests TJPA to provide direction to the Contractor regarding removal of the obstacles encountered.

---

**T-0145** **BSE - Existing Concrete Footing Gridline J between Gridline 26.5-30 along 181 Fre** **Closed** **05/18/2011** **05/28/2011** **05/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 02 41 00

BBII followed the method approved to remove a section of the unforeseen structure in RFI #74 & 74.1, and found a separate concrete footing bellow that. It is believed to be a footing that extends below the 177/181 Fremont St. building. The top of this footing is approximately 8 feet below the original grade, and it is approximately 3 feet wide, and 3 feet deep.
BBII is concerned with the removal of this footing and the extensive rubble that was exposed below it. When a bucket of dirt was removed along the footing, a large amount of water gushed out, from below the 177/181 Fremont St. building, and through the large amount of stone rubble that was exposed. At this point the bottom of the footing was found, and the soil was quickly replaced. This footing is within the CDSM wall extents, and will have to be removed. Due to the fragile nature, and the age of the 177/181 Fremont St. building; please clearly describe and advise.
Please See Attached Pictures.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The RFI refers to RFIs 74 and 74.1. We understand these are BBI numbers; the corresponding RFI numbers in Constructware are 103 and 103.1.

If the CDSM shoring wall is to be installed in the location shown, then the material which is in the way, including any rubble which will interfere with the soil mixing for the CDSM wall, will need to be removed. Based on field observations made earlier today, and recent email correspondence, we understand the concrete (unreinforced) basement wall immediately adjacent to 181 Fremont has been removed. Arup requests TJPA to provide direction to the Contractor regarding any additional demolition and/or excavation should it be necessary.

---

Adamson Associates, Inc. Comment:

CM (Turner) is to confirm that TJPA approves in writing the approach and work the Contractor proposes at this location as the Field Actives and Contractor actions may impact the adjacent property.

---

**T-0146** **BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building South Zone 4** **Closed** **05/19/2011** **05/29/2011** **05/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0103 and attached photo

During BBII demolition of the unknown concrete structure along South side of Zone 4 adjacent 177/181 Fremont building (Refer to [RFI#T-0103] BBII RFI# 74), BBII discovered timber piles beneath the unknown concrete structure - see photos attached.

The location timber piles are in conflict with the alignment of the CDSM wall. Please advise on the method of removal of the obstruction.

Note: BBII has concerns regarding the stability of the adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building (old brick structure).

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

1. We suggest that the timber piles be exposed no more than 3 at a time, and that they are removed and the remnant void is infilled immediately with a material that can be drilled by the shoring wall equipment of DND. A suitable material was proposed for the similar situation adjacent to the parking garage/low rise portion of 301 Mission.

2. If more timber piles are revealed along this part of the pre-trenching, then the process in 2 above should continue along the northern flank of 181 Fremont and for a distance of 20 ft east of the northeast corner of the building.

3. 181 Fremont building is equipped with crack width gauges, and Arup staff will take readings of the gauges before and after removal of the timber piles along this length of pre-trenching provided the building owner grants us access.

4. Inclinometers to monitor the effects of the installation of the shoring wall and the subsequent train box excavation will be installed in due course.

5. The Contractor shall take appropriate measures to retain the material under 181 Fremont and keep it from sloughing into the excavation.

---

Adamson Associates, Inc. Comment:

CM (Turner) is to confirm that TJPA approves in writing the approach and work the Contractor proposes at this location as the Field Activates and Contractor actions may impact the adjacent property.

---

**T-0146.1** **BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building South Zone 4** **Closed** **05/20/2011** **05/30/2011** **05/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0146

Please provide the TJPA's specific written direction and procedure on how to remove the unforeseen piles along North face of 181 Fremont Street according to the response for RFI T-0146.

The contractor cannot proceed on this extra and critical work without the specific direction and procedure provided in writing by the TJPA.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The Sheet pile method using sheet piles either interlocked or not interlocked for 20 feet or so, removing the piles (3ft of exposed pile required to remove) described to TJPA and its representatives this morning (May 20, 2011) on site is compliant with the Contract Specifications Section 02 41 19 (Pile Removal and Section 31 56 13 (CDSM Shoring Wall) Part 3.2 (Execution - Pre-trenching)

---

**T-0146.2** **BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building South Zone 4** **Closed** **05/23/2011** **06/02/2011** **05/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner

**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0146.1

Based on the joint meeting between W/O, BBII and the TJPA on 5/23/2011, BBII would like to confirm the following:

181 Fremont Street Pile Extraction:
1. BBII will install additional survey control to establish the back of the shoring wall limit.
2. BBII will contact DND Construction to confirm the allowable distance between an existing pile and the back of the shoring wall.
3. BBII will expose, in the presence of the engineer, 3 piles at one time.
4. BBII and the Engineer will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall.
5. BBII will install flat sheet piles between the building and the wood piles to prevent caving of soils under the building.
6. BBII will extract the wood piles with vibratory hammer, with the same stroking procedure without steel casing. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile.
7. BBII will backfill the void with low strength material

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per Brian Dykes, this work is authorized to proceed. Allowable work hours will be established after 199 Fremont pile extraction begins.

---

5/24/2011 - George Metzger

ARUP Response:

The procedure described is consistent with that discussed and agreed to at yesterday's meeting with the following exceptions:

Item 4 shall read: BBI and TJPA will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall. Arup will be on site to assist the TJPA.

The Contractor may wish to consider placing the steel sheet prior to excavating to retain the material under 181 Fremont and keep it from sloughing into the excavation.

Items 10 and 11 will be reviewed by others.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Central Concrete Mix FOA100CX (RFI #T-0138.1).
8. BBII will backfill the piles.
9. BBII will remove the sheet piles and start over with Step 3.
10. All of this work will be tracked and compensated on force account under CR T-010.
11. Similar to the extraction in front of the 301 Mission garage wall, BBII will take every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall; however, due to the proximity of the hammer to the wall, BBII will not guarantee not damaging the wall. If damage to the adjacent wall occurs in any phase of the pile extraction operation described above, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.

Please confirm the above as soon as possible. In addition, BBII requests immediate confirmation of allowable work hours for the work described above.

---

**T-0146.3** **BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building South Zone 4** **Closed** **05/23/2011** **06/02/2011** **05/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0146.2

The response RFI T-0146.2 did not answer for Item 10 and 11. Please respond for Item 10 and Item 11.

---
RFI#T-0146.2 Question:

Reference RFI#T-0146.1

Based on the joint meeting between W/O, BBII and the TJPA on 5/23/2011, BBII would like to confirm the following:

181 Fremont Street Pile Extraction:
1. BBII will install additional survey control to establish the back of the shoring wall limit.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The row of timber piles closest to 199 Fremont are only 6"-9" clear of the 36-inch theortical CDSM wall thickness. TJPA in order to avoid the potential risk of these timber piles some of whom are canted and not straight pulled if anyy part of the pile is within 12" of the theoretical CDSM wall line. Since this work has previously been classified as an "unknown obstruction" paid on force account; if there is damage to the 199 Masonry wall that the cost of repair is considered part of the force account work. BBII is to exert efforts to avoid damage and use the method of pulling the piles that gives least amount of risk for damage to the masonry wall. This response is only for 199 Fremont. Discussions must be held when starting pile removal along 181 Fremont.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

2. BBII will contact DND Construction to confirm the allowable distance between an existing pile and the back of the shoring wall.
3. BBII will expose, in the presence of the engineer, 3 piles at one time.
4. BBII and the Engineer will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall.
5. BBII will install flat sheet piles between the building and the wood piles to prevent caving of soils under the building.
6. BBII will extract the wood piles with vibratory hammer, with the same stroking procedure without steel casing. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile.
7. BBII will backfill the void with low strength material Central Concrete Mix FOA100CX (RFI #T-0138.1).
8. BBII will backfill the piles.
9. BBII will remove the sheet piles and start over with Step 3.
10. All of this work will be tracked and compensated on force account under CR T-010.
11. Similar to the extraction in front of the 301 Mission garage wall, BBII will take every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall; however, due to the proximity of the hammer to the wall, BBII will not guarantee not damaging the wall. If damage to the adjacent wall occurs in any phase of the pile extraction operation described above, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.

Please confirm the above as soon as possible. In addition, BBII requests immediate confirmation of allowable work hours for the work described above.

---

**T-0146.4** **BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building South Zone 4** **Closed** **05/27/2011** **06/06/2011** **05/31/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Per Turner's request on 5/27/2011 this RFI is being asked, to modify the 177/181 Fremont pile extraction procedure

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Item 8 - BBI shall make every attempt to ensure voids are completely filled but is not required to test/verify

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

as desired by ARUP:

Based on the revised proposal for unforeseen pile extraction work along 181 Fremont St. from ARUP, BBII (W/O) can agree with revisions as the follows:
- Item 6 should read, "BBII will extract the piles with vibratory hammer only as necessary. BBII will use as little vibration as possible to remove the piles from the ground. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile."
- Item 8 should read, "BBII will back fill the pile voids using a tremie pipe of minimum length 20ft attached to the concrete bucket. The tremie shall be inserted as far into the pile hole as possible prior to pouring the concrete, and the concrete shall be placed using normal tremie techniques. BBII will make efforts to pour the material into the void as possible, but BBII is not responsible to eliminate void completely."
Other items shall remain the same.

Please also clarify that the response from RFI#T-0146.3 stating "Since this work has previously been classified as an "'unknown obstruction" paid on force account; if there is damage to the 199 Masonry wall that the cost of repair is considered part of the force account work. BBII is to exert efforts to avoid damage and use the method of pulling the piles that gives least amount of risk for damage to the masonry wall." is this instead, meant to address the property and work related to 177/181 Fremont? If not, please address the question regarding 177/181 address.

that the voids are completely filled.

Last paragraph of the RFI - Correct. RFI response from T-0146.3 should read 177/181 Fremont in lieu of 199 Fremont.

---
---
5/28/2011 - George Metzger

ARUP Response:

Based on additional observations made 03/27/2011of the pile pulling process adjacent to 199 Fremont, Arup has the following comments and recommends revisions to the procedure as noted below:

Item 6 is acceptable.

Item 8 should be modified to read, "BBII will backfill the voids using gravity fall method immediately after pile is pulled. BBII will accomplish this by having the concrete hopper filled and setup to pour prior to the final pull of the each individual pile, with the hopper's chute aimed at the pile. As soon as the pile is lifted from the void, the concrete is released from the hopper."

The last sentence in Item 8 in the RFI "BBII will make efforts to pour the materials into the void as possible but BBII is not responsible to eliminate void completely," shall be reviewed by the TJPA.

The last paragraph of the RFI shall be reviewed by others.

The Contractor shall not commence pile pulling adjacent to 177/181 Fremont without first receiving direction to do so from TJPA.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **T-0147** | **301 Mission Wall - Stone Application Detail** | **Closed** | **05/19/2011** | **05/29/2011** | **05/27/2011** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached Sketch

Please review the attached sketch showing the thinset manufacturer's recommendations for the tile installation at this wall. In reference to the approved submittal detail (attached) an additional layer of cement board will be installed to fur out the substrate so that the materials can be applied to their recommended thickness. In addition, the manufacturer recommends to use Laticrete 254 Platinum thinset material. The stone tiles finished surface will align with the aluminum panel above. Please expedite the review of this RFI.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

2nd layer of cement board is not as specified in contract documents.

An adhesive shall be used between the layers of cement board in order to ensure the 2 layers act as a single composite layer. 2nd layer of cement board shall be attached to studs at 6" o.c. with stainless steel flat head screws to metal stud framing. All screws shall extend through both layers of cement board for full engagement to framing. There shall be no gaps or voids between the two layers of cement board.

Use of Laticrete 254 Platinum thinset material is acceptable.

---

**T-0148** **BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 199 Fremont Building Zone 4** **Closed** **05/23/2011** **06/02/2011** **05/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0146.2

Based on the joint meeting between W/O, BBII and the TJPA on 5/23/2011, BBII would like to confirm the following:

199 Fremont Street Pile Extraction:
1. BBII will install additional survey control to establish the back of the shoring wall limit.
2. BBII will contact DND Construction to confirm the allowable distance between an existing pile and the back of the shoring wall.
3. BBII will excavate, in the presence of the engineer, 8 piles at one time.
4. BBII and the Engineer will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall.
5. BBII will extract the piles with vibratory hammer, with the same stroking procedure without steel casing. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per Brian Dykes, this work is authorized to proceed. 199 Fremont has been notified and work may commence.

---
---

5/24/2011 - George Metzger
ARUP Response:

The procedure described is consistent with that discussed and agreed to at yesterday's meeting with the following exceptions:

Item 4 shall read: "BBI and TJPA will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall." Arup will be on site to assist the TJPA.

Items 8 and 9 will be reviewed by others.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

6. BBII will backfill the void with low strength material Central Concrete Mix FOA100CX (RFI #T-0138.1).
7. BBII will backfill the piles and start over with Step 3.
8. All of this work will be tracked and compensated on force account under CR T-010.
9. Similar to the extraction in front of the 301 Mission garage wall, BBII will take every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall; however, due to the proximity of the hammer to the wall, BBII will not guarantee not damaging the wall. If damage to the adjacent wall occurs in any phase of the pile extraction operation described above, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.

Please confirm the above as soon as possible. In addition, BBII requests immediate confirmation of allowable work hours for the work described above.

---

**T-0148.1** **BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 199 Fremont Building Zone 4** **Closed** **05/23/2011** **06/02/2011** **06/07/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0148

The response RFI T-0148 did not answer for Item 8 and 9. Please respond for Item 8 and Item 9.

---

RFI#T-0148 Questioin:
Reference RFI#T-0146.2

Based on the joint meeting between W/O, BBII and the TJPA on 5/23/2011, BBII would like to confirm the following:

199 Fremont Street Pile Extraction:
1. BBII will install additional survey control to establish the back of the shoring wall limit.
2. BBII will contact DND Construction to confirm the allowable distance between an existing pile and the back of the shoring wall.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed-In regards to item #8 and 9 in the response to RFI T-0148; All of this work will be tracked on force account under CR T-010. If BBII takes every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.

There is no Noise moratorium for 199 Fremont. This includes demolition, pile pulling, excavation, backfill, equipment set-up etc. is allowed at all times adjacent to 199.

Good neighbor notification policy is in effect - WO/BBIi will notify Singer Assoc. whenever work will encroach on 199 Fremont property or when work activity will disrupt the tenants of 199 Fremont - both inside lot and on sidewalk/street.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

3. BBII will excavate, in the presence of the engineer, 8 piles at one time.
4. BBII and the Engineer will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall.
5. BBII will extract the piles with vibratory hammer, with the same stroking procedure without steel casing. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile.
6. BBII will backfill the void with low strength material Central Concrete Mix FOA100CX (RFI #T-0138.1).
7. BBII will backfill the piles and start over with Step 3.
8. All of this work will be tracked and compensated on force account under CR T-010.
9. Similar to the extraction in front of the 301 Mission garage wall, BBII will take every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall; however, due to the proximity of the hammer to the wall, BBII will not guarantee not damaging the wall. If damage to the adjacent wall occurs in any phase of the pile extraction operation described above, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.

Please confirm the above as soon as possible. In addition, BBII requests immediate confirmation of allowable work hours for the work described above.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0149 | BSE - Revised Contract Drawing GT-2201 | Closed | 05/24/2011 | 06/03/2011 | 05/26/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-2201, RFI#T-0088.2, and attached sketch SKGT-0002

BBII agreed with the TJPA's proposal in the response of RFI T-0088.2. Therefore, please issue the revised contract drawing of GT-2201.
Also, please note that attached Sketch SKGT-0002 includes an error in the CDSM wall alignment at gridline J/34-35.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Based on the 5/26/2011 meeting between TJPA, PMPC, Turner and AAI, and as directed by TJPA a revised contract drawing of GT-2201 will not be issued at this time. However, the attached sketch has been revised to correctly show the CDSM shoring wall outline. See attached SKGT-0002-R1.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0150 | BSE - CDSM Top of Pile Elevations At Zone 4 | Closed | 05/25/2011 | 06/04/2011 | 05/31/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-5101 and attached sketch

Please reference table 16/GT-5101. To facilitate construction on the streets and the Buttress area, at no additional cost to the owner BBII plans to install the CDSM piles on Fremont St., Beale St., and Zone 4 per the table below:

# - (a) Location / Description; (b) Per 16/GT-5101 Top of Pile Elevation; (c) Proposed Top of Pile Elevation

1 - (a) Piles at Fremont St. and Beale St.; (b) EL 13.0 and EL 15.0; (c) Flush to street elevation
2 - (a) Piles in the Buttress Work Pad area along 301 Mission; (b) EL 14.0; (c) Approx. EL 14.0 w/c flush to Top of Pad
3 - (a) Along 301 Mission, piles between the Buttress Work Pad and Beale St.; (b) EL 13.0; (c) Approx. EL 15.0 w/c is 1' above grade
4 - (a) Piles along the 181 Fremont side of Zone 4; (b) EL 14.0; (c) Approx. EL 15.0 w/c is 1' above grade

Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The proposed top of pile elevations are acceptable provided the elevation at the bottom of the pile is not less than that shown in 16/GT-5101.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0151 | BSE - Buttress Footprint Increase Due to Oversized Casing | Closed | 05/26/2011 | 06/05/2011 | 05/31/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached sketch

Becho will be utilizing a 2200mm OD temporary casing for the Buttress Pile Installation. Becho requests that the spacing between tangent piles remain at 4'' minimum and the secant piles overlap remain 1'-6''. This will approximately increase the Buttress footprint by approximately 4'-4'' to the east and 1'-9'' to the south.

Please confirm this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

This is acceptable provided no portion of the overall buttress shifts north-south. In particular, the Contractor shall verify that row R, once shifted east as proposed, can be installed in the same northsouth location, given the corner projection of the 301 Mission low-rise. Contractor to verify that the existing timber piles within the larger footprint have been removed and that the equipment pad is enlarged as necessary.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0152 | BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 199 Fremont Building | Closed | 05/26/2011 | 06/05/2011 | 06/07/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-2103 and RFI#T-0148

In regards to item #4 in the response to RFI T-0148; field investigations of the curvature in first few piles removed along 199 Freemont, BBII feels that at a minimum it is necessary to remove all piles that's top is within 12'' of the "neat line'' 36'' wide CDSM wall.

Please confirm that removal of these piles to the limits described above, in addition to any associated damage to adjacent structures caused by the extraction will be reimbursed under CR T-010.

Item 4:
4. BBII and TJPA will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed-In regards to item #4 in the response to RFI T-0148; All of this work will be tracked on force account under CR T-010. If BBII takes every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0153 | BSE - Additional Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building | Closed | 05/26/2011 | 06/05/2011 | 06/07/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Reference Sheet GT-2103 and RFI#T-0146.2

In regards to item #4 in the response to RFI T-0146.2; field investigations of the curvature in first few piles removed along 199 Fremont, BBII feels that at a minimum it is necessary to remove all piles that's top is within 12'' of the ''neat line'' 36'' wide CDSM wall.

Please confirm that removal of these piles to the limits described above, in addition to any associated damage to adjacent structures caused by the extraction will be reimbursed under CR T-010.

Also, please confirm allowable work hours, since 199 extractions have already begun.

Item 4:
4. BBII and TJPA will jointly determine the piles that can be left in place with reasonable assurance that they will not impact the shoring wall.

Confirmed-In regards to item #4 in the response to RFI T-0146.2; All of this work will be tracked on force account under CR T-010. If BBII takes every precaution to avoid damaging the adjacent wall, BBII will be compensated for repairs under CR T-010 as well.

Noise moratorium for 177/181 Fremont is Monday-Friday from 11 am to 2 PM. This includes demolition and pile pulling adjacent to 177/181 only - Excavation, backfill and equipment set-up is allowed at all times adjacent to 177/181.

---

**T-0154** **BSE - Becho Tremie Placement Process** **Closed** **05/26/2011** **05/26/2011** **05/31/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 63 29, 3.5.G.4.K

SS31.63.29.3.5.G.4.k states ''The tremie discharge end shall be immersed at least 25' in concrete at all times after starting the flow of concrete.''

Becho requests concrete tremie embedment to be reduced to 10ft minimum for all piles and 5ft minimum tremie embedment at the secondary pile transition zones between structural and CLSM mix pushing the minimum contaminated structural/CLSM concrete zone at sub grade to +5 foot above sub grade elevation.

Please confirm this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

This is acceptable. Note that the procedure described pertains to both the primary and the secondary piles, not just the secondary piles as described in the RFI.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0155 | BSE - Primary Concrete Mix Tolerance | Closed | 05/31/2011 | 06/10/2011 | 06/03/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 03 30 01, 1.5.F

BBII, Becho, Central Concrete, W/O, ARUP and Adamson Associates met on Tuesday 5/24/2011 to discuss the results of Buttress Primary Concrete Mix Trial Batches. During this meeting, Central Concrete expressed concern about variability in the Buttress Primary Concrete mix due to slight variations in material and batching. The Buttress Primary Concrete Mix is a very high performance mix and even small variations in the mix constituents can result in significant changes in strength. Please advise how much of a working tolerance is acceptable for the primary buttress concrete mix.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The strength of concrete which has been placed in the primary shafts will be considered satisfactory if both of the following requirements are met:

1. Every arithmetic average of any three consecutive strength tests (each test consisting of at least two 6 by 12 in. cylinders or at least three 4 by 8 in. cylinders made from the same sample of concrete) equals or exceeds 2,000 psi.

2. No individual strength test (average of two 6 by 12 in. cylinders or at least three 4 by 8 in. cylinders) falls below 1,800 psi.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0156 | BSE - Primary Concrete Mix 90-Day Compressive Strength | Closed | 05/31/2011 | 06/10/2011 | 06/03/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 03 30 01, 1.5.F

Per Specification Section 03 30 01 - 1.5F Trial Batches: "The mixes shall be proportioned to develop a compressive strength of 2,000 psi at 28 days." Per the response to Question TG0300-0262, "The rate of strength gain can be reduced so that the design strength is reached after 28 days but less than 91 days".

Please confirm that the Buttress Primary Shaft Concrete may take up to 90 days to achieve 2,000 psi.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The rate of strength gain can be reduced so that the design strength is reached after 28 days but ess than 91 days, provided the Contractor submits test data demonstrating that the mix will reach 2,000 psi at or before 90 days. At a minimum, compressive strength tests of the mix shall be taken at 7, 14, 28, 56 and 90 days. Each test shall consist of a minimum three cast cylinders and a minimum three cores taken from trial batch cubes placed in accordance with submittal TG0300-385.

At shafts C/2, C/4 and C/6 (refer to GT-2201), the mixes shall be proportioned to develop a compressive strength of 2,000 psi at 28 days.

Contractor to submit proposed mixes and corresponding test results for approval prior to their use.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0156.1 | BSE - 120 Day Acceptability of Buttress Primary Shaft Concrete | Closed | 04/16/2012 | 04/26/2012 | 04/19/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: 4/12/12 Central Letter

BBII requests that in the event that the Buttress Primary Mix test specimens do not meet the 2,000 psi specified strength of 2,000 psi at 90 days (reference Response to previous RFIs #T-0157.2, and #T-0156), additional cylinders are to be taken and tested at 120 days. During this cooler climate, initial temperature may be impeding overall strength at the required time. Although only a few specimens are suspect of low strengths, Central Concrete is confident that at 120 days, the specimens in question will reach ·the required strength. If this criteria can be accepted for all test specimens at 120 days, this can mitigate any future concerns of suspect low strength.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

This is acceptable for shaft N-2. For future shafts, we will evaluate on a case by case basis. However, this will require the TJPA to take an additional cylinder at the sampling frequency required in the specfications so that, if the first cylinder tested at 90 days is less than 2,000 psi, there can be three samples tested at 120 days.

Christina Young : Per Turner, the additional cylinder sampling is to be performed by the Contractor's own testing agency.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0157 | BSE - Primary Concrete Mix 500 PSI At 7-Days | Closed | 05/31/2011 | 06/10/2011 | 06/03/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 03 30 01, 2.2.E

BBII, Becho, Central Concrete, W/O, ARUP and Adamson Associates met on Tuesday 5/24/2011 to discuss the results of Buttress Primary Concrete Mix Trial Batches. One of the concerns for the Buttress Primary Concrete is to provide a mix that is able to consistently achieve both 500 psi at 7 days and 2,000 psi at 28 days. The Buttress Primary Concrete Mix is a very high performance mix and even small variations in the mix constituents can result in significant changes in strength. Please advise if it acceptable to allow a working tolerance for the 500 psi requirement at 7 days.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The 7 day compressive strength of primary shaft concrete (Type "A" concrete in spec section 03 30 01) shall be 500 psi +/- 200 psi.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0157.1 | BSE - PSI Schedule for Buttress Shaft Primary Mix | Closed | 01/13/2012 | 01/23/2012 | 01/18/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

To date there are multiple RFI responses that address the scheduled PSI requirements for the primary shaft mix which is resulting in confusion and unnecessary Vela issues. For clarification sake please confirm the following schedule is correct:
1. 300 psi at 7 days pursuant to RFI response T-0157.
2. 2000 psi based on an arithmetic average of tests on or before 90 days pursuant to RFI response T-0155 and T-0156.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

RFI is void and answered in RFI T-0157.2

---

**T-0157.2** **BSE - PSI Schedule for Buttress Shaft Primary Mix** **Closed** **01/18/2012** **01/28/2012** **01/18/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

To date there are multiple RFI responses that address the scheduled PSI requirements for the primary shaft mix which is resulting in confusion and unnecessary Vela issues. For clarification sake please confirm the following schedule is correct:
1. 300 psi at 7 days pursuant to RFI response T-0157.
2. 2000 psi based on an arithmetic average of tests on or before 90 days pursuant to RFI response T-0155 and T-0156.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The cylinder test results will be tracked in Vela as follows:

7 day report: below 300psi: Failure. Add an issue in Vela

28 day report:

below 300 psi: Failure. Keep the issue in Vela open
below 2,000 psi: below specification but within RFI T-0156 guidelines; monitor; if the 7 day break for the same report was less than 300 psi, then the Vela issue stays open; if the 7 day break for the same report was greater than 300 psi, no Vela issue

90 day report:

below 2,000 psi: Failure. Add an issue in Vela

above 3,000 psi: Failure. Add an issue in Vela

Regarding the question of averaging, see response to RFI 155.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0157.3 | BSE - PSI Schedule for Buttress Shaft Primary Mix | Closed | 01/19/2012 | 01/29/2012 | 01/23/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Arup Kevin Clinch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

To date there are multiple RFI responses that address the scheduled PSI requirements for the primary shaft mix which
is resulting in confusion and unnecessary Vela issues. For clarification sake please confirm the following schedule is correct:

1. 300 psi at 7 days pursuant to RFI response T-0157.

2. 2000 psi based on an arithmetic average of tests on or before 90 days pursuant to RFI response T-0155 and T-0156.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The cylinder test results will be tracked in Vela as follows:
Below 300 psi at 7 days: fail
Above 300 psi at 7 days: pass
Below 2,000 psi at 90 days: fail
Above 2,000 psi at 90 days: pass
Above 3000 @ 28 days does not conform with the specifications, but this will not be tracked in Vela.
Regarding the question of averaging, see response to RFI 155

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0158 | 301 Mission Wall - Architect of Record | Closed | 06/01/2011 | 06/11/2011 | 06/06/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** URS Corporation David Fyfe **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Alfred Lau

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please clarify who is the registered Architect of Record, for the 301 Mission Interim Screen Wall Project.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

URS is the Architect/Engineer of Record per signature and seal affixed to the drawings.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0159 | BSE - Unforeseen Obstruction - Timber Piles Within Pre-Trench Limits Zone 3 | Closed | 06/02/2011 | 06/12/2011 | 06/06/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2212, Specification Section 02 41 01, attached sketch and photo

During Pre-trench, BBII found additional unforeseen timber piles within the pre-trench limits along gridline A, between gridlines 24 & 25.
Per Contract Drawing D-2212 (attached), there should only be a single row of timber piles in conflict with the CDSM wall, although when the area was exposed there are three rows within the CDSM wall limits (see attached photo). These will have to be removed and will be considered extra work.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

06/06/2011 - Daphne Faulkner

Response provided by S. Rule of Turner.

Please refer to note on Drawing D-2212 in the upper half between grids 23~26 which states,

"In areas where (N)CDSM wall conflicts with the existing pile caps and piles, remove (E) pile caps and/or piles prior to construction of (N) Transit Center Building CDSM perimeter shoring wall (see Note 3 and 6)."

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please advise.

This includes all piles within the CDSM wall footprint.

"Unforeseen Conditions" are covered in Section 00 07 00 (General Conditions) Article 3.05.A.2 and 3.05.A.3 (Unforeseen or Changed Conditions).

Article 3.05.C states,

C. Differing Site Conditions shall not include:

1. All that is indicated in or reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents;

2. All that could be seen on Site

3. Conditions that are materially similar or characteristically the same as those indicated or described in the Contract Documents or Reference Documents.

Since Section 31 56 13 discusses both pre-trenching and the removal of timber piles and Bid Item #6 is for the removal of timber piles before the CDSM shoring wall is installed TJPA believes that this work was indicated and will provid payment for it under Bid Item #2, #4, #6, and #7.

There will be no additional payment for the removal of timber piles for the CDSM wall.

---

**T-0159.1** **BSE - Unforeseen Obstruction - Timber Piles Within Pre-Trench Limits Zone 3** **Closed** **06/08/2011** **06/18/2011** **06/27/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0159, Sheet D-2212, Specification Section 02 41 19, and attached photos

The Response to RFI#T-0159, appears to have misunderstood the question. Therefore BBII is providing additional information.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The response to RFI T-0159 applies. The contractor shall remove all piles encountered during pre-trench activities.

Per note 7 on D-2212, it was made clear at the time of bid that the actual existing conditions may differ from

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

BBII contends that the lower and smaller diameter piles as indicated in the attached sketch were not shown in either the contract drawings or the reference documents, therefore BBII was un-able to account for the removal of these piles in their bid item prices. These piles meet the general conditions article 3.05A.2 definition of an unforeseen condition, because that quantity of piles encountered exceeds that shown in the bid docs.

Please confirm the removal of the "unforeseen" timber piles in excess of those shown in the drawings, will be tracked and paid under a Force account contract change order similarly as done for Zone 4 pre-trench obstructions.

the information shown on the drawings.

Note 7 on D-2212 states, "Location and depth/thickness of (E) basement slabs, walls and pile caps and location and depth/grouping of (E) piles shown on drawings based on best available information and may vary. [...] These quantities may not represent the actual extents of the entire building and/or ramp structure foundation elements (piles/footings)."

---

**T-0160** **BSE - Timber Piles Not Extracted In Zone 4** **Closed** **06/03/2011** **06/13/2011** **06/16/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner

**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**REQUEST:**

Reference CR T-010 and attached summary and sketch

BBII continues to remove unforeseen timber piles along 199 Fremont Street in Zone 4 and soon will commence extraction along 181 Fremont Street.

As of May 31, 2011, BBII has left 7 piles in place as they were estimated to be more than 12" away from the limits of the CDSM shoring wall. In addition, 5 piles were broken during extraction a portion of which were left in place due to their proximity to the adjacent building walls. While these piles also appear to be more than 12" outside the limits of the CDSM shoring wall, due to possible undulations and alignment changes underground, the possibility of these piles encroaching into the CDSM shoring wall area exist.

These piles are not shown on the contract plans and are extracted with extreme caution under the TJPA's direction and prescribed methods, taking the integrity of the adjacent buildings in consideration. Please confirm that it is the TJPA's intention to leave these piles in place.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contractor is to remove the wood piles adjacent to 199 and 181 Fremont using alternate means and methods. Wood pile can remain along this line if it will not interfere with installation of CDSM wall.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0161 | BSE - CDSM Wall Soldier Pile Installation | Closed | 06/03/2011 | 06/13/2011 | 06/06/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, 3.13 and attached detail sketch

Is it acceptable to cut a 1.5" diameter hole, 16" from the bottom tip, in the web of the soldier beam pile beams? The purpose of the hole is to aid in securing the tail of the beam to the "dolly" that DND will use to raise the beams into a vertical position.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

06/03/2011 - George Metzger

ARUP Response:

This is acceptable.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0162 | BSE - Buttress Concrete Test Cylinders | Closed | 06/03/2011 | 06/13/2011 | 06/08/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 03 30 01 and attached summary of test results

BBII, Becho, Central Concrete, W/O, ARUP and Adamson Associates met on Tuesday 5/24/2011 to discuss the results of Buttress Primary Concrete Mix Trial Batches (please refer to the attachment for a summary of the test results). The 28-day test results for the 4x8 test cylinders were on average 57% of the core 4" diameter core test results. The 28-day test results for the 6x12 test cylinders were on average 88% of the 4" diameter core test results. The test samples were extracted from the same concrete batches, at the same time and cured in the same manner. BBII believes the difference in compressive strength between the test results may be attributed to the sample size & the resultant heat of hydration which drives the concrete cure rate. BBII also believes that the concrete cores may be more indicative of the actual in-situ concrete strength than the concrete test cylinders.

The Specification Section 03 30 01 - 1.5 F Trial Batches references "concrete cylinders", however it does not specify 4x8 or 6x12 test cylinders.

During the course of the meeting, it was generally agreed upon that 6x12 test cylinders appeared to be a more representative and consistent measure of the Primary Buttress Concrete strength relative to the core samples.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Arup believes that there is insufficient information available at this time for the Contractor to draw the conclusions stated in the RFI.

Regarding the question posed in the RFI: Arup's understanding is that there should be little difference between 4x8 and 6x12 cylinders cast, cured and tested under identical conditions and, therefore, it is not essential to limit the TJPA's Testing Agency to one particular cylinder size.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

BBII has confirmed through CTS that there should be no additional cost in sampling and testing a 4x8 cylinder relative to a 6x12 cylinder.

Therefore, BBII proposes that the 6x12 test cylinders should be used as the basis of acceptance testing both for the Trial Batches and also for future Field Quality Control and Testing for the Primary Buttress Concrete; 4x8 test cylinders should only be used for informational purposes only. Please confirm.

---

**T-0163** **BSE - Hazardous Material Removed From Site Zone 2** **Closed** **06/03/2011** **06/13/2011** **06/06/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 00 03 35, 1.2

During Investigation of Zone 2, BBII discovered potential lead based material existing on site. The specific area of concern is the pedestals on First Street.

Please confirm that all contaminated material (specifically the referenced pedestals) as specified in the specification section 00 03 35 Article 1.2 has been removed and abated by the Demolition Contractor.

BBII is scheduled to remove these pedestals next week and cannot proceed with this critical work until it is confirmed that the site is cleared of lead based materials as required by the Specifications.

The TJPA's attention is directed to the following Section of the Specifications:

SECTION 00 03 35 - EXISTING CONDITIONS:
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

"1.2 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS REPORTS
A. The TJPA's environmental consultants have surveyed the facility for the presence of various hazardous

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

06/06/2011 - Kevin Chiu
Hazardous material has been removed from site per the extent of demolition contract drawings for zone 2 - this does not include the "pedestals" in Zone 2. The building and above ground structures were demolished to the extent shown on Demolition contract drawings. Hazardous materials abatement scope was completed within the scope of demolition only. Refer to Demolition Drawings D-1050, D-1051 and D-1073 for representation of limits of structures (specifically the referenced pedestals) demolished and hazardous material abatement.

BSE Contractor to handle remaining demolition and abatement in accord with BSE Spec 00-08-14 Health and Safety Criteria Para 1.2 and 1.3 Lead hazards, BSE Spec. 02-41-01 "Demolition" and BSE Spec. 01-13-50 "Hazardous Materials Procedures."

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

materials. Materials investigated may include asbestos, lead, PCB ballasts, mercury containing lamps, contaminated soils, underground storage tanks, and other hazardous materials. The demolition contractor for the Demolition project (Evans Brothers Inc.) is responsible for removing and abating products containing asbestos, lead, or PCB ballast, and mercury-containing lamps."

---

**T-0164** **BSE - Timber Piles Adjacent 177/181 Fremont Building South Zone 4** **Closed** **06/06/2011** **06/16/2011** **06/06/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI@T-0146.1 [BBI 0104] and attached photo

Per [RFI #T-0146.1] RFI 104 Response, BBII inserted a metal sheet behind the timber piles required to be removed, in the location between 199 and 181 Fremont. The sheet is to hold back the soil in the alley. Due to the close proximity of the timber piles, the sheet location is too close to the timber piles required to be removed from the CDSM Wall Location. The sheet is too close for the pile extractor to attach to the tops of the pile. See Attached Photo.

Please Advise in detail.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

06/06/2011 - Roger Rothenburger

The practice of removing the sheet pile was approved by TJPA in the "181 Fremont test" done on Friday June 3rd. The Contractor can remove the metal sheet and expose the piles as necessary with as steeply a sloped excavation that allows the vibrator pile puller to be attached. The work should be done in as reasonably a short duration as possible. All equipment, manpower, materials should be at hand when the metal sheet is pulled and the piles are exposed for extraction.

---

**T-0165** **BSE - High pH Water Found In Zone 3 Pre-Trenching** **Closed** **06/07/2011** **06/17/2011** **06/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 00 08 13, 1.9.C

BBI found high pH water while digging an exploratory hole in the Fremont St. side of Zone 3. This was confirmed by Peter Cusack from Treadwell & Rollo. Specification Section 00.08.13.1.9.C states that "Should the existing wastewater be contaminated, or should it be

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued for the chemicals to treat the water per specification section 00 08 13 (1.9.B).

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

uncontaminated but subsequently become contaminated as a result of conditions other than the Contractor's operations, a Change Order will be issued..".

Please consider this as a Notice of Existing Contaminated Wastewater as defined by SS00.08.13.1.9.C. Please advise on how to proceed.

---

**T-0166** **BSE - Unknown Concrete Structure at 199 Fremont Zone 4 (Gridline 33-30)** **Closed** **06/07/2011** **06/17/2011** **06/22/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0144 (BBI RFI 0103), Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached Turner Field Condition Report 056 and photos

BBII demolished the Unforeseen Concrete Structure along 199 Fremont St., and associated curb per RFI #103 [RFI#T-0144] response. During the process, due to the previous contractor's construction means, the curb inadvertently damaged the metal flashing, and possibly the waterproofing beside it.

Along with the curb, the fence panel was built on top of the Unforeseen Concrete Structure, so when the structure was removed, the fence came down too.

See attached pictures and Turner Field Condition Report (5/24/11)

BBII requests immediate direction from the TJPA on this issue.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Instructions for this were orally transmitted in the field and complied with by the BSE Contractor. The fence between the buildings 199 Fremont and 181 Fremont has been reinstalled. Repair of the curb and flashing can wait until work in the area is complete or at a point that no further damage is possible. The Contract requires that the BSE Contractor repair damage to any building damaged during construction activity for the site and this Contract.

---

**T-0166.1** **BSE - Unknown Concrete Structure at 199 Fremont Zone 4 (Gridline 33-30)** **Closed** **07/20/2011** **07/30/2011** **07/26/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Reference RFI #T-0144, RFI #T-0166 and Specification 31 56 13

Per the response to RFI#T-0166 (BBI RFI 103.1), please provide an acceptable repair procedure for the 199 Fremont building. Also, please confirm that the repair work will be included in CR T-010.

No action is required by the contractor at this time.

The specific damage to 199 Fremont Street has not been listed in the RFI. TJPA is aware of minor damage to the metal flashing along the curb at the bottom of 199 Fremont St and the removal of the unreinforced "curb" that ran along the base of the cinder block wall. As stated previously repairs to 199 Fremont will be made at a much later date. The damage that occurred to the flashing and unreinforced concrete curb resulted from using breaker on the unreinforced foundation wall and pulling the sections out and repairs will not be done until the project is further along in progress where no more likely damage will occur.

---

**T-0167** **Survey Grid Control Documents** **Closed** **06/08/2011** **06/10/2011** **06/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Tim Maxwell **To:** Transbay Joint Powers Author Edmond Sum **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI T-0112.1 and drawing GT-0100

As requested by Ed Sum in today's (6/8/11) OAC meeting we submit the following question:

Please confirm that gridlines as established from the GT-0100 and as confirmed on Chaudhary & Associates Survey Grid Control Documents (Ref: RFI T-0112.1) can be used for all future construction elements (i.e., CDSM wall, etc). Please confirm by 6/10/11.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

For the purpose of laying out the work shown in the BSE package, the layout drawing provided by Chaudry (included in RFI T-0112.1) is acceptable.

---

**T-0167.1** **Survey Grid Control Documents** **Closed** **07/01/2011** **07/11/2011** **07/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please provide City Survey of property lines with a

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

translation to grid for our use.

The City's property line survey has been provided to the Contractor and GT-0100 ties the building grid to the survey.

---

**T-0168** **BSE - Soil Classification Data** **Closed** **06/08/2011** **06/18/2011** **06/22/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 13 50

The Class 1 and Class 2 Disposal site does not want to use the old "PSI for Caltrans" Reports in the Soil Profile, due to the lack of necessary tests, missing pages in the report, and age.

The Disposal site recommends the use of the Treadwell & Rollo reports from 2008 and 2009, and to dismiss the "PSI for Caltrans" reports.

Please Advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contract Specification Section 01 13 50 Part 1.1.C (General Summary - Soils Management) requires that the Contractor use "Site Mitigation Plan, Transbay Transit Center" by Treadwell and Rollo March 24, 2010 for "...the management of existing soils in a manner consistent with the reuirements of the Contract." This report is attached as Appendix A in Specification Section 01 13 50.

Section 01 13 50 Par 1.1.C for soils management also references a 2nd Treadwell and Rollo Report, "Environmental Site Characterization, Transbay Terminal, San Francisco California April 2009" that is referenced in Specification Section 00 03 35 (Existing Conditions Hazardous Materials Reports). This report is not a part of the Contract as stated in Section 00 03 35 is not part of the Contract except for the technical data incorporated by reference into the Contract.

A partial review of this document shows that there is nothing to require that the Contractor use "PSI for Caltrans" reports. The April 2009 Treadwell and Rollo report is basically a detailed data report which predates the March 2010 report "Site Mitigaiton plan, Transbay Transit Center".

The March 2010 Treadwell and Rollo document modified by any additional data in the 600page April 2009 Treadwell and Roll report should be used to

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

manage the soils being excavated and coordination with the Class 1 and Class 2 Disposal Sites.

---

**T-0169** **BSE - Disposal of Drilling Spoils** **Closed** **06/09/2011** **06/19/2011** **07/07/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 13 50

BBII is concerned of the close proximity of the differently classified layers within the Buttress Area of Zone 4. The concern is during Drilling & Shaft Excavation, cross contamination of the material could potentially lead to Class 1 Material inadvertently going to a Class 2 Disposal site, or even a clean waist site. The class 1, the class 2, and the clean material layers are described below:

Surface to GL-11 ft --- Land fill (clean material except for Equipment Pad Concrete)
GL-11 ft to GL-13 ft --- Class II (based on Spec 01 13 50/APA)
GL-13 ft to GL-16 ft --- Class I (based on Spec 01 13 50/APA )
GL-16 ft to bottom ---Clean Material

BBII is concerned that due to the process of excavating the soil out of the Buttress Shaft with large amount of water and the use of a clam shell digging attachment, that the soil layers have a high opportunity of mixing within the casing. Presumably the mixed the soil layers will make it difficult to distinguish between the class 1, the class 2, and the clean materials.

BBII requests the engineer to provide a revised stratum classification that is better for the actual shaft excavation methods being used, that will prevent cross contamination.

Please Advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Conract Specification 01 13 50 Part 1.1.C (General Summary - Sil Management) requies the Contractor to use the Treadwell and Rollo March 24, 2010 "Site Mitigation Plan, Transbay Tranit Center" and April 2009 "Environmental Site Characterization, Transbay Terminal" reports for managing existing soil disposal.

Only the March 24, 2010 Treadwell and Rollo report is a Contract Document in Appendix A of Section 01 13 50 and only data from April 2009 Treadwell and Rollo Report is included as Contract information even though both reports contain much of the same language. The April 2009 report is 600 pages and the March 2010 report is considerably shorter and condensed.

Section 01 13 50 requires the Contractor to submit a material handling plan for each type of excavation operation on the site and includes the buttress piles as well as CDSM overflow materials, pre-trench excavation material, bulk excavation material, etc.

Both the April 2009 and March 2010 Treadwell and Rollo report give the expected ground condition classifications as:

5~16 feet (below grade) fill material composed of loose to medium dense silty sand with varying amounts of brick, wood, tar, and glass fragments.
15~18 feet (below grade) fill material composed of medium dense to very dense sand with variable amutns of silt
18~55 feet (below grade) Bay Mud
Under Section 01 13 50 Part 1.5.G the Contractor is

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

resonsible for devleoping a plan that reduces the amount of hazardous waste generated. This plan also includes (Part 1.4.C Submittals - Excavation Handling) methods, means, equipment, sequences that segreegates the material to reduce cost of hazardous material disposal.

Since the buttress pile area was excavated to remove piles and backfilled with a combination of existing clean material (fine sand with silt) and crused concrete debris and poured concrete (top 2 feet buttress pile working pad) the Contractor needs to devise and submit the methods to handle the segregation of those materials for disposal in the appropriate Class land fills.

The Contractor will need to test materials for suitability and work out a plan with the Disposal Landfill Operators. TJPA will assist with the TJPA environmental consultant, Treadwell and Rollo but it is the Contractor's responsibility to mke the plan and handle the material. Classification of excavated materials by TJPA will not always govern how the disposal operators deal with the material. The actual conditon of the material must be determined prior to disposal.

The materials listed by elvation in the RFI are presumably the levles of CLSM, crushed concrete debris and the material below. The buttress area was excavated to a minimum of 12 feet below grade at the Fremont St. shoring wall and then another 3~5 feet was excavated to grab on to the timber piles for removal. The excavated material was replace with different materials when the engineered work pad was constructed with compacted material.

This means that the material is not necessarily class I as stated in the RFI or as designated in the Treadwell and Rollo March 2010 report. Whether the land fill operators will agree with that is the open question.

However, as stated in Section 01 13 50 it is up to the BSE Contractor to test and determine the disposal of material in accordance with the Contract.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

TJPA will assist with some testing by their outside environmental consultant Treadwell & Rollo but such testing does not erelieve the Contractor of the responsibility for the means and methods of proper disposal despite TJPA being the "generator" of the material.

---

**T-0170** **BSE - Existing 3" minus Concrete Rubble** **Closed** **06/20/2011** **06/30/2011** **06/29/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Drawing Sheets GT-1303, D-5100, D-5101, D-5102, D-5103, response to Pre-Bid RFI #TG0300-014, and attached drawing

Contract drawings GT-1303, D-5100, D-5101, D-5102, and D-5103 along with the response to Pre-Bid RFI #TG0300-014 describe the finish grades and subsequent quantities of crushed 3" minus concrete to be left on site for the BSE package. In summary, Zone 4 was to be left with a depression as shown on GT-1303 and Zone 1-3 were to be left no higher than existing ground elevations.

Previous discussions between BBII, W/O, EBI and TJPA were made to accommodate BBII's early access into Zones 1-3 for pre-trenching. At the time of these discussions EBI indicated they were short approximately 7000 cy of balancing the site and that they would not be able to get that remaining 7000 cy until the existing ramps were demolished. As a result of the short term shortage and in exchange for access to zone 1-3 BBII agreed to:

- Allow EBI to leave Zone 3 low of the Existing elevations
- Allow EBI to set up Crusher in Zone 2 for ramp demolition
- Allow EBI to leave the 7000 cy shortage in a stockpile in Zone 2, for our later use.

BBII appreciated the partnering agreement however the current size of the stockpile is far greater than BBII ever expected. BBII surveyed the stockpile and the Zone 3

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Intent of the demolition project is to retain processed construction demolition concrete onsite for use as buttress fill material and provide a working platform for construction of new terminal perimeter wall.

Contract drawings state" Subsequent to placement of CDSM wall perimeter shoring remove all onsite crushed/processes demolition concrete backfill." REF: D-2200-2203 inclusive, and D-1001 Note 2.

The amount of crushed concrete (and asphalt) is from the demolition contract is in accord with Demolition Contractor drawings and specs. REF: Demo Spec. 02-42-00.

depression on 6/7/11 after they completed their export to zone 4 and BBII estimates the size of the concrete stockpile to be in excess of 11,000 cy (this does not include the asphalt stockpile that was created after the survey).

Based on BBII's calculations (see attached topo) Zone 3 was left approximately 2000 cy short of existing grade and 5000 cy were taken from the stockpile to Zone 4. As a result BBII requests the current stockpile be removed in its entirety from the site, as it is in excess of the contractual amount to be removed by the BSE contract.

However, If acceptable to TJPA, BBII would be interested in taking 2000 cy of the crushed concrete if it could be delivered and stockpiled in an mutually agreeable staging area. BBII suggests Lot S. This material would then be used as need for excavation stabilization throughout the BSE contract.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0171 | BSE - Concrete Section Protruding Into CDSM Shoring Wall Area Zone 4 | Closed | 06/13/2011 | 06/23/2011 | 06/17/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached photo

While excavating a pile next to 181 Fremont Street, a section of concrete that was protruding into the CDSM shoring wall area fell from the foundation wall of 181 Fremont. Please advise on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The void should be filled with 2000 psi concrete after surfaces of the opening are cleaned. In addition grouted anchorage of #3 rebar hooks at 12'' c.c around the opening in the existing concrete basement wall and mesh is required before placing repair concrete through a ''bird's mouth'' form for a complete filling. A sketch is attached showing the desired configuration of the repair patch.

Cost to be tracked under CRT#10.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0172 | LEED Submittal Requirements | Closed | 06/13/2011 | 06/23/2011 | 06/21/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Ref Spec Section 01 81 13 Section 1.5:

According to spec section 018113.1.5, LEED submittals shall be submitted in addition to other submittal requirements specified elsewhere. If a submitted item is identical to an item submitted to comply with other requirements, a duplicate copy is to be submitted. In effort to minimize duplicate submittals, please confirm it is acceptable to issue one submittal package to cover both the technical spec. and LEED spec section requirements.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

We agree with your proposal to combine the data.

---

**T-0173** **BSE - Enhanced Trial Batch Testing** **Closed** **06/13/2011** **06/23/2011** **06/15/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner

**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 03 30 01, 2.2.E and attached mix designs

BBII, Becho, Central Concrete, W/O, ARUP and Adamson Associates met on Tuesday 5/24/2011 to discuss the results of Buttress Primary Concrete Mix Trial Batches. Based upon the preliminary results of the 2nd Trial Batch, BBII proposes to submit the following three mixes for approval for use on the Buttress Primary Shaft Concrete:
1. Mix 1: 85AEC3B6
2. Mix 5: 86AEC3A6
3. Mix 7: 87AEC3A6

BBII believes that having additional mixes available for use as the Buttress Primary Concrete would be of great benefit to the Project. BBII proposes "enhanced testing" of these three mixes as well as three additional hybrids of each mix for a total of nine mixes (please see attached for mix designs). The intent of the enhanced testing is to further refine the information we currently have on all three of the above three mixes, as well develop additional mixes for future use as Primary Shaft Concrete.

One of the concerns of 1st and 2nd Trial Batches was potentially accelerated curing due to the Styrofoam

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

This is acceptable.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

insulated boxes in which the trail batch "cubes" were cast. BBII proposes a 3rd trial batch using all of the same methodology of the approved trial batch method placing, the only exception being that the concrete will be cast into +/- 5'x5'x4' deep excavations in lieu of the Styrofoam insulated forms. Each mix would be placed in an individual excavation, lined with plastic to retain moisture. All other aspects of the proposed trial batch methodology would be as previously submitted & approved.

The results of the "enhanced testing" would be evaluated and possibly submitted for approval as additional Buttress Primary Shaft Concrete Mixes.

Please confirm that this is acceptable.

---

**T-0174** **301 Mission Wall - New Curb Detail** **Closed** **06/14/2011** **06/24/2011** **06/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached sheet C-5000

The required curb details are not clearly defined. Is new curb set atop finish pavers, onto topping slab, or set all the way down to structural slab. Additionally, provide all applicable rebar details to match condition.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

New concrete curb shall be placed on top of topping slab and shall extend 9 inches above top of pavers. See attached detail for reinforcement. Concrete mix used for new concrete curbs shall be according to RFI T-0176.

---

**T-0175** **301 Mission Wall - Concrete Mix for Curb Around Existing Manhole Covers** **Closed** **06/15/2011** **06/25/2011** **06/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference drawing C-2000

The existing curb around the manholes at the east and west ends of the 301 Mission Wall is unknown. Design documents do not provide information as to the specs of

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

New concrete finish shall match existing concrete finish. Contractor shall provide concrete mix designs for curb(s) and walkway(s) based on specification as follows;

this concrete mixture. The existing concrete appears to have a color added to the mix design. Please provide a mix design and color specification (if necessary) to use at these locations.

Concrete Mix, Design and Testing: Design the mix to produce standard weight concrete consisting of Portland cement, aggregate, air-entraining admixture and water to produce the following properties:

Compressive Strength: except as noted below, four thousand five hundred (4500) psi, minimum at twenty-eight (28) days, with a water cement ratio not to exceed 0.45 by weight.
Slump Range: Two (2) inches to Four (4) inches.
Air Content: Five (5) to seven (7) percent.
Mixed shall be design to provide concrete with the following properties:

| Location | Maximum Size of Aggregate | Min. 28 Day Strength (psi) | Min Sacks of Cement/cu. Yd. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Concrete Curb | ¾" | 3000 | 6 |
| Concrete Walkways | ¾" | 2500 | 5-1/2 |

Integral Color: Sidewalk shall be constructed of a dark grey, Hi-Con at 5 lbs. per cubic yard carbon black based concrete finish, with 25 to 30 lbs per 100 square feet of silicon carbide sparkle grains.

Contractor shall submit mix design (including integral color) for review and acceptance by the TJPA Representative prior to placing concrete.

Contractor shall provide sample of new concrete to ensure that it matches with existing concrete prior to placing new concrete.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0176 | 301 Mission Wall - Fill Pour Back and New Curbs | Closed | 06/15/2011 | 06/25/2011 | 06/20/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Should the concrete mix design for the fill pour back and 9"x12" curbs along the north side of the 301 Mission wall be the same mix that is used for the new curb around the manhole? The mix design for curbs around the existing manhole was requested in RFI T-0175. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Concrete mix design for new concrete curbs shall be as specified in RFI T-0175.

Finished concrete curbs shall match existing concrete curb finish.

Contractor to submit concrete mix design to TJPA Representative for review and acceptance prior to placing concrete.

---

**T-0177** **BSE - Alternate Method Of Pile Removal Along 181 Fremont** **Closed** **06/15/2011** **06/25/2011** **06/16/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached procedure, photos, and sketch

During the extraction of unforeseen piles along 181 Fremont, two piles located inside the proposed CDSM wall broke and are now too deep to extract under using the current extraction method. During the attempted extraction of pile 151, the pile continued to break. The top of this pile is approximately 9' below the base of the foundation wall. Considering the length of the adjacent removed piles, there is approximately 6' left to be removed. Pile 105 is approximately 6' below the base of the foundation wall leaving approximately 12'-14' to be removed. Further excavation to expose these piles is not reasonable. BBII proposes to drill the remainder of each pile out. See below the proposed procedure as per committee meeting and consultation with Viking Drillers Inc. on 6-15-11. It was agreed that this work will be charged to CR T-010. Also attached are photos and a drawing indicating the location of both broken piles (105 and 151).

Please provide direction.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed - Method of pile removal is acceptable. CR T-010 is used to document work.

---

**T-0178** **BSE - Connector Wall Layout** **Closed** **06/16/2011** **06/26/2011** **06/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0151 and Sheets GT-2103 and GT-2201

Per the Engineer's response to RFI#T-0151, it is acceptable to expand the overall Buttress 4'-4" to the east. Please advise if the CDSM connector columns can still be installed per contract drawings GT-2103 and GT-2201.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

This is not acceptable. If the Contractor wishes to increase the spacing of the drilled shafts, then the connector columns will need to shift and / or be supplemented with additional columns to provide CDSM material for the full width of the buttress.

---

**T-0179** **301 Mission Wall - Detail at Steel Baseplates on South Side** **Closed** **06/21/2011** **07/01/2011** **07/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

"Reference drawing D/A-6000 and attached sketch

Detail D/A-6000 does not provide a plywood panel termination detail at the steel baseplate locations along the south side of the 301 Mission wall. At the locations of the steel baseplates, use of sealant and backer rod would leave the steel baseplate exposed (see attached sketch). Please advise."

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

It is noted that the contractor has already installed flashing to protect steel base plate prior to this RFI response. Although installation of flashing is not specified in contract documents this means of protecting the steel base plate is acceptable.

---

**T-0180** **BSE - CDSM Wall Tolerance** **Closed** **06/22/2011** **07/02/2011** **06/22/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13

As requested by the TJPA, DND submits this request to modify the horizontal tolerance for the CDSM shoring wall. The new goal is to set the wall 2" outside of the original planned centerline of shoring wall. This solution has been proposed by the TJPA in order to not encroach into the structure at the bottom of the train box.

DND respectfully requests the maximum soldier pile & CDSM wall tolerances be revised to 0 inches into the

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TJPA did not request this RFI. TJPA stated that if the Contractor was concerned about meeting the tolerances for top horizontal position of the CDSM shoring wall that the Contractor should submit an RFI and TJPA would support such a request in order to avoid any encroachment of the CDSM shoring wall with the Transit Box concrete structure which would be difficult to remediate.

TJPA has no objection in the horizontal setting of the CDSM shoring wall if the horizontal tolerance is 0"

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

trainbox & up to 5 inches outside the trainbox.

There will be no additional excavation and/or bracing costs associated with this increase in tolerance from BBI. However; there may be future additional cost impacts to the Structural Concrete & Waterproofing that are to be handled in future trade packages.

Please confirm, if this is acceptable.

towards the TTC box structure and 4" away from the box structure. The verticality tolerances of 1/150 (CDSM wall) and 1/200 (steel beam) remain in place.

The 4" top horizontal tolerance away from the wall will allow at 1/150 in 55 feet a near 0" clearance at the invert level with the CDSM wall and will allow at 1/200 the steel beam to be clear of the structural outline by 0.70".

It is understood that there is no cost or time associated with this change for the BSE Contractor work and that TJPA accepts the additional overbreak concrete generated by this small adjustment in the top horizontal placement in exchange for a better chance of avoiding structural encroachment issues at the final invert level.

It is also understood that the use of the increased top horizontal tolerance is contingent on actual field physical property line clearances for the CDSM shoring wall.

---

**T-0180.1** **BSE - CDSM Wall Tolerance** **Closed** **06/24/2011** **07/04/2011** **07/07/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Response to RFI#T-0180

Please delete the first sentence "TJPA did not request this RFI" of the response for RFI T-0180, because it is the wrong statement.
Emilio Cruz, PMPC, requested to submit this RFI at the Schedule Review Meeting on 6/14/2011 at W-O JV Office Conference Room, 183 Fremont St.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

It depends on how "request" is defined. TJPA did "request" the RFI for expanded tolerances but only if the CDSM shoring wall subcontractor felt that they needed more tolerances and wished to have TJPA confirm that it would accept a larger set back (4") than allowed in the Specifications (2"). This is the same undertanding held my Emillio Cruz.

TJPA has allowed a 4" set back while maintaining the verticality specifications for the steel soldier piles (1/200) and the CDSM (1/150). The CDSM shoring wall subcontractor has initially selected a 2" setback for placing the steel soldier beams. At 1/200 for a depth of 55ft there could be as much as 1.3" of

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

encroachment (1/200x55x12 - 2" = 1.33").

At the very least it would seem that a 3" setback would minimize further the posibility for encroachment since the 1/200 is still a difficult specification to achieve as TJPA understands it from the CDSM subcontractor.

Since encroachment can be very problematic with the concrete structural wall TJPA supports the larger setback to avoid difficult encroachment problems while maintaining the specifications on verticality. The issue of who requested what and when is immaterial. TJPA has accepted the potential for additional concrete from allowing a larger setback and the BSE Contractor has accepted any impact to the bracing system from a larger impact.

---

**T-0181** **BSE - CDSM Pile Tolerance Measurement Location** **Closed** **06/22/2011** **07/02/2011** **07/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13

BBII's subcontractor DND would like to confirm the exact location of the soldier pile, where the pile tolerance is to be measured. Please find below DND's question:

"It is our understanding that the tolerance of the soldier pile beams is to be measured at the plan top of pile elevation. Is this correct?"

Please confirm that DND's interpretation of the pile tolerance measurement is correct.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

We confirm that the tolerance refers specifically to the location of the CDSM wall and soldier pile centerlines.

Section 31 56 13 3.3 A. states: "The location of the CDSM wall centerline relative to that shown on the Drawings is 0" toward the excavation and 2" away from the excavation." This refers to the location at the ground surface ("original grade") at the start of drilling.

Section 31 56 13 3.13 B. 8. states: "Acceptable construction tolerance for the location of the soldier pile centerline relative to that shown on the Drawings is 0" toward the excavation and 3" maximum away from the excavation." This refers to the location at ground surface ("original grade") at the start of pile installation.

Please also refer to 31 56 13 3.4 A and 31 56 13 3.13

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

B 2 which stipulates respectively the vertical alignment of the CDSM wall and soldier piles.

---

**T-0181.1** **BSE - CDSM Tolerances** **Closed** **07/21/2011** **07/31/2011** **07/26/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch

**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFIs #T-180, #T-0180.1, #T-0181 and Specification Section 31 56 13

Previous RFIs T-180, T-180.1, and T-181 have all addressed CDSM shoring wall tolerances. Below is BBII's interpretation of the responses:

1. Horizontal Tolerance:
a) CDSM Columns: 0" in towards the train box, 2" maximum away from the train box - measured relative to the "plan" CDSM shoring wall centerline located at the ground surface (original grade) at the start of drilling (W/O comment - Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, 3.3.A)

b) Steel Soldier Pile: 0" in towards the train box, 4" maximum away from the trainbox - measured relative to the "plan" CDSM shoring wall centerline located at the ground surface (original grade) at the start of drilling (W/O comment - Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, 3.13.B.8)

2. Vertical Tolerance:
a) CDSM Columns: Inclination deviation no more than 1:150 (horizontal to vertical)
(W/O comment - Same as stated in Specification Section 31 56 13, 3.4.A)

b) Steel Soldier Pile: Inclination no more than 1:200 (horizontal to vertical)
(W/O comment - Same as stated in Specification Section 31 56 13, 3.13.B.9)

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Using the numbering in the RFI:

1 a. 0" in towards the train box, 4" maximum away from the train box is acceptable everywhere along the alignment except at wall segments A/26-30 and A/30-33.5. 0" in towards the train box, 2" maximum away from the train box is acceptable at wall segments A/26-30 and A/30-33.5.

1 b. 0" in towards the train box, 4" maximum away from the trainbox is acceptable everywhere along the alignment.

2 a. Confirmed

2 b. Confirmed

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please confirm this is acceptable

---

**T-0182** **BSE - Inclinometer Locations Within The CDSM Wall** **Closed** **06/23/2011** **07/03/2011** **06/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheets GT-1301, GT-1302, Specification Section 31 56 13, and Transmittal No. 140-01802 (attached)

Please refer to the Instrumentation Plan within the contract drawings GT-1301 & GT-1302, which depicts the rough locations of the 15 inclinometers (IW-1 through IW-15) that are to be installed through the CDSM shoring wall. Please notify BBII of the exact locations of those inclinometers by utilizing the soldier pile numbers 1 through 681, sent in Transmittal No. 140-01802 (attached).

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Provide pipes at the piles (beams) in accordance with detail 13/GT-5101 in the following fourteen beam numbers: 46, 97, 138, 226, 306, 325, 340, 443, 458, 478, 497, 556, 641, 730. Refer to the plan submitted with the RFI for the beam numbers.

As noted in 13/GT-5101, wood block shall be used at the bottom of the pipe. The top of the pipe shall be covered with duct tape to prevent filling with soil cement.

---

**T-0182.1** **BSE - Connector Wall Inclinometer Locations** **Closed** **06/30/2011** **07/10/2011** **07/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0182, Transmittal No. 140-01802, and Specification Section 31 56 13

BBII is in receipt of the Engineer's response to RFI T-0182, which lists the fourteen pile numbers where the inclinometers will be installed. Please note that pile # 443 was already installed on 06/18/2011, as part of the CDSM test panel.

Can the inclinometer casing be installed at pile # 446, instead of pile # 443?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The inclinometer casing shall be installed in pile number 440 rather than number 443.

---

☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0183 | BSE - Connector Wall Shift | Closed | 06/23/2011 | 07/03/2011 | 06/27/2011 | Potentially | |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0178, Sheets GT-2201, GT-5101, and attached sketch

Per the Engineer's response to RFI T-0178, it is acceptable to shift the CDSM Connector Columns to the east and to add additional columns to provide CDSM material for the full width of the Buttress. Please confirm that it is acceptable to shift the lower three rows of the CDSM Connector Columns approximately 3'-6" to the east and add two more columns to the top row. Additionally, please confirm that the CDSM Shoring Wall between Gridlines 26 and 30 can still be installed per GT-2201 and Table 16/GT-5101.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Provided there is no additional cost to the TJPA, it is acceptable to shift the connector columns and add columns as proposed and shown on the sketch.

The CDSM Shoring Wall between Gridlines 26 and 30 shall be installed per GT-2201 and Table 16/GT-5101.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0183.1 | BSE - Connector Wall Shift | Closed | 06/30/2011 | 07/10/2011 | 07/11/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0151, RFI#T-0178, RFI#T-0183, Specification Sections 31 63 29 and 31 56 13, and attached drawing

Please refer to the Engineer's response to RFI # T-0151, which accepted the expansion of the Buttress 4'-4" to the east. Please also refer to the Engineer's response to RFI No. T-#0178, where the designer required the connector columns be shifted and/or supplemented with additional columns to provide CDSM material for the full width of the buttress. BBII suggests to revise the connector column layout per the attached drawing and install two additional connector columns at Grid "A" and "30" intersection.

Please confirm, if the proposed revision of the CDSM connector columns according to the attached drawing fulfills the design requirement.

Also, please issue revised construction drawings that would reflect the changes made to the Buttress and the CDSM connector walls.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The locations of the CDSM connector columns shown on the sketch accompanying the RFI are acceptable. The locations of the buttress shafts shown on the sketch accompanying the RFI have been revised. Please see the marked-up sketch attached to this response.

A revised GT-2201 will not be issued.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0184 | BSE - CIDH Pile Rebar Cage Hoop Size | Closed | 06/27/2011 | 07/07/2011 | 06/28/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc — George Metzger
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-5202, Specification Section 03 20 01, attached sketch, and approved Shop Drawings from Package TA2010-032001A05

Drawing 12/GT-5202 shows 5'' clearance between the hoop OD and the inside diameter of a 7' +/- 2'' shaft. Per discussions with Becho, at least 3'' of clearance is needed between the rebar spacers and the ID of the casing to facilitate proper installation of the rebar cages inside the casing.

BBII would like to propose 7 1/4'' minimum clearance in lieu of the 5'' clearance (shown on 12/GT-5202) between the hoops and the inside diameter of the hole. Changing the clearance from 5'' to 7 1/4'' would give Becho the 3'' of clearance that they need between the spacers and casing ID.

Note that the approved rebar shop drawings show 5'' clearance to the hoops as per 12/GT-5202. BBII will submit for your records only revised shop drawings showing the proposed 7 1/4'' minimum clearance.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Changing the clearance from face of reinforing steel to the soil face from 5'' to 7 1/4'' is acceptable.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0185 | Division 01 specifications issued for the TG08.1 package | Closed | 06/29/2011 | 07/09/2011 | | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Tim Maxwell
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:**
**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Confirm if any of all of the Specification Sections 00 01 10, 00 01 15, 00 01 16, 00 03 50, 01 10 20 / APH, 01 10 30, 01 10 30 / APA, and 01 80 50 issued for the TG08.1 bid documents are to be incorporated into the overall project specifications. If so, the specifications should be issued to W/O by Field Order or Change Order.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0186 | BSE - Hazardous Materials Removed From 564 & 568 Howard Street | Closed | 06/30/2011 | 07/10/2011 | 07/07/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Jack Adams
**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference Final Pre-Demolition Hazardous Materials Assessment: Asbestos & Lead Survey (564 & 568 Howard St) - June 2011, prepared for ERM-West by Millennium Consulting Associates

Please confirm that all the hazardous materials identified in the Final Pre-Demolition Hazardous Materials Assessment: Asbestos & Lead Survey (564 & 568 Howard St) - June 2011, will be removed by the demolition contractor.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Haz Mat abatement will include the materials identified in this report, however removal will be to the extent of demolition drawings issued for Demolition.

---

**T-0187** **BSE - Connector Wall Inclinometer Locations - SEE RFI 182.1** **Closed** **06/30/2011** **07/10/2011** **08/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0182, Transmittal No. 140-01802, and Specification Section 31 56 13

BBII is in receipt of the Engineer's response to RFI T-0182, which lists the fourteen pile numbers where the inclinometers will be installed. Please note that pile # 443 was already installed on 06/18/2011, as part of the CDSM test panel.

Can the inclinometer casing be installed at pile # 446, instead of pile # 443?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

SEE RFI T-0182.1.

---

**T-0188** **BSE - Timber Piles Minna Street** **Closed** **07/01/2011** **07/11/2011** **07/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference D-2211 and D-5101.
During the pre-trenching operation on Minna Street between Gridlines 9-17, BBII discovered unknown timber piles. The timber piles are not shown on the BSE drawings. See attached BSE drawing D-2211, D-5101. The attached pictures indicate timber piles to be approx 2ft

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Please refer to note on Drawing D-2212 which states,

"In areas where (N)CDSM wall conflicts with the existing pile caps and piles, remove (E) pile caps and/or piles prior to construction of (N) Transit Center Building CDSM perimeter shoring wall (see Note 3 and

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

from the centerline of the CDSM wall. These piles meet the general conditions set out in article 3.05A.2. The piles encountered were not outlined in the bid documents. Please confirm the removal of the "unforeseen" timber piles, tracking and paid under a Force account contract change order similarly as done for Zone 4 pre-trench obstructions.

6)."

Please refer to note on Drawing GT-5103 which states,

"Width and Depth as required to remove obstacles"

This includes all piles within the CDSM wall footprint.

"Unforeseen Conditions" are covered in Section 00 07 00 (General Conditions) Article 3.05.A.2 and 3.05.A.3 (Unforeseen or Changed Conditions).

Article 3.05.C states,

C. Differing Site Conditions shall not include:

1. All that is indicated in or reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents;

2. All that could be seen on Site

3. Conditions that are materially similar or characteristically the same as those indicated or described in the Contract Documents or Reference Documents.

Since Section 31 56 13 discusses both pre-trenching and the removal of timber piles and Bid Item #6 is for the removal of timber piles before the CDSM shoring wall is installed TJPA believes that this work was indicated and will provide payment for it under Bid Item #2, #4, #6, and #7.

There will be no additional payment for the removal of timber piles for the CDSM wall.

---

**T-0188.1** **BSE - Timber Piles Minna Street** **Closed** **07/07/2011** **07/17/2011** **07/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI T-0188, Drawing D-2211 and D-5101.

Further to the TJP A response RFI # 188, this response did not address the mentioned timber pile removal method.
Please see the attached cross section showing timber pile location in relationship to the existing utilities and structures. Due to the pile location, in relation to the shoring box BBII proposes direct extraction as done on A line in Zone 3.
Please confirm this removal method is acceptable for the entire length of Minna Street.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Arup recommends that the procedure for removing these piles follow the procedure described in Arup's response to RFI T-0146.4.

---

**T-0188.2** **BSE - Timber Piles Minna Street** **Closed** **07/13/2011** **07/23/2011** **07/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**REQUEST:**

Reference response to RFI#T-0188.1 and RFI#T-0146.4

As discussed at the TG03 BSE Design Team meeting on 7/13/2011, sand shall be used for back fillings instead of the low strength material described in RFI#T-0146.4.
Also, TJPA representative shall observe the extraction and instruct the extraction method in the field, if necessary.

Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TJPA Representatives and Arup will observe the method in practice Thursday July 14, 2011 at 10am to observe the method using sand described above for final verification that this method will be acceptable and suggest any changes to the method at that time.

---

**T-0188.3** **BSE - Timber Piles Minna Street** **Closed** **07/18/2011** **07/28/2011** **07/26/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0188.2 and attached photos

BBII has concerns for the integrity of the adjacent street and utilities, as a result of the pile extraction being performed on Minna Street in accordance with the response to RFI#T-0188.2. BBII has observed

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contractor's concern for the integrity of the adjacent street and utilities is as a result of the shoring method used - not the result of the pile extraction being performed on Minna Street in accordance with the response to RFI#T-0188.2.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

undermining and adjacent settlement during the extraction process (see attached photos).

Please advise an acceptable method of pile extraction that will allow this work to continue

The observed undermining and adjacent settlement during the extraction process is to be restored to prevent damage to Utilities installed in Minna Street. The methods allowed in RFI T-0188.2 are to be followed by the Contractor.

Section 31-56-13 Part 3.2.C (CDSM Wall - Pre-trenching) also references Section 32-12-17 (Street Excavation & Restoration) for pre-trenching "...within and or adjacent to the public right of way." In addition Section 31-56-13 Part 3.2.D requires the Contractor to "Comply with all regulatory requirements regarding trench shoring." Both Section the Street Excavation and Restoration Specification 32-12-17 and the regulatory requirements for trench shoring require a shoring system designed by a Professional Engineer and submitted to TJPA as well as the SFDPW. OSHA requires for all trenches deeper than 5 feet and not sloped according to OSHA standards be designed by a Professional Engineer.

Given the above it is the Contractor's responsibility to select the means and methods and to design pre-trench shoring meeting the above requirements.

TJPA observations of the Minna Street pre-trenching operations showed that the "trench shield" method of support where excavation below the trench shield required for both sinking the shield and exposing "obstructions" allowed the loose fill sand at the bottom of the excavation to slough into the excavation. This loss of ground led to settlement of the street and potential settlement of the adjacent water line and sewer.

TJPA notes that the Contractor has commenced using near-flat sheet piles in combination with the trench shield bracing to achieve the depths required. However, no submittal of a design done by a professional engineer has been submitted to TJPA in accordance with the requirements from the Specifications stated above.

An acceptable method of pile extraction includes a suitable trench shoring method and plan that meets

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

the Specification requirements. TJPA has no objection to the use of braced sheet piles as long as the above Specification requirements are met. The actual method of pile extraction with vibration and sand filling has been addressed in a previous RFI and TJPA has witnessed a satisfactory site demonstration of this method of pulling timber piles.

---

7/20/2011 - George Metzger:

ARUP Response:

Regarding the removal of the piles, Arup recommended a procedure in response to RFI 188.1. Contractor to confirm that this procedure is being implemented as described in the RFI response.

Regarding the installation of temporary shoring to access the piles, this is the Contractor's means and methods.

---

**T-0189** **BSE - CDSM Spoils - Initial Off Haul** **Closed** **07/01/2011** **07/11/2011** **07/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner
**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**REQUEST:**

Per our meeting on 6-23-11 with the TJPA, PMPC, T&R, TCCO and W/O, this RFI is to confirm the initial off haul of the CDSM spoils to be classified as Class 2 non-hazardous waste and will be paid under bid item #38 due to lack of soil testing data required by the landfill and risk of cross contamination.
BBII is currently in talks with various local landfills and their Consultant with the advice of Treadwell Rollo for the acceptance of the spoil to be classified under "clean soil" (not Class 2).
Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

"Initial CDSM overflow "spoils" is considered only the overflow spoils from the CDSM test panels in Zone 4. For the single purpose of removing the CDSM test panel overlfow now on the surface in Zone 4 and without prejudice for the classification of future CDSM overflow materials the "iniital" CDSM overflow materials (30 loads+/-) from Zone 4 may be hauled to a Class 2 land fill site. Payment will be in accordance with the Contract for disposal of Class 2 hazardous waste material for this one time until a future classification for CDSM overflow materials can be agreed with the land fill operator.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0190 | BSE - Connector Wall Daily As Built Requirement | Closed | 07/01/2011 | 07/11/2011 | 07/13/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13 1.4F.

To satisfy the Section 31 56 13 1.4F requirement, BBII will continue to submit the "DND Daily Construction Report" on a daily basis along with the attached as-built drawing within 24 hours of column installation.

Please confirm that this will satisfy the Section 1.4F requirement: "submit as-built drawings within 24 hours of column installation."

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The attached daily report lacks required information (i.e. surveyed as-builts, column diameter, etc.) and therefore does not satisfy the documentation requirements of spec 31 56 13 (1.4, 3.5, 3.11, 3.13, etc.).

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0191 | BSE - Connector Wall Final As Built Requirement | Closed | 07/01/2011 | 07/11/2011 | 07/12/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13 3.3B.

To satisfy the Section 31 56 13 3.3B requirement, BBII proposes to submit as built drawings prepared by a California licensed surveyor at the approximate completion of each Zone.

Please confirm that this will satisfy the Section 3.3B requirement: "Following CDSM wall construction, the Contractor shall submit as-built drawings prepared by a California licensed surveyor indicating the location of the CDSM walls relative to the excavation alignment."

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Contractor to submit as-built drawings within 24 hours of column installation. The drawings shall be prepared by a licensed surveyor and shall indicate the CDSM wall relative to excavation alignment.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0191.1 | BSE - CDSM Connector Wall Final As Built Requirement | Closed | 07/27/2011 | 08/06/2011 | 08/03/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0191 and Specification Section 31 56 13

BBII disagrees with TJPA's interpretation of the

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Submitting as-built drawings prepared by BBII/DND's

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

requirements of the Specifications in its Response to RFI T-0191.

Article 1.4F, Section 31 56 13 of the Specifications state:
Record Documents
1. Submit as-built drawings within 24 hours of column installation.
2. Note and submit immediately to the TJPA's Representative unusual conditions encountered, including amounts of cement grout overpours during construction.

Article 3.11D2, Section 31 56 13 of the Specifications state:
The Daily Quality Control Report shall include as a minimum the results of the following QC parameter monitoring for each column:
a. Rig number
b. Type of mixing tool
c. Date and time (start and finish) of column construction
d. Column diameter
e. Column top and bottom elevations
f. Grout mix design designation
g. Slurry specific gravity measurements (obtained from the Testing Agency)
h. Description of obstructions, interruptions, or other difficulties during installation and how they were resolved
i. Surveyed as-built of previous day's work in relation to grid

Article 3.3B, Section 31 56 13 of the Specifications state: (emphasis added)
Following CDSM wall construction, the Contractor shall submit as-built drawings prepared by a California licensed surveyor indicating the location of the CDSM walls relative to the excavation alignment.

Article 3.3B of the above provides the only requirement for a survey performed by California licensed surveyor. BBII's proposal in RFI T-0191 exceeded the requirements of Article 3.3B by proposing to submit as-built drawings prepared by a California licensed surveyor at the completion of the CDSM wall at each Zone, rather than at the completion of the entire CDSM scope as the Specifications require.

project staff within 24 hours of installation is acceptable.

As-built drawings prepared by a licensed surveyor shall be submitted as each of the following sections of wall are completed:

1. A-line inside Zone 4

2. J-line inside Zone 4

3. Beale and N-lot

4. Fremont Street

5. First Street

6. A-line inside Zone 3

7. J-line inside Zone 3

8. A-line inside Zones 2 and 1

9. J-line inside Zone 2 to Grid 10

10. J-line inside Zone 1 from Grid 10 to Grid 1 and gridline 1

The drawings for a given section shall be submitted within 14 calendar days of completing that section.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please confirm that submitting as-built drawings prepared by BBII/DND's project staff within 24 hours of installation and as-builts of each zone at the completion of the zone by a licensed surveyor is acceptable. BBII will perform additional survey by a licensed surveyor if necessary at areas of concern, to ensure conformance with the project requirements.

---

**T-0192** **BSE - Unforeseen Tank on Gridline 35** **Closed** **07/06/2011** **07/16/2011** **07/08/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

BBII discovered an unforeseen tank structure during the pre-trenching operation along Gridline 35 between Gridline A-J that is not shown on the contract plans. The tank contains liquid substance; the odor from the excavation around the tank, it is assumed this is a fuel liquid. This tank needs to be removed to allow the continuation of the pre-trenching operation. Please advise as soon as possible.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TJPA environmental consultant has contacted Golden Gate Tank Removal Co and removal is being scheduled. The TJPA has not yet received the paperwork from the Golden Gate Tank Removal Co. to schedule the date. TJPA will discuss further with W/O - BBI regarding handling.

---

**T-0192.1** **BSE - Unforeseen Tank on Gridline 35** **Closed** **07/11/2011** **07/21/2011** **08/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0192 and attached photo

The unforeseen tank discovered during the pre-trench operation on Beale Street contains liquid. The liquid has spilled and is present in the surrounding soil, visible from the surface. The response to RFI#T-0192 does not address the soil surrounding the tank. BBII suspects this soil is contaminated with hydrocarbons in excess of the current approved Class 1 profile.

Please advise on the classification, limits and disposal

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See attached test reports

Report Completed By - Title - Date - Work Order - Number of Pages

McCampbell Analytical, Inc. - Analytical Report - July 20, 2011 - 1107352 - 8
McCampbell Analytical, Inc. - Analytical Report - July 25, 2011 - 1107352 A - 8

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

methods for the contaminated soil surrounding the tank.

---
07/15/2011 Roger Rothenburger

TJPA has had their environmental consultant,Treadwell & Rollo (Peter Cusack) arrange for the underground storage tank (UST) and its contents to be removed, test samples of the material, determine the extent of the contamination, and the proper disposal of the soil around the tank. The following response has been reviewed by Mr. Cusack.

1. Soils in the area of the UST were orginally classified as Class I from 0~6ft below grade and Class II from 6~22 feet below grade (Soils Management Plan figure 4 & 7.
2. Remove and stockpile contaminated soils in the immediate area of UST including 2 feet along the sides of the UST and 2 feet below the UST.
3. If soils beyond this area still have a strong gasoline or petroleum odor then remove those soils as well.
4. The samples taken by TJPA environmental consultant Peter Cusack on Thursday July 14, 2011 will be chemically tested for different contaminents.
5. The results of these tests will not be available for approximately 2 weeks (July 28, 2011).
6. Maintain the contaminated stockpiles covered until classifiecation is complete and further directions are given by TJPA at that time.
7. Backfill the open trench/hole from which the contaminated material described above has been removed with clean suitable material as defined in the Specifications.

---

**T-0192.2** **BSE - Unforeseen Tank on Gridline 35** **Closed** **08/02/2011** **08/12/2011** **08/15/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**
Reference RFI#T-0192.1

The Analytical Report for the sample taken from the soil around the Underground Storage Tank (UST) has been

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐
Treadwell and Rollo Response -

Based on the attached analytical results, the soil excavated from the tank removal activities is

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

sent to BBII. The soil classification that has been determined was not listed in the response, nor the Analytical Report. Please advise on the classification of the soil.

considered Class II material and should be disposed of as Class II material using the established soil handling procedures.

---

**T-0193** **BSE - CDSM Buttress Connector Wall** **Closed** **07/07/2011** **07/17/2011** **07/08/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13

DND is refining the CDSM Shoring Wall mix design based upon the initial results of the Zone 4 Test Section in order to meet the specified compressive strength and permeability. DND is currently planning on trying 2 new mixes / methods in the CDSM Buttress Connector Wall:

1) Single Phase (down and up with grout only) - 275 kg/m3 cement treatment, 220% water/cement, specific gravity ~1.4
a. Based on Japanese experience
2) Two Phase (down with water, up with grout) - 265 kg/m3 cement treatment, 70% water/cement, specific gravity ~1.7
a. Based on US experience

DND is currently proceeding with the installation of the CDSM Buttress Connector Wall. Per BBII's July 5, 2011 meeting with the Engineer, BBII believes that this approach is acceptable for the CDSM Connector Wall and the CDSM Buttress Connector Wall will not have to be re-mixed in the event that it does not achieve the specified compressive strength of 90 psi at 28 days and 120 psi at 90 days. Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Arup will review the strength tests from the connector columns and make a determination of acceptable in-situ strength based on these.

---

**T-0194** **BSE - Unforeseen Buried Obstructions at CDSM Connector Wall in Zone 4** **Closed** **07/12/2011** **07/22/2011** **07/19/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, attached sketches, and photo

During the installation of the CDSM Connector Wall at Zone 4, DND's drill rig hit unidentified buried obstructions at approx. 14' - 15' below the original grade (El. 0 ~ -1). Please see DND's attached sketch for further details. The exact location and composition of the obstructions are yet to be determined but BBII's preliminary findings indicate that they are timber piles that were neither shown on the original contract plans nor found during buttress area pile extraction. Find attached the as-built drawing that depicts the locations and the top elevations of the timber piles that BBII extracted at that location. Please note that the top elevations of the extracted piles range between 2.40 to 3.11 feet.

BBII has just been informed by DND Construction that the other rows of the connector wall cannot be installed while these obstructions are being removed per the committee meeting on 07/11/2011, due to the proximity of the obstruction removal trench to the next two rows. The CDSM connector wall installation has currently ceased until further notice. BBII is currently seeking drill rigs capable of removing these obstructions also as discussed at the committee meeting.

Please direct BBII on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TJPA and its Representative agreed that the reasonable approach for removal of the obstructions as encountered was to mobilize an auger drill rig similar to the Viking drill rig used for the dewatering wells and removal of broken off piles along 181 Fremont sreet to drill out the area. A 36" diameter casing was used in this application. This meeting was held on Monday July 11, 2011 at approximately 12:30pm.

The drill rig arrived on site mid Thursday morning July 14, 2011 (3 work days after the site meeting) and drilled until 7pm exploring the CDSM connector piles in the remaining rows. The material removed was some wood (volume less that a 5 gallon bucket - photos attached) and a number (approximately 15 pieces)of chunks of unreinforced concrete 3" to 10" in size.

At this time without more evidence TJPA believes that this material was inadvertantly left behind in the backfilling of the timber pile removal zone. BBI should prepare a formal claim as to why TJPA should pay for this work or delay. TJPA will give it fair consideration but needs to have this filed as a claim outside the RFI process. BBI did perform the work in accordance with specifications and site agreements made as to means and methods for the way forward. The drill rig requiring 3 work days to mobilize was at the choice of BBI to use their subcontractor Malcolm-DND.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0195 | BSE - Unknown Utility on Beale Street West Side | Closed | 07/13/2011 | 07/23/2011 | 07/14/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached photos and drawing

BBI discovered an 8" utility line during the installation of the wheel wash on the west side of Beale Street. The utility indicated in the attached pictures is not shown on the BSE contract drawings. The alignment (North to South

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Remove the obstruction in accordance with the best means and methods. Maintain records of labor, equipment, materials for removal. Inform TJPA Representative of the methods chosen before starting work.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

direction) of this utility appears in conflict with the CDSM wall. On 7/12/2011, BBI was able to confirm that this utility is not active. This utility will need to be removed during the pre-trenching operation, to avoid conflict with the CDSM.

Please advise on the method for removal of this utility line.

---

**T-0196** **BSE - CDSM Shoring Wall Installation Sequence Zone 4 North of A-Line** **Closed** **07/20/2011** **07/30/2011** **07/26/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 56 13

See Note 1 on Sheet GT-2201. DND is concerned that if the row of buttress connector columns (A/26.5 - A/30) immediately adjacent to the shoring wall is installed prior to the shoring wall, the shoring wall will not meet verticality and tolerance specifications due to a difference in strength of the soil on one side and the CDSM on the other side. BBII believes that it will be possible to install the buttress connector columns after the shoring wall without hitting the shoring wall beams.

Is it acceptable to install the shoring wall prior to the immediately adjacent buttress connector columns?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

This is acceptable. Contractor to exercise care to prevent the auger from hitting the soldier pile while achieving the column overlap shown on 9/GT-5101.

---

**T-0197** **BSE - Maximum Allowable Vibration** **Closed** **07/20/2011** **07/30/2011** **08/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Sections 31 09 13 and 01 35 65

According to the Final FEIS/EIR, specified in the Specification 01 35 65 as the reference document, the Vibration Impact Criteria, which is the base criteria for the analysis, is shown in the table 5.21-8 (refer to BBI RFI for

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The table reportedly from the FEIS/EIR included in the RFI appears to be in error. This shall be addressed by others.

The Action Trigger Level and Maximum Allowable peak particle velocities listed in Table 1 in

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

table).

The vibration impact criteria used in the Final FEIS/EIR contradicts the Maximum Allowable Movement for the vibration (PPV) specified in Specification 31 09 13. In this specification section, the maximum allowable movement for vibration and the action trigger level is described in Table 1 (refer to BBI RFI for table).

Please clarify where within the project site the vibration impact criteria for fragile structures are applicable (according to Specification 01 35 65), and where the maximum allowable movement for vibration of 1 inch per second is applicable (according to Specification 31 09 13).

specification section 31 09 13 are for separate, transient vibration events rather than continuous construction vibration. It is not known if the values shown in the FEIS/EIR table are intended for transient or continuous events.

The Action Trigger Level and Maximum Allowable peak particle velocities listed in Table 1 in specification section 31 09 13 apply to all structures around the site where vibration monitoring will occur. In drawing up these values we have taken into account the types of plant likely to be employed in construction and the very low probability that the natural frequency of the input vibrations will approach those of the surrounding buildings and utilities.

The RFI question regarding the identification of "fragile structures" shall be addressed by others.

---

URS - Response by Alana Callagy 8/11/2011

The table in the FEIS/EIR included in the RFI is in error. The table cites the FTA as the source of the potential impact thresholds for vibration. However, the table used in the FEIS/EIR appears to have reversed the FTA's threshold levels. The RFI should cite Table 12-3 (page 12-13) of the FTA's Noise and Vibration Manual (www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf).

FTA Table 12-3 is for potential structural or architectural building damage, which is generally a function of Peak Particle Velocity (PPV), not a time-averaged level. These criteria should be applied to both transient and continuous construction events. Furthermore, the PPV value should be presented/evaluated as the vector sum of the PPV values in the three orthogonal coordinate directions (vertical, transverse, and longitudinal or x,y,z).

The FEIS/EIR called out "fragile structures" however when we reviewed the table (after first identifying that the table should be inverted to be consistent with the FTA's manual) it may be assumed that "fragile" would

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

related to "non-engineered timber and masonry buildings." Based on FTA table 12-3, a little more detailed discussion is as follows:

Class I: buildings in steel or reinforced concrete, such as factories, retaining walls, bridges, steel towers, open channels, underground chambers and tunnels with and without concrete alignment, 0.5 PPV in/sec.

Class II: buildings with foundation walls and floors in concrete, walls in concrete or masonry, stone masonry retaining walls, underground chambers and tunnels with masonry alignments, conduits in loose material, 0.3 PPV in/sec.

Class III: buildings as mentioned above but with wooden ceilings and walls in masonry, 0.2 PPV in/sec.

Class IV: construction very sensitive to vibration; objects of historic interest , 0.12 PPV in/sec.

We are not sure where the maximum allowable value of 1 in/sec (presumably PPV) came from prior to it being put in the spec. This value seems too high relative to the FTA criteria presented in FTA Table 12-3 (which range from 0.12 to 0.5 in/sec PPV for various building categories). Ideally, the vibration values should be measured as close as possible to the edge of the building footprint, preferably in the internal envelop of the building, such as a basement or first floor slab floor within about a foot of the exterior wall nearest to the vibration generating activity. Locations away from the walls and on upper floors should be avoided since these areas could show elevated values due to building amplification. If interior areas are not available, an exterior location close to the edge of the building structure nearest to the construction activity can be used. In either case, care should be taken that the transducer is adequately coupled with the surface being measured and that PPV vector sum values are being reported.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **T-0197.1** | **BSE - Maximum Allowable Vibration** | **Closed** | **07/20/2011** | **07/30/2011** | **09/12/2011** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

| *Number* | *Subject* | *Status* | *Date Created* | *Date Required* | *Date Answered* | *Cost Impact* | *Proceed* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Turner Construction Company Gary Krutsch

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**To:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Ventu Nhi Tran

**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**REQUEST:**

Refer to RFI #T-0197

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Table 5.21-8: Construction Vibration Impact Criteria in the Project EIS / EIR has a number of typos. Refer to Table 12-3: Construction Vibration Damage Criteria in Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (FTA document # FTA-VA-90-1003-06) for the corrected version. For the avoidance of doubt, these values shall be considered Action Trigger Levels as defined in Section 31 09 13 of the Specification. All the buildings within 25 ft of the site boundary shall be considered to be Category I with the exception of the following buildings that are to be considered Category III:

177/181 Fremont Street

530 Howard

540 Howard

580 Howard

594 Howard

133 Second St

141 / 143 / 145 Second

163 Second

171 Second st.

90 Natoma

92 Natoma

83 Minna

46 Minna

In accordance with the recommendations at Section 12.2.1 of FTA(2006) , we expect BBI to assess quantitatively the potential groundborne vibration impact from site operations on adjacent buildings using the formula:

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

(PPVequip)=(PPVref) x (25/D)**1.5.

Where PPV ref is the reference peak particle velocity for a given item of equipment in Table 12-2 of FTA(2006) and D is the shortest distance between the operating location of the equipment and the building to be assessed.

Where the item of plant is not listed in either FTA(2006) or Caltrans (2004), BBI should carry out calibration measurements at ground surface in order to provide equivalent (PPV ref) values.

BBI should carry out vibration monitoring inside buildings when (PPV equip) is calculated to lie within 90% of the values given in Table 12-3: Construction Vibration Damage Criteria in Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment in FTA-VA-90-1003-06. The Action Trigger and Maximum Allowable movement level for vibration given in Table 1 of Section 31 09 13 is for Category I buildings only.

---

**T-0197.2** **BSE - Maximum Allowable Vibration - VOID** **Closed** **09/12/2011** **09/22/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:**

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0197, Specification Section 01 35 65 & 31 09 13, and attached map

BBII recognizes and agrees Table 5.12-8 is in error, and BBII will refer to FTA Table 12-3 as the correct table. However, BBII believes the TJPA's response provides information that is in conflict with the specifications as well as between the two separate responses provided. BBII requests the following clarifications and confirmations:

1. BBII has applied FTA Table 12-3 per [RFI #T-0197]

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

(BBI RFI 147) to the attached map. The attached map indicates PPV values for continuous construction events, based on the surrounding buildings. Please review and verify this interpretation. Please note that this table, as also indicated in ARUP's response, applies to "continuous construction events".
2. As also stated in ARUP's response, BBII's interpretation of Section 31 09 13 is that the limits provided in this section apply to "transient construction events". Therefore, contrary to URS' response, the values provided in this section are applicable to transient construction events.

In addition, BBII will apply Table 1 in Specification Section 31 09 13 for transient construction events to all structures around the site. Table 1 indicates the Action Trigger Level for vibration (PPV) is 1/2 inch per second and Maximum Allowable Movement for vibration (PPV) is 1 inch per second.

Please confirm the vibration Peak Particle Velocity (PPV) values indicated above are acceptable for continuous and transient construction events.

---

**T-0198** **BSE - Demolition Drawings in South-West Corner of Zone 1** **Closed** **07/28/2011** **08/08/2011** **08/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 02 41 01

BBII is requesting a copy of the added scope demolition drawings issued to EBI, for the South-West corner of Zone 1.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See attached Transmittal 140-02181, sent to W/O on 8/25/2011.

---

**T-0199** **BSE - Pile Extraction Method For Grid Line 35.2** **Closed** **08/01/2011** **08/11/2011** **08/15/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Reference RFI#T-0188.2

After exposing piles at grid line 35.2 east of Beale Street, BBII intends on extracting these piles as per the method described in RFI#T-0188.2 (BBI 0139.2). This involves backfilling any voids with sand. Please confirm this method is acceptable.

ARUP Response:

Arup did not respond to RFI T-0188.2. As noted in our response to RFI T-0188.1, we recommend that the procedure for removing the piles east of Beale Street follow the procedure described in our response to RFI T-0146.4 with the exception that backfilling with sand is acceptable.

---

**T-0200** **BSE - Unforeseen Buried Obstructions - Zone 4 A Line (Gridline 27-34)** **Closed** **08/02/2011** **08/12/2011** **08/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13, attached photos, and sketch

On Saturday, July 30th 2011, DND's CDSM drill rig encountered unidentified buried obstructions during the installation of the CDSM Shoring wall panel identified by the pile numbers 285-286 at Zone 4 "A" line between Grid "27 & 28". The newly found obstructions are deeper than the previously excavated timber piles.

DND construction initially attempted to drill through the buried obstructions without success. The drill rig was subsequently moved to further east to drill the next available panel. Between 10:30 am and 3:30 pm, DND made eight drilling attempts along the "A" line between pile numbers # 285 and # 300. All eight drill attempts failed due to the similar obstructions encountered within the 13' - 17' depth range below grade. Consequently, the CDSM shoring wall installation along grid line "A" at Zone 4 had to be suspended. DND is able to provide a drill rig to drill out these obstructions and currently this rig is scheduled to arrive Tuesday morning, August 2, 2011.

These obstructions constitute a differing site condition in accordance with Article 3.05 of Section 00 07 00 of the Specifications.

Please provide confirmation and/or direction regarding the

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per Contract Spec. 31-56-13 Shoring wall by CDSM Method Para 3.2 Pretrenching and removal of Obstructions, Contractor is to '' remove any obstructions that might be encountered along the alignment of the walls. The depth and width of trench shall be that required to remove the obstructions from the path of the shoring wall.''

This area was to be Pretrenched per Spec and should have been cleared. The Spec calls for fill the voids from pile removal with 300psi CLSM, However; the area in question had CLSM installed of between 1000psi and 1600psi which may be causing this condition.

''Unforeseen Conditions'' are covered in Section 00 07 00 (General Conditions) Article 3.05.A.2 and 3.05.A.3 (Unforeseen or Changed Conditions).

Article 3.05.C states,

C. Differing Site Conditions shall not include:

1. All that is indicated in or reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents;

2. All that could be seen on Site

following:

- BBII is to proceed with drilling out these obstructions on 8/2/2011, so CDSM installation in this area can continue.
- These obstructions constitute a differing site condition.

3. Conditions that are materially similar or characteristically the same as those indicated or described in the Contract Documents or Reference Documents.

---

**T-0201** **BSE - Buttress Shift To South** **Closed** **08/02/2011** **08/12/2011** **08/08/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-2201, RFI#T-0151, and attached sketch

Per response to RFI T-0151, the Buttress can expand to the east as long as it doesn't shift to the south. Per discussions with Arup in last week's TG03 BSE Design Team Coordination Meeting (7/27/2011), it is acceptable for the Buttress to shift to the south per the attached sketch. Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The shift shown on the sketch is acceptable.

---

**T-0202** **BSE - Pile Extraction Method For Grid Line 33.5** **Closed** **08/04/2011** **08/14/2011** **08/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0146.2

After exposing 5 piles at gridline 33.5 west of Beale Street, BBII intends on extracting these piles as per the accepted method described in RFI # T-0146 2,

"6. BBII will extract the wood piles with vibratory hammer, with the same stroking procedure without steel casing. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile.
7. BBII will backfill the void with low strength material Central Concrete Mix FOA100CX (RFI #T-0138.1).

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contractor may wish to consider placing the steel sheet prior to excavating to retain the material under Beale Street to keep it from sloughing into the excavation.

Extract the wood piles with vibratory hammer, with the same stroking procedure without steel casing. BBII will perform dewatering enough to be able to connect the hammer to the pile.

Option: Backfill the void with CLSM low strength material Central Concrete Mix FOA100CX (RFI #T-

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

8. BBII will backfill the piles.

Answer:
Per Brian Dykes, this work is authorized to proceed. Allowable work hours will be established after 199 Fremont pile extraction begins."

This involves backfilling any voids with 1 sack sand. The attached drawing indicates the location and quantity of piles to be extracted. Please confirm that this method is acceptable.
Also, please advise if any work hour restrictions apply.

0138.1).
Option: Back fill the pile voids using a tremie pipe of minimum length 20ft attached to the concrete bucket. The tremie shall be inserted as far into the pile hole as possible prior to pouring the concrete, and the concrete shall be placed using normal tremie techniques. BBII will make efforts to pour the material into the void as possible, but BBII is not responsible to eliminate void completely."(RFI 146.4)

Recommends that the procedure for removing these piles follow the procedure described in Arup's response to RFI T-0146.4. Optional is to use method from RFI 188.2. Sand can used for back fillings instead of the low strength material described in RFI#T-0146.4.

---

**T-0203** **BSE - Clearance From Verticals For CSL Tubes** **Closed** **08/04/2011** **08/14/2011** **08/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-5202, Specification Section 31 63 29, and attached photo

In the Phase 1 DFOW Buttress Rebar QC Meeting at Harris-Salinas Rebar's yard in Livermore on 8/01/2011, ARUP suggested moving the adjacent vertical bars away from the CSL tubes to allow for approximately 4" of concrete cover along the entire length of the shaft. Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:
The longitudinal bars on each side of each CLS tube shall be shifted so that the clear distance between a given bar and the CSL tube is 3" minimum, 4" maximum. The total number of bars which will be shifted is 8.

---

**T-0204** **BSE - Tie Backs Along 535 Mission Street - Vacant Lot** **Closed** **08/04/2011** **08/14/2011** **08/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Reference GT-2102 & Detail 8 - GT-5103

BBII cannot locate the tie backs in the area of the vacant lot on Minna St. described in the Detail 8 on Contract Drawing GT-5103. The BBII crew went to a depth of 17 feet along the Pre-Trench and was unable to locate the tie backs. This was an additional foot more than the specified 15'-0" +/- 1'-0" depth. BBII believes the tie backs do not extend into the Pre-Trench limits and plans to move forward. Please advise if there is information to the contrary.

BBII is to continue plans and specs (Ref: Dwg. Detail 8 GT-5103). Subsequent to this RFI BBII did locate and sever a tie back in Minna Street trench from the 535 Mission St. Project .

BBII was directed to be cautious when installing sheetpile shoring to ensure the Tie Backs are cut back sufficiently to prevent interference with CDSM Drill/Wall installation.

---
---
2011-08-09 George Metzger
ARUP Response:
No additional information is available. Turner or PMPC to provide answer to this RFI.

---

**T-0205** **BSE - Testing Weld On Hoops** **Closed** **08/05/2011** **08/15/2011** **08/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch

**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-5202 and Specification Section 31 63 29

Per SS03.20.01.3.3.B.4, "Inspect welding as required by Code for compliance with AWS D1.4."

Per AWS D1.4.2, "Other welding processes may be used when approved by the Engineer, provided that any special qualification test requirements not covered here are met to ensure that welds are satisfactory for the intended application will be obtained."

As of this writing, the AWS does not cover Resistance Welding which is the type of welding that Harris-Salinas Rebar is using for the hoops. Caltrans has a written specification for Resistance Welding. Per Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 52, four (4) samples out of a lot of one hundred fifty (150) are taken to the lab for testing. If three (3) or more samples comply with the requirements, the whole lot is accepted. If only two (2)

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

This is acceptable.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

samples comply, one (1) additional test of four (4) samples out of the same lot is allowed. If any of the four (4) fail, the whole lot is rejected.

It was agreed upon in the DFOW meeting this week (8/1/2011) that it is acceptable to test the lots per Caltrans Standard Specifications. Please confirm.

---

**T-0206** **BSE - Smart Hoops For CSL Tubes** **Closed** **08/05/2011** **08/15/2011** **08/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-5202, Specification Section 31 63 29, attached photo and sketch

Drawing GT-5202 shows four (4ea) 4" CSL tubes equally spaced around the perimeter of the shaft tied to reinforced steel.

Approved rebar shop drawing shows a square spider designed to serve two purposes:
1. To allow the tremie pipe to pass through.
2. To keep the CSL tubes equally spaced around the perimeter per Drawing GT-5202.

In subsequent discussions the engineer suggested orientating the CSL tubes at a 23 degree angle from the longitudinal center of pile. In the Phase 1 DFOW Buttress Rebar QC Meeting on 8/1/2011 Harris-Salinas Rebar suggested using "smart hoops" to keep the CSL tubes in place and symmetrical around the perimeter at 23 degrees since the square spider could no longer be utilized for CSL tube alignment. This suggestion was well received by meeting attendees. Please confirm that the 23 degree CSL spacing is required. If so, please advise if the added "smart hoop" CSL alignment bars are acceptable?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The 23 degree CSL spacing is required. The added "smart hoop" CSL alignment bars are acceptable.

---

**T-0207** **BSE - Unknown Fiber Optic on Fremont Street** **Closed** **08/09/2011** **08/19/2011** **08/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 02 41 01

PG&E was scheduled to have all the utilities and structures confirmed dead on the East side of Fremont Street 8/07/2011 as part of the phase 1 PG&E relocation work. On 8/08/2011, W/O and PG&E conducted a USAR walk-through on Fremont Street to sign off and confirm that all PG&E utilities and structures have been confirmed de-energized and abandoned. PG&E discovered a live fiber optic cable between vaults 1675-1670. This fiber optic cable is in conflict with and causing delays to the CDSM wall and Buttress work commencement.

Please provide a date this fiber will be confirmed de-energized.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Fiber was confirmed de-energized on 8/12/11.

---

**T-0208** **BSE - Long Term Seismic Loading** **Closed** **08/09/2011** **08/19/2011** **08/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-1110 and Specification Section 31 55 00

Note 7 on sheet GT-1110 states that "Seismic Increment Loads shall be considered to be long term loading." Per conversation at the 8/03/11 TG03 Design Team Coordination meeting, BBII understands that this note applies only to the lower level struts at the 301 Mission buttress case. Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

We refer to Comments and Corrections provided by DBI to TJPA in a document dated July 27, 2011 at item G 23.

With reference to Drawing GT-1110 we clarify that Note 7 applies strictly to the incremental strut loads in Table 7 (301 Mission buttress case shaking analysis) and consequently apply to calculations for the lowest level of struts and walings between Gridlines 26 and 30. The incremental strut loads given in Tables 5, 6 and 8 can be considered as transient, rather than long term, loads on the bracing system.

---

**T-0209** **BSE - Abutment Bearing On CDSM Wall** **Closed** **08/11/2011** **08/21/2011** **08/19/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Reference Specification 01 53 13

During previous discussions with URS, ARUP, and DPW it has been expressed that the temporary bridge abutments should not bear on the CDSM shoring wall. The temporary bridges spec section 01 53 13, however, specifically states that ''abutments for bridges shall be supported by the CDSM shoring wall.'' Please advise if this statement still applies.

Yes, statement still applies.

---

**T-0209.1** **BSE - Abutment Bearing On CDSM Wall** **Closed** **09/02/2011** **09/12/2011** **09/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0209, Specification Section 01 53 13, and attached sheets

Included with this RFI are loading conditions for CDSM supported abutments. Please confirm that the shoring wall as currently designed can accommodate the loading.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Contractor to provide calculations demonstrating the adequacy of the shoring wall to support the loads from the bridges.

---

**T-0209.2** **BSE - Abutment Bearing On CDSM Wall - Follow-Up** **Closed** **09/13/2011** **09/23/2011** **09/16/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0209.2, Specification Section 01 53 13, and attached sheets

As requested by ARUP, please see the attached loads placed on each individual CDSM soldier beam beneath the proposed temporary bridge abutment. The loads include both the bracing self weight and the combined dead and live loads of the temporary bridges.

BBII requests confirmation from the CDSM shoring wall EOR that these imposed loads do not exceed the assumed vertical loads used during original design

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response: The results of the analysis reported in the table "SUMMARY OF LOADS ON CDSM SOLDIER PILES AT BRIDGE ABUTMENTS" indicates that, for a number of locations, the load per soldier pile is too great and that the pile spacing will need to decrease from 4'-0" o.c. to 2'-0" o.c. to reduce the load per pile. Subsequent analysis by the Contractor shall demonstrate the structural adequacy of the pile shape and the adequacy of the pile embedment.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

analysis.

---

**T-0209.3** **BSE - Abutment Bearing On CDSM Wall - Follow-Up** **Closed** **09/13/2011** **09/23/2011** **09/28/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0209.2, Specification Section 01 53 13, and attached sheets

As requested by ARUP, please see the attached loads placed on each individual CDSM soldier beam beneath the proposed temporary bridge abutment. The loads include both the bracing self weight and the combined dead and live loads of the temporary bridges.

BBII requests confirmation from the CDSM shoring wall EOR that these imposed loads do not exceed the assumed vertical loads used during original design analysis.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

1. The CDSM wall cannot accept the widely varying point loads as implied by the submitted tables of imposed loads from the cross-lot bridges. We recommend that a spreader beam arrangement is provided for each bridge abutment and is connected to the all the affected W21x201 soldier piles in the CDSM wall. A vertical spring constant of 1150 kips/inch can be used to calculate the pile reactions under such a spreader beam arrangement for the range of loads given.

2. The allowable loads from the bridge deck for the soldier piles on the basis of 1 above is 90 kips/pile at an excavation of 10 feet below grade and can be taken to fall linearly to 60 kips/pile at 60 ft elevation depth.

3. It follows from 2 above that the ability of the CDSM wall to carry the maximum load, the construction crane condition, will reduce as excavation proceeds. This may require disassembly of the construction crane into smaller components in order to remove it from site at the later stages of excavation.

4. The load pathway, from the bridge deck at the abutment into the ground, is in direct shear transfer across 2 interfaces: steel/soil mix and soil mix/in-situ ground. The shear transfer across the steel/soil mix interface cannot be estimated with accuracy, in the absence of an embedded soldier pile test in compression or tension. If the early excavations, down to 10 feet below grade at the bridge abutment, show that soil mix falls away easily from the face of the W21

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

steel soldier pile, the bond/interface shear is likely to be very low indeed and the allowable capacity of the soldier piles will need to be re-evaluated.

---

**T-0209.4** **BSE - Abutment Bearing On CDSM Wall - Follow-Up** **Closed** **01/09/2012** **01/19/2012** **01/16/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Arup Kevin Clinch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference T-0209.3, Specification Section 01 53 13

Contrary to RFI response T-0209.3, subsequent to the test pile loading CR T-025 during which there was little to no movement please confirm the revised direction to install the bridge abutment atop the CDSM wall at all streets pursuant to specification section 01 53 13.1.2.A.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Arup cannot provide a response to this RFI without seeing the revised design of the bridge bearing on the soldier piles and the revised calculations.

---

**T-0210** **BSE - Pile #498 Top Of Pile Elevation Issue** **Closed** **08/16/2011** **08/26/2011** **08/19/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference W/O NOTICE0010 (attached), Sheet GT-5101, and Specification Section 31 56 13

Please address the following information request from BBII's subcontractor DND:

"The specifications do not specify an allowable tolerance with regard to the vertical position of the beam tip relative to the plan drawings (GT-5101, Note 16). Please clarify the allowable tolerance for the beam tip elevation.

For example, beam 498 (BBII ID #287) was set slightly high. The beam was measured prior to setting to be 97'-5 1/2" long. It was set to a top elevation of approximately +16'-11" which calculates a tip elevation of approximately -80.63'. Specified tip elevation is -81-0" in this wall section (J/27-33.5)."

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The acceptable variation in bottom of pile elevation (shown on 16/GT-5101) is +/- 1'-6". In order to verify this using the top of pile elevation as the measure, the Contractor shall provide Turner with the length of the piles.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0211 | Easement Information | Closed | 08/11/2011 | 08/21/2011 | 08/23/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Email "Fencing Plan at CDSM Wall Radius R2-1 and X1-1" from Turner on 8/10/2011 and attached documents

W/O received the enclosed email "Fencing Plan at CDSM Wall Radius R2-1 and X1-1" and it's attachments from Turner on 8/10/2011, listed below:
- 3192 OR 151 easement.pdf
- Parcel F BNDY-ALTA_AB3721_15A_Rev 1.pdf
- CASFRA_2007 00369409.pdf
- Eminent Domain Fencing Plan .pdf

The information contained in the above documents differs from and/or does not exist in the current contract documents. Please provide a direction on what W/O and our Trade Subcontractors are to do with this easement information. In addition please indicate what requirements the TJPA expects Webcor Obayashi to now comply with.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The information contained in the above documents is provided for information. WO and our Trade Subcontractors are to ensure the 540 Howard has 24 hour access to their easement. The current location of the CDSM wall and protection fencing will accomodate this access.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0212 | BSE - Unforeseen Timber Piles At Grid Line 33.5 J | Closed | 08/15/2011 | 08/25/2011 | 08/16/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0148.1, Sheet D-2213, attached photos and sketch

BBII exposed 24 piles at gridline 33.5 J close to Beale Street in Zone 4, as shown in the attached photographs. However, drawing D-2213 indicates five piles inside the CDSM wall limits. BBII intends to extract these piles using the method approved in RFI # T-0148 1. Please confirm that it is acceptable to continue tracking this unforeseen work as CR-T-010, as was practiced in this area previously.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

RFIs shall be used for interpretation or clarification of the Contract Documents (01 10 40) and a change request (CR) is not a Contract Document as defined by the General Conditions. Questions related to construction means, methods, techniques, sequences, procedures and non Contract Documents will not be replied to by the TJPA and will be rejected (01 10 40).

Refer to the procedures of previously issued CR T-010 for further direction.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0213 | BSE - Pile Extraction Method For Concrete Piles Between GL 5-10 at Natoma St | Closed | 08/15/2011 | 08/25/2011 | 08/19/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0188.1, Specification Section 02 41 19, and attached sketch

BBII intends on extracting the existing concrete piles located between gridlines 5 and 10 on the south side, using the method approved in RFI#T-0188.1. This involves extracting piles using the vibratory hammer without a steel casing and backfilling the void with structural pre-trench sand. Attached is a drawing indicating the locations of the piles obstructing the CDSM wall. Please confirm that this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

This is acceptable for concrete piles which are 16" x 16" square or less and which are located 16 ft or greater from the nearest face of an adjacent building.

---

**T-0214** **BSE - Instrumentation Protection Slab Zone 4** **Closed** **08/16/2011** **08/26/2011** **08/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-5102 and attached shop drawing and BBI sketches

BBII is proposing to pour a 2' thick instrument slab per the attached BBII drawings in lieu of the 1' thick concrete slab shown on Drawing GT-5102 to match the overall thickness of the Buttress Temporary Work Platform Concrete Cap. Approved 6000 psi Central Mix #960PC3Z3 (Submittal Item #TZ1010-033001A10) will be used for the instrument protection slab. Please confirm that this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Pouring a 2' thick instrument protection slab in lieu of the 1' thick concrete slab shown on Drawing GT-5102 is acceptable.

Central Mix #960PC3Z3 is acceptable for use in the instrument protection slab.

The reinforcing steel configuration shown on Section A is acceptable. The bars may be shifted to clear the soldier piles and the instrument locations.

Block-outs shall be placed in the slab for the instruments as noted on GT-5102. Contractor to coordinate locations of block-outs with Arup field staff.

The protection slab shall be extended as noted on the attached sketch.

---

**T-0215** **BSE - Diagonally Cut Unforeseen Piles at Grid Line 33.5 J** **Closed** **08/17/2011** **08/27/2011** **08/17/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-2103, Specification Section 02 41 19, and attached photos

BBII has extracted four (4) unforeseen piles at GL 33.5 J. Three (3) piles had an average length of 45' long. However, one (1) of these piles appeared to have 20' diagonally cut out of it at the bottom (see attached Photo 3). Another pile was only 23' long and appeared to have broken off underground (see attached Photo 1). BBII has concerns that lengths of pile may still remain in ground and will be an obstruction to the CDSM shoring wall installation. Please advise on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Refer to specification 31 56 13, 3.2, A, which states, "The Contractor shall construct a trench along the entire alignment of the shoring wall and the cut-off walls and remove any obstructions that might be encountered along the alignment of the walls. The depth and width of the trench shall be that required to remove the obstructions from the path of the shoring wall."

---

**T-0215.1** **BSE - Diagonally Cut Unforeseen Piles at GL 33.5 J** **Closed** **08/23/2011** **09/02/2011** **08/30/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0215 and RFI #T-0177, Sheet GT-2103 and Specification Section 02 41 19

As the top of the broken pile is 33' below ground, further trenching to remove this pile is not practical. BBII proposes following the procedure approved by RFI T-0177 (BBII 0126) to extract this pile. In the future, BBII proposes this to be the standard procedure when a broken or lost pile presents an obstruction to the CDSM Shoring Wall installation and needs to be extracted.

Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Arup takes no exception to the use of the method described in RFI T-0177 for this pile.

---

**T-0216** **BSE - Revised Buttress Shop Drawings For Record Only** **Closed** **08/18/2011** **08/28/2011** **08/19/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached revised CIDH Rebar Shop Drawings, RFI#T-0184, T-0203, T-0205 and T-0206

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Arup takes no exception to the shop drawings included with the RFI.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Per discussions at the TG03 BSE Design Team meeting on 8/17/2011, it was agreed by Adamson and ARUP to confirm the finalized buttress rebar cage shop drawings via RFI because the shop drawings have already been approved in a previous submittal TG0300-320 / TA1020-032001A05.

Attached are the revised shop drawings that incorporate all the changes that were agreed upon in the referenced RFIs. Please confirm that these shop drawings accurately reflects all changes made.

Note that review is only for general conformance with the design concept of the project and general compliance with the information given in the contract documents. Contractor is responsible for quantities and dimensions which shall be confirmed and correlated at the job site; checking for deviations between the field, submittal and the contract documents alerting Arup of same; fabrication processes and techniques; the means and methods of construction; coordination of its work with that of all other trades; and performing all work in a safe and satisfactory manner. This review does not modify contractor¿s duty to comply with the contract documents and any action shown is subject to requirements of plans and specifications. This review does not increase Arup's standard of care or scope of services and contractor shall immediately notify Arup of any intent to make a claim based on this submittal.

---

**T-0217** **BSE - Buttress Shift To The East** **Closed** **08/24/2011** **09/03/2011** **08/30/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0183.1, Sheet GT-2201, Specification Section 31 63 29, and attached sketch

The sketch that was included in the Engineer's response to RFI T-0183.1 shows Buttress rows S, T, U, V, and W, shifting 4" to the west. Per discussions with the Engineer in the 8/17/2011 TG03 BSE Design Team Meeting, all parties agreed that the 4" shift is not needed. Please confirm that the 4" shift is not necessary and that it is acceptable to install the Buttress shafts per the attached drawing.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response: The proposed northings and eastings shown are acceptable.

---

**T-0217.1** **BSE - Maximum Allowable Spacing Between Buttress Shafts** **Closed** **03/23/2012** **04/02/2012** **03/23/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Becho requests for ARUP to provide the maximum allowed spacing between the tangent shafts East of P-Line and West of C-Line. Allowing such changes could possibly help mitigate Buttress Shaft schedule.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The tangential spacing of the buttress shafts may be increased from 4 inches to 8 inches east of PLine and west of C-Line.

Contractor to verify that this does not impact the trestle pile locations / design.

Contractor to verify tht there is adequate equipment clearance at 301 Mission.

Contractor to provide revised northing and easting coordiantes in a sketch similar to that incuded in RFI 217 for tie-down location coordination.

---

**T-0217.2** **BSE - Increased Spacing Between Buttress Shafts east of P-line** **Closed** **04/12/2012** **04/22/2012** **04/19/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: BBII Spacing Sketch

Per the Engineer's response to RFI T-0217.1, "The tangential spacing of the Buttress shafts may be increased from 4" to 8" east of P-line and west of C-line." Please confirm that the revised Buttress footprint and coordinates shown on the attached sketch is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Confirmed except that the coordinates for shafts A1 and A3 do not appear to reflect RFI 217.1.

---

**T-0218** **BSE - Timber Lagging Underneath Instrument Protection Slab** **Closed** **08/29/2011** **09/08/2011** **08/31/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0214, Sheet GT-5102, and Specification Section 31 56 13

Contract drawing GT-5102 indicates timber lagging being installed underneath the 2' section of the concrete

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response: It is acceptable to omit the lagging below the protection slab as proposed. Contractor to take appropriate measures to keep any loose material below the slab from falling into the excavation.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

instrumentation protection slab between grids 27 and 30. The original construction sequence foresaw the instrumentation protection slab being installed prior to the adjacent buttress work platform. BBII is planning on pouring the instrumentation slab and the adjacent buttress work platform monolithically on Wednesday 8/31/2011, which makes the timber lagging support redundant.

Please confirm that the timber lagging shown on contract drawing GT-5102 is not required to be installed. Your prompt response is highly appreciated.

---

**T-0219** **BSE - Abutments At Temporary Bridges** **Closed** **08/29/2011** **09/08/2011** **09/15/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and Submittal TG0300-201 Item TZ1030-015313A09 response comments (attached)

DPW review comment #40 on the temporary bridge submittal (TZ1030-015313A09, package TG0300-201) calls for BBII to "provide concrete approach slabs similar to Caltrans." URS comment #32 on the submittal states that "Approach slabs are recommended. After seismic event, it is important that emergency vehicles still have access to these temporary bridges."
Concrete approach slabs are not included as a requirement in the temporary bridge specifications. Please advise if approach slabs must be added to the scope of the temporary bridges.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per spec 01 53 13 and David Fyfe's response included herein, approach slabs are necessary items required to provide a coordinated design and a completely functional temporary bridge.

---
---

2011-09-14 - David Fyfe

SF DPW requires approach slabs.

---

**T-0219.1** **BSE - Approach Slabs At Temporary Bridges** **Closed** **11/04/2011** **11/14/2011** **11/16/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0219 and Specification Section 01 53 13

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Comments made by PMPC in across the table

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

On 11/3/11 W/O was informed by PMPC during a temporary bridge coordination meeting that contrary to RFI response T-0219 approach slabs were not required at the (3) temporary bridges.

Please confirm.

discussions shall not be considered as modifying the response to RFI# T-0219. As an added clarification to RFI# T-0219, please note that the permitting agency, SF DPW, has expressed the potential need for use of approach slabs to achieve a package which can be approved by the agency. It is recommended that requirements concerning approach slabs be addressed between the contractor and the permitting agency during the building permit submission of the Temporary Bridges Package.

---

**T-0220** **BSE - Pile Extraction Method For The Remaining Timber Piles At GL 33.5 J** **Closed** **08/29/2011** **09/08/2011** **09/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0188.1, Specification Section 02 41 19, and attached sketch

BBII intends on extracting the remainder of the existing timber piles located at gridline 33.5J/Beale St., using the method approved in T-0188.1, as the piles are located a considerable distance from the 199 Fremont building. This involves extracting piles using the vibratory hammer without a steel casing and backfilling the void with structural pre trench sand. Attached is a drawing indicating the locations of the piles obstructing the CDSM wall. Please confirm that this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

We recommend that the procedure for removing the piles east of Beale Street follow the procedure described in our response to RFI T-0146.4 with the exception that backfilling with sand is acceptable. See also answer to RFI T-199.

---

**T-0221** **BSE - Salvage Steel At Temporary Bridges** **Closed** **08/29/2011** **09/08/2011** **09/30/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** URS Corporation Carolina Aguilar

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and Submittal TG0300-201 Item TZ1030-015313A09 response comments (attached)

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

In order to evaluate compliance, additional information is required. Please submit list of all structural steel members that will be used on each of the three temporary bridges. For each structural steel member

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

DPW review of the temporary bridges submittal (TZ1030-015313A09, package TG0300-201) includes comment #8 that states "salvage materials are not acceptable to be used as structural members for the bridges. The temporary bridge specifications do allow for the use of salvage material as follows:

"2. Steel, Salvage Material: Submit coupon tests for mechanical properties and chemical tests for determination of weldability. For steel materials which are recycled from prior Projects (salvaged materials) and are to be incorporated into temporary works, testing shall be performed on a random sampling basis as follows:
a. Where material properties relied upon for design corresponding to minimum yield strength fy=30,000 psi, sampling shall be performed on 5% of each major series of structure element type.
b. Where material properties corresponding to minimum yield strength fy=36,000 psi, sampling shall be performed on 10% of each major series of structure element type.
c. Where material properties corresponding to minimum yield strength fy=42,000 psi or 50,000 psi is used, sampling shall be performed on 20% of each major series of structure element type.
d. Testing performed per subparagraphs above at sampling rates of 5%, 10%, and 20%, respectively, shall be reported to the Owner's Representative in writing. Testing results must satisfy all samples meeting 100% of materials strength requirements for acceptance of salvage materials. If less than 100% of materials tested meet this requirement, then the sampling rate shall be increased. In this event, the sampling rate for retesting shall be subject to review and approval by the Owner's Representative."

Please advise if salvage material is still acceptable per the project specifications.

listed:

1). Indicate whether the structural steel member consists of new or salvaged material

2). Provide the exact location along the bridge that the steel member is located

3). Provide information on the salvaged material, such as its current condition, when and where it may be inspected by a TJPA Representative, and what its prior use was

4). For each complete temporary bridge, provide the total weight of salvage steel, summarized by element type and usage.

Finally, please provide the weight of total salvaged steel material that will be used at each temporary bridge.

---

**T-0222** **BSE - Temporary Bridge Pier Locations** **Closed** **08/29/2011** **09/08/2011** **09/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:** **SUGGESTION:** **ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and Submittal TG0300-201 Item TZ1030-015313A09 response comments (attached)

Temporary bridge review comments (Submittal TZ1030-015313A09, package TG0300-201) call for the end piers on all three bridges to be relocated to avoid interrupting chamfer rebar (see attached markups). With the information provided to BBII in the plans and specifications, there was no indication that this reinforcement must be avoided, nor was there a required clear zone from the shoring wall to the first pier. Please advise if these piers absolutely need to move, or if their current locations can be accommodated. Increasing the span between the abutments and the first pier will have commercial impacts.

Thornton Tomasetti Response: The piers shall not be in conflict with the mat foundation chamfer (chamfer shown in plan and section S1-3201). Minimum clear distance from face of pier to bottom edge of chamfer shall be 2'-0."

---

8/31/2011 George Metzger
ARUP Response: Arup takes no exception to the referenced pier locations that are shown in the submittal.

---

**T-0223** **BSE - Temporary Bridge Pedestrian Barrier Height** **Closed** **08/30/2011** **09/09/2011** **09/27/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and Submittal TG0300-201 response comments (attached)

DPW review of the temporary bridges includes comment #42 that calls for the pedestrian barrier to be designed as a combination railing with a minimum height of 4'-6" while the specifications only call for a 3'-6" barrier. Please advise if the minimum height must be increased to 4'-6".

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Response to RFI No.T-0223 is provided herein and on attached sketch titled, "Sketch - RFI Nos.T-0223 and T-0228." This attached sketch is a mark-up of BBII's traffic plan figure, "Non-Working Hours, Temporary Bridge Traffic Plan" (submittal package TG0300-204, submittal item TZ1030-015313, page 3 of 6) because this is the latest presentation of the Contractor proposed product.

This attached sketch shows an installation in conformance with current coordination comments completed between the Project and CCSF DPW and SFMTA. Where the handrail/guardrail system occurs separating pedestrian and vehicle traffic, required height equals 3'-6" measured from the top of pedestrian walking surface.

Note, these comments provided on this attached sketch pertain only to RFI Nos.T-0223 and T-0228, a full review and response of Traffic Plan Submittal

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Package TG0300-204 will be finalized and transmitted at a later date.

---

**T-0224** **BSE - Temporary Bridge Deflection and Suspended Utilities** **Closed** **08/30/2011** **09/09/2011** **09/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and attached cut sheets

Where utilities transition from direct bury to hanging under the temporary bridges, BBII believes there must be some allowance for deflection to prevent damage to the conduits during a seismic event. Attached are cut sheets for an expansion fitting and deflection fitting that BBII has seen used in combination at bridge transitions. Watertight flexible steel conduit may be an option as well.
Please confirm that all Phase 2 utilities to be suspended below the temporary bridges will include some means of handling bridge deflection.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Please provide information on the predicted movement and hanger support system such that the condition can be assessed.
Movement direction; lateral or longitudinal?
How much movement is being predicted and at what location?
Are the steel conduits rigidly connected to the hanger supports? Please provide the hanger support design for review.

---

**T-0224.1** **BSE - Temporary Bridge Deflection and Suspended Utilities** **Closed** **09/23/2011** **10/03/2011** **09/27/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0224, Specification Section 01 53 30, and attached e-mails

The response to RFI T-0224 requested additional information about bridge movements. This information was provided by email to AECOM on 9/9/11. Follow on questions were answered on 9/15/11. Please see the attached email string.

Please provide the make, model, location and quantity per conduit run for all the utilities supported by the bridge

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

In reference to the request in RFI T-0224, it has been confirmed that all Phase 2 utilities (Verizon and PG&E) to be suspended below the temporary bridges will include means of handling bridge deflection.

Verizon has indicated the use of O-Z/GEDNEY expansion fittings for rigid steel conduit type EX, or equal. One fitting is proposed on each conduit located along the supported section staggered such that no two are aligned. This design element will be incorporated into construction documents being prepared by Verizon.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

PG&E has indicated the use of O-Z/GEDNEY Expansion fittings for rigid steel conduit type EX, or equal. One fitting is proposed on each conduit located along the supported section staggered such that no two are aligned. This design element will be incorporated into construction documents being prepared by PG&E.

---

**T-0224.2** **BSE - Temporary Bridge Deflection and Suspended Utilities** **Closed** **10/05/2011** **10/15/2011** **10/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI T-224, 224.1, CR T-017 and Specification Section 01 53 30

The response to RFI T-0224.1 The 4" EX model is not readily available (8 week lead time), however the very similar AX is. Please see the attached data sheets for each model and advise if this revised material is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Response from PG&E (attached) is as follows:

The type AX expansion fitting for 4" steel conduits is an acceptable substitute for the type EX expansion fitting. Type BJ external bonding jumper will still be required.

---

**T-0224.3** **BSE - Temporary Bridge Deflection and Suspended Utilities** **Closed** **10/24/2011** **11/03/2011** **11/08/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference CR T-017R1 and Response to RFI#T-0224.2

BBII have been advise that only 1 deflection fitting is required on per rigid conduit run, between gridline A and J.

The PG&E construction drawings attached, indicate (highlighted in yellow) 2 locations A and J line; request expansion fitting to be used.

It is not clear from the drawings attached if PG&E require 1 deflection fitting per conduit run as previous stated in RFI # T-0224.2. Please confirm only 1 deflection fitting per

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

1 deflection fitting per conduit run as described in RFI # T-0224.2 is required.

Submit proposed configuration of deflection fittings coordinated with temp bridge supports and other bridge elements for review.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

conduit run between GL A-J is required by PG&E.

Please provide a drawing showing, the deflection fitting configuration for individual conduit runs.

---

**T-0225** **BSE - CDSM Alignment Conflict With Existing Utilities GL 1-J** **Closed** **08/31/2011** **09/10/2011** **08/31/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2231, Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached photo

BBII laid out centerline of the CDSM on Gridline 1 and Gridline J. The centerline of the shoring indicates that the existing utilities PG&E/Water is in direct conflict with the location of the CDSM shoring wall. These utilities appear to be capped east of the centerline.

Drawing D-2231 BSE contract states "Unless specified otherwise all utilities have been cut and capped outside the limits of the work by Transbay Transit Centre program relocation of utilities"... Please see photos attached.

Please confirm the status on the relocation of these utilities.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Shoring wall changed per the response to BSE RFI-0017. Basis of the AECOM Plans is the pre RFI-0017 shoring wall. We are planning to issue revisions to TJPA early next week to address the shoring wall change.

---

**T-0225.1** **BSE - CDSM Alignment Conflict With Existing Utilities GL 1-J** **Closed** **08/31/2011** **09/10/2011** **09/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0225

The response received for RFI #T-0225 does not provide the requested information.

---

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Status is as follows, RUP ASI-015 has been created to address the relocation of utilities impacted by the change to the CDSM shoring wall resulting from BSE RFI-0017. ASI-015 was issued for pricing and implementation on 9/8/11.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

---
Question from RFI#T-0225

Reference Sheet D-2231, Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached photo

BBII laid out centerline of the CDSM on Gridline 1 and Gridline J. The centerline of the shoring indicates that the existing utilities PG&E/Water is in direct conflict with the location of the CDSM shoring wall. These utilities appear to be capped east of the centerline.

Drawing D-2231 BSE contract states "Unless specified otherwise all utilities have been cut and capped outside the limits of the work by Transbay Transit Centre program relocation of utilities"... Please see photos attached.

Please confirm the status on the relocation of these utilities.

---

**T-0225.2** **BSE - CDSM Alignment Conflict GL 1-J - PG&E Vault Utility Conflict on Natoma** **Closed** **09/12/2011** **09/22/2011** **09/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0017, #T-0225.1, Sheet U-1110, and Specification Section 31 56 13

Please refer to RFI No. T-0017, which revised the southwest corner of the CDSM shoring wall alignment. Your attention is also directed to the utility drawing U-1110, which depicts the utilities to be abandoned and the ones to be protected in place with respect to the old CDSM wall alignment. According to U-1110, the PG&E vault on Natoma Street shall be protected in place. However, based on the field layout, the PG&E vault on Natoma St. is in conflict with the southwest corner of the CDSM wall alignment, which was revised per RFI No. T-0017.

Based on BBII's field measurements, the clearance between the PG&E vault on Natoma St. and the centerline

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Based on provided field information, the existing PG&E MH is located 11" clear of the CDSM shoring wall revised per resonse to RFI T-0017, please clarify what/where the conflict is.

If safety is of concern while working in close proximity to a live PG&E MH, coordinate with PG&E through TJPA's Representative to de energize the existing MH prior to and during CDSM wall construction. Existing PG&E MH 1348 exists to provide power to 90 Natoma. 90 Natoma is owned by the TJPA and is currently vacant.

The 36" demarcation line mentioned in the RFI is an arbitrary scope division line established between the RUP and BSE packages to differentiate abandon utility removal between the two packages.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

of the CDSM wall is 29", which is less than the 36" typical distance required by the contract plans as the minimum clearance between the demarcation lines and the CDSM wall alignment.

BBII requests the PG&E vault on Natoma St. to be relocated to a safe distance outside the work limits of the revised CDSM wall alignment.

---

**T-0225.3** **BSE - CDSM Alignment Conflict GL 1-J - PG&E Vault Utility Conflict on Natoma** **Closed** **10/03/2011** **10/13/2011** **10/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0225.2, Sheet D-2231 and ASI-015, Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached photos and sketch

BBII in discussions with DND will be able to work adjacent to PG&E vault #1348, referenced in RFI #T-0225.2.

BBII is currently considering removing the concrete over pour on the vault, de-energizing the power in the vault and installing CDSM Shoring Wall without relocating the vault.

Please confirm it is acceptable to remove any concrete over pour within 20" from the centerline of CDSM wall.

Also, please confirm it is acceptable to install CDSM Wall at the location close to the PG&E vault #1348 without potential damages.

Please refer to the attached photos

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

It is noted that prior to receiving the response to this RFI, the contractor installed CDSM panel #W0001 adjacent PG&E vault 1348 without chipping away the concrete over pour. A PG&E standby crew was present and observed the installation.

It is understood that during this work the outside tooth of auger may have broken off during install of piles in this area. W/O to confirm there is no damage to Vault #1348 due to CDSM work

---

**T-0226** **BSE - Revised Instrument Protection Slab** **Closed** **09/02/2011** **09/12/2011** **09/06/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Reference RFI #T-0214 and attached sketch

Per discussion with the engineer, it is acceptable to install the Instrument Protection Slab per the attached sketch and the following revisions to RFI T-0214:

1. W-beams cut so that the top mat will be resting on them.
2. #6 rebar thru the W-beam, tie-wired to the top mat in lieu of Nelson Studs.

Please confirm.

ARUP Response:

This is acceptable.

---

**T-0227** **BSE - Buttress Anti-Washout Admixture** **Closed** **09/02/2011** **09/12/2011** **09/08/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 03 30 01 and attached Rheomac product data

Per the recommendations from both Becho and Central Concrete, BBII would like to propose the use of an Anti-Washout Admixture, Rheomac UW 540 in all submitted and approved Buttress Primary and Secondary Shaft Concrete. Please review and confirm that this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:
This is acceptable.

---

**T-0228** **BSE - 6-inch Sidewalk At Temporary Bridges** **Closed** **09/02/2011** **09/12/2011** **09/27/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 53 13 and attached sketches

During a temporary bridge traffic coordination meeting on 8/29/11, SFMTA suggested the use of a 6" elevated

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Response to RFI No.T-0228 is provided herein and on attached sketch titled, "Sketch - RFI Nos.T-0223 and T-0228." This attached sketch is a mark-up of BBII's traffic plan figure "Non-Working Hours, Temporary Bridge Traffic Plan," (submittal package TG0300-204,

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

sidewalk curb in lieu of the crash rated pedestrian barrier. The crash rated barrier would be relocated to the outside edge of the temporary bridge.

BBII believes this layout has numerous advantages and resolves some concerns as well:
- SFMTA brought up the obvious concern of damage to side mirrors with tall barriers directly adjacent to the traveled lanes. To compensate for this, drivers will shy away from barriers in already tight lanes. Moving the barrier alleviates this problem on one side of the road.
- A barrier between the sidewalk and traveled lanes has a blunt ends that pose a hazard (see sketch). Relocating the barrier eliminates this hazard.
- The area formerly occupied by the pedestrian barrier (approx 14" in width) can be used as extra traveled width for vehicles (distributed per SFMTA's discretion)
- An elevated sidewalk curb will make trestle crossings feel like a typical street crossing, especially for the visually impaired. As such, pedestrians will be more likely to treat the trestle intersection as a
true signalized intersection.

SFMTA has indicated that the elevated sidewalk is preferred over a pedestrian barrier. Attached are several sketches of the proposed layout - please confirm this is acceptable.

submittal item TZ1030-015313, page 3 of 6) because this is the latest presentation of the Contractor proposed product.

This attached sketch shows an installation in conformance with current coordination comments completed between the Project and CCSF DPW and SFMTA. As shown on attached Sketch - RFI Nos.T-0223 and T-0228, a handrail/guardrail providing separation of pedestrian and vehicle traffic is required.

Note, these comments provided on the attached sketch pertain only to RFI Nos.T-0223 and T-0228, a full review and response of Traffic Plan Submittal Package TG0300-204 will be finalized and transmitted at a later date.

---

**T-0229** **BSE - Concrete Time of Discharge Requirement** **Closed** **09/06/2011** **09/16/2011** **09/08/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification 03 30 01

Per SS 03 30 00, 3.3.D, "Discharge of concrete shall be completed within 1½ hours or before the drum has revolved 300 revolutions, whichever comes first, after the introduction of the mixing water to the cement and aggregates or the introduction of the cement to the aggregates."

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:
This is acceptable.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Per ACI 301 (Section 4.1.2.9), "Time of discharge - When it is desired to exceed the maximum time for discharge of concrete permitted by ASTM C 94C/ 94M, submit a request along with a description of the precautions to be taken."

BBII is planning for discharging concrete with the following precautions: As concrete hydration can be controlled for a maximum of 10 hours, BBII suggests discharge of concrete shall not be restricted to 1½ hours. In order to sustain the requirements of Becho, BBII purposes to replace the 1½ hour time restriction to 3 hours with an 80° F maximum temperature requirement.

Please confirm that this discharging plan is acceptable for Buttress Concrete per ACI 301.

---

**T-0230** **BSE - Concrete Sampling Location** **Closed** **09/12/2011** **09/22/2011** **09/16/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch

**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 03 30 01

Per the Pre-Construction Buttress Shoring Phase 1 DFOW Meeting on 8/30/2011, BBII proposes to conduct concrete sampling of Central Concrete Trucks in Lot P in lieu of Zone 4 due to site congestion and safety concerns. In order to sustain the requirements of Becho and to provide safe disposal of concrete for sampling, BBII purposes Lot P for all concrete sample inspections.

Please confirm that this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The Contractor shall bear all additional costs associated with changing the concrete sampling location from Zone 4 to Lot P (including, but not limited to, additional inspectors)

---

---

2011-09-15 George Metzger

ARUP Response:

Arup takes no exception to sampling the trucks in Lot P provided the concrete is sampled and tested in accordance with the ASTM Standards. For example, in accordance with the Standards, sampling of the concrete shall be obtained after 10 % and before 90 % of the batch has been discharged from the truck.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0231 | BSE - 24-Hour Inspection of Buttress Shoring Shaft | Closed | 09/12/2011 | 09/22/2011 | 09/12/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 03 30 01

Per the Pre-Construction Buttress Shoring Phase 1 DFOW Meeting on 8/30/2011, Becho requests that a TJPA representative be available to observe the 24 hour Buttress Shoring drilling operation and to perform any/all specified inspections. This includes: verticality of shaft, shaft cleanliness, verification of bed rock, concrete and rebar. In addition, Becho requests that a TJPA representative be available 24 hours of the day to provide Becho/BBII with full support and contact information of all available representatives.

Please confirm that this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TJPA Representatives will be available to inspect the work as specified in 31 63 29 (referenced in 03 30 01).

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0232 | BSE - Buttress Red Color Concrete | Closed | 09/15/2011 | 09/25/2011 | 09/16/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 03 30 01 and Sheet GT-2201

Per discussion with the Engineer, it is acceptable to place red color concrete in Secondary Buttress Shafts C3 and C5 in lieu of Primary Buttress Shafts C2, C4, and C6.

Please confirm this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

This is acceptable.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0233 | BSE - Internal Bracing Design Coordination with Structural Design | Closed | 09/20/2011 | 09/30/2011 | 09/23/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 55 00

The BSE submittal TG0300-542.1 Internal Bracing Design was approved by TJPA and the fabrication will start as soon as permission is issued by the City.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Thornton Tomasetti's response is pending receipt and review of revised internal bracing submittal.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please confirm the design was acceptable to permanent structural designer (Thornton Tomasetti) and incorporated into their design for future trade packages.

---

**T-0233.1** **BSE - Internal Bracing Design Coordination with Structural Design** **Closed** **09/23/2011** **10/03/2011** **10/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0233 and TJPA Transmittal No. 140-02321

The SFDBI-approved Internal Bracing drawings and related calculations was sent to W/O on 9/22/2011 as TJPA Transmittal No. 140-02321 - Approved Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall Permit Drawings, and available in Constructware.

---

RFI #T-0233 Question:

The BSE submittal TG0300-542.1 Internal Bracing Design was approved by TJPA and the fabrication will start as soon as permission is issued by the City.

Please confirm the design was acceptable to permanent structural designer (Thornton Tomasetti) and incorporated into their design for future trade packages.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TT is currently reviewing the Internal Bracing Design Documents, which was received by TT on 09/29/2011.

TT's comments to this document will be marked up on the Internal Bracing Design Document.

---

**T-0233.2** **BSE - Internal Bracing Design Coordination with Structural Design** **Closed** **10/05/2011** **10/15/2011** **10/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0233, T-0233.1, Submittal TG0300-542 and TJPA Transmittal No.140-02321.

W/O is in receipt of TJPA Submittal Package #TG0300-

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Thornton Tomasetti will be issuing comments to Transmittal #140-02321.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

542 for the internal bracing from which W/O is proceeding per specification section 01 13 00.
W/O is aware the design team did not review and comment on Transmittal #140-02321 (DBI's comments) to Submittal Package #TG0300-542.
Please confirm no design team changes or comments will be made to Submittal Package #TG0300-542 rather future trade packages.

----- RFI #T-0233.1 Response -----
TT is currently reviewing the Internal Bracing Design Documents, which was received by TT on 09/29/2011. TT's comments to this document will be marked up on the Internal Bracing Design Document.

----- RFI #T-0233.1 Question -----
The SFDBI-approved Internal Bracing drawings and related calculations was sent to W/O on 9/22/2011 as TJPA Transmittal No. 140-02321 - Approved Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall Permit Drawings, and available in Constructware.

----- RFI #T-0233 Response -----
Thornton Tomasetti's response is pending receipt and review of revised internal bracing submittal.

----- RFI #T-0233 Question -----
The BSE submittal TG0300-542.1 Internal Bracing Design was approved by TJPA and the fabrication will start as soon as permission is issued by the City.
Please confirm the design was acceptable to permanent structural designer (Thornton Tomasetti) and incorporated into their design for future trade packages.

---

**T-0233.3** **BSE - Internal Bracing Design Coordination with Structural Design** **Closed** **10/10/2011** **10/20/2011** **10/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0233, T-0233.1, T-0233.2, Submittal TG0300-542 and TJPA Transmittal No.140-02321.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

This RFI contains a statement, not a question and is inappropriate for the RFI process.
RFI T-0233.2 will remain closed but unresolved until

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

This RFI shall not be closed until the information / confirmation received from the Design team.

----- RFI #T-0233.2 Response -----
Thornton Tomasetti will be issuing comments to Transmittal #140-02321.

----- RFI #T-0233.2 Question -----
W/O is in receipt of TJPA Submittal Package #TG0300-542 for the internal bracing from which W/O is proceeding per specification section 01 13 00.
W/O is aware the design team did not review and comment on Transmittal #140-02321 (DBI's comments) to Submittal Package #TG0300-542.
Please confirm no design team changes or comments will be made to Submittal Package #TG0300-542 rather future trade packages.

----- RFI #T-0233.1 Response -----
TT is currently reviewing the Internal Bracing Design Documents, which was received by TT on 09/29/2011.
TT's comments to this document will be marked up on the Internal Bracing Design Document.

----- RFI #T-0233.1 Question -----
The SFDBI-approved Internal Bracing drawings and related calculations was sent to W/O on 9/22/2011 as TJPA Transmittal No. 140-02321 - Approved Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall Permit Drawings, and available in Constructware.

----- RFI #T-0233 Response -----
Thornton Tomasetti's response is pending receipt and review of revised internal bracing submittal.

----- RFI #T-0233 Question -----
The BSE submittal TG0300-542.1 Internal Bracing Design was approved by TJPA and the fabrication will start as soon as permission is issued by the City.
Please confirm the design was acceptable to permanent structural designer (Thornton Tomasetti) and incorporated into their design for future trade packages.

the requested information is provided.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0233.4 | BSE - Internal Bracing Design Coordination with Structural Design | Closed | 10/10/2011 | 10/20/2011 | 10/11/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0233, T-0233.1, T-0233.2, Submittal TG0300-542 and TJPA Transmittal No.140-02321.

When will the Design team provide the information / confirmation for RFI #T-0233?

----- RFI #T-0233.3 Response -----
This RFI contains a statement, not a question and is inappropriate for the RFI process. RFI T-0233.2 will remain closed but unresolved until the requested information is provided.

----- RFI #T-0233.3 Question -----
This RFI shall not be closed until the information / confirmation received from the Design team.

----- RFI #T-0233.2 Response -----
Thornton Tomasetti will be issuing comments to Transmittal #140-02321.

----- RFI #T-0233.2 Question -----
W/O is in receipt of TJPA Submittal Package #TG0300-542 for the internal bracing from which W/O is proceeding per specification section 01 13 00.
W/O is aware the design team did not review and comment on Transmittal #140-02321 (DBI's comments) to Submittal Package #TG0300-542.
Please confirm no design team changes or comments will be made to Submittal Package #TG0300-542 rather future trade packages.

----- RFI #T-0233.1 Response -----
TT is currently reviewing the Internal Bracing Design Documents, which was received by TT on 09/29/2011. TT's comments to this document will be marked up on the Internal Bracing Design Document.

----- RFI #T-0233.1 Question -----
The SFDBI-approved Internal Bracing drawings and related calculations was sent to W/O on 9/22/2011 as TJPA Transmittal No. 140-02321 - Approved Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall Permit Drawings, and available in Constructware.

----- RFI #T-0233 Response -----

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Comments will be returned by 14 October 2011.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Thornton Tomasetti's response is pending receipt and review of revised internal bracing submittal.

----- RFI #T-0233 Question -----
The BSE submittal TG0300-542.1 Internal Bracing Design was approved by TJPA and the fabrication will start as soon as permission is issued by the City.
Please confirm the design was acceptable to permanent structural designer (Thornton Tomasetti) and incorporated into their design for future trade packages.

---

**T-0233.5** **BSE - Internal Bracing Design Coordination with Structural Design** **Closed** **10/17/2011** **10/27/2011** **10/18/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0233, T-0233.1, T-0233.2, T-0233.3, T-0233.4, Submittal TG0300-542 and TJPA Transmittal No.140-02321.

Per response to RFI#T-0233.4, comments from the design team were to be received by October 14, 2011.

Please provide the design team comments and confirmation for RFI #T-0233.

----- RFI #T-0233.4 Response -----
Comments will be returned by 14 October 2011.

----- RFI #T-0233.4 Question -----
Reference RFI #T-0233, T-0233.1, T-0233.2, Submittal TG0300-542 and TJPA Transmittal No.140-02321.

When will the Design team provide the information / confirmation for RFI #T-0233?

----- RFI #T-0233.3 Response -----
This RFI contains a statement, not a question and is inappropriate for the RFI process. RFI T-0233.2 will remain closed but unresolved until the requested

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Comments have been sent to W/O previously, see attached transmittal.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

information is provided.

----- RFI #T-0233.3 Question -----
This RFI shall not be closed until the information / confirmation received from the Design team.

----- RFI #T-0233.2 Response -----
Thornton Tomasetti will be issuing comments to Transmittal #140-02321.

----- RFI #T-0233.2 Question -----
W/O is in receipt of TJPA Submittal Package #TG0300-542 for the internal bracing from which W/O is proceeding per specification section 01 13 00.
W/O is aware the design team did not review and comment on Transmittal #140-02321 (DBI's comments) to Submittal Package #TG0300-542.

Please confirm no design team changes or comments will be made to Submittal Package #TG0300-542 rather future trade packages.

----- RFI #T-0233.1 Response -----
TT is currently reviewing the Internal Bracing Design Documents, which was received by TT on 09/29/2011. TT's comments to this document will be marked up on the Internal Bracing Design Document.

----- RFI #T-0233.1 Question -----
The SFDBI-approved Internal Bracing drawings and related calculations was sent to W/O on 9/22/2011 as TJPA Transmittal No. 140-02321 - Approved Internal Bracing for Shoring Wall Permit Drawings, and available in Constructware.

----- RFI #T-0233.0 Response -----
Thornton Tomasetti's response is pending receipt and review of revised internal bracing submittal.

----- RFI #T-0233.0 Question -----
Reference Specification Section 31 55 00
The BSE submittal TG0300-542.1 Internal Bracing Design

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

was approved by TJPA and the fabrication will start as soon as permission is issued by the City.

Please confirm the design was acceptable to permanent structural designer (Thornton Tomasetti) and incorporated into their design for future trade packages.

---

**T-0234** **BSE - Buttress Shaft Post Pour Settlement** **Closed** **09/20/2011** **09/30/2011** **09/22/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29

Please be informed that an uncontrolled settlement was observed at Buttress shaft C2, which was poured on Sunday 9/18/2011. The settlement led to the formation of a 13' deep unstable hole on the buttress working pad. After consulting with ARUP representative and W/O's field personnel, BBII/Becho Inc. decided to fill the newly formed hole with concrete to mitigate the settlement risk of the working pad. Additional concrete was poured into the 13' deep hole on Monday 9/19/2011.

Please confirm that pouring additional concrete/CLSM will be considered as an acceptable method, if such settlements will occur during the future installation of the upcoming buttress shafts.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The Contractor shall place concrete (or CLSM, where specified) up to the gound surface as specified in the Contract Documents. The Contractor shall employ the means and methods necessary to properly measure the level of concrete before concrete placement is terminated, and to verify that the material at the ground surface is quality concrete rather than the concrete / water / concrete plug mixture that rises to the surface in advance of the quality concrete due to the tremie method. If some consolidation of the concrete occurs over time, then the top of the shaft shall be filled to the ground surface with conrete (or CLSM, where specified).

---

**T-0235** **BSE - Unforeseen Reinforced Concrete Slab at GL 7.5 J** **Closed** **09/20/2011** **09/30/2011** **09/27/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2210, Specification Section 31 56 13, attached photos and sketch

While excavating a pre trench at gridline 7.5J close to

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

This slab is a Cal Trans slab and is located within TJPA property limits. The slab is not unknown and is shown in the set of Drawings listed in Section 00-03-31 Part 1.2.D.6 (Existing Condition: Buildings and

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Natoma Street, BBII uncovered an unforeseen reinforced concrete slab. This slab is 3ft thick, uncovered at grade and a section of it is in the direct line of the proposed CDSM wall. Indicated at this location in drawing D-2210 are grade beams and pile caps which BBII assumes will be encountered under this mat slab. However, this slab is not indicated on contract drawing D-2210.
The concrete shown in contract survey sheet 5 appears to be a concrete driveway and it does not indicate the 3ft thick concrete slab that BBII are encountering. Measurements taken in the field also indicate a larger area than this. The attached photos and drawing indicate the scale of this obstruction. It is required to be removed.

Please advise if this is acceptable.

Improvements - Drawings "Project Plans for Construction from Figth Streeet to Beale Street, 2000" (168 pages). Removal of the slab is acceptable.

---
9/22/2011 - George Metzger

ARUP Response:

It is Arup's understanding that the slab encountered is a remnant of the Caltrans seismic retrofit work of the previous, now-demolished bus ramps. Therefor, removal of the portion of the slab within the shoring wall alignment is acceptable, but ownership of the property on which the slab is located should be confirmed by the PMPC / TJPA.

---

**T-0236** **BSE - Unforeseen Concrete Section Found at Grid Line 1E** **Closed** **09/22/2011** **10/02/2011** **09/26/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2210 (attached), Specification Section 31 56 13, and attached photos

While DND were drilling at panel 28 and 29 on grid line 1E at the locations of piles 839-843, an unknown section of concrete was encountered. The concrete was found at a depth of 9.5ft. The quantity of concrete is unknown at this point. The concrete is not indicated on contract drawing D-2210. It is in direct conflict with the CDSM shoring wall and must be removed. Shown below [attached] are photos of the debris removed from the excavation.

Please advise on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Contract documents require obstacles that may interfere with installation of the CDSM wall to be removed by pre-trenching. The concrete shall be removed.

---

**T-0237** **BSE - Bridge Welding Code** **Closed** **09/26/2011** **10/06/2011** **10/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification 01 53 30

Temporary Bridge Specification 01 53 13 (1.6H) requires the welding qualifications for the bridges to be in accordance with AWS D1.5 "Bridge Welding Code", however BBII's design was based on AWS D1.1 "Structural Welding Code" as specified in General note 3.2-A4.2 of Sheet SH-0100. BBII and their designer felt AWS D1.1 is more applicable for the temporary bridge structure for the following reasons:

- The members that make up BBII's temporary bridge consists of readily available standard grade mill rolled shapes, comprised of a variety of base metals (A36, A53, A572, A992, A500, and A252) which are joined by simple prequalified joints (fillets). D1.1 provides the flexibility to weld all of these base metals in any combination utilizing prequalified procedures, since they are all in the same base metal group. D1.5 only allows prequalified welding of A709 plate material only.

- BBII's temporary bridge structure contains structural tubing (piers and rails), which D1.5 does not cover tubing

- The bridge as designed has short spans and very simple welded connections. All welds shown are fillet welds (mostly single pass). Additionally there are no complete penetration welds as are typically seen on steel plate girder bridges.

- The life span of these temporary bridges are less than 5 years

- The temporary bridge's intended use and the site specific geometry restraints led to a steel framing design much more similar to a structural steel building than to a typical Highway bridge. The steel columns with angle cross-bracing, and the girders and cap beams as detailed are similar to building with columns and floor beams.

The submittal review did not take exception to the general note specifying D1.1. therefore please confirm it is acceptable to submit weld procedures and welder qualifications per AWS D1.1 as specified by the bridge's Engineer of Record.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ISI Commentary:

"We have been requested to provide a commentary/discussion regarding AWS D1.5-2002 Bridge Welding Code in reference to RFI #T-0237. The scope of our discussion is limited to an interpretation of D1.5 and not to the design/use of welded temporary steel bridges. The RFI's request by BBII is to accept WPSs/WQTRs to AWS D1.1 rather than to AWS D1.5.

Base Materials: Although D1.5 specifies A709 as the approved steel, it also states that other steels may be approved by the Engineer [D1.5 Section 1.2.2].

Fillet Welding: The RFI states all welding to be fillet welds (mostly single pass). D1.5 state fillet welding may be performed, within given limitations, without performing WPS qualification tests [D1.5 Section 2.8.1].

Welder Qualifications: We note that the qualification requirements for both groove and fillet welds are similar between AWS D1.1 and D1.5 with exception of base metal restrictions.

Engineer's Discretions: See Commentary Sections C1.1.2, C1.2.1 and the "Forward" section of D1.5 Pgs. vii and viii."

---

9/26/2011 - David Fyfe

See Specification Section 01 53 13, 1.6H;

Welding Qualifications: Qualify procedures and personnel according to the following:

1. AWS D1.5/D1.5M, "Bridge Welding Code - Steel."

2. AWS D1.4/D1.4M, "Structural Welding Code - Reinforcing Steel."

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

This does not allow use of AWS D1.1. Comply with paragraph 1.6H requirements.

---

**T-0237.1** **BSE - Bridge Welding Code** **Closed** **10/03/2011** **10/13/2011** **10/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0237 and Specification Section 01 53 30

RFI #T-0237 was returned to W/O with two responses regarding the temporary bridge welding. Please clarify which is the governing response or provide one coordinated response.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Response provided in RFI T-0237 by David Fyfe, dated 9/26/2011, is the governing response.

---

**T-0238** **BSE - Zone 1 CDSM Crossing Over Existing Wall** **Closed** **09/26/2011** **10/06/2011** **09/29/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-5101, Specification Section 31 56 13, attached photos and sketch

Please address the following information request from BBII's sub contractor DND:

"The new CDSM shoring wall crosses an existing CDSM wall at 2 locations. Following CR T-005B, both of these crossings are perpendicular to the existing CDSM wall, as shown in Note 1 on GT-5101. Note 1 shows the new wall making a jog to avoid hitting the beams of the existing CDSM wall. The detail shown on contract plan GT-5101 is constructible only if the existing CDSM wall was built exactly as shown, without any room for construction tolerances for both the new and existing wall. Instead of trying to install this section of the CDSM wall according to the detail shown on GT-5101, which would potentially cause damage to the CDSM equipment, DND proposes to

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

This is acceptable provided there is no additional cost to the TJPA.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

remove the existing CDSM beams that are in conflict. The contract plan GT-5101 shows two CDSM panels to jog around the existing beam and one offset panel parallel to the new wall.

DND's proposed solution would eliminate the 2 panels in the jog but still maintain the additional offset panel parallel to the wall line. This additional offset panel would act as insurance so a seal is maintained through any deflection caused by the hard in-situ soil mix. This would present a potential cost savings to the project (due to 2 less panels being installed), providing the conflicting beams can be successfully removed.

DND has mobilized a drill rig with an auger to this area to pre-drill the wall prior to the removal of beams. This will substantially reduce the amount of vibration that will be required to remove the beams. DND proposes to utilize the same method at the other wall crossing near Natoma Street. Is this proposed method of removing the existing beams and soil mixing through the existing CDSM wall acceptable?"

---

**T-0239** **BSE - Rebar Cages for Deeper Buttress Shafts** **Closed** **09/28/2011** **10/08/2011** **10/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-5202 Detail 12, RFI T-0216, and Approved Rebar Shop Drawings

The approved rebar cages per RFI T-0216 are sized for 241' deep shafts. Rebar cages for shafts C-1 and M-1 have already been released and fabricated. Note that the depth after airlifting of shafts C-2 and M-2 have been 247' and 252.7' respectively. Please advise on how to proceed with the installation of the cages for shafts C-1 and M-1 and with the fabrication of the rest of the cages assuming these shafts extend beyond planned depth.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Detail 12/GT-5201 requires the reinforcing steel to be placed up to 1'-0" below the top of the concrete. The top of concrete is shown on GT-5201. Longitudinal bar extensions shall be spliced as needed to achieve this. If the top of the fabricated cage is within 3'-0" of the top of the concrete, no bar extensions are required.

The 24" tie spacing shown on the shop drawings at the setting cage (Drawing SC1) is acceptable at the bar extensions.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0240 | BSE - Demo AT&T Duct on Natoma at Second | Closed | 09/29/2011 | 10/09/2011 | 10/07/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Gary Krutsch
**Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic — Eric Zagol
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheets U-1110, D-2231, ASI-015, Specification Section 31 56 13, attached email and BBI RFI 222

It was discovered on 9/27/2011 while performing the utility demo for the revised shoring wall alignment (TG03 BSE CR T-005B) issued in ASI 15 that the abandoned AT&T line servicing the demolished buildings on Natoma was never fully abandoned by AT&T. According to the attached email from Huan Huynh of AT&T, AT&T was never notified that these lines needed to be abandoned due to the revised shoring wall alignment of the Transbay Project.

Please confirm when CDSM Shoring Wall can be installed in the area. Currently, BBII is installing the CDSM Shoring Wall on line 1 and the confirmation of the line abandonment is required as quickly as possible to avoid any project delay.

Please also refer to the attached BBI RFI 0222 for this issue

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

AT&T has de-energized the abandon telecommunications lines referenced in the RFI. Proceed with CDSM wall installation at this location following demolition of existing utilities per RUP contract documents and execution of a USARs.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0241 | BSE - Brick Wall at GL 2, J Line In Conflict With The CDSM Wall | Closed | 09/29/2011 | 10/09/2011 | 10/07/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Gary Krutsch
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Jack Adams
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13 and attached meeting minutes and photos

The brick wall remaining from the 580 Howard building, at grid line 2 J, is protruding into the CDSM wall limits, as noted in BBII's previous RFI #203 (The question was responded by TCCO at the job site meeting on 9/6/2011. Refer to the attached meeting minutes). While attempting to remove, BBII has discovered that the fence and patio pavement are founded on this remaining portion of brick wall. This condition does not allow for the removal of the wall without damage to the fence and patio.

Please provide direction on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

1. The 580 Howard courtyard fencing can be removed from the corner because it is owned by TJPA and located on TJPA property.
2. After removal of this corner section of fence, a section of temp fence and signage shall be placed on TJPA property.
3. During demolition of this corner section the temp fence and signage will likely have to move in towards the 580 Property as a safety precaution.
4. The demolition and backfill shall be expedited so that the courtyard can be restored (preferably same day).
5. The temp fence section and signage shall be moved back on to TJPA property until CDSM wall is complete.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

6. The permanent fence will be reinstalled on TJPA property as soon as possible after CDSM wall installation at the corner.

CR T-5B excluded this scope. These costs will be issued under forthcoming CR.

---

**T-0242** **BSE - Becho's Request For Rock Classification Data** **Closed** **09/29/2011** **10/09/2011** **10/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-2201, Specification Section 31 63 29, and attached letter from Becho

Please find attached BBII's sub-contractor Becho's letter that requests the following information:

"... during the drilling of buttress shaft M4 rock socket, at a depth of approximately 250 feet below ground level, Becho encountered rock formations of unmeasured hardness. At a depth of 250 feet, Becho's steel grab, used for rock drilling, fractured under the increased stress. Please see attached photos. The incident occurred between the hours of 9.30 am and 10.00 am on Wednesday, 09.28.11. BBII immediately notified W/O and called for an emergency meeting to discuss the hardness of the rock formation and the status of drilling. During the meeting, Arup confirmed and accepted the 250 foot depth to be adequate and sufficient to stop the rock socket drilling. Immediately, following Arup's confirmation at 11.09 am, Becho proceeded to clean the remaining rock debris from the bottom of the shaft and prep for air lifting operation. The total down time recorded as a result of the incident is 68 minutes, not including adjustments of airlift, tremie pipe and repair of grab.
Please advise, if shafts are to be drilled and excavated to new depths not indicated on plan GT-5201. Becho will need to mobilize additional non-conventional drilling equipment to successfully achieve depths currently being directed to drill to (255 ft). In addition, Becho requests that a soil report be generated containing borings pertaining to

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Regarding the question: "Please advise, if shafts are to be drilled and excavated to new depths not indicated on plan GT-5201": the specifications note "Depth of piers shown on drawings may vary due to field conditions based upon TJPA's Representative¿s assessment of actual conditions."

The Geotechnical Data Report and the Prototype Test Report, included in the Contract Documents as references, provide sufficient information for the Contractor to plan and execute their work.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Zone 4 Buttress drilling operations which include rock classification, strength and location."

---

**T-0243** **BSE - Emergency Exit at 530 Howard GL 10 J** **Closed** **09/29/2011** **10/09/2011** **10/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13 and attached sketch

Pre-trenching and CDSM wall installation at the rear of the 530 Howard building will have an impact on the accessibility to the emergency exit at that location. In order for the pre trench and the CDSM wall installation to safely proceed past this location, the rear exit must be closed for 1-2 days for each operation. The attached drawing indicates the location of the emergency exit and its proximity to the CDSM wall.

Please confirm if this is acceptable. BBII is available to meet with the property owner to coordinate this work.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Coordination with 530 Howard property management cannot be obtained without specific dates. Once the dates are known, coordinate through Jason Padavich (jpadavich@tcco.com 510-453-8598).

---

**T-0244** **BSE - Request for Additional Geotechnical Data Pertaining To Zone 4** **Closed** **09/29/2011** **10/09/2011** **10/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet GT-2201 and Specification Section 31 63 29

Please address the following information request from BBII's sub contractor Becho Inc.:

"... for each of the shafts completed and under construction, Becho has excavated deeper than the elevations shown for boring logs. Becho is requesting soil samples, boring logs, torque requirements, skin friction values, and rock strengths be provided for these depths.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The elevation of the bedrock is highly variable as indicated by the contour plan in the Geotechnical Data Report. It is for this reason that the specifications include the requirement: "Excavation and drilling equipment: shall have adequate capacity, including power, torque, and down thrust to advance the temporary casing to the depths shown on the drawings, excavate a hole of both the maximum diameter and to a depth of 20 percent beyond the

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

(Currently 254 ft below elevation +14.00).

The requested information is similar to what was provided up to the depths of 234 and 237.5 feet in the "Final Geotechnical Data Report" prepared by Arup dated February 2010, and "Prototype Test Program and Monitoring During Construction of Drilled Shafts" prepared by Arup dated May 2010. Becho requests this information for drilling beyond the depths specified in the Geotechnical Report."

depths shown on the plans."

---

**T-0244.1** **BSE - Becho Request for Buttress Field Logs** **Closed** **03/23/2012** **04/02/2012** **04/24/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

BECHO formally requests to obtain the Daily Field Logs from every ARUP field engineer/geotech/geologist, TJPA representative involved with the Buttress Shaft work. More specifically, field notes/logs from engineers and TJPA representatives involved with the field data collection, sample collection and inspection process. Becho requests the Daily Field Logs for the following dates:
- September 12th 2011 through October 20th 2011
- February 22nd 2012 through Today

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The TJPA Representative Daily Field Logs are attached to the Field Observation Reports that are posted to and available in Constructware.

---

**T-0244.2** **BSE - Becho Request for Buttress Field Logs Follow-Up** **Closed** **04/18/2012** **04/28/2012** **04/24/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

After reviewing Constructware as directed in RFI T-0244.1; W/O is unable to locate ARUP field reports for the dates between 9/12/11-9/30/11. Please advise as to the location of the aformentioned documents.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per Arup on 04/10/2012, "The first report begins on October 1, 2011. Prior to that, Arup was not documenting the project progress and deficiencies through these field reports."

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0244.3 | Becho's 3rd Request for Arup's Field Logs | Closed | 07/24/2012 | 08/03/2012 | 08/01/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ernie Cortez **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Stacy Wilson

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Becho formally requests to obtain any and all documentation Arup has for logging and documenting soil samples retrieved from the Buttress shafts starting 9/12/2011 thru 10/1/2011, including all documentation pertaining to quality control as specified in section 31.63.29.3.8.B.

Reference attached Becho Letter BI-0244.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contractor is to refer to Constructware or the ISI special inspection website for the available field logs/test reports/field samples. All necessary parties have access to these sources.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0245 | BSE - Ground Conduits detail for PG&E phase 2 works on First Street | Closed | 10/05/2011 | 10/15/2011 | 10/12/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference: CR No. T-017 - BSE - First Street Phase 2 Utility Relocation

For the installation of the PGE 6" and PGE 4" GRS conduit between the CDSM walls, is grounding of the PGE conduits required? If so, please provide grounding details/requirements.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Response from PG&E (attached) is as follows:

Yes and at both ends of the conduits. As a suggestion, we would propose to tie into the bonding jumpers of the AX and EX expansion fittings with a bare copper solid stand #6 copper wire. The #6 wire can be either soldered or crimped to the bonding jumper. All the #6 ground wires would then be brought together and connected to a single bare #2/0 copper wire. The 2/0 copper ground wire would then be routed and cadwelded to the nearest I-beam that support the traffic bridge.

If it is not possible to attached the #6 copper wire to the AX and EX grounding jumpers, we will require a separated bonding clamp that can be used in a wet or dry location.

One grounding point is usually sufficient but I am asking for grounding at both ends of the steel conduits in case one ground is accidentally cut.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0246 | BSE - PG&E Sweep Radius Requirements | Closed | 10/10/2011 | 10/20/2011 | 10/11/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference CR T-017.

(The attached drawings provided at the PG&E / BBII / Verizon Coordination Meeting on 9/29/2011) refer to 10ft radius elbows and bends. PG&E standards refer require 6ft radius elbows and bends. Please confirm radius requirements for 6" conduit installation for the Phase 2 utility on First Street.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per PG&E (see attached), the requirement is 10ft radius.

---

**T-0247** **BSE - Proposed Corrective Action Plan for Sunken CDSM Soldier Piles** **Closed** **10/10/2011** **10/10/2011** **10/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13

Please address the following information request from BBII's sub contractor DND:
"As of to date, the following three soldier piles have sunk below grade during their placement into the CDSM wall.
- Beam # 154 installed on 09.08.11
- Beam # 631, installed on 09.29.11
- Beam # 602, installed on 10.01.11

DND was unable to recover those piles and set them to their plan elevations without disturbing the adjacent beams that were already in place. To mitigate this issue, DND proposes to conduct the below course of remedial action:
1) Wait until mass excavation commences. Excavate with caution the locations, and determine the top elevation of the sunken beams.
2) Provide this information to the Engineer for evaluation.
3) Implement corrective action based on Engineer's evaluation. Possible corrective measures are:
a. No action necessary. The strength of the CDSM material may be sufficient to support the unreinforced depth.
b. Install lagging between the adjacent beams above the top of the sunken beam.
c. Splice a beam on the top of the sunken beam and backfill with low strength concrete.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The proposed sequence is not acceptable. The Contractor shall submit a corrective action plan at least four weeks prior to the start of excavation for evaluation by the TJPA's Representative. The plan shall assume a range of depths to the top of the sunken beam and shall describe the impact on the waling and strutting plan. The plan shall be location-specific and shall include a drawing indicating the location of the sunken beam.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please advise, if the proposed course of remedial action and/or any of the three possible corrective measures are acceptable."

---

**T-0247.1** **BSE - Proposed Corrective Plan for the following Sunken Solider Piles** **Closed** **01/10/2012** **01/20/2012** **01/12/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached Corrective Action Plan

Message:
Please find attached BBII's proposed corrective plan for the following sunken solider piles:
1. Pile #59, Notice #47, Vela Issue #J-00007.
2. Pile #154, Vela Issue #J-00001.
3. Pile #602, Vela Issue #J-00008.
Please approve and or comment.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The written RFI above is not a clear question and is not acceptable. The content in the attached document should be provided in a submittal, not an RFI. GC to conform to comments in RFI 247.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0248 | BSE - First St. Verizon Utilities Relocation | Closed | 10/10/2011 | 10/20/2011 | 01/04/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Masashi Kojima
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Gary Krutsch
**Answered By:** Transbay PMPC — Roger Rothenburger
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 53 13

Attached is an as-built sketch of Verizon utilities potholed and located along First St. on 10/4/10. These utilities were originally scheduled to be relocated during phase two to allow for CDSM installation and subsequently temporary bridge construction. BBII has learned that in an effort to save time, the TJPA is considering leaving the utilities in their current locations and working around them. As shown on the attached section of the First St. temporary bridge, the Verizon utilities will be in direct conflict with the temporary bridge structure. Please confirm these utilities will be relocated as planned to allow for installation of the CDSM shoring wall and temporary bridge.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

"Yes, they will be relocated. This RFI was related to the lateness of Verizon relocation and the idea of installing CDSM wall with Verizon still in place. Due to delays in starting PGE is now taking longer than Verizon so that PGE work governs duration and we no longer have to install last CDSM wall with Verizon in place to save time on bridge installation on First Street."

Solcom has a start date of 1.03.2012 and a finish date of 2.29.2012.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0249 | BSE - Pavement lights at the rear of 580 Howard | Closed | 10/10/2011 | 10/20/2011 | 10/12/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Masashi Kojima
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Gary Krutsch
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Kevin Chiu
**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13 and CR T-005B.

There are two lights located on the ground inside the boundary fence at the rear of 580 Howard. The lights are located 4ft away from the brick wall (which is due to be demolished) as shown the attached photos. A preliminary investigation indicates that the lights are de-energized. Please confirm that access to the property's electrical system will be available to confirm that the lights are de-energized.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Access to 580 Howard cannot be obtained at this time.

See attached, "RFI T-0249 Field Photos 11 Oct 2011," which shows that as of 2PM on 11 OCT 2011 the lights have been removed and wires capped by an unknown entity.

Contractor to verify status of electrical lines by alternate means.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0250 | BSE - Soil Classification of South West Area of the Work Site | Closed | 10/13/2011 | 10/23/2011 | 11/03/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Gary Krutsch
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Kevin Chiu
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 13 50 and Treadwell & Rollo site maps (attached)

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Treadwell and Rollo response-

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

BBII needs the soil classification listed and mapped for the lot between Natoma Street and Howard Street, and between Gridline A to Gridline 10.
Please see the attached Treadwell & Rollo's Site Mitigation Map of the Soil Classification for the area in question.

"See attached site plan, figure 1. Where encountered, up to 4' of State of California hazardous waste exists."

---

**T-0251** **BSE - Drawings To Coordinate Trestle Pile Locations** **Closed** **10/13/2011** **10/23/2011** **10/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

During the 10/12/11 trestle submittal review meeting, statements were repeatedly made with regard to incrementally complete underground drawings in which to coordinate trestle pile locations. As of 10/13/11, W/O has not received any future package documents accompanied with the direction to coordinate with the TG03 documents. If such documents are available please make available the entire series to include, however not limited to, A, S, M, E, & P.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The question being asked is unclear. Please rephrase the question and resubmit the RFI.

---

**T-0251.1** **BSE - Drawings To Coordinate Trestle Pile Locations** **Closed** **10/14/2011** **10/24/2011** **11/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

RFI T-0251 original inquiry:
During the 10/12/11 trestle submittal review meeting, statements were repeatedly made with regard to incrementally complete underground drawings in which to coordinate trestle pile locations. As of 10/13/11, W/O has not received any future package documents accompanied with the direction to coordinate with the TG03 documents. If such documents are available please make available the entire series to include, however not limited to, A, S, M, E, & P.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Thornton Tomasetti Reply:

"See attached PDF files SKS-0130 through SKS-0137 for exclusion zones for trestle and pin pile locations, per requested additional TT review. W/O to review for constructability. Submit updated pile locations for review.

Note:

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

RFI T-0251.1 Clarification to RFI T-0251:
The TG03 package was executed with limited documents in which to coordinate future packages with. Please provide all documents the TJPA requests BBII coordinate the TG03 package with and to.

As it pertains to structural columns (round/pill/rectangle/ect.) please provide the minimum clear distance to trestle pile penetrations in the mat slab so BBII may coordinate.

Should there remain any ambiguity in the inquiry above please indicate the nature of misunderstanding.

Penetrations through the Mat slab shall not intersect the hatched zones in the attached sketches. Note hatched zones at and near columns and at side walls.

Any Lower Concourse level penetrations within 3'-0" on either side of primary column lines (e.g. 1.4, 2, ..., 35, V, W, X) will impact construction of primary concrete moment frame beam elements; coordinate with W/O. Block outs in moment frame beams shall not encroach into the hatched zones in the attached sketches.

Coordinate interruptions of lower concourse slabs and secondary framing beam elements with W/O.

24" Diameter columns located 21'-3" west of GL 23 and 21'-3" east of GL 23 along GL D.8 and E.2, extending between mat level and lower concourse level.

Verify construction sequence of Light Column at GL 23 in relation to cross lot bracing and re-bracing; coordinate with W/O.

Penetrations that interrupt Mat reinforcement shall not be placed closer than 3xDia clear spacing between penetrations, with Dia = larger diameter of two adjacent penetrations. Penetrations are those causing interruptions of mat reinforcement in the structure in its final condition. Note especially conflict between pin pile 22 and trestle pile 107 (GL 9), trestle piles 18 and 103 (GL 10), and temporary bridge piers close to pin piles 13 and 14 (GL 34)."

Adamson Associates Note: "The additional A, S, and MEP documents you requested are currently in design progress and the information is not availble at this time."

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **T-0251.2** | **BSE - Drawings To Coordinate Trestle Pile Locations - "No Pin Pile Zone" at Lowe** | **Closed** | **11/04/2011** | **11/14/2011** | **11/14/2011** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** **Answered By:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch — Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

On 11/3/11 W/O was informed by PMPC during an Access Trestle Criteria Discussion meeting with URS and W/O that PMPC will request Thornton Tomasetti to provide "no pine pile zone" sketches for the Lower Concourse Level similar to the Sketches provided through RFI T- 251.1 response. Also, PMPC is requesting Thornton Tomasetti to provide criteria of concrete connection details around pin piles/trestle piles for the future Below Grade Concrete Package.

Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TT Response:

The response to RFI T-0251.1 and the associated sketches included criteria for Lower Concourse. As stated in the response, BBII is to coordinate the Lower Concourse framing elements with Webcor. Although the block out at the lower concourse level is a means and methods issue, TT further clarifies the implication of the block out if it affects the primary moment frames along the column grids as noted below:

The primary moment frame girders at the Lower Concourse level are to act as a brace when the Second level braces are removed as shown in the GT drawings. If a complete moment frame girder is not poured due to conflict with the trestle piles, those bracing elements immediately adjacent to that girder will need to remain in place until the blocked-out beam is re-cast and reaches its design strength. Alternatively, BBII shall establish another method of temporary bracing and submit for review.

Concrete connection details around pin piles/trestle piles are included in the Below Grade Package.

---

**T-0251.3** **BSE - Drawings To Coordinate Trestle Pile Locations - "No Pin Pile Zone" at Lowe** **Closed** **11/28/2011** **12/08/2011** **12/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Adamson Associates, Inc. George Metzger **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0251.2

So W/O may coordinate as requested in RFI response T-0251.2 please provide a drawing that depicts the column configurations, dimensions, and minimum clearance requirements, for both the platform and concourse levels. This information is required to locate trestle piles and internal bracing struts.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See attached SKS-0138 through SKS-0178 (41 total) for requested
information. Note that these sketches are in progress, for reference only,
and subject to change.
Refer to RFI T-0263 response regarding minimum clearance requirements.

---

**T-0252** **BSE - Buttress Rebar Cage Length Adjustment** **Closed** **10/19/2011** **10/29/2011** **10/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch
**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0216, #T-0239, Sheet GT-2201, Specification Section 31 63 29, and attached sketch

Per the response to RFI T-0239, BBII needs to extend the length of rebar cages to accommodate buttress shafts that are deeper than 240'. The exact length of the rebar cage cannot be known until the drilling of the adjacent shaft. Due to this uncertainty, and the long lead time required to fabricate cages with varying lengths, BBII proposes to fabricate all rebar cages to a pre-extended length of 260'.

Once the depth of the adjacent shaft is known, the final length of the rebar cage will be adjusted by cutting the top of the rebar cage and the CSL tubes to the desired length. The length of the bottom "structural cage" section that consists of 24 Ea. vertical rebars will remain unchanged at 186'. The length of the top "setting cage" section that consists of 8 Ea. vertical rebars will be adjusted as described above. Please refer to the attached documents and the original shop drawings for the "structural cage" and the "setting cage" details.

BBII proposes to accommodate this change at no additional cost to TJPA beyond the bid item quantity payment per drilled shaft lengths.

Please advise, if it is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The proposal is acceptable with the following notes. Detail 12/GT-5201 requires the reinforcing steel to be placed up to 1'-0" below the top of the concrete. The top of concrete is shown on GT-5201. Longitudinal bar extensions shall be spliced as needed to achieve this (as noted on the sketch; attached). If the top of the fabricated cage is within 3'-0' of the top of the concrete, no bar extensions are required.

The 24" tie spacing shown on the shop drawings at the setting cage (Drawing SC1) is acceptable at the bar extensions.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0253 | BSE - Trestle Design Criteria Confirmation | Closed | 10/19/2011 | 10/29/2011 | 11/01/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal
**To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**REQUEST:**

Reference Attachment 3 of Exhibit A of the TG03 Bid Package and attached memo from PB&A

Pursuant to the trestle design meeting held on October 12, 2011, Balfour Beatty Infrastructure Inc.' (BBII) requests clarification regarding their interpreted design criteria of the Temporary Access Trestle

As the only Contract document regarding the Trestle,

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

PMPC repsonse per Roger Rothenburger, 11/01/11:

"1. The RFI process is not the appropriate venue to "review the provided information and confirm whether or not BBII's design criteria is appropriate." The RFI requested at the October 12, 2011 meeting was to request clarifying instructions to specific perceptions of conflict between Exhibit A - Attachment 3 and Specification Section 01-53-13 (Temporary Bridges)

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Attachment 3 of Exhibit A of the TG030 Bid Manual has the following instructions:

In the second sentence of the second paragraph, the following statement is made, "For the design criteria for the Access Trestle, the Contract Documents and applicable standard shall be referred to." The next sentence states, "All requirements in the Temporary Bridge Specification in the Contract Documents, Section 01 53 13, shall apply to the Access Trestle."

Attachment 3 goes on further to provide very specific design load conditions and structural elements (i.e. Deck & barrier) that contradict the requirements of the Temporary bridge Spec Section 01 53 13. Based on the more "Trestle Specific" requirements of Attachment 3 and the interpreted function, being for construction use and not public use, of this type of temporary works structure, BBII and its Engineering Team arrived at the criteria /(basis of design) described in the attached memo from PB&A. This document was included with BBII's original design submittal; however for this RFI BBII has expanded some of the explanations.

Please review the provided information and confirm whether or not BBII's design criteria is appropriate for the Temporary Access Trestle.

2. As for the design criteria, the fourth sentence of "Exhibit A - Attachment 3" is explicit; "All requirements in the Temporary Bridges Specification in the contract Documents, SECTION 01 53 13, shall apply to the Access Trestle." This would include the requirement in Section 01-53-13 Part 1.3.A.1 (Temporary Bridges - Performance - Design Loads) stating the use of seismic design load for 475 year earthquake (earthquake with 10% probability of being exceeded in 50 years),

3. Among other criteria, wood decking material, "wheel stops, hand rails, special working access, etc listed in the balance of Attachment 3 modify the requirements in Section 01-53-13 and are not contradictory.

4. Attachment 3 does not address crash barriers or lateral bracing, among other criteria, which would defer to section 01-53-13. (Temporary Bridges)

5. PMPC recommends a small group meeting of the constructing parties to discuss the technical details to meet as many requirements as possible for BBI to get approval for Zones 1 and 2 and proceed with the Access Trestle work in a timely manner."

---

**T-0253.1** **BSE - Trestle Design Criteria Follow-Up** **Closed** **11/21/2011** **12/01/2011** **12/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Nhi Tran

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch

**Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0253, Attachment 3 of Exhibit A of the TG03 BSE Bid Package, Specification Section 01 53 13, and attached memo from PB&A

Follow up to RFI T-0253 and the meeting held 11/16/11

As noted in the 11/16/11 meeting, the cross lot bracing "struts" are supported by the Trestle substructure and analysis requires limiting trestle deformations to be

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

If the Access Trestle is designed to resist the full 475 year earthquake design requirement with all response being elastic (R=1), then the Access Trestle system is not subjected to inelastic deformation for the design event. If the design is additionally shown to be capable of sustaining significant overload (no connection failures, no weld failures, no member failures, remaining stable under loading corresponding to at least two times the required design load, or

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

compatible with the allowable strut deflections (approximately 2"). As a result the "push over" analysis as required by the AASHTO Seismic Design Criteria "SDC" (requirement of bridge spec 01 53 13) is not applicable. This was discussed in detail during the 11/16 meeting and it was concurred that due to unique structural configuration and deflection requirements, an alternate analysis method other than the SDC would be required. Discussions were had that a site specific elastic analysis using the 475 year seismic loads that is controlled by the deflection limits of the cross lot bracing would be necessary. Please confirm that a "push over" type analysis of SDC will not be required for the trestle and that the attached detailed Design Criteria (and analysis method) is acceptable.

(W/O added clarification)
BBII believes the site specific analysis would demonstrate the trestle substructure will not deform greater than 2" however the trestle superstructure will deform greater than 2".

corresponding to a ductility demand requiring R=2), then a pushover analysis is not necessary to verify performance. If there are questions raised regarding if this is sufficient, then the response could be demonstration that the system remains fully stable without connection or member failures at a load level corresponding to the deterministic earthquake load corresponding to the maximum event capable of being delivered by the earthquake fault system at the project location. If the design presented is in accordance with the above, then URS would be able to assist with technical engineering discussions to validate this design approach to the City of San Francisco during the building permitting process.

Further clarification: The procurement specification requires an integrated model capturing interaction between the Cross Lot Bracing and the Access Trestle, note the Cross Lot Bracing is not a component against which the trestle reacts but the Cross Slot Bracing delivers load to the Access Trestle. This behavior must be captured with sufficient accuracy and within all project criteria.

If another alternative is proposed that meets all required design criteria at all structure elements, including contractor teams identified maximum allowable deflection of 2 at the Cross Lot Bracing, URS takes no objection to the contractor pursuing this potential design alternative.

---

**T-0254** **BSE - Modified CDSM Installation Plan for Verizon Lines at First St.** **Closed** **10/20/2011** **10/30/2011** **11/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 31 56 13 and attached sketches from PMPC

W/O received the modified CDSM Installation plan for

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

The minimum overlap of columns and panels defined in specification section 31 56 13 shall be satisfied full

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Verizon lines at First St. without the relocation of the lines from PMPC as the attached.
Please confirm the plan is acceptable for CDSM Shoring Wall Designer (ARUP).

depth on each side of the obstruction.

The Contractor's means and methods, e.g., rig type, lowering the Verizon lines and protecting the Verizon lines, have not been reviewed as this is the Contractor's responsibility.

Since the RFI was submitted by the Contractor, we assume that the subcontractor doing the work, DND, has reviewed and approved the proposed methodology, including the "Plate Sealing Detail".

The efficacy the "Plate Sealing Detail" will need to be demonstrated in the field. If used, the plate should be applied to the excavation - face of the steel beam flange rather than behind the flange and removed when it is time to apply the permananent waterproofing.

---

**T-0255** **BSE - Verizon Spacing Requirement on First Street (Phase 2 Utility Installation)** **Closed** **10/21/2011** **10/31/2011** **10/31/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference

BBII have commenced the PG&E Phase 2 installation on First Street, in order to co-ordinate the PG&E utility locations and the future Verizon phase 2 utility indicated on the attached drawing. The attached drawing was issue to BBII in the field, please confirm this drawing has been co-ordinated with the PG&E construction drawings.

BBII require the following:
- Provide a profile/section drawing indicating accurate clearances between PG&E and Verizon,
- Include (Verizon) Trench dimensions, on First Street for the phase 2 installation.
- Site meeting with Verizon representative to discuss Verizon configuration.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Verizon has prepared preliminary design drawings for their Phase II work and is in the process of coordinating with PG&E.

As indicated on RUP Sheet U-4005, the intent of the Phase II utility relocations is such that utilities of different proprietor are to be separated by 1' min.

Coordinate with TJPA's Field Representative (Turner) to arrange a site meeting with Verizon to discuss Verizon's configuration.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0256 | BSE - CR T-018 Design Omissions | Closed | 10/21/2011 | 10/31/2011 | 11/03/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference CR T-018

Neither the original albeit incomplete CR T-018 dated 9/21/11 or the flurry of subsequent email clarifications furnished the following design omissions required to complete the CR T-018:

1. Emergency egress signage requirements?
2. Lighting: Location, lumen, schedule, and if emergency lighting is required?
3. Gates & crash bar requirements?
4. Although the driveway design was not provided until 10/20/11, no dimensions were provided and there are proximity conflict(s) with the fire hydrant relative to the vent & DI.

Please provide and or remove from scope so the contractor may complete the work.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

1. Emergency egress signage is not required by Contractor.

2. Lighting: Relocate the two portable street lights installed under EBi contract and connected overhead to the Streetlight circuit on Natoma as shown on EBi demolition drawing D-1084 (NOTE This circuiting was approved by BLHP (Robert Kawano and Roman Muros BLHP 415 - 554-1688. Light #1 install midway along the north south K Rail fence @ 540 Howard. Light #2 install midway of K Rail fence at 580 Howard. Owners of both properties have installed lighting at their exit doors.

3. Gates and Crashbars are no required at this time - install 10 foot saw horse barricade with signage Private Property - No Trespassing.

4. Driveway curb cut for 540 Howard will be 12 feet wide, with the centerline placed midpoint between the Fire Hydrant and sidewalk fresh air vent. Curb cut per DPW standard.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0257 | BSE - Request to Sonic Caliper 20 feet from Projected Bottom of Rock Socket | Closed | 10/24/2011 | 11/03/2011 | 10/31/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Please address the following information request from BBII's sub contractor Becho Inc.:

"... Becho would like to start performing Sonic Caliper analyses within 20 feet of the projected final bottom elevation of the shaft(s) to expedite the "Drill, Place, Pour" process. In order to continue the Buttress Drilling Operation without interruptions, Becho would like to utilize the hours between 1am - 6am to perform the Sonic Caliper test. For example, if Becho anticipates the completion of shaft at 10am, it would be beneficial to perform the Sonic Caliper test during the hours of 1am - 6am. This allows crews to prep, setup and perform the airlift process without having to wait for Becho engineers

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

George Metzger's response is limited to the first sentence of this RFI which states, "... Becho would like to start performing Sonic Caliper analyses within 20 feet of the projected final bottom elevation of the shaft(s) to expedite the "Drill, Place, Pour" process." Acceptance of permissible work activities between 1am-6am will come in the form of a TJPA Night Noise Permit. Please be sure to include the proposed work activity on the Night Noise Permit application.

---

10/27/2011 - George Metzger

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

to test the shaft(s) during normal hours of operation, thus expediting the "Drill, Place, Pour" process.

Please advise, if it is acceptable.

Arup Response:

This is acceptable.

---

**T-0258** **BSE - Demolition Status of Pile Cap at GL 33.5** **Closed** **10/27/2011** **11/06/2011** **12/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet D-2213 (attached) and Specification Section 02 41 19

The underlined sections of Notes A and B state that pile caps have already been removed. This area clearly includes the pile cap at GL 33.5.
However, Note C implies that the pile cap at GL 33.5 was not removed.

Please confirm that the existing pile caps have already been removed within the "triangle" line boundary shown on drawing D-2213.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Existing pile caps at GL 33.5 have not been removed.
CR to follow

---

**T-0259** **BSE - Request for approval of alternate backfill compaction inspection method** **Closed** **10/31/2011** **11/08/2011** **12/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Masashi Kojima **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 32 12 17

With regard to the areas of non-conforming backfill compaction inspection i.e. FCR #TCB-00246: In lieu of contemporaneous compaction inspection by ISI, BBII has proposed the methodology described in attached letter #4225-000-00238. Please confirm the alternate methodology, assuming acceptable results, would suffice to meet the contract requirements.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The proposed methodology will be evaluated pending receipt of the test results.

Submit test results for review and evaluation.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0260 | BSE - D.I. Installation at Natoma Street and First Street | Closed | 11/01/2011 | 11/11/2011 | 11/08/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Gary Krutsch
**Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic — Eric Zagol
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3012 and attached sketch

BBII carried out an investigation of the active catch basin around the perimeter of the BSE project; and has a concern regarding the street elevation relative to the flow line on Natoma Street between GL 10-17.

The flow line directs surface water in a North East direction towards First Street. The only active catch basin at the intersection of Natoma and First Street is CB #305, which is approximately +8.5" higher than the currently decommissioned CB located at the intersection of Natoma St and First St (see sketch attached).

Noted during the last rain fall, surface water was directed to the decommissioned catch basin at the North East corner of Natoma Street and First Street intersection, BBII recorded approximately 6" of standing rain water accumulating at First Street and Natoma intersection. Please note that existing catch basin was decommissioned during the new sewer installation on First Street (see attached mark up drawing).

BBII recommends 2 options to control rain water from outside the BSE work area:
A) modify the flow line on Natoma Street to direct the flow toward CB # 305,
B) Install a new catch basin and connect it to the existing lateral connection CB # 305 to the combine sewer system, or connect directly to the existing MH.

Please advise on TJPA method to prevent water collecting on First Street.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The referenced decommissioned CB"at the north west corner of Natoma and First streets was to be protected in place per RUP documents.

AECOM understands that the CB was decommissioned by BSE contractor in accordance with D-2230 Detail 1 and not RUP as claimed. D-2230 Detail 1 states (E) sewers, MH(s) and CB(s) are to remain active until construction of (N) CDSM perimeter shoring wall along northern end of site.

The decommissioned CB is within the excavation site. In accordance with the specifications referenced in the Recommendation section (i.e. 011560 STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION, EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL) submit for review storm water control plans indicating contractor's method of addressing storm water entering the site in accordance with 011560 1.4.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0260.1 | BSE - D.I. Installation at Natoma Street and First Street | Closed | 11/28/2011 | 12/08/2011 | 12/02/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP — Nhi Tran
**To:** Turner Construction Compan — Gary Krutsch
**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp — Kevin Chiu
**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. — Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0260 and Sheet U-3012 (attached)

RFI response T-0260 does not address the issue request

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The contractor shall control storm water in accordance with specification 01 15 61 and approved submittals.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

information, to resolve the surface water from outside the BSE project. BBII recommend a catch basin should be installed at the corner of Natoma and First Street, as part of BBII storm water control. The catch basin will need to be installed at the low point of Natoma Street, across from CB #305.

BBII request confirmation and approval to install a catch basin at the above location. Also confirm the lateral from the new catch basin can discharge directly into SSMH#305.

Per field walk by Turner on 12/02/11 and prior to return of this RFI, it was observed that the contractor had installed measures that appear to have resolved this issue.

---

**T-0261** **BSE - Natoma Street Trestle Access** **Closed** **11/01/2011** **11/11/2011** **11/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch

**Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference CR T-018, Specification Section 01 53 13, BBI Letter #4225-000-0145 (attached), and attached sketch

CR T-018 included drawings for access to the side and rear of 540 Howard St. BBII issued letter 4225-000-0145 in response and included a sketch highlighting a conflict between the proposed building access and the Natoma St. trestle offshoot.

The Natoma St. trestle offshoot was originally specified to span from Grid 11.5 at the center of the excavation to Grid 10 at the edge of excavation. The offshoot was moved further west per [W/O] response to the conflict with 530 Howard St.

The 540 Howard St. building access arrangement as proposed in CR T-018 does not provide sufficient access to the Natoma offshoot (see attached sketch). Please provide direction if the offshoot is to be relocated or eliminated.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

W/O shall coordinate the location of the offshoot with its subcontractor(s) such that it does not conflict with other required elements of the project.

If the 540 Howard egress per CR T-018 is an issue, provide W/O's original egress plan (i.e. plan prior to issuance of CR T-018) that was coordinated with the Natoma St offshoot for review.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0262 | BSE - CAD File for trestle/pin pile exclusion zones | Closed | 11/09/2011 | 11/19/2011 | 11/17/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0251.1 and Specification Section 01 53 13

The response to RFI T-0251.1 included a set of sketches showing hatched "exlusion zones" where trestle/pin pile placement is not allowed.
Please provide the CAD file for these sketches for BBII use in coordinating pile locations.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TT Reply:

See attached for requested CAD file for RFI No. T-0262.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0262.1 | BSE - CAD File for Micropile Exclusion Zones | Closed | 05/17/2012 | 05/27/2012 | 05/29/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference:
Specification 31 63 33
RFI T-0262

Please provide the CAD file for Micropile "Exclusion Zones," if they differ from the exclusion zones subjected to RFI # T-262.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The exclusion zones provided in response to RFI T-262 do not apply to micropiles (detail 1/S1 - 3003). Please reference IFB - Below Grade package for coordination of micropile layout and submit micropile design and coordinated layout for review by design team via submittal process per Specifications.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0263 | BSE - Strut Conflicts to Thornton Tomasetti's comments on the approved Internal | Closed | 11/09/2011 | 11/19/2011 | 11/17/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #T-0251.1 and Transmittal No. 140-02329

Subsequent to W/O's receipt of an approved 100% internal bracing submittal and procurement, Thornton Tomasetti's comments in the plans transmitted via Transmittal #140-02329 added both columns & dimensions and revised column configurations relative to the location of the internal bracing struts not otherwise included in the base contract BSE documents. So as W/O may accurately coordinate strut locations in order to mitigate conflicts, please provide the minimum allowable dimension from column to strut.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TT's response to RFI No. T-0263:

This is a means and methods topic. GC to coordinate clearance requirements.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0264 | BSE - Bridge / Trestle Piles in Exclusion Zones | Closed | 11/09/2011 | 11/19/2011 | 11/18/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI#T-0251.1 and Specification Section 01 53 13

BBII is in receipt of the drawings included in RFI T-251.1 that illustrate trestle pile "exclusion zones" where piles cannot penetrate the mat slab. Of the 24 piles that are currently in conflict with the pile exclusion zones, 20 of them can be relocated with relatively minor member changes. The other 4 as indicated in the attached drawings will require significant redesign and re-procurement, especially at the bridges. Can an exception be made at these four locations?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See the attached TT response.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0264.1 | BSE - Beale St Bridge Pile Conflict (Follow up to RFI T-264) | Closed | 01/26/2012 | 02/05/2012 | 02/03/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: BBI Marked-Up SKS-0135, SH-3103

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

The previous response to RFI T-264 requested BBII move one of the Beale St. Bridge piles 3' west to avoid mat slab reinforcing congestion. BBII has investigated this request and found that the cap beam already has a significant cantilever on the east side of the pile in question. In order to comply with the request to move the pile, we would have to extend the cap beam and support it off the CDSM wall as shown on the attached sketch. Please advise if this is acceptable, otherwise the pile will need to remain in its current position.

This cannot be evaluated properly by Arup without more information regarding the loads on the shoring wall. Contractor shall submit calculations for review. Calculations shall include the load, if any, which will be imposed on the shoring wall due to settlement of the bridge supports.

Note that we have not yet seen the calculations and details for the bridge abutments at the north and south ends of the bridges.

---

**T-0264.2** **Beale St Bridge Pile Conflict (Follow up to RFI T-264.1)** **Closed** **02/08/2012** **02/18/2012** **02/16/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The response to RFI T-264.1 requested BBII provide the loading that would placed onto the CDSM wall.
This response leads us to believe that the option to leave the pile in the current location was unacceptable.
Please confirm that the pile must be moved and provide a detailed location of where the pile placement would be accepted.
Upon receipt of this information BBII can accurately determine the load to placed on the Wall for Arup's review.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The bridge pier near 35-E must be relocated. See attached SKS-0179 for acceptable range of pier shift.

---

**T-0264.3** **BSE -Bridge-Trestle Piles in Exclusion Zones Beale St** **Closed** **08/13/2012** **08/23/2012** **08/17/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

W/O in in receipt of RFI response T-0264.2 (Exhibit-A).

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TT will allow the proposed location of the "bent-3" East

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

BBII is purporting any shift of the "bent-3" East pile West will cause excessive bridge cantilevering to the extent the Beale St. bridge must be reconfigured (less the sidewalk) and relocated (East) atop the CDSM wall.

Since the issuance of the TG03 package a third pit for an oil & sand interceptor appears to have been added in room B2761 reference:
1. TG06 4/P1-3006 (Exhibit-B) room B2761 floor plan
2. TG03 1/S1-2027 & C/S1-3004 (Exhibit-C) for original room configuration
3. TG06 1/S1-2057 & 2/S1-3007 (Exhibit-D) for revised room configuration

Please reference marked-up sheet S1-3007 (Exhibit-E). W/O is unaware of why the bridge pile could not be located 12" off the edge of the sump pit as depicted. The corner of the oil & sand interceptor pit which is shallow and could easily be formed, reinforced, and poured after the bridge pile is removed.

Please advise.

pile along grid E as depicted in Exhibit E (pile is east of the sump pit and the edge of pile is 12" from the east face of pit). Note that a pile in this location will require the pile to be cut off at a lower elevation than the typical detail, which will involve a larger block-out. The mat shall be re-braced at the block-out by TG03. Acceptance of this pile location will result in a Change Order for TG06.

---

**T-0265** **BSE - TG03 BSE CDSM Cut-off Wall** **Closed** **11/09/2011** **11/19/2011** **11/17/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Drawings GT-2102, GT-2103, QBD TG0300-0098

Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. (BBII) is planning to start dewatering and excavation without installing cut-off walls and sectionalized dewatering. According to the response for QBD TG0300-0098, BBII can eliminate cut-off walls as their means and methods although contract drawings/specifications indicate cut-off walls.
Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

These cut-off walls were shown on the drawings at the request of the Contractor during preconstruction review. The installation of these, or not, is at the discretion of the Contractor.

Arup has not yet received the dewatering submittal for the mass excavation.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0266 | BSE - Moratorium Conflict With Phase 2 Utilities In 1st Street | Closed | 11/23/2011 | 11/23/2011 | 12/06/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Manuel Saldana **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Jeff Molloy

**REQUEST:**

BBII is in receipt of the moratorium waiver expire date of 12-09-2011. BBII/PEC will not be able to complete the Phase II utility work by 12/9/11 without accelerating the schedule. Our original request for extension was December 19, 2011. A 12/9/11 completion date may be achievable if PEC is allowed to work 10 hr shifts during the day beginning 11/28 through 12/2 as well as working on 12/3 and 12/4. In addition, we propose to have a separate night crew to work near / around the Minna Street intersection to alleviate impacts to heavy demand of day traffic. The majority, if not all, of the demolition can occur during the dday to mitigate noise at night. The night work would need to begin on 11/28 and run through 12/2. Please keep in mind that implenting an accelerated schedule may also impact PG&E. We have no control over their work and the completion of the utlity tie-ins and Mandral testing is contingent on PG&E's availability per the new adjusted completion date.

In summary we are requesting direction for the following items to meet the 12/9/11 moratorium deadline:
1) W/O to permit BBII / PEC to work the extended hours, and night shift i.e. 10 Hours Days and Night work operations,
2) Permit from MTA to extend working hours (closure times) during the day
3) Permit from MTA and DPW to work at night within lane closures
4) Permit from TJPA to work in Zones 1 & 2 at night
5) Agreement / Approval for compensation of additional cost (premium time and or shift rate) BBII will have magnitude of cost for the Monday morning discussion

We respectively request a meeting with W/O on Monday morning (11-28-2011) to discuss direction regarding the above items.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Holiday Moratorium waiver is extended to 12/21/11 by SFMTA. BBII/PEC work can continue on day shift Monday-Friday in accord with SFMTA Special Traffic Permit 11-7786 issued on 12/2/11.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0269 | BSE - Mass Excavation Pile Extraction Clarification | Closed | 12/13/2011 | 12/23/2011 | 12/27/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Dean Wallahan

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Reference: 31 00 00 1.4 C.2 and Attached Sketch

31 00 00 1.4.C.2 Pile Extraction - To occur in two (2) stages per Zone.
Stage 1 extraction will remove the piles within the footprint of the trestle the middle 60' of the work zone, dewatering wells and piles that are in conflict with the bracing pin pile locations. Piles will be removed using a non ground deformation control method and be removed full length to be utilized for offsite LEED projects and to help achieve sustainability for this material.
Trestle piles will be installed after Stage 1 pile extraction and concurrently with Stage 2 pile extraction.

Stage 2 extraction will remove the piles within the 50' +- area adjacent to the CDSM walls along A and J lines. Piles will be extracted using a ground deformation control method as per Section 02 41 19 - 3.1.B of the specifications utilizing both casing and backfilling of the void or removal by means of cutting the pile off at the grade of each level of excavation as the work proceeds.
Please reference the attached drawing for details of the above procedure.

The 80 Natoma shoring wall will be removed in stages coinciding with the stages of excavation.

Please confirm this method of pile extraction during mass excavation is acceptable.

ARUP Response:

The method described is not in accordance with the Contract Documents which require the existing piles to be removed using Ground Deformation Control Methods (as defined in 02 41 19) except where Non-Ground Deformation Control Methods are allowed and noted as such on the drawings.

The method described is acceptable with the following notes: this is acceptable for timber piles only, and if they are longer than 30 feet, Arup may re-evaluate the methods used. If the density of existing piles exceeds 30 piles per 1000 square feet, Arup may re-evaluate the methods used. If excessive ground movements are observed, the Contractor shall switch to using a Ground Deformation Control Method.

---

**T-0269.1** **BSE - Zone 2 Free Pull Pile Extraction Test Section** **Closed** **01/25/2012** **02/04/2012** **02/07/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

BBII are proposing to perform "free pull" pile extraction on a 'test section' in Zone 2. The proposed piles will be extracted near GL14, close to CDSM wall on the south side using a 'non ground deformation control

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

method' by free pulling each pile without using steel casing. Any movement that may occur in the CDSM wall will be monitored by the inclinometer located close to GL 14. This test section will give us give us the information we need to determine:
1) If free pulling the piles using a non ground deformation control method affects the CDSM wall by causing movement.

Reference: DD-2211

W/O Note: W/O understands this RFI is the result of ongoing conversations between BBII, ARUP, & PMPC. W/O remains concerned that should the CDSM wall experience movement, the use of the 'Free Pull' method beneath or outside the trestle area, would significantly increase the difficulty in determining the cause of the CDSM wall movement.
2) If it is a suitable method to adopt for removing the remainder of the piles in Zone 2 located outside the trestle area.
The attached drawing (D-2211) conveys the test section in red.
Please advise on the suitability of this test to determine if free pulling can be used outside the trestle zone.

Contractor to provide details of the instrumentation that will be installed by the Contractor to demonstrate compliance with Minimal Ground Loss defined in 02 41 19 3.2 G.

Arup's response to RFI 269 continues to be our position regarding pile removal during mass excavation

---

**T-0269.2** **BSE - Zone 2 Free Pull Pile Extraction Test Section** **Closed** **05/01/2012** **05/11/2012** **05/04/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: BBII 4/30/12 Ground Deformation Control Drawing

BBII are proposing to perform "free pull" pile extraction on a "test section" in Zone 2. The proposed piles will be extracted near GL14, close to CDSM wall on the north side using a "non ground deformation control method" by free pulling each pile without using steel casing. Inclinometer (I-011) located close to GL 14 will be monitored during the test. This test section will give the

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The test set-up and monitoring are acceptable. Since they differ from that used in the area of the buttress, Arup will draw conclusions on the suitability of free pulling outside the trestle zone after we evaluate the test results.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

information needed to determine:
1) If free pulling the piles using a non ground deformation control method affects the CDSM wall by causing movement.
2) If it is a suitable method to adopt for removing the remainder of the piles in Zone 2 located outside the "trestle area".

The attached drawing conveys the test section in green. Please advise on the suitability of this test to determine if free pulling can be used outside the trestle zone.

---

**T-0269.3** **BSE - Zone 2 Pile Extraction Test Section** **Closed** **06/15/2012** **06/25/2012** **06/21/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

BBII completed the timber pile extraction test section in zone 2 on 06/12/2012. Based on the data recorded by ARUP inclinometers, please advise if BBII can continue with the timber pile extraction in Zone 2 using non ground deformation control methods ("free pull').

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See attachmed memo for Arup's review of the Contractor's test program and proposed method of removing piles, and actions required by the Contractor going forward.

---

**T-0270** **BSE - Clarification for Existing Ground Water Elevation** **Closed** **12/28/2011** **01/07/2012** **12/30/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields **To:** Arup Kevin Clinch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Jeff Molloy

**REQUEST:**

Reference: 31-23-29 and Attached Document

As discussed during the meeting on 12/22/11, to help obtain an accurate dewatering model, BBII is requesting the recent piezometer data for Zones 1 and 2. In addition, BBII has reviewed the data for piezometers 1182, 1229 and 1255 located adjacent to 301 Mission St (see attachment) and would like to clarify the initial ground water level to use in the model for Zone 4. Based on our review, the existing natural groundwater condition fluctuates between 1.6 E.L

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Available piezometer data for zone 1 and 2 has been recently transmitted through an email to Turner dated 12/28/2011.

The baseline water level for piezo P-06F (aka 1262) is +1.6 ft NAVD88.

The baseline water level for piezo P-06MS (aka 1182) is +1.1 ft NAVD88.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

and -8.1 E.L in this area. BBII would like to agree upon a starting groundwater elevation of -5.0 E.L for Zone 4.
Also, BBII would like clarification as to the base groundwater level to use for Zones 1, 2 and 3 based on the
project data.

The baseline water level for piezo P-07MS (aka 1229) is +1.0 ft NAVD88.

Additional baseline data will need to be collected in the piezometers in Zone 1 and 2 prior to establishing a baseline datum.

---

**T-0271** **BSE - CRT-021 Gate Fence Clarifications** **Closed** **01/05/2012** **01/05/2012** **01/10/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gwynne Powell **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:** Turner Construction Company Jack Adams

**REQUEST:**

In regards to the Proposed Driveway shown on the CRT#021 drawing and outlined in Bullets #1 and #2 in the Scope of Work, please clarify the following:

-Per the location of the 18ft Gate, a 10ft fence would need to be constructed to connect the existing 9ft tall fence to the Proposed Driveway gate location (see 1/4/12 Photo attached). Please confirm the 10ft fence should be included in this CRT-021.
-Should the 24'-10" section of the existing 6ft tall fence (see 1/4/12 Photo attached) be replaced?

Confirm Howard St shown on the CRT#021 attached drawing should read "Folsom St"

Confirm that Bullet #3 under the "Scope of Work" refers to Gate #1 in the CRT#021 attached drawing.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Proposed Driveway, Gate and Fence shown on the CRT#021 drawing:

-Not Confirmed. The location of new gate and curb cut is where the Contractor is currently driving trucks and equipment over city sidewalk and curb north of this light pole. Contractor has misinterpreted the locations of curb cut and gate provided by TJPA. The location of proposed driveway curb cut and new gate is to be north of existing light pole as shown - dimensions were provided only as guidance.

- Confirmed the added fence cost should be included in this CR T-021. Contractor to add small section of fence as required to install new gate (fence added both north and south side of gate). Fence can be nine foot and align with top of existing Parcel P'-P" fence and/or step down to align with existing 6 foot fence. Note: green slats are to be eliminated at both gate and fence in this area to assist Truck Drivers and pedestrian vision.

-Not Confirmed. Section of the existing 6ft tall fence up to AC Transit Fence corner is acceptable as is.

- Confirmed. "Howard St" shown on the CRT#021

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

attached drawing should read "Folsom St" .

- Confirmed. Bullet #3 under the "Scope of Work" refers to "Current Driveway" Gate #1 in the CRT#021 attached drawing

---

**T-0272** **BSE - D1 Casing Recovery Inquiries** **Closed** **01/27/2012** **02/02/2012** **01/27/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Arup Kevin Clinch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

BBII is requesting the following to complete its D1 casing retrieval plan:
1. Condition specific engineering calculations to mitigate earth and water heave from the bottom of the casing.
2. Condition specific engineering calculations to substantiate no casing buckling.
3. Condition specific plan engineering calculations for dewatering, specifically expected water quantity.

Note - This RFI is high priority and an expedited review/response is necessary.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

NOTE: Void. Answered in RFI T-0272.1

ARUP Response:

Arup is in receipt of the Contractor's Buttress Shaft D1 Casing Retrieval Plan (Constructware Transmittal item 140-03134). Designing and executing the plan to retrieve the casing is the Contractor's responsibility. The Contractor shall provide calculations for Arup to review which demonstrate that the method does not lead to ground loss beneath and around the casing. Arup will not provide calculations in support of the Contractor's plan.

1. Arup cannot comment without a more complete plan that includes the methodology by which they intend to retrieve the casing. The plan should include, but not be limited to, the current height and composition of the soil plug in the shaft, the planned height and composition of the soil plug during the retrieval process, the depth of maximum dewatering, the method by which the shaft will be backfilled upon retrieval of the casing, and the measures they will take to monitor heave at the plug.

2. Arup will not perform these calculations. The Plan (Constructware Transmittal item 140-03134) states that calculations are being prepared.

3. Refer to response to question 1.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Answered by Kevin Clinch (ARUP)
01/27/2012

---

**T-0272.1** **BSE - D1 Casing Recovery Inquiries** **Closed** **01/27/2012** **02/06/2012** **01/27/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen **To:** Arup Kevin Clinch **Answered By:** Arup Kevin Clinch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

BBII is requesting the following to complete its D1 casing retrieval plan:
1. Condition specific engineering calculations to mitigate earth and water heave from the bottom of the casing.
2. Condition specific engineering calculations to substantiate no casing buckling.
3. Condition specific plan engineering calculations for dewatering, specifically expected water quantity.

Note - This RFI is high priority and an expedited review/response is necessary.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Arup is in receipt of the Contractor's Buttress Shaft D1 Casing Retrieval Plan (Constructware Transmittal item 140-03134). Designing and executing the plan to retrieve the casing is the Contractor's responsibility. The Contractor shall provide calculations for Arup to review which demonstrate that the method does not lead to ground loss beneath and around the casing. Arup will not provide calculations in support of the Contractor's plan.

1. Arup cannot comment without a more complete plan that includes the methodology by which they intend to retrieve the casing. The plan should include, but not be limited to, the current height and composition of the soil plug in the shaft, the planned height and composition of the soil plug during the retrieval process, the depth of maximum dewatering, the method by which the shaft will be backfilled upon retrieval of the casing, and the measures they will take to monitor heave at the plug.

2. Arup will not perform these calculations. The Plan (Constructware Transmittal item 140-03134) states that calculations are being prepared.

3. Refer to response to question 1.

Answered by Kevin Clinch (ARUP)
01/27/2012

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0273 | BSE - Clarification for Driveway Desgin at 540 Howard CR -018R2 | Closed | 01/30/2012 | 02/09/2012 | 02/06/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached BBI Sketch
CRT-018Rl directs BBII to complete a 12ft driveway at the 540 Howard Street. The existing conditions/location of the curb, USPS facilities and water fire hydrant prevents the driveway from being installed within compliance with the DPW and ADA standards.
DPW/Tumer/W/0 and BBII discussed various solutions to bring the driveway into confmmance with ADA and DPW standards at the field meeting held on January 17th 2012 and again 01/24//2012.
Pursuant to the field meeting and direction of CRT-018R2, BBII is requesting detailed plans to allow for construction of a compliant driveway at 540 Howard Street. BBII has been directed in the field by W /0/Tumer, to complete modification to the driveway at 540 Howard Street. Per our field meeting please refer to the attached drawing, indicating BBII understanding on the modifications required.
Please confirm the modification per the attached drawing is compliant with City and ADA driveway standards.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per Alberto Herrera of DPW, Mike Pavich of BSM, and Pete Arnautoff of BFP, the proposed modification is acceptable. See (2) linked documents for the full breadth of their responses.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0274 | BSE - Conflict between CDSM & Dewatering specification | Closed | 02/10/2012 | 02/20/2012 | 02/16/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Arup Kevin Clinch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Section 31 56 13.3.12.F.1 states "The performance of the shoring wall shall be such that the groundwater levels around the excavation are maintained within (3.0) feet from the pre-excavation levels." The section further states "In the event the water levels begin to drop below the specified limit, the Contractor shall be responsible to implement appropriate measures to control groundwater levels within the specified limits."

Section 31 23 19.1.5.B.10 states "Include description of emergency procedures to follow when system failure or other problems arise."

In the event the CDSM wall fails to mitigate the effects of

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Recharing wells may be used at the Contractor's discretion pending Arup's review of the well details.

These wells shall be at no additional cost to the TJPA

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

the dewatering within the excavation should not previously drilled recharge wells be ready to recharge the affected area outside the excavation?

---

**T-0275** **BSE - Request for relief from 1" deep dimension of CDSM cavities** **Closed** **02/15/2012** **02/25/2012** **02/16/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Section 31 00 00.3.8.L states
"On vertical surfaces of CDSM shoring walls, scarify high areas and fill in cavities exceeding 1" deep with patching cement to provide a reasonably uniform surface over which protection board, installed in a later contract, will span without buckling."
The trade subcontractor is seeking relief from the 1" deep requirement. Please advise as to:
1. Acceptance.
2. Revised dimension.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

This RFI does not comply with the RFI definition in Spec 00 07 00 Section 6.02. WOJV must comply with Spec 31 00 00 Section 3.8.L.

---

**T-0275.1** **BSE - Request for relief from 1" deep dimension of CDSM** **Closed** **02/16/2012** **02/26/2012** **02/17/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Section 31 00 00.3.8.L states
"On vertical surfaces of CDSM shoring walls, scarify high areas and fill in cavities exceeding 1" deep with patching cement to provide a reasonably uniform surface over which protection board, installed in a later contract, will span without buckling."
The trade subcontractor is seeking relief from the 1" deep requirement. Please advise as to:
1. Acceptance.
2. Revised dimension.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

WOJV must comply with Spec 31 00 00 Section 3.8.L.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0276 | BSE - Request to Change Buttress Concrete Slump Requirements | Closed | 02/16/2012 | 02/26/2012 | 02/17/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Emre Erzen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Arup Kevin Clinch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: 31 63 29

Currently, the primary and the secondary shafts utilize a superplasticizer to achieve slump as the water content of the mixes is low. Typically, mixes that utilize a superplasticizer are intended for slump ranges between 9" and 12," however, project specifications require an 8" +/- 1" slump. Unfortunately, the addition of the superplasticizer has made it difficult to achieve slump as specified. BBII and Central Concrete are requesting an 8" + 1" - 2" slump (giving a range of 6" to 9") in lieu of the specified 8" +/- 1". There will be no adverse effect to the strength as slump is achieved through chemical admixtures and not by adding water. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

This is acceptable.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0277 | BSE - Request for Buttress Shaft Design Documentation | Closed | 02/16/2012 | 02/26/2012 | 02/23/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Emre Erzen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please address the following information request from BBII's sub contractor Becho Inc.:
" ... Becho requests to obtain all and any documentation used in the design ofthe Buttress Shafts. Documentation should include, but is not limited to, submitted and approved calculations, sketches, preliminary designs and calculations, conceptual drawings, all site investigation, and all other work documents and ·work papers that were utilized to develop the buttress shaft design in addition to ·what's provided in the contract documents and specifications. "

Please advise, if it is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The request for documents contained in this RFI is rejected as overly broad, burdensome and seemingly unrelated to any legitimate enquiry relating to the contract or the required work. This is not the proper use of an RFI.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0277.1 | BSE - Becho's 2nd Request for Buttress Design Doc | Closed | 03/23/2012 | 04/02/2012 | 03/28/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Becho requests to obtain all work documents, sketches, preliminary calculations and approved calculations which show how the designer arrived the final skin friction values used in the design of the buttress shafts as well as the buttress shafts minimum 10 feet embedment into bedrock.

Per the TJPA, refer to response given in RFI T-0277.

---

**T-0277.2** **BSE - Request for Buttress Shaft Design Documentation** **Closed** **04/04/2012** **04/14/2012** **04/11/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Douglas Jacobson

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per the agreement at the 4/4/12 TCCO Progress Meeting BSE Buttress Shoring and Excavation please find Becho's Request for additional design documentation below:

Becho is in receipt of RFI # T-0277.1 regarding the Buttress Shaft Design Documentation. As per the TJPA response, Becho more specifically requests the Reference Shoring Design work documents pertinent to zone 4.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

We are able to reply to a more specific information request. Per Contract Spec 00 03 20 - GEOTECHNICAL DATA, sections 1.2 A.1 and 1.3 A.1 and A.2, three documents (listed below) are available for the Contractor to review. Please specify which report is requested.

00 03 20 1.2 A.1 Transbay Transit Center, Final Geotechnical Data Report, Volumes 1, 2, and 3. Transbay Joint Powers Authority. Prepared by Arup North America Limited, February 2010.

00 03 20 1.3 A.1 Final Report, Results of Prototype Test Program, Installation of Shoring Walls Using the Cement Deep Soil Mixing Method. Transbay Transit Center, Prepared by Arup North America Limited, May 2010.

00 03 20 1.3 A.2 Final Report, Results of Prototype Test Program and Monitoring during Construction of Drilled Shafts. Transbay Transit Center, Prepared by Arup North America Limited, May 2010.

---

**T-0278** **BSE - Access Trestle Bump Out Coordination** **Closed** **02/16/2012** **02/26/2012** **02/24/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Arup Kevin Clinch

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Attached BII Sketch
Due to the deletion of the "Natoma Finger" portion of the access trustle BBII is proposing to install additional "bump outs" (per the attached sketch). For coordination purposes, please provide "no fly" zone information for these locations.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Arup understands that the design team's response to RFI-251.1 shows the "no-fly-zones". Contractor shall refer to the RFI-251.1 response for this information. Regarding the addition of the "bumpouts", Arup will review the geotechnical aspects of the revised design when they are submitted.

---

**T-0279** **BSE - Trestle Welding Code Compatibility** **Closed** **02/27/2012** **03/08/2012** **03/20/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference:
ASHTO/AWSS D1.5M/D1.5:2008
SH-0200

The Temporary Access Trestle Design submitted in December specified AWS 01.1 as the required welding code. During the review process the reviewers requested that the welding code be changed to AWS 01.5- Bridge Welding Code. This request was complied with by revising general note A5.2 on the conformed trestle drawings.

Since issuing these documents, BBII has been informed by both our shop and field welding inspectors that a compatibility discrepancy exists between the 01.5 welding code and base metals/ member shapes originally specified in the trestle design.

D1.5 is specifically intended for use on bridges and it is not intended for use on "structures composed of structural tubing" as noted in section 1.1.1 attached. This causes a discrepancy because unlike most bridges, our trestle contains a substructure completely comprised of structural steel tubing. (ie Pipe pile, lateral and longitudinal X-bracing).

In addition to the pipe incompatibility, there is also an incompatibility between the specified base metals. 01.5 requires base metals to be ASTM A709 and the trestle design specified a variety of different base

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

URS Response to RFI No. T-0279 Trestle Welding Code Compatibility:

A series of typographic errors occur within the RFI, referencing the AWS documents D1.1 and D1.5 as 01.1 or 01.5. References to AWS documents should be correctly identified by the correct AWS document numbers to avoid any future confusion within the project documentation. This RFI should be corrected or annotated to reflect these typographic errors.

No exception has been taken to use tubular steel elements as components within the trestle structures.

Note AWS D1.5 section 1.2.2 Approved Base Metals: This AWS section provides a list of approved base metals, and prefaces this with Unless otherwise specified, and furthermore specifically states Other steels may be approved by the Engineer. We understand other steels have been recommended for approval by the Engineer (EOR = Pirooz Barar of PB&A) as they are included for use in the set of contract drawings for the Access Trestle. With the recommendation by the EOR and concurrence by the Peer Reviewer that the base metals proposed for use are suitable for the intended usage including an assessment of fatigue and potential for cracking of welding for the required service loading an service life, URS takes no exception to the use of the alternate base metals.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

metals depending on their structural shape as shown in general note 2.28 also attached
Since Article 1.1.1 of 01.5 permits the Engineer to choose to reference an alternate applicable welding standard when fabrication or structure components are not specifically addressed within its sections, BBII proposes keeping AWS 01.1 as the specified welding code because of its base metal compatibility, but adding a supplemental trestle specific welding specification written by the EOR that increases the quality control to a level equal to that of 01.5. This supplemental specification will include applicable portions of 01.5 section 3 "Workmanship" and section 3 "Inspection" when the requirements are greater than that of 01.1. (ie: fit-up tolerances, NOT frequency, etc).

Please advise if the proposed resolution is acceptable. Upon concurrence, BBII will submit the EOR's Trestle Welding specification for review.

Use of AWS D1.5 is a requirement of the procurement specification, not simply a request made by technical reviewers. Reference 01 53 13 Rev 1.

Where materials within the trestle structure are not addressed by AWS D1.5, then use of AWS D1.1 is approved for connection of these elements where D1.5 is not applicable as follows:

Where preapproved joint geometry for welding is required, geometry in accordance with preapproved welding procedures per AWS D1.1 are approved for use;

Provide all inspections for AWS D1.1 elements in accordance with all requirements of AWS D1.1;

Where an element that is addressed by AWS D1.5 is connected to an element governed by AWS D1.1 (for example, plate to structural tube), the most stringent inspection requirements of AWS D1.1 vs. AWS D1.5 shall be provided; and,

Minimum and maximum fillet weld sizes and other requirements applicable to fillet welding per AWS D1.5 shall apply to all fillet welding irrespective of the base metal to which welding is applied.

Use of a supplemental welding specification in place of use of AWS D1.5 is not acceptable. Provide full compliance with AWS D1.5 for all procedures and inspections except where AWS D1.1 has been approved for use per the notes above.

---

**T-0279.1** **BSE - Trestle Welding Code Compatibility** **Closed** **03/28/2012** **04/07/2012** **04/09/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference:
BBII Demarcation Sketch

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Use of AWS D1.1 and AWS D1.5 for superstructure and substructure as indicated on bridge cross section

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

PB&A Trestle Welding Inspection Plan

The response to RFI T-279 provided a method of dealing with the trestle welding code compatibility issues that would be difficult to enforce, track and document. BBII proposes making a clear demarcation line at the bottom the cap beam that will clearly differentiate the two welding codes.

Additionally the RFI response appears to infer that the Temporary Bridge Specification 01-53-13 requires full compliance with AWS D1.5 as described in the third and last paragraph. 01-53-13 Paragraph 1.6.H (revB) only requires Welding Qualifications (procedures and personnel) to be performed in accordance with AWS D1.5.

Therefore in order to comply with the project specifications and the appropriate welding codes, BBII will Perform all welding below the demarcation line (substructure) with weld procedures and welder qualifications in conformance with AWS D1.1 since the members are predominately comprised of tubular material.

Perform all welding above the demarcation line (superstructure) with weld procedures and welder qualifications conformance with AWS D1.5 since the main members are Wide flange beam.

Inspection will be performed by the project special inspector in accordance with recommendations of the EOR attached.

Please confirm this is acceptable.

figure prepared by BBII and attached to this RFI No. T-0279.1 is acceptable.

Submission of the Trestle Welding Inspection Plan (by PB&A and attached to this RFI No. T-0279.1) for review and acceptance via the RFI process is not an acceptable method, therefore we have no comment on it.

For clarity we respond to the welding inspection plan with the following: All requirements, including inspection, of AWS D1.1 apply to AWS D1.1 areas. All requirements, including inspection, of AWS D1.5 apply to AWS D1.5 areas.

---

**T-0280** **BSE - Request to shorten depth on shaft D/1** **Closed** **02/29/2012** **03/10/2012** **03/02/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref - Attached RFI from BBI/Becho

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:
Earlier discussions regarding the consideration of

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Due to the blowout conditions previously encountered on Buttress Shaft D1, BECHO requests to install Shaft D1 to a depth of 180 feet as previously proposed by ARUP. BECHO believes the blowout condition still exists and thus would like to proceed with caution to prevent another occurrence. Alternatively, if ARUP feels this is no longer an option, BECHO requests that ARUP increase the maximum spacing allowed between the tangent shafts, in event to mitigate possible schedule delay, and/or re-break of casing while advancing D1. By allowing such changes will help mitigate Buttress shaft schedule.

W/O acknowledges that BBII has yet to demonstrate that a "blowout" condition has in fact occurred. W/O would request the design team consider short pouring D-1 due to drilling difficulties encountered. Alternatively, W/O would request the spacing revision described above.

shortening shaft D-1 was based on having E-1 and E-2 in place to depth and abandoning the casing at D-1 beneath the sheared break. Shafts E-1 and E-2 are not complete and the casing has been painstakingly removed, therefore shaft D-1 shall be installed in accordance with the Contract Documents.

The Contractor shall submit a proposal for achieving the increased spacing that acknowledges the fixed distance between shaft rows C and M which were established based on RFI 151.

---

**T-0281** **BSE - Survey Site Drawing and Certificate Submittal** **Closed** **03/06/2012** **03/16/2012** **03/09/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Danny Walsh **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

BBIII is unclear on what is required for the "site drawing and certificate" submittal listed in section 01 10 50 1.3B. As the first contractor working on the construction of the terminal, no previous work is in place. Please confirm that the requirement is intended for future trade packages (to verify the work already completed by previous trade subcontractors), or provide additional clarification on what is required of BBII to complete this submittal requirement.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The Contractor with certification of the GC's surveyor is to provide items specified in Division 01 10 50 1.3B for the purpose noted in the specification: to certify "the elevations and locations of the Work are in conformance with Contract Documents".

---

**T-0282** **BSE - News/Advertisement Stand Removal** **Closed** **03/16/2012** **03/26/2012** **03/19/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The unused news/advertisement stand on the Westside of Fremont Street needs to be removed to accommodate the

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per Jack Adams of Turner, at no cost to the owner the Contractor may remove the news/advertisement stand

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Buttress drilling on shafts A & B. BBII intends to modify the sidewalk at this current location to provide 3 - 11ft lanes on Fremont Street per specification section 01-15-70. (see attached sketch)

Please provide direction to relocate or remove these stands.

and store in Parcel M

---

**T-0283** **BSE - Backfill Material For Pre-Trench** **Closed** **03/15/2012** **03/25/2012** **03/20/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Jeff Molloy **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference:
Proposed 1 sack sand mix design

BBII is not able to achieve the required compaction per SFDPW requirements due to inclement weather conditions. We have been advised from suppliers that the sand backfill material is saturated, and from past experience will not achieve the required compaction.

If the weather persists as forcasted BBII is proposing to backfill with 1 sack sand as a substitute to dry material. This will allow us to maintain the scheduled CDSM wall installation on 3/23/2012, and maintain the DPW compaction standards. Note sand slurry is only required in the street or public right of way.

Note: According to BBII this will not impact DND/Malcolm in the installation of the CDSM wall.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

BBII has requested use of sack sand slurry mix design FOA100CX. This use of sand/slurry is specified in Section 31 23 10, 2.2, H of the utility relocation spec. See also RFI U-0156.

This use is acceptable per SFDPW requirements due to inclement weather conditions. Also, this use of slurry is important for the upcoming CDSM wall at the pretrench locations. Per correspondence attached from Webcor-Obayashi the CM/GC, they state that their Trade Subcontractor "BBII has considered and coordinated with DND/Malcolm in this regard." (see uploaded document under 'Supporting Documents')

Substituting this slurry versus soils compaction and testing is acceptable. However this sand slurry use is a Contractor scheduling decision and will be at no additional cost to the TJPA from WOJV, BBII, and/or Malcolm-DND.

---

**T-0283.1** **BSE - Backfill for Pretrenching** **Closed** **03/29/2012** **04/08/2012** **03/30/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

As a supplement to RFI 283 regarding the use of a CDF mix for backfill of the pre-trench at A-line across First Street, BBII is submitting the attached mix design for review and acceptance. The previously submitted mix design was not pumpable and due to the nature of the pile extraction and backfill operation a pumpable mix is required so backfill compaction can be achieved. The attached mix will allow us to achieve the DPW compaction requirements and also allow for the installation of the CDSM wall.

The use of this mix design is scheduled for this afternoon in order to maintain the CDSM installation schedule for this weekend. BBII would much appreciate an expedited review and acceptance of this mix design.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

CDF mix for backfill of the CDSM pre-trench locations is acceptable. CM/GC Webcor-Obayashi to confirm with their Trade Subcontractor such that "BBII has considered and coordinated with DND/Malcolm in this regard.

Substituting this mix versus soils compaction and testing is acceptable for the upcoming CDSM walls at the pretrench locations First and Fremont Streets.

However, again this use is a Contractor scheduling decision and will be at no additional cost to the TJPA from WOJV, BBII, and/or Malcolm-DND

---

**T-0284** **BSE - Request to Borehole Coordinates TTB-07 TTB-09** **Closed** **03/21/2012** **03/31/2012** **03/23/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

After further review of the Geotechnical Report produced by ARUP it has come to BECHO's attention that Boreholes TTB-07 and TTB-09 were not surveyed. BECHO respectfully requests to obtain Northing and Easting coordinates for TTB-07 and TTB-09.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

These boreholes were not surveyed. The approximate coordinates are listed in Table 3 in the Geotechnical Data Report.

---

**T-0285** **BSE - Buttress Rebar Cage Length Adjustment** **Closed** **03/21/2012** **03/31/2012** **03/26/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please refer to RFI T-0252, where the Engineer accepted BBII's proposal of fabricating the buttress rebar cages to a pre-extended length of 260' in order to accommodate the buttress shafts that are deeper than 241'. In RFI T-0252, BBII had suggested to extend the overall length of all rebar cage assemblies to 260' by increasing the length of the top "setting cage" 19 feet more. In this proposal, the

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Detail 12/GT-5201 requires the reinforcing steel to be placed up to 1'-0" below the top of the concrete. The top of concrete is shown on GT-5201. Longitudinal bar extensions shall be spliced as needed to achieve this, or the cage shall be fabricated long to achieve this. However, if the top of the fabricated cage is within 9'-0" of the top of the concrete, no bar extensions nor

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

lengths of structural cage segments were to remain unchanged.

BBII's proposal of extending the length of the setting cage by 19' got accepted with the added requirement of splicing vertical rebar extensions on the job site. BBII takes exception to the added requirement of splicihg vertical rebar extensions on the job site, which would lead to an increase in durations of the rebar cage installations.

In order to eliminate splicing, BBII now proposes to fabricate the setting cage segments up to 9 feet longer than shown on the plans. The structural rebar cage segment lengths will remain unchanged. The top of the structural cage sections will be within up to 9 feet proximity from the top of concrete. This proposal will accommodate the rebar cages with a maximum total length of 250' (241 '+9'=250').

If the rebar cage assembly needs to be longer than 250 feet, BBII will direct the rebar cage manufacturer to also extend the bottom structural cage segment by an added distance equal to the required total length of the rebar cage assembly less 250 feet.

extended cages are required.

---

**T-0286** **BSE - Use of Actual Utility Weights** **Closed** **03/26/2012** **04/05/2012** **03/29/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Douglas Jacobson

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference:
Marked-Up SH-3101
Marked-Up SH-3102
Utility Weight Calculations
PG&E Weights Email
Verizon Weights Email

Temporary Bridge specification 01-53-13 (1.3B) requires the bridge design to include a 3000 lb/lf allowance for hanging utilities below the bridge. Extensive coordination between the RUP designers and the utility owners, BBII has attained the exact location and actual weight of the

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Reply to RFI 286.0 Use of actual utility loads versus 3000lb per lf in Specifications

RFI T-0286.0 regarding the use of actual weight of utilities versus the nominal 3000 lb/lf required in Specification Section 01-53-13 Part 1.3.B (Temporary Bridges - Performance Requirements) first requires the correct actual weight of the utilities and the application to each of the streets, First, Fremont, and Beale respectively..

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

utilities to be supported by the bridge structures. These weights are shown in the attached document and have been used in the design of the bridge structure as well as the utility hangers. Through our coordination efforts we also know that future utilities will not be added until the temporary bridges are removed. Please confirm that use of the actual utility weights in our design is acceptable.

First Street Utility Unit Weights

The BBI/PBA temporary bridge design for First Street shows the following utilities suspended from the bridge:

Girder #3 & Girder #4 (Counting from left to right facing north)

PG&E (6) each 6" diameter steel ducts (17.7 lb/lf) + cable (8.2 lb/lf) @ 25.9lb/lf = 155.4 lb/lf under 2 girders #3 & #4 (counting left to right)
Girder #5 & Girder #6 (Counting from left to right facing north)

PG&E (9) each 6" diameter steel ducts @ 25.9lb/lf = 233.1 lb/lf under 2 girders #5 & #6)
PG&E (1) each 4" diameter steel duct @ 25.9lb/lf = 25.9 lb/lf under 2 girders #5 & #6)
Verizon (6) each 4" diameter steel duct @ 11.59lb/lf = 69.54 lb/lf under 2 girders #5 & #6
Subtotal utility load used by BBI/PBA for girders #3 & #4 = 155.4 lb/lf

Subtotal utility load used by BBI/PBA for girders #5 &#6 = 328.54 lb/lf

Total utility load used by BBI/PBA for all girders #3~#6 = 483.94 lb/lf

There are several slight errors in this BBI/PBA calculation:

Verizon has incorrectly used the weight of 4" diameter PVC duct rather than steel duct used in the temporary bridge crossing (4" diameter steel @ 10.3lb/lf duct + 3lb/lf fiber cable x 6 each lines = 6ea x 13.3 lb/lf = 79.8 lb/lf versus 69.54 lb/lf)

PG & E weight for 6" diameter steel duct is slightly less than the weight for 6" diameter pile Schedule 40 (17.7lb/lf versus 18.4 lb/lf x 15 ducts = 0.7 x 15 = 10.5 lb/lf differential)

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Total differential = 10.5 lb/lf + (79.8 - 69.5) = 10.5 lb/lf + 10.3 lb per lf = 20.8lb/lf

Corrected Utility weight = 483.9 lb /lf + 20.8 lb/lf = 505 lb/lf

This small differential weight is unlikely to have a major impact on the temporary bridge design based on the capacity/demand ratios calculated by the Engineer of Record.

AASHTO Section 1.1.1 (General Provisions - Design Analysis) states:

"When these Specifications provide for empirical formulae, alternate rational analysis, based on theories or tests and accepted by the authority having jurisdiction, will be considered as compliance with these Specifications".

Based on AASHTO Section 1.1.1 (General Provisions - Design Analysis) the use of actual utility loads now known rather than the provisional 3000 lb/lf loading stated in Specification 01-53-13 Part 1.3.B is acceptable with the following provisions:

Contractor accepts responsibility for the statement regarding the City plans not to install any additional utilities in the bridge streets until the below grade structure is completed and the streets are restored.

BBI's Engineer of Record (PBA) has calculated the Demand over Capacity ratio is a minimum of 47% (2:1 Safety Factor) for the crane girders and the other girders Demand over Capacity ratio is 67% (Safety Factor 1.5:1)

---

**T-0287** **BSE - Drain Inlet at the Northwest Corner of Minna and First street** **Closed** **04/04/2012** **04/14/2012** **04/12/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Shad Gardner **To:** **Answered By:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch — URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference:
TG0300-210.1
TG0300-205.2
City Planning/KCA Emails

In order to comply with city standards BBII intended to install a standard city drain inlet on the north west corner of the Minna and First street intersection as required by our site civil drainage plan (submittal TG0300-205.2, TZ1030-01513A08.2 see also submittal TZ1030-015313A04.1 package TG0300-210.1 for product data). When potholing where this drain inlet is to be located, it was discovered that it would be in conflict with an existing gas line. BBII's design engineer KCA contacted the city planning department and got pre approval of the attached catch basin per the attached email and details. Please confirm that it is acceptable for us to install this catch basin in lieu of what was submitted in the aforementioned submittals.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Submission of the storm water inlet detail (attached to this RFI No. T-0287) for review and acceptance via the RFI process is not an acceptable method, therefore we have no comment on it.

In an effort to help expedite resolution of this conflict the following questions/requests are provided below:

What is the location (depth of cover and horizontal offsets to existing and proposed features) of the existing gas line (and electrical conduits/conductors) relative to the proposed storm water inlet?
The proposed storm water inlet appears to extend approximately 41" deep from top of rim/grade. From review of RUP sheets U-3409 and U-3410/Section T, it appears that there could be as little as 36" of cover over top of the existing PG&E gas line. If PG&E gas line is located within limits of proposed storm water inlet (plan view), there does not appear to be sufficient vertical clearance to install the proposed storm water inlet?
Specify engineered base material that is to be placed beneath proposed storm water inlet.
Provide a detailed sketch (plan and section) with submittal illustrating location of proposed storm water inlet and adjacent existing/proposed features.
Has PG&E reviewed and approved the proposed storm water inlet location?
Provide comfirmation that the proposed storm water inlet is in compliance with PG&E separation requirements

---

**T-0288** **BSE - Request to Relocate Rathole to D9** **Closed** **04/05/2012** **04/15/2012** **04/10/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch

**Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Attached please find Becho's request to relocate existing rathole to Shaft D9 where it will remain until Buttress work is complete. Below is Becho's exact wording:

"Due to the upcoming bridge construction on Fremont

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

Arup understands there was no attachment, only the one page RFI.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Street, Becho will be losing the existing location of the rathole. Becho requests that the existing rathole be relocated to Shaft D9 where it will remain for the duration of the Buttress Shaft Work. Becho proposes to pour Shaft D9 30 to 35 feet short from grade to accommodate the new rathole. Please advise if this is acceptable."

Provided the hole remains cased at all times, or backfilled with CSLM (or an approved equal) whenever the casing is removed, this is acceptable.

---

**T-0289** **BSE - Becho Requesting 9-20-2011 Meeting Minutes** **Closed** **04/11/2012** **04/21/2012** **05/08/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

"On September 20th, 2011 a meeting was held in the TJPA's office to discuss Noise Issues, Coring thru the Concrete Slab and Buttress Work. Present in the meeting where the following key representatives: Brian Dykes, Maria Ayerdi-Kaplan, Rebecca Armenta, and Steven Rule. Please request the meeting minutes for the meeting on 9/20/2011."

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

No meeting minutes were taken during this meeting.

---

**T-0290** **BSE - Stabilization of Unimproved Soil Conditions Along the Interior Face of the C** **Closed** **04/11/2012** **04/21/2012** **04/18/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: 31 56 13 3.7 C
BBII Photo of CDSM Wall J-Line

BBII is requesting direction for a method to stabilize the unimproved soil conditions along the interior face of the CDSM wall.

The current condition of the CDSM wall includes unimproved soil conditions that have the potential to become detached from the wall and create large voids at the face of the wall. Please reference attached photo for visual details.

Based on our records, the CDSM wall met all the

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The quality of the CDSM wall is dependent upon the Contractors' chosen means and methods. If the Contractor has concerns regarding the integrity of the wall, the Contractor shall provide a remedial plan to the TJPA for consideration.

Conformance with the criteria within a sample does not relieve the Contractor of their responsibility that the entire wall meet the specifications.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

specification requirements for uniformity and improved soil as per section 31 56 13 of the contract specifications. Please note: Section 31 56 13 3.7 C's requirements (10% and 6") are satisfied by during the TJPA's Representative inspection of double-tube samples at the time of installation.

---

**T-0290.1** **BSE - Relevance of Unimproved Soil Pockets in CDSM Wall as it Relates to Waterp Closed** **05/28/2012** **06/07/2012** **06/05/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Neither section 31 00 003.8.L or 07 12 10.3.2.C anticipated +1" cavities in the surface of the CDSM wall. However there are +6" cavities in the surface of the CDSM wall the result of unimproved soil pockets although BBII would contend the CDSM wall was installed in accordance with section 31 56 13.3.7.C. On 5/25/12 W/O spoke with Jonathan Lawrence President of Laurenco Systems (888) 321-3338 specified per section 07 12 10.2.1. Sections 31 00 00.3.8.L and 07 12 10.3.2.C speak of "buckling" due to cavities of the face of the CDSM wall. Mr. Lawrence was not concerned over the cavities in the face of this project's CDSM wall for two reasons:

1. Subsequent to his review of the bid documents the substrate for the waterproofing is the INS-1, depicted on 4/A1-8710, rather than the CDSM wall.
2. Due to the thickness of the substrate system:
a. ¼" Protection board
b. 3/16" (2) plys #15 felt
c. ¼" Drainage composite panel.
d. ½" INS-2
1-3/16" thick in total Mr. Lawrence was not concerned over a CDSM cavity less than

1'- 0" x 1'-0" x ½" deep.

When asked why he thought section 07 12 10.3.2.C was included in the below grade waterproofing section, if in fact the CDSM was not the substrate for the waterproofing, Mr. Lawrence responded that section 07 12 10.3.2.C was part

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per specification section 31 00 00 / 3.8 L: "On vertical surfaces of CDSM shoring walls, scarify high areas and fill in cavities exceeding 1" deep with patching cement to provide a reasonably uniform surface over which protection board, installed in a later contract, will span without buckling." Repair wall as required in the contract documents.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

of the Laurenco's template boiler plate specification really inapplicable to this application.

Please confirm that given the CDSM wall is not the waterproofing substrate system, rather items a-d above, and in light of the frequency of unimproved soil pockets, the project needn't infill the unimproved soil pockets less than 1'- 0" x 1'-0" x ½" deep.

---

**T-0291** **BSE - Arup Requesting Exploratory Cores on Buttress Shaft D1** **Closed** **04/16/2012** **04/26/2012** **04/24/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Arup is requesting exploratory core samples at Buttress Shaft D1. Please provide direction on depths, sizes, and locations of cores.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Shaft D1 is, so far, non-conforming. It is in the Contractor's best interest to perform exploratory drilling to ascertain why they are unable to reach the required depth. Arup recommends that the Contractor do so, and that a plan be developed based on the observations made during the two previous attempts to place the shaft.

---

**T-0291.1** **BSE - Arup Requesting Exploratory Cores on Buttress Shaft D1 Follow-Up** **Closed** **04/25/2012** **05/05/2012** **05/04/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Fields **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Arup has requested to revise the response to RFI T-0291 in which the following question was presented -

"Arup is requesting exploratory core samples at Buttress Shaft D1. Please provide direction on depths, sizes, and locations of cores."

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

ARUP Response:

There has been further discussion regarding this proposal. Arup retracts the request to core within the footprint of buttress shaft D1.

---

**T-0292** **BSE - First St Bridge Pier 1 Relocation** **Closed** **05/02/2012** **05/12/2012** **05/03/2012** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Gary Krutsch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference:
Revised Drawings and Calculations for Revised Pier 1 Location

The western Pier 1 CIDH pile was rejected due to an anomaly. The corrective action is to replace it with a new pile 6'-0" south. Attached is the revised Bridge Drawings and the revised calculations. This package was emailed to the Bridge Design reviewers on 4-24-12 for expedited review. Please confirm that the new pier 1 location does not cause conflicts with the future structure.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The attachments are not appropriate for an RFI, they should be submitted through the submittal process. Resubmit RFI with pertinent information only

---

**T-0292.1** **BSE - First St Bridge Pier 1 Relocation** **Closed** **05/03/2012** **05/13/2012** **05/04/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference:
SH-2100
SH-2101

Detail: The western Pier 1 CIDH pile was rejected due to an anomaly. The corrective action is to replace it with a new pile 6'-0" south. Attached are the revised Bridge Drawings showing new pile locations. Please confirm that the new pier 1 location does not cause conflicts with the future structure. Please note the revised design documents were emailed to the Bridge Design reviewers on 4-24-12 for expedited review.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The 2 northernmost First Street temporary bridge piers to be shifted as depicted in this RFI is acceptable.

ARUP Response:

Arup takes no exception to this.

---

**T-0293** **BSE - First Street Natoma blind spot hazard** **Closed** **06/05/2012** **06/15/2012** **06/15/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** URS Corporation David Fyfe

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Regarding the temporary first street bridge. Contract specification section 01 53 13-1.3.A.4 requires us to provide a "8' -high solid barrier system" consisting of 1" plywood which does not allow viewing through the barrier.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Alternative barrier system shall be provided for pedestrian protection to mitigate vehicle/driver sight line obstructions (such as chainlink or other similar product). Contractor to verify alternative barrier

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

This is creating a blind turn hazard for traffic entering First street from Natoma street on the south side of First street. Please advise on how you would like to mitigate/fix this hazard.

product meets visibility requirements. Required height of barrier system is not changed.

Alternative barrier system system shall be designed by the temporary bridges design engineer of record and shall meet all code requirements including size of openings and resistance to all loading. Final product shall be continuous (including at transitions to other barrier systems), climb proof and topped with barbed wire. Contractor/engineer of record shall obtain all required approvals for alternate barrier system.

Vehicle barrier system/guardrail(s) are not modified by this RFI response.

---

**T-0293.1** **BSE - First Street and Natoma blind spot hazard.** **Closed** **06/29/2012** **07/09/2012** **07/09/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Douglas Jacobson

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please find attached sketch SK-0293 for proposed pedestrian barrier at the First st. bridge. Please confirm this is acceptable in lieu of previously installed plywood barrier.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contractor to install 9 gauge galvanized chain link fence with 2" mesh along zone of previously installed plywood barrier on First Street Temporary Bridge. Secure to existing bridge posts MC6x18 with 1/2" diameter galvanized bolts 2' o.c. on each post with full-length 1" x 3/16" flat bar. Install 1/4" galv. top and bottom wire with 3/8" turnbuckles. Secure fence to wire with 11 gauge wire ties. Double twist ends of chain link mesh are on top. See TJPA Spec 32 31 13 Chainlink Fences and Gates. For barbed wire at the top, see 32 31 13 2.5 and 2.8 for requirements. Install barbed wire support arms at 45° tilted away from bridge.

Temporary Bridge engineer of record shall verify that the loading from 1" thick plywood to chain link mesh is not detrimental to the Temporary Bridge design.

---

# Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

## *PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG*

## 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0294 | BSE - Expected CDSM wall deflection | Closed | 06/14/2012 | 06/24/2012 | 07/02/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

BBII requests the anticipated deflection values for the CDSM wall obtained in ARUP's design of the shoring wall and used to determine appropriate action trigger levels specified in section 31 09 13.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The request for information contained in this RFI is rejected as overly broad, burdensome and seemingly unrelated to any legitimate enquiry relating to the contract or the required work. This is not the proper use of an RFI. Please follow the requirements specified in section 31 09 13 regarding maximum allowable movements and corrective action trigger levels.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0295 | BSE - 301 Mission drive way | Closed | 06/19/2012 | 06/29/2012 | 06/24/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per conversation in previous coordination meeting between Balfour Beatty Webcor, Turner, TJPA and 301 Mission¿s management. We are confirming direction to extend the sidewalk past the limits shown in our grading and drainage submittal through the limits of the 301 Mission drive way. It is also our understanding that we are directed to match the color of the existing black sidewalk in this area. Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The work BBII has proceeded with at the 301 Mission driveway is in general conformance with the 6/8/12 TCCO, W/0, BBII, Millennium Mgmt. meeting. The direction however is from, to include however limited to, base contract specification section: 00 08 13.1.8.E, 0115 40.1.4, and or General Excavation Permit #12E-0181. The TJPA is not anticipating added cost the result of this issue.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0296 | BSE - Clarification of Soil Segregation and Disposal per spec. section 01 13 50/SM | Closed | 06/27/2012 | 07/07/2012 | 06/29/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Roger Rothenburger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

On 6/26/12 BBII clarified their desired method / location of disposing of the Zone-3 concrete rubble was to deliver it to Brisbane.

Section 01 13 50 / 5.2.1 of the SMP states:

"TJPA shall be provided documentation from the excavation contractor that the accepting landfill for the soil from Transbay Terminal project has been provided with and has reviewed all analytical data collected from the Site."

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Roger Rothenburger 6/28/2012 Section 01-13-50 Part 1.1.C (Hazardous Materials Procedures - Summary) references "Site Mitigation Plan, Transbay Transit Center, Treadwell & Rollo, March 24, 2010" report and states,

"Contractor's work shall include the management of existing soils in a manner consistent with the requirements of the Contract Document including the following reports, "Site Mitigation Plan, Transbay Transit Center, Treadwell & Rollo, March 24, 2010",

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Brisbane has refused to provide the aforementioned documentation.

In order to facilitate BBII's desired method / location of disposing of the Zone-3 concrete rubble W/O requests that the TJPA clarify, exclusively for the subject Zone-3 rubble, that the documentation required by the TJPA consists only of standard shipping tags and invoices.

appended to this Sectin as 01 13 50/APA, and Section 00 03 35 ..."

Section 5.2.1 ( Soil Segregation and Disposal) of the Treadwell & Rollo Site Mitigation Plan, 01-13-50/APA states, "Before any excavation activities begin at the Site, TJPA shall be provided documentation from the excavation contractor that the accepting landfill facility for the soil from Transbay Terminal project has been provided with and has reviewedall analytical data collected from the Site. TJPA shall approve all off-site disposal facilities and soil transportation contractors, including, without limitation, available insurable coverge, and prior to the shipment of any soil or other waste materials (emphasis added)."

TJPA in the interest of facilitating disposal of material to Brisbane and other disposal sites removes from Site Mitigation Plan Section 5.2.1 by Treadwell & Rollo, the highlighted words, "with and has reviewed" .

The only requirement is that some documentation from BBI (the "excavation contractor" that the "analytical data collected from the Site" has been provided to the disposal site.

---

**T-0296.1** **BSE - Clarification of Soil Segregation and Disposal per spec** **Closed** **07/02/2012** **07/12/2012** **07/02/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

RFI response T-0296 was overly broad and failed to conform to previous conversations between TJPA, TCCO, & W/O.

RFI T-0296 Inquiry:

On 6/26/12 BBII clarified their desired method / location of disposing of the Zone-3 rubble was to deliver it to Brisbane.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

7/2/2012 Confirmed - exclusively for the subject Zone-3 rubble, the documentation required by the TJPA consists only of standard shipping tabs and invoices.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Section 01 13 50 / 5.2.1 of the SMP states:

"TJPA shall be provided documentation from the excavation contractor that the accepting landfill for the soil from Transbay Terminal project has been provided with and has reviewed all analytical data collected from the Site."

Brisbane has refused to provide the aforementioned documentation.

In order to facilitate BBII's desired method / location of disposing the Zone-3 concrete rubble W/O requests that the TJPA clarify, exclusively for the subject Zone-3 rubble, that the documentation required by the TJPA consists only of standard shipping tabs and invoices.

RFI T-0296.1 Inquiry:

Please confirm, in order to facilitate BBII's desired method / location of disposing the Zone-3 concrete rubble W/O requests that the TJPA clarify, exclusively for the subject Zone-3 rubble, that the documentation required by the TJPA consists only of standard shipping tabs and invoices.

---

**T-0297** **BSE - Phase 3 Utilities on Beale Street** **Closed** **06/28/2012** **07/08/2012** **07/10/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached sketch.

The BSE subcontractor is proposing to relocate the Beale Street temporary bridge to the east; similar to the attached sketch. Please confirm if this will impact any future utilities, i.e. PG&E phase 3 on Beale Street.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The Beale Street Phase I temporary utilities were relocated outside and east of the CDSM shoring wall. The RUP project design intent is that Phase II utilities will not be suspended from the temp bridge in Beale Street. In the future, permanent Phase II utilities on Beale Street will be constructed within a designated area above the Transit Center train box termed the "utility corridor". Please coordinate your work with CM/GC.

---

# Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

## *PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG*

## 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0298 | BSE -Timber Pile Extraction at grid line 19 to 20 and 24 to 25 | Closed | 06/29/2012 | 06/29/2012 | 07/02/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

BBII completed the timber pile extraction test section in zone 2 on 06/12/2012. Based on the data recorded by ARUP inclinometers, please advise if BBII can continue with the timber pile extraction at grid line 19 to 20 and grid line 24 to 25 using non ground deformation control methods ("free pull').

The attached drawings (D-21 02 and D-21 03) for reference.

Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

6/29/2012 ARUP Response: This is acceptable.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0299 | Micropile Performance Testing | Closed | 07/16/2012 | 07/26/2012 | 07/30/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Arup Kevin Clinch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Part 3.2 "Performance And Proof Testing" of Specification Section 31 63 33

In order to expedite the Micropile Performance Testing review period, BBII is requesting to conduct the performance testing of micropiles prior to excavating Level 5, at approximately -32' Elevation, concurrent with the installation of Level "0" struts. See attached sketch for details.Please confirm that it is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Specification section 31 63 33 3.2 A states: The contractor shall conduct performance tests and proof tests consisting of tension load testing on micropiles. The tests are to be done on piles installed from the bottom of the excavation.

The Contractor's proposal is not acceptable as the testing methodology and the acceptance criteria in the Project Specifications have been developed assuming the piles used for the performance tests will be installed and tested in conditions matching those of the production piles. The performance of the piles installed and tested as proposed will differ due to the higher effective stresses in the soil.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T-0300 | Micropile Performance Test Pile Relocations | Closed | 07/17/2012 | 07/27/2012 | 07/26/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Yuriy Stryzheus **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Arup Kevin Clinch

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please refer to BBII's micropile layout submittal and RFI T-262 that references IFB- Below Grade package for

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Arup takes no exception to the proposed locations

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

coordination of micropile layouts.

Based on the information provided within BBII's Micropile layout drawing and Below Grade package drawings S1-2023 through S1-2027, the four micropiles subjected to performance testing are labeled as: W411, W396, E383, and E401.

BBII requests to conduct the performance test in Zone 1 at pile No. W604 instead of pile No. W411, which is located underneath Struts No. 6 & 7.

Similarly, BBII requests to test the piles numbered as W473, E477, & E599, instead of the piles numbered as W396, E383, & E401, which are located underneath the trestle.

Please confirm that it is acceptable.

---

**T-0301** **Trestle Piles in Exclusion Zones (Zone 4)** **Closed** **07/23/2012** **08/02/2012** **07/30/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Robert Kjome **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Adamson Associates, Inc George Metzger

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Review comments on submittal package TG0300-284 directed BBII to shift two trestle piles (#69 &#72) out of pile exclusion zones (provided by Thornton Tomasetti in response to RFI T-0251.1). BBII worked to avoid these zones to the extent possible. However, in zone 4 the additional buttress shafts created further limitations on trestle pile locations and it was infeasible to completely avoid both the permanent structure and buttress. BBII is aware of the possibility ofeliminating some of these additional buttress shafts but this will not resolve these specific conflicts. Due to the congestion in Zone 4 with both the pile exclusion zones and added buttress shafts, BBII requests an exception for trestle piles #69 and #72.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Requested exceptions will be granted for locations of trestle piles #69 and #72 in submittal TG0300-284. Prior to proceeding the GC is to confirm this has no cost impact to the TJPA or impact on other trades.

---

**T-0302** **ISI Low Compression Strength for CLSM** **Closed** **07/31/2012** **08/10/2012** **08/10/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please confirm the low compression strengths for the CLSM, in the ISI test results
(attached), are acceptable. The CLSM was used for pre-trench backfill on Gridline A, First
St. and Fremont St.

Please see attached ISI Test reports:
55606 Compression Test Report on A line between 18-19 lines, sampled 3/29/2012
55607 Compression Test Report on A line between 19-20 lines, sampled 3/30/2012
55608 Compressive Test Report on A line between 19-20 lines, sampled 4/4/2012
51399 Compression Test Report on A line between 19-20 lines, sampled 3/28/2012
56162 Compressive Test Report on A line between 25.2 - 25.5 lines, sampled 4/2/2012

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

There is no compressive strength requirement for the pre-trench backfill Slurry(CLSM) chosen by the Trade Subcontractor in lieu of compaction of soils. This was confirmed with ARUP and per RFI 283/RFI 283.1.

1. TJPA Spec. 31-00-00 Earthwork requires pre-trenching to be backfilled and compaction with satisfactory materials, i.e., sand / soil.

2. These Slurry(CLSM) materials were allowed for backfill as a ¿weak CLSM ¿ per RFI 283.

3. There is no project design/specification of ultimate compressive strength for these pre-trench backfill Slurry(CLSM).

4. The purpose of sampling the CLSM mix is to document the Slurry(CLSM) strength data only

A review of the ultimate strengths (attached and below) are consistent with the strength of compacted soils used for temporary backfill areas prior to completing the CDSM wall processes.

Lab ID No.: 51396

TG03/IR 917

Mix FOA100CX Central

35 Days 170psi

Lab ID No.: 51399

TG03/IR 933

MIX 400FLO Bode

90 Days avg. 180psi

Lab ID No.: 55600

TG03/IR 913

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Mix FOA100CX Central

39 Days avg. 130psi

Lab ID No.: 55606

TG03/IR 934

MIX 400FLO Bode

90 Days avg. >160psi

Lab ID No.: 55607

MIX 400FLO Bode

TG03/IR 935

90 Days avg. >160psi

Lab ID No.: 55608

TG03/IR 949

MIX 400FLO Bode

90 Days avg. >160psi

Lab ID No.: 56162

TG03/IR

MIX 400FLO Bode

120 Days 160psi

---

**T-0303** **BSE - Verizon Duct Bank at the First St Bridge** **Closed** **08/07/2012** **08/17/2012** **08/08/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Kirk Nielsen **To:** **Answered By:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch  Turner Construction Comp Stacy Wilson

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference:
Attached Photo

Despite providing Verizon surveying, staking, and cutsheets, the Verizon duct bank at the North side of the First St. bridge was installed by others at the incorrect elevation (too low). Please confirm if additional utility supports will be required of TG03 or if others will be proforming the additional utility supports required for the Verizon duct bank.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

8/8/2012 Per Steve Cunningham, TCCO -

Review attached drawing provided by BBIi:

1. PB&A; First, Fremont, and Beale Street Temporary Bridges, Detail 1/SK 3105. Horizontal layout is provided, but not vertical layout for the PGE duct banks.

2. BBIi letter number 4225-000-0316, dated 1/9/12, provided bottom elevation for Verizon duct bank at 12.57' and 13.40'.

Please provide as built elevations of all duct banks. Confirm PGE Phase 2 duct banks were installed with higher elevation at center of bridge.

---

**T-267** **BSE - DI Installation at First Street** **Closed** **11/29/2011** **12/09/2011** **12/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. Ural Yal

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI U-101, Sheet U-3021

The RFI response U-101 dated 02-28-2011 eliminates the CB #501 from the RUP contractor's scope of work. However there has been no replacement or adequate surface water control system neither suggested nor installed to replace the CB # 501.

BBII recommends that this catch basin # 501, be installed per the original design to control surface water. Please confirm it will installed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

CB#501 was deleted from RUP due to unforeseen field conditions. For RUP, runoff from adjacent area to drain south to existing CB at STA 4+20. Existing CB at STA 4+20 to remain in place and active at completion of RUP.

BSE Contractor to provide stormwater control on site accordance with BSE documents.

---

**T-268** **BSE - Rebar in Secondary Shafts** **Closed** **12/08/2011** **12/18/2011** **12/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Arup Kevin Clinch

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference GT-2201, Installation Sequence Note 5

Please confirm the reinforcement in the secondary shafts should be installed in the last buttress shaft of each row.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

As described in Note 5 on sheet GT-2201, since the cost-add option has been excercised, the reinforcement shall be installed in the secondary shafts along rows 15 and 16.5.

*END OF REPORT*

Report Parameters

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project: | 30100 | Status Class: | C |
| Sent To: | | Run Date: | 08/21/2012 |
| Restrict Value of: | C | Run Time: | 09:13 AM |
| From Date: | | Operator: | NTRAN |
| To Date: | | Report Code: | PM3012 |
| Status: | CLOSED | | |

# Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture

## *PROJECT MANAGEMENT - REQUEST AND ANSWERS LOG*

## 30100 - Transbay Transit Center Project

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0001 | First Street Electrical or Telecom Trench | Closed | 10/25/2010 | 11/08/2010 | 11/05/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-2016, U-2020 and Attached

Sheet U-2016 calls out a 9-6", 1-4" E by PG&E. Sheet U-2020 calls out the same trench as AT&T's. The section shows it as a AT&T's. Please confirm this trench is AT&T's.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Sheet U-2020 call out for the subject trench is correct, the trench is AT&T's.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0002 | Conflict with Electrical and Water Pipe Station 5.50 | Closed | 10/25/2010 | 11/08/2010 | 11/05/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-3408 and attached.

During the review of the model, we have found that a conflict exists between the joint trench electrical conduits and water pipes. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Adjust Joint Trench per U-3400 General Notes 2, 3, 5 and 6.

Construct hydrant lateral to maintain a minimum 28-inch cover (18-inch below street concrete base) and adjust joint trench at lateral crossing to maintain a minimum 6-inch separation at crossing per U-3400 General Note 6.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0003 | Conflict Between Electrical trench and telecom conduit near station 1.50 | Closed | 10/25/2010 | 11/08/2010 | 11/05/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-2007, and attached

During our review of the model, we have found a conflict between the electrical joint trench and telecom conduit near station 1.50 on Minna Street. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

4-6" Electric ductbank is to cross under the 6-4" Telecommunications ductbank, see U-3407 and U-3410 Section E.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0004 | Telecom and Water Conflict Station 3.25 | Closed | 10/25/2010 | 11/08/2010 | 11/05/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-2007 and attached.

During our review of the model, we have found that the water latereal running north on Minna street is in conflict with telecom conduits in the joint trench. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Adjust Joint Trench per U-3400 General Notes 2, 3, 5 and 6.

Construct hydrant lateral to maintain a minimum 28-inch cover (18-inch below street concrete base) and adjust Joint Trench at lateral crossing.

---

**U-0005** **Water, Telecom and Electrical Conflict at Station 5.50** **Closed** **10/25/2010** **11/08/2010** **11/05/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-2008, U-2030 and attached.

During our review of the model, we have found that the water system running in the east/west direction along Minna Street at station 5.50 is in conflict at three locations with the Electrical/Telecom joint trench. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

At water laterals crossing Joint Trench:
- Adjust Joint Trench per U-3400 General Notes 2, 3, 5 and 6.
- Construct hydrant lateral to maintain a minimum 28-inch cover (18-inch below street concrete base) and adjust Joint Trench at lateral crossing.

At water main crossing with 6-4-inch conduit constructed by AT&T in Phase II (Sheet U-2030):
- Construct water main as shown.
- AT&T to design and construct Phase II AT&T conduit to avoid water main constructed under TG04.5.1.

---

**U-0006** **Gas and Electrical Conduit Conflict** **Closed** **10/25/2010** **11/08/2010** **11/05/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-2008, U-2030 and attached.

A conflict exists between the 4" HPG and electrical conduits near station 6.45. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Electrical trenches at STA 6+42 +/- and at STA 6+85 +/- as shown on Sheet U-2030 are Relocation of Utilities Project Phase II work Not Included in Package TG04.5.1. The FINAL alignment and elevation of these trenches will be coordinated and designed by

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

others pending the conduit penetration elevations through the Transit Center perimeter shoring wall and into the Transit Center West Center Electric Vault. As shown in Sheet U-3410 Section Q electric ductback is located below the 4-inch HPG. Per U-3410 General Notes 2, 3, 5 and 6 adjust Joint Trench at crossings to allow conduits to stub out below the 4-inch HPG.

---

**U-0007** **Water and Electrical Conduit Conflict at Station 6.50** **Closed** **10/25/2010** **11/08/2010** **11/05/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-2030 and attached.

The water line running east/west along Minna street is in conflict with an Electrical trench at station 6.45. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Electrical trenches at STA 6+42 +/- and at STA 6+85 +/- as shown on Sheet U-2030 are Relocation of Utilities Project Phase II work Not Included in Package TG04.5.1. The FINAL alignment and elevation of these trenches will be coordinated and designed by others pending the conduit penetration elevations through the Transit Center perimeter shoring wall and into the Transit Center West Center Electric Vault. U-2030 elevation shows the ductbancks crossing under the 8-inch water in Minna Street.

---

**U-0008** **Gas and Water Conflict at Station 7.30** **Closed** **10/25/2010** **11/08/2010** **11/05/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-2009 and attached.

A conflict exists between the HPG and water line at station 7.30 along Minna Street. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Adjust Joint Trench per U-3400 General Notes 2, 3, 5 and 6.

Construct hydrant lateral to maintain a minimum 28-inch cover (18-inch below street concrete base) and adjust joint trench at lateral crossing to maintain a minimum 6-inch separation at crossing per U-3400 Note 6 with approval from PG&E on-site inspector.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

---

**U-0009** **Joint Trench and Sewer Conflict on First Street at Station 9.25** **Closed** **10/25/2010** **11/08/2010** **11/05/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-2009 and attached

The sewer line running in the north south direction at station 9.25 along First street is in conflict with the electrical joint trench. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Adjust Joint Trench per U-3400 General Notes 2, 3, 5 and 6.

Joint Trench crossing 10-inch SD at STA 9+29 +/- is shown in U-3409 and U-3031 Profile D.

---

**U-0010** **Electrical Line Transition In Joint Trench from Minna to Shaw Alley** **Closed** **10/25/2010** **11/08/2010** **11/05/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-3408, Q/U-3410, P/U-3410 attached.

Section Q/U-3410 shows a 5" and 2" electrical line on the north side of the joint trench. Section P/U-3410 shows the same 5" and 2" electrical lines on the west side of the joint trench as it turns north on Shaw Alley. Is the intent for these electrical lines to cross within the joint trench? Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

No. The 5-inch and 2-inch electric conduits in Section Q/U-3410 should be located on the south side of the Joint Trench

---

**U-0011** **Manhole #203 Elevation Conflict** **Closed** **10/25/2010** **11/08/2010** **11/05/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U3031, U3007 and attached.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Construct sewer MH#203 rim to match existing grade

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Detail B/U-3031 shows the elavtion of manhole #203 at 21.75 however U-3007 calls out an elevation of 22.0. Please confirm what the elavation of Manhole #203 is.

at EL 22.0 +/- as shown on Sheet U-3007.

---

**U-0012** **Electrical/Telecom Conflicts between Plan and Section** **Closed** **10/25/2010** **11/08/2010** **11/05/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-1108. U4000, H/4001 and attached.

1. Section H/U-4001 shows the (E)(6)4"E(D) just north of the (E)T(NR) however the plans show it north of the (E) SS. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Existing Topographic and Utility Survey Sheets and Sheet U-1108 show the horizontal location north of the (E) sewer. Section H on Sheet U-4001 shows the subject (E)(6)4"(D) at two locations, one is incorrectly shown. The horizontal location of the subject duct in Section H on Sheet U-4001 should be consistent with location shown in the Existing Topographic and Utility Survey Sheets and Sheet U-1108.

---

**U-0013** **Water Connections at Howard** **Closed** **10/25/2010** **11/08/2010** **11/05/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref I-3120, U-3116, U-3112

There is a discrepancy in the elevations called out for the 12" water line connections at Howard. The First and Howard connection shows the elevation at 13 on U-3120 and no elevation is provided on Howard. If we were to scale, the elevation should be at 14. Please provide the connection elevation.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Construct the 12"x12"x12" TEE at center line EL 13.0 as shown on Sheet U-3120.

---

**U-0014** **Size of Gas Line on First Street** **Closed** **10/25/2010** **11/08/2010** **11/05/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref U-2003, U-2021 and attached.

The HPG line on U-2003 is 4". The same gas line on U-2021 is shown as 2". What size is the gas line?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

HPG by PG&E on First St. is 4" as shown on Sheet U-2003.

---

**U-0015** **LEED Requirements for RUP work** **Closed** **10/26/2010** **11/09/2010** **11/05/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Daphne Faulkner **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Guy Hollins

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

RE: Specification 01-81-13 1.1.3B

The specification section referenced provides a drawing which outlines the "LEED Project Limit". On this drawing, the limit line is drawn on Minna Street and Natoma Street and incorporates First Street, Fremont Street and Beale Street where they cross the new building. Is it the intent of this specification section that the RUP work in the areas enclosed are to be incorporated into the LEED program?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

It is not the intent of this specification section apply LEED requirements to the RUP work.

---

**U-0016** **Street Light Relocation** **Closed** **11/02/2010** **11/16/2010** **11/17/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Plan/Drawing Reference: U-3201

Please identify the PG&E manhole on Second St & Minna, where we are to connect the new conduit for the relocated street light on the west end of Minna St.
The connection manhole depicted on the plans does not appear to be owned by PG&E - the cover is marked "Steam".
Please review and advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

11/8/2010
Eric Zagol
Alignment of conduit shall be south of existing NRG Energy steam manhole, adjacent to existing street light conduit as shown, connecting to and intercepting existing street light conduit in PG&E MH E-1319 immediately west of the existing steam manhole. Coordinate connection with PG&E through BLHP and TJPA's representative.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0017 | JT Conflict with Basement @ Rickenbacker Rest. | Closed | 11/09/2010 | 11/23/2010 | 01/12/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference sheet U-3407.
PG&E has been potholing on the south east corner of Minna @ 2nd St. for a new gas line over the past number of days. We have observed in their potholes that a basement structure for the Rickenbacker Restaurant (123 2nd St.) extends out beyond the property line and under the sidewalk, along both Minna and 2nd Street. The basement appears to extend almost up to the roadway curb on 2nd Street and to face of curb or beyond on Minna. The joint trench at its current alignment (on Plan Sheet U-3407) along the south east corner of 2nd & Minna will be in conflict with this basement structure.
Please review and advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

E. Zagol 1/11/11

See revised Joint Trench Plan and Elevation Phase I Plans titled "Revisions - Minna Street 12/27/10" for realignment of Joint Trench.

**********

E. Zagol 12/17/10

The Joint Trench as currently shown in Sheet U-3407 is in conflict with the 123 Second Street sidewalk basement between Minna Street stations 0+75 and 0+90.

Separate from the conflict mentioned above, PG&E has requested TJPA to add additional conduits to the Joint Trench.

Revised drawings will be provided that address the following:

Realignment of Joint Trench west of station 2+00, realignment of the sewer west of station 2+25, and revisions to the water line (vertical and hydrant lateral) west of station 1+02 to address the conflict with 123 Second Street sidewalk basement.
Modifications to Joint Trench sections from First Street to Second Street to accommodate PG&E's additional conduits.
Modifications at the future Transit Center stubouts to accommodate PG&E's Joint Trench configuration revisions.
RFI-U0050.
**********
**********

E. Zagol 11/18/10

AECOM will attend the planned site visit to 123 Second Street on 11/19/10 to evaluate conflict. We are actively working with PG&E to identify options for the Joint Trench alignment west of STA 1+12 if 123 Second Street basement is confirmed in conflict.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

On 11/17/10 PG&E reported at TJPA's weekly PG&E coordination meeting that the preferred realignment option, north of the proposed sewer utilizing existing PG&E MH 1319, was electrically feasible. PG&E has scheduled field crews for the week of 11/29/10 to confirm that there is adequate space in their existing manholes to facilitate the preferred option.

Proceed with Joint Trench subsurface investigations and Joint Trench shop drawing preparation in accordance with plans and specifications for the Joint Trench east of STA 1+12 to STA 9+31.32 at First Street.

---

**U-0018** **AWSS caps requirement** **Closed** **11/10/2010** **11/10/2010** **11/24/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please refer to sheets MA-5, MA-8, U-1120, U-1121, see attached.

Please confirm that the AWSS caps shown on sheets MA-5 and MA-8 are required prior to the installation of the new PG&E ductbank (sheet U-2021) on the East side of First St.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

RFI U-0018 to be closed as RFI U-0018.1 was created to address a two part question that arose. RFI U-0018.1 was answered on 11/24/10 and the RFI is marked closed.

---

**U-0018.1** **AWSS Removal Work on First Street - Scope Clarification** **Closed** **11/22/2010** **11/24/2010** **11/24/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The First Street AWSS cap issue has created a two part question. RFI #U-0018 will remain open to track the sequence of installation regarding installation of the AWSS cap and PG&E trench.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

11/23/2010
Eric Zagol
See attached sketch from Michael Smith (SFDPW BOE) indicating work required to abandon existing 10"

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

AWSS main in First St.

RFI #U-0018.1 addresses scope.
Refer to sheets MA-5, MA-8, U-1120, U-1121, and Guy Hollins email attached.

Per conversations between Guy Hollins, Eric Zagol and Michael Smith (mechanical engineer with DPW Bureau of Engineering), please clarify the work involved to install the two AWSS caps on First & Howard and First & Mission St. Also produce a list of material required to complete the work. Provide drawing/ sketch if necessary to clarify scope of work.

---

**U-0019** **Street Light Location** **Closed** **11/10/2010** **11/12/2010** **12/02/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please provide layout for the Street Lights shown to be relocated on sheets U-3201 and U-3202.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Rev. 12/1/10

As dicussed during the site visit on 11/24/10 with Turner, Webcor, Trinet and AECOM to review SFPUC BLHP proposed street light markings, the proposed locations by SFPUC BLHP required a final review by BLHP due to conflicts with the Joint Trench and a FDC. SFPUC BHLP provided additional clarification on street light locations on 12/1/10.

Relocate existing street lights as shown to be relocated on U-3201 to the north side of Minna St. at STA 2+89.25 (center of pole) and at STA 4+12.03 (center of pole). Locate foundation, street light per SFDPW Standard Plans A-33,308 File No. 87,210. Provide guard post in accordance with SFDPW Standard Plan A-33,308 File No. 87,210 for the street light relocated to STA 2+89.25.

**********

U-3201 shows two street lights to be relocated from

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

the south side of Minna St. to the North Side of Minna St. Based on informal discussions with Jason Dunne (W/O) proposed street light locations have bee marked by Trinet along Minna St. at the locations shown on U-3201. TJPA's representative (Tuner) is scheduling SFPUC BLHP to inspect the proposed locations as marked. Following inspection by SFPUC BLHP, layout dimensions will be provided.

U-3202 shows one street light to be recoated and is to be relocated to an existing traffic signal base as noted in U3202. Remove and salvage traffic post and signal equipment as shown on U-3302.

---

**U-0019.1** **Light Pole at Station 4+12.03: Reroute existing conduit** **Closed** **12/21/2010** **12/31/2010** **02/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Michelle Smith

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: RFI #U-0019, attached picture and sheet U-3201

The streetlight at station 4+12.03 was laid out per the response to RFI #U-0019. When the new location was potholed, a number of existing utilities were discovered. Per inspection with BLHP on 12/20/2010, inspector Robert Kawano requests to re-route existing conduits in the new light pole ftg. location at STN. 4+12.03. Utilities seem to be privately owned by 555 Mission St.. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See RFI Response #U-0019.2

---

12/27/2010 E. Zagol

Unforeseen condition requiring improvements by property owner to relocate privately owned utilities in the City right of
way. TJPA Representative to coordinate with property owner to relocate utilities.

---

**U-0019.2** **Light Pole at Station 4+12.03: Reroute existing conduit** **Closed** **12/21/2010** **12/31/2010** **02/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Michelle Smith

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Question from RFI #U-0019.1

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Electrical conduit has been relocated by 555 Mission

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

---
Reference: RFI #U-0019, attached picture and sheet U-3201

The streetlight at station 4+12.03 was laid out per the response to RFI #U-0019. When the new location was potholed, a number of existing utilities were discovered. Per inspection with BLHP on 12/20/2010, inspector Robert Kawano requests to re-route existing conduits in the new light pole ftg. location at STN. 4+12.03. Utilities seem to be privately owned by 555 Mission St.. Please advise.

St. property management. Webcor/Obayashi to relocate irrigation conduit to be out of the way of the light pole base location. Coordinate with 555 Mission (Julian Marsh 415-546-6036 or Rob Edlenbos 415-546-6037) to have the irrigation controllers shut off for the work.

---
RFI U-0019.1 Response - Eric Zagol - 12/27/2010

Unforeseen condition requiring improvements by property owner to relocate privately owned utilities in the City right of way. TJPA Representative to coordinate with property owner to relocate utilities.

---

**U-0020** **Street Lighting Relocation Plan for Minna** **Closed** **11/15/2010** **11/29/2010** **11/18/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Plan/Drawing Reference: U-3201

We have been informally advised that the Design Engineer and BLHP are considering a revised installation plan for the street lights on Minna. This would include the installation of temporary overhead power lines to feed the relocated street light poles, until such time as the new lights are powered from underground by Trinet.

Here is a sequence as Trinet understands it. Trinet would install the new light pole foundations on the north side of Minna and then relocate the light poles from the south side, per plans. BLHP would then install overhead cable, extending from a pole on 2nd St., to provide power for the lights. During installation of the new foundations, Trinet would install underground conduit from the pole to an adjacent splice box, and then later extend the underground conduit from the splice box to the PG&E power source, as depicted on the plans.

Please clarify the street lighting relocation plan currently under consideration. Also, if the BLHP plan to feed the

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

11/18/2010, per Eric Zagol;
At the request of the TJPA, SFPUC BLHP provided temporary overhead power for four street lights on Minna St. The temporary overhead power is shown in the attached sketch RFI-U0020 SKU-01. The temporary overhead street light power allows PG&E to de-activate existing underground electric ductbanks in Minna St. while maintaining power to the existing street lights.

The temporary overhead power to existing street lights can remain active until the two street light relocations in Minna Street are constructed, new underground street light duct, bull boxes and cables are constructed, and new underground power connections have been coordinated with SFPUC BLHP and PG&E.

Since SFPUC BLHP provided temporary power to the existing street lights, the construction sequence of the new street lights with respect to the other works on Minna St. now has more flexibility and is not required prior to performing other works in Minna St.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

lights temporarily from overhead, will any changes be required to the foundation and light pole installation plan to accommodate an overhead power feed?

Please review and advise.

---

**U-0021** **M.H. #501 and existing utilties** **Closed** **11/17/2010** **11/22/2010** **12/02/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Plan/Drawing: U-3021

During potholing activities in 1st St. where Manhole #501 is to be installed Trinet has encountered a number of existing utilities which occupy the same intended space for Manhole #501. Please see the attached sketch for locations and clarifications of these utilities.

Some of these utilities, particularly UT Group #2 and UT Group #5 (reference sketch) are intended to be disconnected by PG&E by November 24th. Please confirm.

UT Group #1, which appears to be owned by ATT is noted on the drawings as to be disconnected and demolished. Please advise as to when this utility is scheduled to be disconnected.

UT Groups #3 and #4 are unidentified and were not included in the USA markings for this area. In order to construct M.H. #501 per the contract drawings these utilities must be removed or relocated. Please advise as to the ownership of these utilities and provide direction on how to proceed.

Note: due to construction, we are requesting that this RFI be answered by 11/22/10 if possible.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Please provide a mark up of U-3021 indicating the horizontal location of the utilities discovered that correlate to the section sketch provided. Also, please clearly indicate those utilities that were not marked in the field in response to the USA ticket for this excavation work.

**********

E. Zagol 11/24/10

In response to items listed above:

1. As of 11/17/10 PG&E has stated that the de-energization of Minna St. will be complete by 11/24/10. In accordance with Specification 024100 1.3 B and 024100 3.5 B obtain in writing a Utility Severance Certificate (or equal) that all connections have been disconnected and the utility is not active.

2. As of 11/17/10 AT&T has stated that contents in AT&T existing ducts along First St. have been terminated with the exception of the new duct from Howard St. to 400 Howard St. property. Confirm that the existing AT&T duct subject of discursion is the the exiting duct from TMH-1887 to Existing Transbay Terminal as shown to be demolished on U-1121. In accordance with Specification 024100 1.3 B and 024100 3.5 B obtain in writing a Utility Severance Certificate (or equal) that all connections have been

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

disconnected and the utility is not active.

3. Groups #3 and #4 utilities are not shown on AECOM's existing utility plans and as noted in the RFI are not included in the USA markings. Pending direction from TJPA's representative in accordance with Specification Section 00 08 10 the suggested first course of action is to notify USA and request a "No Response Follow Up Message". Other suggested actions have been provided to TJPA PMPC for consideration and direction further direction provided by the TJPA's Representative.

**********

E. Zagol 11/26/10

RE item #1, See attached email and email attachment from Antonio Chan (PG&E) dated 11/24/10 confirming de-energization of electric ducts in Minna St. and First St.

---

**U-0022** **SFWD crossings at Minna St. and 1st** **Closed** **11/17/2010** **12/01/2010** **12/03/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Plan/Drawing: U-1002 and attached PDF.

Current USA markings have identified (2) SFWD laterals which are not indicated on the drawings. These are located at approximately STA 8+59 and 9+06 and extend from the main in Minna St., North toward the building of 100 1st. ST. These laterals need to be identified and recorded in order to properly document and construct both the new water line and the new joint trench.

Any additional work associated with these utilities may result in a cost or schedule impact. Please review and provide direction on how we should proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

100 First St. Building Engineer confirmed existing laterals do not provide service to 100 First St.

After new water in Minna Street is constructed, water services and hydrant laterals are connected; main to main connections are made by CDD , and pipes are secure; and the existing water main is abandoned, demolish existing laterals identified at approx. STA 8+59 and 9+06.

DO NOT provide a connection from new water main to existng laterals at approx. STA 8+59 and 9+06.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**********

Tap record and meter information provided by SFPUC Customer Service Bureau indicates two water laterals to the 100 First St. property entering the building from First Street approximately 50 feet south of Mission St. Meter boxes located along First St. west sidewalk.

Coordinate with the 100 First St. Building Maintenance, Bradford J. Collins (CAC Real Estate Management Co., Inc.), Tel: 415.243.8803 thru the TJPA's representative to confirm that laterals do not provide service to 100 First St. property from Minna Street.

---

**U-0023** **MOP 1 for de-energizing PG&E at Minna St. between 1st and 2nd St** **Closed** **12/01/2010** **12/02/2010** **12/02/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Michelle Smith

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

There is a live PG&E cable in conduit (see RFI U-0021) in First Street at intersection of Minna Street.

Per spec section 01.01.42 / AT2-1 MOP for the Utility Shutdown Template, MOP 1 was created and sent via email on 11/29/10 requesting signatures from TJPA and PG&E for verificaiton the conduit is de-energized. Copy enclosed.

Also per spec section 02 41 00-3 (Vol. 20 Contract # CMCG 08-04 Existing Utilities)
Item A - "Coordinate the shut off or disconnect of existing utilities affecting demolition work with the utility owner at least (7) seven calendar days prior to commencing with the work. The TJPA Representative will coordinate with the utility owner to open/close valves on piping, perform piping disconnects required and perform electric and telecommunication disconnects required. Do not proceed with this phase of work before getting the approval from the TJPA Representative".

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Please see attached document. This will be the MOP Form that W/O and its subcontractors are to use for the duration of the project for the deenergization, disconnect, or demolition of any utilities.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please provide approval.

In addition, per item B of spec section 02 41 00-3, "Prior to removal of any non-governmental (privately owned) ductbank, conduit or gas lines, obtain in writing a Utility Severance Certificate that all connections have been disconnected and the utility is not active".

Please provide a Utility Severance Certificate per item B above.

Sewer work on First Street is scheduled to start 12/1/10. Work cannot proceed until the conduit is de-energized.

Thank you.

---

**U-0024** **EBI demo dwgs and schedule for coordination** **Closed** **12/02/2010** **12/03/2010** **12/08/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jeffrey Negley **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Michelle Smith

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Due to ongoing demolition work by EBI, W/O is requesting formal transmission of the most current demolition drawings and schedule.

These documents will be used for coordination efforts with the RUP subcontractors.

Please forward to W/O as soon as possible.

Thank you.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per our utilities working session yesterday (12/7/10), the demolition drawings being used are the original set issued for construction, dated 1/14/10. C. Traylor will follow up to find out if/when Webcor/Obayashi was issued a copy of this set, or issue a new one for your records. The following supplemental documents have been issued since this set:

- BSE drawing package - issued to W/O as Field Order #002 by TJPA (not attached to this RFI)

- Demolition Sequence drawings and manual - (copies attached to this RFI)

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0025 | Capped 6" Water Main in First St Investigative Trench at Minna St. | Closed | 12/03/2010 | 12/06/2010 | 12/08/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order), and attached sketch

Trinet has encountered a capped 6" water main running along the center of the First St. investigative trench at the east end of Minna St. - see attached sketch . Please confirm if the line is active or dead. We cannot excavate this section of trench to the required 8' depth until this water line is removed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contact USA and request SFWD (or SFPUC CDD) contact information.

Contact SFWD (or SFPUC CDD) and request field visit to determine status (active or abandoned) of existing capped 6" water pipe.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0026 | Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 21'-7 from Curb | Closed | 12/03/2010 | 12/06/2010 | 12/09/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)

See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 21'-7" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Verizon (MFS and MCI) conduits appear to be labeled in section however unknown conduits are indicated either directly below or adjacent to the identified Verizon conduits. How were the Verizon conduits (MFS and MCI) identified? Did Verizon confirm those labeled as Verizon (MCI and MFS) are theirs and the others are unknown? Please clarify. As per Demolition Plans, protect Verizon (MFS and MCI) structures in place until temporary bridge is constructed and Verizon conduits are relocated.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0027 | Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 18'-7 from Curb | Closed | 12/03/2010 | 12/06/2010 | 12/07/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)

See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 18'-7" from face of curb, on the attachment

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

- Confirm the "unidentified" utility was not marked by a utility in response to USA ticket.

- Confirm that USA No Response Follow-Up procedures (First, Second and Third No Response Follow-Up) were followed in an effort to identify the utility including notifying utilities. Investigation information provided appears to be consistent with

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.

plans indicating a PG&E utility.

- Confirm PG&E was contacted via USA process to mark underground facilities.

---

**U-0028** **Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 14'-7 from Curb** **Closed** **12/03/2010** **12/06/2010** **12/07/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)

See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 14'-7" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

- Confirm the "unidentified" utility was not marked by the utility in response to USA ticket.

- Confirm that USA No Response Follow-Up procedures (First, Second and Third No Response Follow-Up) were followed in an effort to identify the utility including notifying utilities. Investigation information provided appears to be consistent with plans indicating a PG&E utility.

- Confirm PG&E was contacted via USA process to mark underground facilities.

---

**U-0029** **Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 13'-4" from Curb** **Closed** **12/03/2010** **12/06/2010** **12/07/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)

See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 13'-4" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

- Confirm the "unidentified" utility was not marked by the utility in response to USA ticket.

- Confirm that USA follow up procedures were followed in an effort to identify the utility including notifying utilities with no response.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0030 | Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 9'-10" from Curb | Closed | 12/03/2010 | 12/06/2010 | 12/10/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)

See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 9'-10" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Verizon (MFS and MCI) conduits appear to be labeled in section however unknown conduits are indicated either directly below or adjacent to the identified Verizon conduits. How were the Verizon conduits (MFS and MCI) identified? Did Verizon confirm those labeled as Verizon (MCI and MFS) are theirs and the others are unknown? Please clarify. As per Demolition Plans, protect Verizon (MFS and MCI) structures in place until temporary bridge is constructed and Verizon conduits are relocated.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0031 | Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 7'-2" from Curb | Closed | 12/03/2010 | 12/06/2010 | 12/07/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)

See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 7'-2" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

- RFI states "unidentified" utility yet highlighted utility in New Section 1 states "10 AWSS", please clarify question.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0031.1 | 24in Concrete Wall in First St. Invest Trench - 7ft 2in from FOC | Closed | 12/23/2010 | 01/02/2011 | 12/29/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached section and plan sketches, and attached documentation of notifications to USA North

See the highlighted wall on attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the East side of First St.from Stn. 10+00 to 9+70. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007 Trinet requests direction regarding the unidentified 24"

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown 24" concrete wall to be demolished by Transit Center Project (NIP) within the area impacted by the CDSM shoring wall and mass excavation.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/29/2010

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

concrete wall found 7'-2" from the East face of curb and 10" cover that was encountered but not indicated on the contract plans.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this wall by 12/27/10.

---

**U-0032** **Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 3'-2" from Curb** **Closed** **12/03/2010** **12/06/2010** **12/07/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)

See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the east side of First St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 3'-2" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

- Confirm the "unidentified" utility was not marked by a utility in response to USA ticket.

- Confirm that USA No Response Follow-Up procedures (First, Second and Third No Response Follow-Up) were followed in an effort to identify the utility including notifying utilities. Investigation information provided appears to be consistent with plans indicating a AT&Y utility at this location.

- Confirm AT&T was contacted via USA process to mark underground facilities.

---

**U-0032.1** **Unidentified 18" Concrete Wall in First St Invest Trench - 3ft-2in from Curb** **Closed** **12/23/2010** **01/02/2011** **12/29/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached section and plan sketches, and attached documentation of notifications to USA North

See the highlighted item on attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the East side of First

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown 18" concrete wall to be demolished by Transit Center Project (NIP) within the area impacted by the CDSM shoring wall and mass excavation.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/29/2010

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

St.from Station 10+00 to 9+70. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet requests direction for the demolition of the 18" concrete wall found 3'-2" from the East face of curb and 17.5" covered that was encountered but not indicated on the contract plans.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/27/10.

---

**U-0033** **Unidentified Facility in First St Invest Trench - 5'-8" from Curb** **Closed** **12/03/2010** **12/06/2010** **12/07/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1002 (dated 2010-10-01 - RUP Field Order)

See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on First St. at Minna St.. During Trinet's investigation, an unidentified utility/facility was encountered in the trench. Please identify the highlighted utility, located 5'-8" from face of curb, on the attachment and advise if it needs to be cut and capped.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

- Confirm the "unidentified" utility was not marked by the utility in response to USA ticket.

- Confirm that USA No Response Follow-Up procedures (First, Second and Third No Response Follow-Up) were followed in an effort to identify the utility including notifying utilities. Investigation information provided appears to be consistent with plans indicating traffic signal utility.

- Confirm SFMTA was contacted via USA process to mark traffic signals and street light underground facilities.

---

**U-0033.1** **Unidentified 2in Pipe in First St Invest Trench - 5ft-8in from Curb** **Closed** **12/23/2010** **01/02/2011** **12/29/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached section and plan sketches, and attached documentation of notifications to USA North

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirm exposed 2" pipe is Traffic Signal conduit as shown in the Plans. Once confirmed demolish in accordance with Demolition Plans.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the East side of First St.from Station 10+00 to 9+70. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet requests direction for demolition of the unidentified 2" pipe found 5'-8" from the East face of curb and 15" covered that was encountered but not indicated on the contract plans.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/27/10.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/29/2010

---

**U-0034** **Station 9+10 New Hydrant Conflict with Sidewalk Basement** **Closed** **12/09/2010** **12/20/2010** **12/13/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-3109 (dated 2010-09-29)

During Trinet's potholing for the Joint trench along the North side of Minna St, a basemenet for building "100 First St." was revealed. The basement wall is located just behind the face of curb and extends to more than 8 feet below finish grade. The extent of the basement is unknown, but assumed to run the length of the "100 First St" property. The basement structure is in conflict with the proposed new fire hydrant installation at Station 9+10.

Please provide layout for the fire hydrant.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The wall encountered appears to be an abandoned side walk basement wall for the 4 story brick building that existed prior to the current 100 First St. building. Approximate width of wall is 2 feet and the outside face is approximately at the face of curb. Neatly cut and remove wall to form a trench. Required trench width and depth per Detail 7 on U-5101. Construct hydrant lateral, riser and hydrant as shown in Detail 2 on Sheet U-5101.

---

**U-0035** **Installlation Depth of Storm Drain New Catch Basins** **Closed** **12/09/2010** **12/13/2010** **12/13/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-3023, U-3033 (Detail B), Attached detail from Department of Public Works Buearu of Engineering

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

AECOM has confirmed with SFDPW Hydraulics that limited vertical bends in the 10-inch culvert run are acceptable. SFDPW also confirmed that from a maintenance perspective the clean out on the cast

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Trinet is concerned that the installation depth for many of the new catch basin does not comply with SFDPW Sewer Departent guidelines, specifically regarding access to the traps for the maintenance department. The DPW sewer maintenence crews need to have ready access to the p-trap during flooding emergencies. DPW crews need to be able
to reach the p-trap to, either remove the cleanout cap and release the flow to the culvert pipe (if the trap bottom is plugged), or rod the culvert line through the trap (if the culvert is plugged). To get some clarification of the installation
guidelines, Trinet had informally talked to one of the design engineers at the SF Bureau of Engineerring, Hydraulics
Department. He advised Trinet that new catch basins should be installed with center of trap and discharge piping grade located between 3 and 4 feet below the culvert runs to cross under existing utilities that are in conflict with a direct run to the discharge manhole. Bends should be 22 1/2 degrees where possible as required, and if 45 degree bends must be used we should limit the number to two (2).

Please provide the depth of CB#603 on Freemont Street. To expedite the work in the field, we require an answer by 12/13/10.

iron trap is more accessible at a depth of 3 to 4 feet below ground surface.

Please submit subsurface utility investigation information including top, bottom and size of existing utilities along the 10-inch culvert alignment from catch basin to manhole such that the 10-inch culvert can be engineered and the catch basin depth can be determined to avoid existing and future utilities.

---

**U-0035.1** **Fremont Street Storm Drain from CB#603 to (E) Manhole** **Closed** **12/23/2010** **01/02/2011** **12/28/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jason Dunne **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Refer to Sheet U-3023, U-3033 (detail B) and see RFI #U-0035

Per the response to RFI #U-0035, find attached for your review a drawing showing the proposed alignment for the catch basin (CB# 603) installation and storm drain run to the existing manhole on Fremont St.

Please confirm this proposed alignment is acceptable or provide another solution.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Based on a site visit on 12/28/10 with Jason Dunne (W/O) and Victor (Trinet) to review exposed trench alignment for 10-inch culvert it was confirmed that the culvert alignment will clear the new temporary 8-inch water and existing 8-inch water main with adequate separation.

Alignment as shown in the attached drawing is acceptable.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

***Please confirm this alignment by 12/27/10 if possible.

Note, existing 3" HP Gas immediately west of the catch basin is to be abandoned by PG&E per Sheet U-1123 Demolition and Sequence item 2. Coordinate with PG&E to confirm 3" HP Gas is inactive and can be demolished and removed to facilitate construction of the catch basin and culvert, if required.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/28/2010

**********
**********
*********

Please indicate the location of new temporary 8-inch water main in Fremont Street in the section drawing and resubmit for review.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/27/2010

---

**U-0036** **Unidentified 6in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 7ft-9in from FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/30/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 28 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 6" steel pipe at 7'-9" from the east face of curb and 3'-4" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

Note, 6" steel pipe is in the same alignment as PG&E's excavated manhole 1675. Coordinate with PG&E to see if PG&E has demolished this line.

---

**U-0037** **Unidentified 2in Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 7in from FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/30/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 16 and Documentation of notification to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U - 1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 2" steel line found 7" from south face of curb and 2'-2" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

12/16/10.

nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

---

**U-0038** **Unidentified 4" Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 7ft 4in from FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/16/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 17 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U - 1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4" steel line found 7'-4" from north face of curb and 2'-11" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed that the existing 4" steel line is an abandoned PG&E conduit connected to the abandoned PG&E manhole 1354 abandoned and de-energized as part of PG&E's Minna Street Stage I de-energization work. Demolish and remove conduit and contents following confirmation of abandonment by PG&E.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0039 | Unidentified 4" Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 6ft 7in from FOC | Closed | 12/15/2010 | 12/25/2010 | 12/16/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 18 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U - 1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4" steel line found 6'-7" from north face of curb and 2'-3" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirm that the existing 4" steel line is an abandoned PG&E conduit connected to the abandoned PG&E manhole 1354 abandoned and de-energized as part of PG&E's Minna Street Stage I de-energization work. Demolish and remove conduit and contents following confirmation of abandonment by PG&E.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0040 | Unidentified 4in Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 5ft from FOC | Closed | 12/15/2010 | 12/25/2010 | 12/16/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 19 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U- 1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4" steel line found 5' from north face of curb and 2'-10" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Existing 4" steel conduit is directly in line with abandoned PG&E manhole 1354. Confirm that the existing 4" steel is an abandoned PG&E conduit connected to the abandoned PG&E manhole 1354 abandoned and de-energized as part of PG&E's Minna Street Stage I de-energization work. Demolish and remove conduit and contents following confirmation of abandonment by PG&E.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0041 | Unidentified 1in Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 2ft 9in from FOC | Closed | 12/15/2010 | 12/25/2010 | 12/30/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 20 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 1" steel line found 2' 9" from north face of curb and 18" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0042 | Unidentified 6in Facility Encountered in Minna St. - 6in from FOC | Closed | 12/15/2010 | 12/25/2010 | 12/16/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 21 and documentation of notifications to USA North

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirm with PG&E that the 6" steel line identified is an abandoned PG&E 6" cast iron gas main. Demolish abaondoned 6" cast iron pipe and contents as

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet "hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 6" steel line found 6" from north face of curb and 36" to cover. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

required to construct the Joint Trench.

---

**U-0043** **Fire Hydrant at St. 5+70 on Minna** **Closed** **12/13/2010** **12/23/2010** **12/14/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Mario Saldana Sr. **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

INFORMATION NEEDED
See the attached picture of the proposed fire hydrant location as indicated by drawings on Minna St. at Stn. 5+70. This location is in conflict with an existing driveway apron not shown on drawing #
U-2008. Eric Zagol from AECOM is aware and has seen this issue in the field. NOTE - Due to the 8" water line currently being installed, the location for the "T" section oinstall could be as early as Tuesday the 14th. Please provide direction by 12-14-10 if possible.

We propose to move the fire hydrant location 6¿ West to Stn. 5+64. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Due to the close proximity to the existing street light at the suggested location, please construct the hydrant east of the existing driveway at STA 5+87.5.

---

**U-0044** **Unidentified 4ft x 6.5ft Wall Encountered in Minna St. - 1ft from FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/20/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolish and remove structure as required to

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Trinet RFI 22 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4' x 6.5' wall (bottom was not found) at 1' from north face of curb and 18" to cover that Trinet encountered in the east wall of the trench. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this structure.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

construct Joint Trench.

---

**U-0045** **Unidentified Concrete Wall Encountered in Minna St. - in line with FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/29/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 23 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 2 + 29.68 on Minna St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified concrete wall (bottom was not found) in line with the north face of curb and 30" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this structure. Also, this wall may effect Trinet's ability to build the catchbasin at Station 2+13.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Two part question, responses are as follows:

1. In reference to the exposed concrete wall, TJPA Representative to confirm that the concrete wall exposed is an old sub sidewalk basement backfilled with concrete during construction of the 101 Second St. building.

2. In reference to "this wall may effect Trinet's ability to build the catchbasin at Station 2+13", pothole in accordance with the contract documents at catch basin location to identify any conflicts.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/29/2010

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0046 | Unidentified Concrete Wall Encountered in Fremont St. - in line with FOC | Closed | 12/15/2010 | 12/25/2010 | 12/29/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 24 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified concrete structure wall (the bottom was not found) at the east face of curb and 18" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this structure.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown concrete wall to be demolished by Transit Center Project (NIP) within the area impacted by the CDSM shoring wall and mass excavation.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/29/2010

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0047 | Unidentified 3in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 5ft-8in from FOC | Closed | 12/15/2010 | 12/25/2010 | 12/30/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 25 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 3"steel pipe at 5'-8" from the east face of curb and 4'-3" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

---

**U-0048** **Unidentified 3in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 6ft-10in from FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/30/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 26 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 3" steel pipe at 6'-10" from the east face of curb and 18" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

---

**U-0049** **Unidentified 1in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 6ft-10in from FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/30/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 27 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 1" steel pipe at 6'-10" from the east face of curb and 4'-3" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

---

**U-0050** **Lower Sewer Laterals on Minna** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **01/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Mario Saldana Sr. **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheets U-3007 & 3008, and Trinet RFI 41

Two of the active sewer service laterals potholed on Minna St.are lower than the new sewer main and will not drain. The details of each issue are as follows:
1. Station 5+05 - Service for #2 Shaw Alley
Top of pipe grade @ FOC for the 6" VCP sewer lateral is 11.37 . The invert elevation is approximately 10.8. The invert elevation of the new 24" sewer main @ Station 5+05 is approximately 11.4

2. Station 2+10 - Service for Anchor & Hope Restaurant
Top of pipe grade @ FOC for the 6" VCP sewer lateral is 13.51. The invert elevation is approximately 12.94. The invert of the new 18" VCP sewer main @ Station 2+10 is approximately 13.4.

Please review these issues and advise. An expedited response is requested by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

1/11/11

See revised Sewer Plan and Elevation Phase I Plans titled "Revisions - Minna Street 12/27/10" for revisions to sewer main elevations.

**********

12/27/10

Adjust new sewer main in Minna Street to accommodate existing laterals as shown in the "Minna Street Revisions" sheet revision forthcoming addressing both this RFI and RFI U-0017.

---

**U-0051** **Unidentified 6in x 6in Concrete Duct Encountered in Fremont St. - 10ft-1in from FC Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **01/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 30 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 6in x 6in concrete duct at 10'-1" from the east face of curb and 5' to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

Note, 6"x6" conc. duct is in the same alignment as PG&E's excavated manhole 1675. Coordinate with PG&E to see if PG&E has demolished this line.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0052 | Unidentified 12in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 11ft-6in from FOC | Closed | 12/15/2010 | 12/25/2010 | 12/20/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 32 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 12" steel pipe at 11'-6" from the east face of curb and 3'-6" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirm with PG&E that the 12" steel line identified is an abandoned PG&E 12" cast iron gas main. Following confirmation from PG&E, cut and cap existing abandoned 12" cast iron gas main at the demarcation line shown on U-1123.

---

**U-0053** **Unidentified 3in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 10ft-3in from FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/30/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 31 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 3" steel pipe at 10'-3" from the east face of curb and 3'-10" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

Note, 3" steel pipe is in the same alignment as PG&E's excavated manhole 1675. Coordinate with PG&E to see if PG&E has demolished this line.

---

**U-0054** **Unidentified Pair of 4in Pipes Encountered in Fremont St. - 22ft from FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/30/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 33 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified pair of 4" steel pipes at 22' from the west face of curb and 2'-7" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

---

**U-0055** **Unidentified 10in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 14ft 3in from FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/20/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 34 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 10" steel pipe at 14'-3" from the west face of curb and 2'-11" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirm with PG&E that the 10" steel line identified is an abandoned PG&E 10" cast iron gas main. Following confirmation from PG&E, cut and cap existing abandoned 10" cast iron gas main at the demarcation line shown on U-1123.

---

**U-0056** **Unidentified 4in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 12ft 3in from FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/29/2010** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 35 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4" steel pipe at 12'-3" from the west face of curb and 2' to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirm 4" steel pipe is SFPUC BLHP street light conduit as shown in the Plans. Once confirmed demolish in accordance with the Demolition Plans.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0057 | Unidentified 2.5in Pipes Encountered in Fremont St. - 4ft 10in from FOC | Closed | 12/15/2010 | 12/25/2010 | 12/30/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 36 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified pair of 2.5" steel pipes at 4'-10" from the west face of curb and 21" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

Note, 2-2.5" steel pipes are in the same alignment as PG&E's excavated manhole 1674. Coordinate with PG&E to see if PG&E has demolished this line.

---

**U-0058** **Unidentified 4in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 2ft from FOC** **Closed** **12/15/2010** **12/25/2010** **12/29/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 37 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 4" steel pipe at 2' from the west face of curb and 15" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirm 4" steel pipe is SFPUC BLHP street light conduit as shown in the Plans. Once confirmed demolish in accordance with the Demolition Plans.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/29/2010

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0059 | Unidentified 6in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - in line with FOC | Closed | 12/15/2010 | 12/25/2010 | 01/03/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 38 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 6" clay pipe at the west face of curb and 4'-7" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Possible existing Transbay Terminal sewer laterals. Coordinate with Existing Terminal & Ramps Demolition Plans Project (Demolition Project) through the TJPA Representative to confirm that the Demolition Project has abandoned sewer laterals. Sewer laterals should be abandoned per SFDPW Standards.

Once confirmed abandoned, cut and plug at the demarcation line shown in the Drawings.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0060 | Unidentified 6in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - in line with FOC | Closed | 12/15/2010 | 12/25/2010 | 01/04/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008, attached sketch of section from Trinet RFI 39 and documentation of notifications to USA North

See the attached section through the investigative trench at station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4 on sheet U-1008, Trinet hereby requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 6" clay pipe in line with the west face of curb and 6'-6" to cover that Trinet encountered in their trenching which was not indicated on the contract plan. Per the same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this line.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/16/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Possible existing Transbay Terminal sewer laterals. Coordinate with Existing Terminal & Ramps Demolition Plans Project (Demolition Project) through the TJPA Representative to confirm that the Demolition Project has abandoned sewer laterals. Sewer laterals should be abandoned per SFDPW Standards.

Once confirmed abandoned, cut and plug at the demarcation line shown in the Drawings.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0061 | Revised drawing for 8" water line on Minna St. at Second St. | Closed | 12/20/2010 | 12/30/2010 | 12/21/2010 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Mario Saldana Sr. **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-3407

Please provide drawing for the 8" water line and vertical / hydrant installation on Minna St. (reference RFI U-0017 response) west of Station 1+02. Please provide A.S.A.P. as field construction should be at this point by Tuesday pm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Please see the attached sketch that shows revisions to the water line along Minna Street as a result of the Joint Trench realignment due to the sub sidewalk basement conflict at 133 Second St.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0062 | Unidentified 8in Pipe Encountered in Fremont St. - 8ft 3in from FOC | Closed | 12/22/2010 | 01/01/2011 | 01/03/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1008 (dated 2010.09.29) and attached sketch from Trinet

See attached section through the investigative trench at Station 4+40 on Fremont St. Per note 4, on sheet U-1008 Trinet requests direction on an unidentified 8" steel pipe found 8'-3" from the East face of curb and 4'-4" to cover that was encountered but not indicated on the contract documents.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this pipe by 12/27/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3 EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

Note, 8" steel pipe is in the same alignment as PG&E's excavated manhole 1675. Coordinate with PG&E to see if PG&E has demolished this line.

---

**U-0063** **Unmarked service lateral on Minna St. at Station 3+08** **Closed** **12/22/2010** **01/01/2011** **12/27/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-3107 (dated 2010.09.29)

During excavation for the 8" water main along Minna Street, Trinet encountered a 1" Polyethylene service lateral at station 3+08, that extended into the vacant lot on the south side of the street. The service was broken during construction and Trinet has temporarily capped it. The utility was not shown on any utility plans. There is also no new service lateral, or reconnection of an existing, depicted on the new water main drawings at or adjacent to this location. Please advise on what should be done with the service. The repair is only temporary and a permanent reconnection will need to be performed by the SFWD if the service is to be maintained active. If the service is to be de-activated, then Trinet recommends that it be shut off at the connection to the old main.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown service lateral to vacant lot. Coordinate with SFWD through TJPA Representative to shut off broken lateral.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/27/2010

---

**U-0064** **Unidentified Facility in First St. Invest Trench - from Stn. 9+70 to 9+59.5** **Closed** **12/22/2010** **01/01/2011** **01/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007 and attached sketch of areas plan view

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown unforeseen existing utility condition.

In accordance with specification 00 08 10 section 1.3

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

See attached, plan views of the investigative trench on the East side of First St, West of the concrete MUNI median, from Stn. 9+70 to 9+59.5. Per note 4 on sheet U -1007, Trinet requests direction on the 4" Cardboard Pipe found 2'-0" West of the concrete MUNI median face of curb and 3'-6" to cover that was encountered but not indicated on the plans.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/23/10.

EXISTING UTILITIES NOT INDICATED and specification 020630 section 4.1 POTHOLING AND TRENCHING OPERATIONS paragraph C, please proceed with the following in order to identify all interfering utilities that are unknown after all specified procedures or other non destructive methods proposed by the contractor have been exhausted:

Pipe: If conductive material, perform subsurface investigation via electromagnetic detection (or other nondestructive methods) to trace utility back to nearest vault, pull box, manhole or valve to identify owner and content. If nonconductive, excavate along pipe alignment to expose coating and a joint. Inspect and provide information on coating and joint type. If content is still unknown, tap each line in order to identify contents and operating status of utility (i.e. abandoned or operational.)

Conduit and duct bank: Determine if utility is a charged electric utility utilizing a contractor that performs NETA type work. Determine if telecommunication cables are operational.

Once the utility has been identified including owner and contents, and determined inactive or de-energized, cut and cap utility at the demolition demarcation line shown in the drawings.

---

**U-0065** **Two Unidentified 4" Pipes in First St. Invest Trench from Stn. 10+00 to 9+70** **Closed** **12/23/2010** **01/02/2011** **12/29/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached sketch of areas in plan and section, attached USA North tickets

See attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the East side of First St.from Stn. 10+00 to 9+70. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007 Trinet requests

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirm 2-4" concrete and redwood encased pipes are the inactive 2-3" AT&T conduits from AT&T manhole TMH1887 to the Existing Transbay Terminal as shown in the Plans. Once confirmed demolish in accordance with the Demolition Plans.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

direction regarding the two 4" concrete and redwood encased pipes found at the East face of curb and down 2'-3" that was encountered but not indicated on the plans.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this facility by 12/27/10.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/29/2010

---

**U-0066** **Minna St Station 2+09 - 4" Water Service Lateral Encountered** **Closed** **12/23/2010** **01/02/2011** **12/28/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Refer to Sheet U-3107

During the water installation on Minna St we encountered an existing 4" water service lateral at Sta 2+09. The 4" service extends from the old 8" water main to 83 Minna St (Anchor & Hope Restaurant). This is in addition to a 1" service lateral to the same building which we encountered at station 2+09. The contract drawings only show the 1" water lateral service connecting to the new main.

Please advise if the existing 4" service lateral is active and if it must be connected to the new water main. There was no material on site to install a tee in the line, and to avoid delaying the work, the new water main isntallation continued past the 4" service lateral. The recommendation is that if the 4" service line needs to be connected to the new main, work can be performed by SFWD as an additional tie-in.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Existing 4-inch service for 83 Minna Street is indicated in specification 331160 Appendix A. Service is an active fire service to 83 Minna Street and must be connected to the new 8-inch water main.

Furnish and install 8"x8"x4" tee with joint restraint in accordance with the specifications. Furnish and install service 4-inch DIP, fittings and valve. Set 4-inch service and valve elevation to match existing 4-inch service elevation.

Connection from new 4-inch service valve to existing 4-inch service by SFWD.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/28/2010

---

**U-0066.1** **Minna St Station 2+09 - 4in Water Service Lateral Encountered** **Closed** **01/10/2011** **01/20/2011** **01/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jason Dunne **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3107 and Trinet RFI 059.1

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Construct water serive lateral in accordance with

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

This is a follow up to the engineer's response to Trinet RFI #59 (RFI#U-0066). Upon further evaluation of the 4" fire service connection at 83 Minna by Tom Farhnam (SFWD Senior Inspector), the water department proposed the attached installation detail for an 8"x4" tee in the 8" main, to be performed by Trinet, and the connection detail to the existing 4" service, to be performed later by the SFWD crew. This change was proposed to avoid conflicting utilities running along the south side of teh new 8" main. AECOM's Design Engineer, Eric Zagol, was advised of the changed design plan proposed by SFWD in the field on 12/28/2010. Please confirm if the attached plan is acceptable and approved for construction.

contractor's attached plan and note the following:

1. Provide full joint restraint in accordance with contract documents

2. Provide 4" DI pipe for the section labeled "9" DI NIPPLE"

---

**U-0067** **Buried Manhole in First St. Invest Trench - 15ft 7in from FOC** **Closed** **12/23/2010** **01/02/2011** **12/28/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference: Sheet U-1007, attached section and plan sketches, and attached documentation of notifications to USA North

See the highlighted man hole on attached plan and section through the investigative trench on the East side of First St.from Stn. 10+00 to 9+70. Per note 4 on sheet U-1007 Trinet requests direction regarding the unidentified manhole found 15'-7" from the East face of curb and buried 4'-6" deep that was encountered but not indicated on the contract plans.

Trinet has this plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. An expedited response is requested with official direction on how to proceed with this wall by 12/27/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Manhole appears to be an abandoned separated sanitary sewer manhole.

Please provide data on utility material (e.g. brick) and condition (e.g. filled with sand or concrete) in accordance with 02630 4.1 G.5 such that the demolition can be determined.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/28/2010

---

**U-0068** **Minna St Water Main Conflict w Abandoned Sewer MH** **Closed** **12/23/2010** **01/02/2011** **12/27/2010** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

See attached drawings adn photos

During the water main installation on Minna St, Trinet encountered what appears to be an old abandoned sewer manhole in the trench line at station 1+15. the structure was not indicated on the drawings and was not discovered untill the pavement asphalt was removed. The sewer manhole is direclty in conflict with the alignment of the new water main. The installation of the watermin cannot proceed furhter untill the manhole is demolished and/ or abandoned.

Per a field walk with Eric Zagol on 12/23/10, the existing MH was confirmed abondoned. Please confirm/ advise the top of the MH will be demolished to allow the installation of the waterline, and the MH will be backfilled with CDF.

****Please provide direction by 12/28/10.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

1. Remove and dispose of existing abandoned separated sanitary sewer system manhole to a depth of 1 foot below bottom of new water main.

2. Plug existing abandoned 8-inch sanitary sewer with concrete per 024100 3.6 A.

3. Backfill abandoned manhole with CDF to an elevation 1 foot below bottom of new water main.

4. Provide 6-inches of bedding material between CDF and bottom of trench bedding per Detail 7 on Sheet U-5101 such that the total depth
of trench bedding crossing the abandoned structure is 1 foot.

Answered by Eric Zagol
AECOM 12/27/2010

---

**U-0069** **Street Light CCTV Camera-East Side of Fremont St. @ Stn. 5+45** **Closed** **01/05/2011** **01/15/2011** **01/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Richard Buellesbach **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3302 and Trinet RFI 62

During removal of the light pole arm on the east side of Fremont St. @ Stn. 5+45, Trinet observed that there is a CCTV camera and associated wiring on the light pole. Please advise of the plan for removal of CCTV camera.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

1/14/11

Remove and salvage existing CCTV camera as part of the traffic signal equipment removal. Deliver traffic signal equipment and camera to the Traffic Signal Shop Yard in accordance with specification 02 41 00 par. 3.4 C 4.

**********

1/12/11

Please clarify how this RFI relates to RFI U-0073 "VOID - reference RFI U-0069"

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0070 | Subsurface Structures in Conflict with Minna St. AT&T Vault | Closed | 01/10/2011 | 01/20/2011 | 01/12/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jason Dunne **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-2008 and Trinet RFI 63

During our potholing on Minna St. for the proposed AT&T vault in the sidewalk (Stn. 3+72), we encountered an existing subsurface foundation and slurry shoring wall. The top of the subsurface foundation is at a depth of approximately 4' from the top of the sidewalk and is in conflict with the installation of the proposed AT&T vault. Installation of the proposed AT&T vault in accordance with the plans will require partial demolition of the existing foundation wall encountered. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

As determined during a site visit on 1/10/11 with W/O, Turner, AECOM and Tishman Speyer, the exposed wall is an abandoned sidewalk basement wall. Remove and dispose of existing abandoned sidewalk basement wall as required (approx. 1.5 feet in depth) to construct proposed AT&T vault.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0071 | Existing fittings at tie in location for Minna St. 8 in. Water Main (Stn. 9+30) | Closed | 01/10/2011 | 01/20/2011 | 01/12/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Richard Buellesbach **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3109 and Trinet RFI 64

Due to the presence of existing fittings installed in the existing 8 inch water main at our tie in location (Stn. 9+30) at First St. and Minna St. for the new 8 inch water main on Minna St., SFWD inspector Dan Helmnik has requested to extend the limits of the tie in excavation beyond the locations of the existing fittings. This is beyond what would normally be required for a tie in of this nature. Existing conditions were reviewed in the field by W/O, Turner, SFWD, Eric Zagol from Aecom, and Trinet personnel.

Please advise. An expedited response is requested.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Provide labor and equipment to excavate and shore trench for pipes, fittings, and valves as necessary for connections to the existing water mains by SFWD in accordance with U-3100 Note 4 and specification section 33 11 00 par. 3.5.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0072 | Fremont St traffic Signal Pole to be removed and salvaged - has Muni Cable attach | Closed | 01/10/2011 | 01/20/2011 | 01/18/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jack Adams

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3302 and Trinet RFI 65

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

J. Adams 01/18/2011

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Per contract, Trinet is required to remove and salvage the existing light pole indicated in the attached drawing. Through observation in the field, the existing light pole has a MUNI cable attached which runs to the intersection of Fremont St. and Mission St.. Based on these findings, should the light pole be removed as indicated? Mario Saldana from W/O was present when this item was observed and issue has been discussed with Eric Zagol from AECOM.

Please advise. An expedited response is requested by 01/12/2011.

These are MUNI OCS Poles not Lighting Poles. Both OCS poles along east side of Fremont near 301 Mission Tower are in use by MUNI OCS System. MUNI has designated each OCS pole to hold different guy wires at Fremont and Mission see Demolition drawing Sheet 105 of 137. The poles are to remain and be deleted from Webcor-Obayashi/Trinet scope.

NOTE: Evans Bros Subcontractor Reliance Electric are to correct OCS cables to both of these OCS Poles. Reference Demolition drawing plan sheet 105 of 137. A second cable will be installed at OCS Pole 4030 and the cable will be reinstalled at OCS Pole directly north of Pole 4030 per contract.

**********

J. Adams 01/13/2011

The MUNI Overhead Contact System (OCS) Pole in question not light pole. This OCS pole was to have the guy wires relocated to nearby MUNI OCS Pole by the Demolition Contractor in July 2010 during mods to Transbay Terminal MUNI OCS system. Demo drawing plan sheet 105 of 137 shows the guy wires relocated to pole 4030 - this is in EBi scope.

Pole 4030 is shown to remain per Demo drawing above - But, Pole 4030 is shown to be removed per RUP U-3302 .

It should be noted that upon relocation of this OCS guywire the removal of the pole is Webcor-Obayashi scope per drawing U-3302.

**********

E. Zagol 01/13/2011

Change in existing conditions. New MUNI guy wire was attached to existing pole at STA 5+45 as part of the Existing Terminal & Ramps Demolition Plans project.

1. Remove and salvage traffic signal equipment per U-

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

3302.

2. Protect in place existing MUNI pole.

**********

E. Zagol 01/12/2011

Change in existing conditions. New MUNI guy wire was attached to existing pole at STA 5+45 as part of the Existing Terminal & Ramps Demolition Plans project. Existing Terminal & Ramps Demolition Plans project to remove the MUNI pole at STA 5+60.

1. Remove and salvage traffic signal equipment per U-3302.

2. Protect in place existing MUNI pole at STA 5+60.

---

**U-0073** **Fremont St. Light Pole and Muni Cables to be protected - indicated light pole has r** **Closed** **01/10/2011** **01/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:**

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3302 Traffic Signal E and Trinet RFI 66

As indicated on the plans, Trinet is required to "Remove and Salvage Traffic Signal Equipment. Protect Pole and Muni Cables in Place." Conditions were reviewed in the field and there is no Muni cable attached to the (E) light pole.

Mario Saldana from W/O has observed there is a CCTV cable attached to the pole not mentioned in Trinet RFI 66 and requests clarification on ownership and status of the CCTV line. This issue has been discussed with Eric Zagol from AECOM.

Please advise. An expedited response is requested by

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

01/12/2011.

---

**U-0074** **Unidentified 9in Concrete Wall in First St Invest Trench - 10ft-5in west of Conc. Mu** **Closed** **01/10/2011** **01/20/2011** **01/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jason Dunne **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-1007 Traffic Signal E and Trinet RFI 051

See attached, plan views of the investigative trench on the east side of First St., west of the concrete Muni median, from Stn. 9+70 to 9+59.5. Per note 4 of sheet U-1007, Trinet requests that Webcor "notify TJPA" of the unidentified 9" concrete wall at 10ft-5in west of the concrete Muni median face of curb and 3ft-6in cover that Trinet encountered "not indicated on plans". Per same note, Trinet requests "direction on the demolition" of this structure. Trinet has plated but would like to backfill the trench as soon as possible. Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unknown concrete wall to be demolished by Transit Center Project (NIP) within the area impacted by the CDSM shoring wall and mass excavation.

---

**U-0075** **Water Main Connection at 2nd St and Minna St - expose new line for SFWD** **Closed** **01/11/2011** **01/21/2011** **01/12/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Mario Saldana **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3107 and attached photos

At the intersection of 2nd St and Minna St, there is an existing 2in gas line running directly on top and next to the existing 8in main to be tied into. SFWD cannot make the Tee connection due to the bells of the fittings with the 2in gas line so close.

The end of the new line installed by Trinet will need to be exposed about 2ft for SFWD to move the end of the line by 1ft east so that SFWD can make the connection without moving the gas line. This will require extra work for Trinet to expose the new line for SFWD. Eric Zangol

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Provide labor and equipment to excavate and shore trench for pipes, fittings, and valves as necessary for connections to the existing water mains by SFWD in accordance with U-3100 Note 4 and specification section 33 11 00 par. 3.5.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

from AECOM and Dan Helminiak from SFWD were present during the discussion of this issue.

Please provide direction as soon as possible as this will impact the chlorination and tie-in schedule.

---

**U-0076** **Water Main Connection at 2nd St and Minna St - demo/excavate per SFWD** **Closed** **01/11/2011** **01/21/2011** **01/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Mario Saldana **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3107 and attached photos

At the intersection of 2nd St and Minna St, the new 8in water main is to be connected to an existing 6in water line. The new 8in line installed by Trinet is above and below existing utilities, and SFWD requires more demo/excavation to make the connection.

This will require extra work for Trinet to demo/excavate per SFWD. Inspector Dan Helminiak is scheduling the SFWD to come back and measure this afternoon (01/11/2011). Eric Zangol from AECOM was also present during the discussion of this issue.

Please provide direction as soon as possible as this will impact the chlorination and tie-in schedule.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Provide labor and equipment to excavate and shore trench for pipes, fittings, and valves as necessary for connections to the existing water mains by SFWD in accordance with U-3100 Note 4 and specification section 33 11 00 par. 3.5.

---

**U-0077** **Fire Hydrant Installation at Minna St Stn. 0+90** **Closed** **01/12/2011** **01/22/2011** **01/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3107

With reference to the fire hydrant at Minna St. Stn. 0+90, (northeast corner of Second St. and Minna St.) General Note #5 on sheet U-3107 directs Trinet to "replace in place existing fire hydrant."

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

As discussed on site with Daniel Helminiak (SFPUC Inspector) and those mentioned above, the proposed construction sequencing of the fire hydrant at Minna St. STA 0+90 is acceptable.

Coordinate with Daniel Helminiak (or assigned SFPUC

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Per on site field discussions with Eric Zagol from AECOM, Robert Friend from Trinet and Mario Saldana from W/O, it was determined that the existing hydrant would remain in place until after the new water main connections are performed by CDD crews. After which the existing hydrant will be removed and new hydrant and lateral piping will be installed and tested.

Please confirm if this is acceptable. An expedited response is requested.

Inspector) and the SFWD to ensure the fire hydrant is properly decommissioned by SFWD and SFFD following main connections by SFWD and prior to abandonment of the existing main in Minna Street by SFWD prior to fire hydrant installation by Trinet. Coordinate with SFPUC inspector to ensure SFWD and SFFD installs a black hydrant "donut" on the existing fire hydrant and new fire hydrant prior to the new fire hydrant being placed in service. Coordinate the removal of the "donut" once new fire hydrant is in service.

---

**U-0078** **6in and 4in Service Laterals to 2 Shaw Alley** **Closed** **01/12/2011** **01/22/2011** **01/14/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-2008

The existing 4" water service found at Stn. 5+37 has been confirmed abandoned by SFWD personnel through on site investigations. Since the service is determined to be inactive, Trinet intends to not provide service from the new main for this 4" service as discussed in the field, with Eric Zagol from AECOM, Mario Saldana from W/O, Dan Helminick from SFWD and Robert Friend from Trinet. In addition, Dan Helmnick from SFWD requested to have the service tee installed in the new 8" main which was to provide service for this 4" lateral removed and straight pipe installed. Please confirm if this is acceptable.

The 6" water service lateral found at Stn. 5+30 has been confirmed as an active fire service to 2 Shaw Alley by SFWD personnel through on site investigations. Trinet intends to provide service from the new water main for this 6" service as discussed in the field with Eric Zangol from AECOM, Mario Saldana from W/O, Dan Helminiak from SFWD and Robert Friend from Trinet.

An expedited response is requested.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Existing 4" water service at STA 5+37. Subsurface utility investigations should have been performed and submitted prior to installation of water main to determine status of existing lateral in accordance with U-3108 General Note No. 3. It is acceptable to remove the 8"x8"x4" tee installed and replace with straight pipe per the request of SFPUC SFWD inspector.

Provide 6" water service later at STA 5+30 per contract documents.

AECOM suggests that there is no change in contract price to perform this work.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0079 | Fremont St Temp Water Line Installed over AT&T Duct | Closed | 01/17/2011 | 01/27/2011 | 01/19/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3123 and attached detail

During Trinet's installation of the temporary water line in Fremont St., Trinet encountered an existing AT&T duct that was in direct conflict with the temporary water line. Trinet was directed by Eugene Chu of SFWD/SFPUC to run the temporary water line over the existing AT&T duct using 45 degree bends. This resulted in less cover for the piping than what is required by the Water Department. Due to the lack of cover, Trinet was directed to install a 1/2in steel plate beneath the concrete base along the trench as depicted in the attached detail. The plate was approximately 2ft wide by 6ft long and extended to the limits of the installed 45 degree bends.
Please provide confirmation that this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

It is AECOM's understanding that Trinet encounter an existing PG&E electrical duct (4-4") crossing the water alignment feeding 301 Mission property and not an AT&T duct as referenced above. It is also AECOM's understanding that Trinet encountered an existing PG&E electrical duct (8-3") parallel to the water alignment which is ultimately to be abandoned by PG&E and demolished by Trinet. Both PG&E ducts are shown in the plans. Per sequencing shown on U-1123, the water line should be constructed after PG&E completes their work on Fremont Street.

Given the fact that the PG&E duct parallel (8-3") has not been abandoned by PG&E, and given the fact the option to go under the existing 4-4" PG&E duct per plans is not feasible because the existing 8-3" PG&E duct is not demolished, and given the fact that the new water main is a temporary condition, the above mentioned installation proposal is acceptable.

AECOM suggests no additional cost to contract price to perform this work.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0080 | Proposed Design Change for MH #501 | Closed | 01/17/2011 | 01/27/2011 | 01/28/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-2021 and attached drawings

Trinet proposes to change the design of sewer manhole #501 from a Modified Box Manhole (per SF Standard Plan #87,184) to a Precast Concrete Manhole (per SF Standard Plan #87,181 - see attached drawing). The proposal includes the installation of a temporary 24" PVC pipe stub, extending south from the manhole and connected to the brick sewer per SF Standard Plan #87,197.

The proposed manhole design will facilitate construction around the many utilities identified in the excavation - see RFI # U-0021 (Trinet RFI 04). It is also the preferred manhole design for 24in pipe per the SF Standard

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

CCSF DPW Standard Plan #87,181 referenced specifies a 4 ft diameter precast concrete manhole. Three (3) 24-inch pipes connecting to a 4 ft diameter manhole at invert elevation as proposed by contractor may yield an unstable structure and is not approved. A larger diameter precast concrete manhole may be acceptable however the alternative would need to be submitted as a substitution for CCSF SFDPW approval.

As per the response to RFI U-0021, please provide a mark up of U-3021 indicating the size, and horizontal and vertical location of the utilities identified in the excavation for review.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Drawings, especially since the brick sewer on the south side will later be abandoned and plugged (in the manhole) by the owner. This plan will also facilitate the later abandonment of the outlet to the south, as the owner will just have to plug the 24in outlet pipe and not a 3x5 brick sewer.

Please consider. An expedited response is requested.

---

**U-0080.1** **Proposed Design Change for MH #501** **Closed** **02/09/2011** **02/18/2011** **02/22/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-2021, RFI #U-0080, and attached drawings

In response to the Engineer's concerns with the number and size of pipes in Trinet's original revised detail for MH 501 (RFI#U-0080), Trinet has changed their proposed installation drawing to include a 5' I.D. cast-in-place MH base. The lower precast section of the MH will be 5' I.D., with a precast reducer section transitioning from 60" to 48" I.D. placed above. Attached is the revised drawing for MH 501 and shop drawings for the precast MH sections. The design was discussed with Cliff Wong from the SF Bureau of Engineering, Hydraulics Department, and he did not have a problem with a 5' I.D. manhole.

Trinet requests an expedited response.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

02/22/2011 - Kevin Chiu

A Change Request (CR) may be issued for the accepted substitution of the 5-foot diameter precast concrete manhole in lieu of the cast in place Modified Box Manhole.

---

02/18/2011 - Eric Zagol

The proposed design change for sewer manhole #501 from a Modified Box Manhole per SFDPW Standard Plan #87,184 included in the contract documents to a 5-foot diameter precast concrete manhole with a temporary 24¿ PVC pipe connection to the existing 3¿x5¿ brick sewer per SFDPW Standard Plan #87,197 is acceptable.

Provide flexible pipe connections to the 5-foot diameter precast concrete manhole as shown in SFDPW Standard Plan #87,181.

As per the response to RFI U-0080 and U-0021, please provide a markup of U-3021 indicating the size, and horizontal and vertical location of the utilities identified in conflict for review. This request is now 7

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

weeks outstanding.

AECOM suggests a cost credit for the substitution of the 5-foot diameter precast concrete manhole for the larger cast in place Modified Box Manhole per contract documents.

---

**U-0081** **Water Main Alignment - Howard St STA18+72 and STA19+98** **Closed** **01/19/2011** **01/28/2011** **01/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3119 and attached drawing

Please confirm that it is acceptable for M Squared to install the new 12in water line in a straight line as sketched on the attachment. Contract Drawings show the pipe offsetting between Sta 18+72 and Sta 19+98.
Due to existing utilities discovered in potholes the 12in line will be installed 18ft from centerline.

Also, please confirm the elevations of the water line can be raised dependant on the depths of the existing utilities

Also, the referenced drawing has a discrepancy shown between the 12in water line bend station called out and the location shown in plan view. Please confirm that the first 45degree bend is located at 18+72, and not 18+27.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

1. Contract Drawings indicate an offset to avoid a bus island, as shown on the plans, that was to be constructed as part of the Transbay Temporary Terminal Project. AECOM received confirmation from Philip Sandri TJPA/PMPC that the bus island was deleted from the Transbay Terminal Project. It is acceptable to eliminate the offset and construct water main between STA 18+72 and STA 19+98 at 18ft from centerline.

2. Elevations of the water line can be raised dependant on the depth of the existing utilities. Minimum depth of cover shall be 18-inches below the bottom of the concrete base pavement section per DPW Order No. 176,707 or 28" which ever is greater.

3. 45 degree at STA 18+72. 45 degree bend no longer required due to response provided in item 1 above.

---

**U-0082** **Sewer System Quality Assurance Clarification** **Closed** **01/19/2011** **01/29/2011** **01/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Michelle Smith

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specifications Section 33 31 10, 1.4.E

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

For general materials, please follow the specification

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please clarify if TJPA or DPW is going to complete the inspection of the pipe as described in the referenced specification section.

requirements regarding delivered materials in 01 16 00 1.6D.

For materials falling under specification section 33 31 31, section 1.4C determines that all piping is SUBJECT to inspection by TJPA and/or DPW. This means that all piping is to be made available upon delivery if TJPA/DPW deems it is necessary to inspect the material. Contractor to inform TJPA of all deliveries and assure the storage facility is accessible. TJPA will inform contractor if material will be inspected prior to installation. When TJPA determines that additional labor is needed to move materials around for inspection, please reference 1.4E, which states that contractor is to furnish labor as needed to assist TJPA with this effort.

There is no ¿HOLD POINT¿ for TJPA or SFWD to inspect materials at manufacturer or upon delivery. TJPA/DPW intends to inspect the materials deliveries of each subcontractor until such time as a confidence level is built that subcontractor and W/O are ensuring the proper amount of quality control through their own material inspections.

Per specification Section 01 14 00 1.4, W/O shall verify all dimensions in the field and shall check all field conditions continuously during construction, including materials. Any inspection of materials by TJPA, DPW, or any other agency does not alleviate the subcontractor or W/O of the responsibility of performing your own quality assurance measures, or constitute an acceptance of materials. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the subcontractor and W/O to ensure the materials used for the project meet the contractual requirements set forth in the drawings and specifications.

---

**U-0083** **Water Main Alignment on Howard at Beale** **Closed** **01/19/2011** **01/29/2011** **01/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3118

Potholes on Beale Street at Sta 14+00, Sta 14+90 and Sta 16+25 reveal a 6in steel line that is unmarked and not shown on contract drawings. The line is 18ft south of the Howard St centerline. This is the proposed alignment for the new 12in water main. The pothole at Sta 14+00 also reveals a 3in steel conduit which is 16ft south of the Howard St centerline. Also there is a 6ft x 6ft wooden telecom duct bank that runs east to west on Howard Street at 15ft south of the Howard Street centerline. This location offers the closest window for the new 12in water line to the original alignment shown in the contract drawings.

This would require the removal of the wooden duct bank and the removal of the abandoned manhole shown on U-3118 (Sta 14+96 ¿ 15ft from Howard St centerline)

Please confirm the alignment of the new 12in water main.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Existing 6-inch steel pipe appears to be a 6-inch cast iron abandoned PG&E gas main. Confirm the "6ft x 6ft wooden telecom duct bank" is a 6-inch x 6-inch wooden duct bank and is abandoned.

Refer to RFI # U-0083.1

---

**U-0083.1** **Water Main Alignment on Howard at Beale** **Closed** **01/24/2011** **02/03/2011** **01/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squared has confirmed that the wooden duct bank is a 6inch x 6 inch wooden duct bank and is abandoned.

Please direct M Squared on how to proceed.

**********

Question from U-0083:

Reference Sheet U-3118

Potholes on Beale Street at Sta 14+00, Sta 14+90 and Sta 16+25 reveal a 6in steel line that is unmarked and not shown on contract drawings. The line is 18ft south of the Howard St centerline. This is the proposed alignment for the new 12in water main. The pothole at Sta 14+00 also reveals a 3in steel conduit which is 16ft south of the

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Construct 12-inch water main at the location proposed; 15 ft south of Howard Street centerline. Remove and dispose of abandoned wooden duct bank and abandoned manhole as required to construct new 12-inch water main.

Refer to response provided for RFI U-0083.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Howard St centerline. Also there is a 6in x 6in wooden telecom duct bank that runs east to west on Howard Street at 15ft south of the Howard Street centerline. This location offers the closest window for the new 12in water line to the original alignment shown in the contract drawings.

This would require the removal of the wooden duct bank and the removal of the abandoned manhole shown on U-3118 (Sta 14+96 15ft from Howard St centerline)

Please confirm the alignment of the new 12in water main.

---

**U-0084** **Water Main Alignment on Beale Street** **Closed** **01/21/2011** **01/31/2011** **01/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3124

M Squared potholed at Sta 1+10 on Beale Street. We discovered that the 10in High pressure water line is 9ft-5in from the FOC. The existing 12in water line is 14ft-8in from the FOC. The 10in High Pressure line is closer to the FOC that shown on contract drawings. This now means that there is a larger window between the 10in high pressure water and the existing 12in water main.

M Squared would like to install the new 12in water line at 12ft-3in from center line of the pipe to the FOC.
This would mean the new 12in water line would be outside the parking strip and the parking strip would stay in tact. SFWD would also prefer it outside the parking strip for maintenance purposes.

Please confirm that it is acceptable to install the new 12in water line at 12ft-3in from FOC, going from Sta 0+60 to Sta 1+90.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contract drawings show existing 10-inch HPW (AWSS) at 9ft-7in from FOC. Contract drawings show existing 12-inch water line at 13 ft-11in from FOC.

Please clarify if dimensions provided by Contractor are to centerline of pipe.

Please provide depth to centerline of the existing 10-inch HPW (AWSS) potholed.

Contractor's proposed location at 12ft-3in from FOC is in conflict with proposed Beale St. sewer main.

Following receipt of information requested, AECOM will evaluate if water line can be moved west of parking strip.

---

**U-0084.1** **Water Main Alignment on Beale Street** **Closed** **02/18/2011** **02/28/2011** **02/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3124 and RFI #U-0084

In response to the Engineer's questions, M Square has noted the following:
- Yes, the dimensions provided are to centerline of the pipe
- Depth to centerline of existing 10-inch AWSS is 72-inches

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

In reference RFI U-0084, it is not acceptable to install the new 12in water line at 12ft-3in from FOC, going from Sta 0+60 to Sta 1+90. As discussed during a site meeting with Noel M. (M2) and Mario S. (Webcor) on 2/11/11, construct 12-inch water line as shown on U-3124. Restore parking strip per Contract Documents.

---

**U-0085** **AT&T Duct Bank on Beale at STA 6+00** **Closed** **01/21/2011** **01/31/2011** **01/27/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3125 and attached sketch

The existing 4no. 4in AT&T lines on Beale Street at Sta 6+10 are not as shown on the contract drawings. See attached sketch.
Contract drawings show the conduit crossing M Squared's trench for 6 or 7 feet, however the duct bank is in the trench for 37 feet due to the alignment and width of the duct bank. The conduits are covered with a 2 foot wide concrete cap and appear in the trench for the new 12in water main at Sta 6+12 before leaving the trench at Sta 5+75. M Sqaured cannot lay the pipe on top of the concrete cap as the pipe will not have the required coverage.
Due to this M Squared is unable to install the new 12in water as shown. Juan with AT&T advised that M Squared remove the concrete cap from the conduits to allow for excavation of this portion of trench. With the cap removed it is more likely that the pipe will have the necessary minimum coverage.

Please confirm that this is how M Squared is to proceed. An expedited reponse is requested.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Please proceed as per AT&T's suggestion.

Please coordinate with AT&T's representative Huan Hunynh and field representative Dave Olson for an onsite inspection by AT&T of the affected AT&T conduits prior to backfill.

Confirm minimum cover of 30-inches or 18-inches below concrete pavement base which ever is greater, is maintained.

Provide distance between top of water main and bottom of AT&T conduits for review.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0086 | Concrete Slab & Rail Ties at Howard STA 13+60 | Closed | 01/24/2011 | 02/03/2011 | 01/25/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3117 and attached sketch

M Squared potholed at Howard Sta 13+60. The pothole revealed a 15in thick concrete slab which is in conflict with the proposed alignment of the new 12in water line.
M Squared broke out a cross section of the slab and found nothing in it. There was also nothing underneath the slab for 5.5 feet. The southern edge of the slab is 4 feet north of the Howard Street center line. M Squared also discovered 6inch x 8inch x 4foot-6inch wooden rail ties.

If M Squared has to remove the concrete slab to install the water line at the alignment shown there is a danger that the MFS (fiber optic) conduits will be damaged as these conduits sit on top of the slab.

Breaking off an 18in section of the concrete slab and also a section of the rail ties would allow M Squared to excavate and install the new water pipe, while keeping away from the MFS conduits and not damaging them. However this will be time consuming.

An alternative option is to move the trench for the new 12in water pipe 18in south and just remove the wooden rail ties (as shown in sketch).

Mario S. from W/O and Eric Z. from AECOM were present during the discussion of this issue with M Squared in the field.

Please direct M Squared on how to proceed with the water line installation. An expedited response is requested

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

As discussed during a site visit on 1/25/11 with Noel (M Squared) and Mario S. (W/O) the Contractor's proposed alignment of 18-inches south of alignment per Plans is in conflict with the existing sewer (limited separation).

As discussed, pothole along Howard St. between Fremont St. and First St. to determine if 15-inch concrete slab is a local condition at the intersection of Howard and Fremont streets or if the slab extends to First St.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0086.1 | Concrete Slab & Rail Ties at Howard STA 13+60 | Closed | 02/03/2011 | 02/14/2011 | 02/04/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

As discussed at the meeting on Friday, 01/28/2011 between Noel (M2), Eric (AECOM) and Mario (Webcor) - due to existing utilities and the presence of the concrete

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed. See attached sketches SK-U-0003 and SK-U-0004 for the revised alignment.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

slab and rail ties found in the additional potholing that was requested (Ref. Response to RFI U-0086), the new 12in water main is to be installed 5ft from the northern FOC on Howard Street Sta 12+60 to Sta 9+50.

Please confirm.

---

**U-0087** **Compact Sewer Backfill Sand by Jetting** **Closed** **01/27/2011** **02/06/2011** **02/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference San Francisco Standard Specification Section 703.08, attached

Trinet requests authorization from the Engineer to compact the sewer trench backfill sand by jetting in accordance with the San Francisco Standard Specification Section 703.08.

The native material along Minna, which Trinet is re-using for trench backfill, is a clean well grade dune sand. Trinet believes jetting is an ideal method of compaction for this type of material. It is also an effective means of compacting the sand around the top and sides of the pipe without disturbing the pipe, and backfilling any voids left from removal of the shoring or that might have formed behind the shoring. This method of compaction is commonly utilized in San Francisco for sewer projects in similar ground conditions.

An expedited response is requested.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jetting in accordance with CCSF DPW Standard Specification Section 703.08 of the backfill layers above the sand backfill (pipe zone) as specified in CCSF DPW Standard Specification Section 703.06 for sewer installations is acceptable.

Contractor shall determine that jetting will not result in damage to sewers, adjacent structures, or cause adjacent materials to be softened. Any resulting damage shall be repaired at the Contractors expense.

Meet compaction requirements for each horizontal lift. If compaction requirements are not met, discontinue the use of jetting.

Notify TJPA's geotechnical engineer through the TJPA representative in advance of jetting to coordinate on-site observation of jetting and compaction testing.

---

**U-0088** **Minna St 18in Sewer Conflict with PG&E MH#1355 at STA 1+77** **Closed** **01/28/2011** **02/07/2011** **03/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-2007 and attached drawings

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

==UPDATE== 3/24/11

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

During layout for the installation of the new 18in Sewer Main on Minna St., Trinet observed that the alignment of the 18in Sewer Main is in conflict with existing PG&E MH #1355 at STA 1+77.50,
which is to remain in place. The center line of the new sewer main is 0.10ft north of the outside edge of the manhole wall, as depicted in the attached drawing. The north side wall of the manhole is constructed on top of the existing 3ft x 5ft brick sewer. The brick sewer structure extends approximately 16in into the vault along its entire length. The brick sewer therefore cannot be demolished without undermining the north wall of the electric vault. Eric Z. of AECOM was notified of this issue via phone call on 01/21/2011.

Please advise:
1. How should Trinet proceed with the installation of the new 18in VCP Sewer at this location?
2. How should Trinet proceed with the demolition ofthe existing 3ft x 5ft brick sewer?

See revised drawings Minna Street Revisions dated 3/16/11 assoicated with ASI#003.

---

**U-0089** **TJPA/DPW Inspection of Materials** **Closed** **01/31/2011** **02/10/2011** **02/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Bob Garcia **To:** Turner Construction Compan Kevin Chiu **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Michelle Smith

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref. response to RFI U-0082, specs 331100, 011600:

In response to RFI U-0082 stated "TJPA/DPW intends to inspect the material deliveries of each subcontractor..."

Does the TJPA/DPW or Turner have an established material inspection protocol in place to allow W/O and the trade subcontractors to verify and document that the materials have been inspected by TJPA/DPW or Turner per the above referenced specifications?

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Procedure for material inspections will be finalized as part of the QA/QC manual, to be issued by TJPA.

---

**U-0090** **46 Minna St 6in Fire Service Connection** **Closed** **02/01/2011** **02/11/2011** **02/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3108 and attached sketch and photos

The original plan for connection of the 6in Fire Service Lateral @ 46 Minna St. was to leave the existing 6in gate valve (which is located at FOC) in place and connect the new 6in fire line to the downstream side of the old valve (See attached photo and sketch). This plan was proposed by SFWD inspectors, Tom Farhnam and Dan Helminiak, at a field meeting on 12/28/10. On Friday 1/28/11 the SFWD, plumbers when taking measurements for the tie-in, proposed a different plan. They want to extend the new 6in fire line beyond the curb and into the basement, and connect to the homeowners fire line inside the basement (under the sidewalk).

Note: This will require coordination with building owner to put a hole through their foundation. Layout and a detail would need to be provided for the wall penetration, as well a detail to plug the hole where the existing water line is entering the basement.

Please provide direction on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

VOID.

See RFI U-0093, 46 Minna 6in FS Water & 1in Copper Water Service Lateral at STA 5+17 Tie-In.

---

**U-0091** **SSMH #301 Located in Crosswalk at Natoma STA 0+81.72** **Closed** **02/01/2011** **02/11/2011** **02/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3010

SSMH #301 is shown to be located in the crosswalk at Sta 0+81.72.

Please confirm that it is to be located in the pedestrian crosswalk.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Construct sewer manhole #301 at the location shown on U-3010. An ASI for a revised SFDPW Standard manhole cover (ADA compliant) is forthcoming.

---

**U-0092** **AWSS Schedule Restrictions** **Closed** **02/02/2011** **02/12/2011** **02/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Richard Buellesbach **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Webcor/Obayashi has received Bid Addendum #1 for the TG04.2R bid. As part of this addendum, note number 8 under "General Notes" on sheet U-0008 is deleted. This note had previously placed a constraint on the AWSS construction schedule that the Mission Street work must be complete prior to cutting both the Beale Street and the 1st Street lines. It was acceptable to abandon one or the other prior to the Mission Street work but not both.

Based on the deletion of this note, it is our understanding that there is no schedule constraint on any of the AWSS system modifications other than the cutting & capping proceedures at 1st Street and Beale Street which are required for construction of the TTC Building. Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

02/11/2011 - Richard Buellesbach Email to Michelle Smith & Kevin Chiu - The received response to RFI U-0092 is not complete. We require a final resolution for the following language from the RFI response:
"TJPA is currently coordinating with SFPUC to determine when AWSS improvements, other than the improvements required to abandon existing AWSS mains on First and Beale streets, are required to be complete."
Please be sure that this RFI remains open in Constructware.

---
---

02/10/2011 - Eric Zagol - The construction sequence constraint has been removed per GENERAL NOTE 8 on U-0008 (rev. 2 01/31/11) and as detailed in SFDPW BOE AWSS drawings (rev. 1 01/31/11) MA-0, MA-5, MA-6, MA-8, MA-10, MA-11 and MA-19.

TJPA is currently coordinating with SFPUC to determine when AWSS improvements, other than the improvements required to abandon existing AWSS mains on First and Beale streets, are required to be complete.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0093 | 46 Minna 6in FS Water & 1in Copper Water Service Lateral at STA 5+17 Tie-In | Closed | 02/03/2011 | 02/13/2011 | 02/07/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3108, attached sketches, and material information sheets

At 11:30am on 2/2/2011, Michelle Smith (Turner), Eric Zagol (AECOM), Guy Hollins (TJPA), Rick Bowling (46 Minna Property Manager), Dan Helminiak (SFWD Inspector), SFWD water department crew, Robert Friend (Trinet), Jason Dunne (Webcor Obayashi), and Mario Saldana (Webcor Obayashi) met to discuss the 6in Fire Service Lateral and 1in Water Service Lateral for the 46 Minna building.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

AECOM has coordinated with SFPUC Engineering (Chi Yu, Division Manager) and SFPUC inspector (Eugene Shu) and the direction agreed to is as follows:

6-inch Fire Service Renewal -

1. Coordinate with SFWD for the shutdown of the existing 6-inch fire water service. Shutdown by SFWD. SFWD to coordinate shutdown with SFFD.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

SFWD has proposed the new tie-in pipe configuration.
1. New 6in Fire Service Lateral Tie-in at 46 Minna St (See Attachment A)
- Old existing fire service lateral is to be cut out of the existing water main up to the gate valve as shown in the sketch, and replaced with straight pipe. A new 10in hole is to be core drilled into the existing basement wall 22in east of the existing service lateral to incorporate the new 6in fire service lateral. SFWD will run the new 6in fire service lateral through the hole and Trinet is to provide Link Seals (see attached material information sheets) to seal the space between the new pipe and wall hole.

2. New 1in Copper Service Lateral Tie-in at STA 5+17 (See Attachment B)
- Old existing 1in plastic poly pipe is to be cut and plugged with non shrink grout. A new 2in hole is to be core drilled 4in east of the existing 1in service, to incorporate the new 1in copper service lateral. The space between the new pipe and wall hole will be sealed with non-shrink grout.

Please advise if this is acceptable. An expedited response is requested.

2. Neatly remove existing fill material between the existing pipe and wall penetration to dislodge and free the existing pipe such that it can be removed by SFWD.
3. SFWD to cut and remove existing pipe.
4. Remove excess fill material to create flat even surface for link seal type pipe sleeve.
5. SFWD to install and connect new service.
6. Restore wall per SK-U-0005 attached.

1-inch Water Service Renewal -

1. Coordinate with SFWD for the shutdown of the existing domestic water service. Shutdown by SFWD.

2. Neatly remove existing fill material between the existing pipe and wall penetration to dislodge and free the existing pipe such that it can be removed by SFWD.
3. SFWD to cut and remove existing pipe.
4. SFWD to install and connect new service.
5. Fill void between pipe and exposed wall penetration with non-shrink grout.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0093.1 | 46 Minna 6in FS Water & 1in Copper Water Service Lateral at STA 5+17 Tie-In | Closed | 02/16/2011 | 02/25/2011 | 02/17/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Response to RFI #U-0093, Sheet U-3108, and attached sketch

The SFWD completed the 1in domestic and 6in fire water service change-overs on 02/15/2011.
Part of the detailed provided in the response to RFI #U-0093 for the 46 Minna 6in Fire Service water lateral could not be installed due to the angle of the pipe installed by the SFWD.

Per discussion with E. Zagol of AECOM, please confirm

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Confirmed. Fill the void on the property side with 2-5 inches of non-shrink grout, finishing grout flush with the inside wall.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

the direction is to fill the void on the property side with 2-5 inches of non-shrink grout, finishing grout flush with the inside wall.

---

**U-0094** **Joint Trench Alignment Conflict With (E) Steam MH at Minna St. STA 0+85** **Closed** **02/03/2011** **02/13/2011** **02/04/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3107 revised 12/27/10

The revised drawings show the Joint Trench alignment crossing through an existing old steam MH (Sta 0+85). The vault is a very large structure and extends to the north face of the curb of Minna St. Trinet believes that this vault is an abandoned structure.

Trinet requests direction for abandonment and/or demolition of this structure.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Steam MH at STA 0+75 has been abandoned by NRG Energy. Demolish as indicated on U-1107 (rev. 1 12/27/10) and in accordance with the contract documents.

Coordinate with Mike Eurkus (NRG Energy) at (415) 644-9668 through the TJPA's representative for the pick up of the salvaged steam MH ring and cover.

---

**U-0095** **Utility Company Contacts** **Closed** **02/03/2011** **02/13/2011** **02/04/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-0002 General Notes - Existing Utilities

Sheet U-0002 - EXISTING UTILITIES lists several phone numbers for contacting various utility companies in the city. M Squared has tried to contact most of these numbers and each one has had either no answer or is currently not in service.

M Squared requests a list of active phone numbers for the utility companies listed. An expedited response is necessary due to utilty conflicts.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

"M Squared has tried to contact most of these numbers"

Please provide a list of the specific agencies that M Squared has tried to contact.

---

☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0096 | PG&E Conflict with Sewer Installation at Natoma STA 9+50 | Closed | 02/09/2011 | 02/19/2011 | 02/14/2011 | Yes | |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3012 and attached drawing

On 02/07/2011, M Squared encountered what appeared to be a live PG&E duct bank during their sewer installation excavation on Natoma Street STA 9+50. Due to this conflict, M Squared was unable to continue excavating for the sewer (See attachment). On 02/09/2011, M Squared's Superintendant met with a PG&E Representative and PG&E Representative confirmed that the duct bank is live and is not due to be decommissioned for at least 3 months.

In order for M Squared to continue with the sewer installation, M Squared is proposing to:
- install MH #305 and begin installing pipe west of MH #305
- perform a temporary connection from MH#305 to the existing 3' x 5' brick sewer

M Squared can then perform the remainder of the work once PG&E has decommissioned the duct bank.

M Squared estimates that the additional cost to perform the temporary tie-in would be approximately $4,500.

Please confirm how you would like M Squared to proceed. M Squared requests an expedited response as they are currently stopped work and awaiting a response.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

02/14/2011 Kevin Chiu

See CR U-006 issued on 2/14/11

---

02/10/2011 Eric Zagol

Demolition and Construction Sequence shown on U-1112 and U-1120 lists per sequence order that the sewer work is to commence after PG&E has completed their Phase I work in Natoma and First St., all services cut over and existing duct bank is abandoned by PG&E. Given the fact that PG&E has experienced construction delays associated with their structures on First Street, the proposed sequence for sewer construction is acceptable.

Submit a temporary connection detail for review.

Coordinate with PG&E to abandon the existing 2-inch HP Gas along Natoma per U-1112 and U-1120 prior to demolition.

Coordinate with Verizon to abandon existing conduit (labeled "U" on base plans) prior to demolition per U-1112 and U-1120.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0096.1 | PGE Conflict with Sewer on Natoma at First Workaround | Closed | 02/15/2011 | 02/25/2011 | 02/18/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference U-3012 and attached sketch

Per response to RFI#U-0096, M Squared has provided the attached connection detail.

Please confirm if it is acceptable to proceed

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Proceed with the temporary connection per the M Squared connection detial.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0097 | PG&E Conflict with Sewer Instll on Natoma at First | Closed | 02/10/2011 | 02/20/2011 | 02/14/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3012

Following on from M Squared's RFI #U-0096, M Squared has confirmed in the field that there is a grade conflict between the proposed sewer and the existing electrical duct bank on Natoma between STA 9+30 to 9+50. The conflict is between the bottom of the electrical duct bank and the top of the new 24'' sewer pipe.

The elevation of bottom of electrical duct bank is 11.5'
The top of the 24'' VCP sewer is 11.82'

M Squared has also confirmed with PG&E that 3 of the 4 concrete encased conduits are occupied, 2 being occupied by 12KV lines. The duct bank is to be abandoned in the future but PG&E was unable to provide a schedule for this work.

Please advise M Squared on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Demolition and Construction Sequence shown on U-1112 and U-1120 lists per sequence order that the sewer work is to commence after PG&E has completed their Phase I work in Natoma and First St., all services cut over and existing duct bank is abandoned by PG&E.

Proceed per response to RFI U-0096.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0098 | Potholing at Blackrock | Closed | 02/10/2011 | 02/20/2011 | | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:**

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squared is planning to pothole next week at Howard STA 9+40, First St STA 1+50 and First St STA 2+10 to confirm the alignment and depths of the new 12'' water main on First St. from Howard to Natoma.

Guy Hollins from TJPA has advised M Squared that Blackrock is requesting additional potholing in the off-hours to determine locations of AT&T facilities in the area.

Please provide M Squared information regarding the locations of the addtional potholes requested, including the requested depths and sizes.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0099 | Returned Submittal Comments | Closed | 02/16/2011 | 02/26/2011 | 03/11/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP David Hungerford **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Ref Spec section 01 13 10

According to the Action and Distribution (section 1.11) of the submittal specifications, Submittals shall be returned indicating one of the following:

No Exceptions Taken
Make Corrections Noted
Revise and Resubmit
Rejected

We have received submittals back as "Not Reviewed" or "For Record Only". Please confirm these responses are acceptable and should be incorporated into the specifications.

**SUGGESTION:**

VOID - See RFI #T-0051

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See RFI T-0051, Returned Submittal Comment, for response.

---

**U-0100** **Minna St MH#207 Proposed Relocation** **Closed** **02/18/2011** **02/28/2011** **02/22/2011** **No** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Revised Sheet U-3009 and attached sketches

The current location of MH#207 at STA 9+25.87 will place a cap on the existing water main (installed by SFWD on 02/17/2011) in Trinet's excavation. Trinet is concerned that the old water main may not be adequately restrained and could create a dangerous condition for their excavation for MH#207. Trinet proposes to move MH#207 4 feet west to STA 9+21.87 +/-, as shown in the attached sketch, so that the cap is outside of Trinet's MH excavation. The revised invert elevation for the new MH location is shown on the attached sketch.

Please confirm if this is acceptable,

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Proposed design change is acceptable.

AECOM suggests no change to contract price for this modification.

---

**U-0101** **First St CB#501 Conflict with Existing Utilities** **Closed** **02/22/2011** **03/04/2011** **02/28/2011** **Yes** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3021, attached sketch, and USA ticket

During excavation for CB#501, Trinet encountered what appears to be a PG&E vault (shown in plans as EMH 7712), PG&E Duct (Shown in plans as 1- 2" & 4-6" EP), 2-2" steel conduits (not shown in plans), and a concrete shoring wall (not shown in plans).

- The 2-2" steel pipe is in conflict with Trinet's installation of CB#501, and will need to be relocated or abandoned to facilitate the installation of the catch basin. Trinet has done their due diligence (2nd and 3rd No Response follow ups) and these lines were not marked by the owner through USA (attached). Trinet requests direction on the relocation/abandonment of these utilities.

- Trinet proposes to move CB#501 two-feet north to avoid the conflict with the existing EMH 7712. Please advise if this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Pending approval by the TJPA, a deductive CR will be issued.

---

02/28/2011 - Eric Zagol

Following AECOM's review of the Transbay Transit Center Project 50% construction documents (rev. 12/20/10), further review of the Existing Terminal Ramps & Demolition Plans Project construction documents, and AECOM's understanding of the demolition of the existing Terminal "hump" structure and the timing of such demolition, CB#501 is no longer required.

Delete catch basin #501 and associated 10-inch sewer lateral.

---

**U-0102** **First St. CB#206 in Conflict with (E) Subsurface Conc. Structure / Duct Bank** **Closed** **02/23/2011** **03/05/2011** **03/04/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Daphne Faulkner

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3009 and attached sketch and photo

During Trinet's excavation for replacement of CB#206 on the northwest corner of First St. and Minna St. (at STA 9+31), they encountered a concrete subsurface structure or concrete encased duct bank not indicated on the contract drawings. The existing catch basin is approximately 30in deep and is constructed on top of the existing concrete structure/duct bank (see attached drawing).

Trinet requests direction on the demolition of the existing catch basin and the installation of the new catch basin CB#206.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Pending approval by the TJPA, a deductive CR will be issued.

---

03/04/2011 - Eric Zagol

As determined during a site visit on 3/3/11 with Trinet, AECOM and W/O; existing unforeseen conditions including an abandoned sub-sidewalk basement wall along Minna Street, an active sub-sidewalk basement wall for the 100 First St. property, and an abandoned telecommunications concrete duct along First Street create a situation where the installation of a new catch basin would require an extensive amount of unforeseen demotion.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

In lieu of installing a new catch basin barrel to replace existing modify the existing catch basin as follows:

Clean interior walls and bottom.
Apply 1/2-inch think uniform layer of mortar on interior walls and bottom.
Install cast iron trap.
Install pipe culvert and connect to MH#207 as shown in Plans. New culvert size and invert shall match existing culvert at catch basin. Use ductile iron pipe if depth of cover is less than 3 feet.

---

**U-0102.1** **Catch Basin #206 redesign** **Closed** **04/01/2011** **04/11/2011** **04/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please clarify the following items relating to the re-design of CB#206:

1) The only specification section addressing mortar coating is in 33 31 10 Paragraph 2.1.I, which specifies a "Wet Spray Mortar" application. This process would be cost prohibitive for coating only one catch basin. Trinet proposes the use of "SikaTop 123 Plus" mortar - product data sheets are attached. Please advise if this product is acceptable or specify an alternate material.

2) The RFI response directs Trinet to use ductile iron pipe for culvert runs with less that 3' of cover. If 22.5% DI bends are required to construct the culverts Trinet would prefer to use Mechanical Joint Fittings. Please advise if these are acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

Eric Zagol 4/12/2011: 1) SikaTop 123 Plus mortar is acceptable. 2) MJ DIP for 22.5 degree fittings is acceptable for culvert runs with less than 3 feet of cover.

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

---

**U-0103** **Natoma St. 4in Water Line Conflict with MH#306** **Closed** **02/24/2011** **03/07/2011** **02/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Reference Sheet U-1113 and U-3113

A 4-inch water line runs from east to west on the south side of Natoma from Sta 9+40 to Sta 10+95. At Sta 10+95, the 4-in water line 90degrees into the building at 400 Howard St. This building however, appears to be fed from the existing 8-inch line on 1st St between Howard and Natoma.

Is this 4-inch water lateral at Sta 10+95 on Natoma already abandoned? If not, can M Squared abandon it? It is currently in conflict with the proposed location of MH#306, and is also in conflict with the excavation and shoring for the new 30-inch sewer along Natoma (TG04.1).

It is AECOM's understanding that the existing 4-inch lateral is "killed" (not supplying water) however the "killed" lateral may still be pressurized up to the lateral terminal point at the gate valves located on the south side of Natoma Street at Natoma Street STA 10+95.

Demolish 4-inch water as indicated on U-1112, U-1113 and U-1120.

Prior to demolition:

1. Coordinate with SFPUC inspector to confirm 4-inch lateral is "killed".
2. Coordinate with SFPUC inspector to confirm that the lateral is not pressurized and that the 4-inch gate valve at Natoma Street STA 9+40 (intersection with existing First Street 8-inch water main) is closed.
3. Coordinate with SFPUC inspector and install cap in First Street as shown on U-1120 at Natoma STA 9+55 +/-.

---

**U-0104** **Natoma St. Temporary Sewer Connections at Sta 9+25 and Sta 7+20** **Closed** **02/24/2011** **03/06/2011** **03/01/2011** **Yes** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheets U-1112, U-1120, U-3012, and RFI#U-0096

In order for M Squared to install the new water main on Natoma Street between Sta 6+40 to Sta 10+00, the existing 3'x5' sewer must first be demolished. The 3'x5' sewer cannot be demolished until the new 24-inch VCP has been installed and connected to the existing sewer on First Street at Sta 9+59. Per sheets U-1112 and U-1120, the new 24-inch sewer is to be constructed after the demolition of the PG&E ducts. However, demolition of the PG&E ducts cannot be completed because PG&E has not completed their relocation work

Per RFI#U-0096 (M Squared RFI #009), as confirmed by

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Due to existing PG&E duct in conflict caused by PG&E's delay with First St. Phase I relocations, the two 12-inch temporary HDPE connections as proposed are acceptable as an interim condition until PG&E Phase I work is complete and the existing duct in conflict can be demolished per plans.

Daphne Faulkner - Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

PG&E in the field on 02/09/2011, there is a live PG&E duct bank in conflict with MH#305 and the new 24-inch VCP between MH#305 and MH#306, and not due to be decommissioned for at least three months.

M Squared proposes to install a 12-inch HDPE pipe from Sta 9+25 to Sta 9+59, and perform a temporary connection to the existing 3'x5' sewer on First Street. Surveys carried out on the electric duct bank at Sta 9+30 on 02/08/11 shows that the bottom of the Duct Bank is approx. 10.8, meaning a 12-inch pipe will fit. In addition, M Squared proposes to perform a temporary connection (also 12-inch HDPE) at Sta 7+20 from the new MH#303 to the existing 3'x5' sewer. This would allow M Squared to demolish the 3'x5' sewer from Sta 7+02 to Sta 9+59, and allow M Squared to install the water from Sta 6+40 to Sta 10+00.

M Squared estimates the cost for both of these connections is $20,000.

An expedited response is required to avoid impact to the installation of the water line

---

**U-0105** **Natoma St Duct Bank Conflict at Sta 12+92** **Closed** **02/24/2011** **03/06/2011** **03/01/2011** **Yes** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-1113, U-1122, U-3013 and attached drawing

A pothole on Natoma Street at Sta 12+92 confirmed that the duct bank shown on Sheet U-3013 is in conflict with the proposed 30-inch VCP sewer (see attached drawing).

Per sheets U-1122 and U-1113, the new 30-inch sewer is to be constructed after the demolition of the PG&E ducts. However, demolition of the PG&E ducts cannot be completed because PG&E has not completed their relocation work. Per PG&E's new schedule this work is not scheduled to be completed until 06/31/2011. This would

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Due to existing PG&E duct in conflict caused by PG&E's delay with Fremont St. Phase I relocations, the12-inch temporary HDPE connection as proposed is acceptable as an interim condition until PG&E Phase I work is complete and the existing duct in conflict can be demolished per plans.

Daphne Faulkner - Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

mean M Squared's work cannot start until after this.

In order for M Squared to continue with their work, M Squared proposes the use of 12-inch HDPE pipe from Sta 12+80 to existing sewer at Sta 13+15 (proposed location of MH#602). Once PG&E has completed their cutovers and the duct bank is abandoned, M Squared will demo the duct bank per specifications and complete the installation of the 30-inch VCP sewer from Sta 12+80 to MH#602.

M Squared estimates the cost for this work is $15,000.

An expedited response is required to avoid impact to the installation of the sewer and water line

---

**U-0106** **First St Sewer MH#502 Adjustment to Avoid Conflict w/ (E) PG&E Duct** **Closed** **02/25/2011** **03/07/2011** **02/28/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3021 and attached sketch

In order for Trinet to avoid a conflict with the existing PG&E duct along the west wall of their excavation, Trinet adjusted the south end of the MH#502 structure by 7 inches to the east (as shown in attached sketch). MH#502 is still aligned to incorporate the connection to the existing brick sewer, and the alignment of the new 24-inch VCP run is unaffected by this change. Trinet will adjust rebar as required to maintain the required spacing and clearances.

Please confirm if the adjustment of MH#502 is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The sketch referenced above is based on CCSF DPW Standard #87,184 that shows the minimum reinforcing plan for the connection to the existing 3'x5' brick sewer. Provide reinforcing for connection to 3'x5' per CCSF DPW Standard.

Confirm that the manhole is being constructed per CCSF DPW Standard #87,182 as shown in Detail 10 on U-5001.

Provide width of west wall and location of reinforcing steel at 3'x5' brick sewer connection and 24-inch VCP sewer connection for review.

---

**U-0107** **AWSS Cap Permit Requirements** **Closed** **02/25/2011** **03/07/2011** **02/28/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

W/O would like to confirm that other than any standard permits required for any excavation in the city of San Francisco, there is no additional permit required by any city agency in order to perform work on the AWSS caps.

Per discussions with Michael Smith SFDPW BOE, there are no additional permits required for AWSS construction beyond the standard permits for constructing utilities within the public right-of-way.

Notify CCSF SFFD and SFPUC/SFWD through the TJPA's representative in advance the work to isolate work areas.

---

**U-0108** **FH Relocation on Beale St** **Closed** **02/25/2011** **03/07/2011** **02/28/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference sheet U-3124 and attached photo

See the photo attached. The proposed location for the FH on Beale St at ~Sta 2+20 is in between a driveway for a parking garage and a driveway for a loading dock. Per discussions with Eric Zagol, please confirm the FH is to be relocated to the East side of Beale St as highlighted by the green line on the attached drawing.

Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Construct FH lateral and FH on the East side of Beale Street at STA 2+04 as shown on SK-U-0008 attached.

---

**U-0109** **First St Sewer Grade Change To Conform to Existing 3'x5' Brick Sewer** **Closed** **03/02/2011** **03/14/2011** **03/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3021, U-3009, and attached sketch

This RFI confirms modification discussed in the field by Trinet and discussed with the Design Engineer, SFDPW, and W/O personnel. Trinet's field survey shows the existing 3'x5' brick sewer on First Street to be approximately 11-inches lower than the grade depicted on the drawings. Trinet also checked the elevation of the existing SSMH (10-feet north of MH#501) and confirmed

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Construct MH#502 at First St. STA 4+98 as shown on U-3021 to match the invert elevation of the existing 3'x5' brick sewer, elevation 6.77 as determined in the field by contractor.

Construct MH#501 at First St. STA 4+45 as shown on U-3021 with an invert elevation of 7.58 as determined by contractor.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

that it is approximately 11-inches lower than what is shown on the drawings. Trinet installed MH#502 with invert elevation at 6.77 to match the existing brick sewer at the connection point. The new 24-inch VCP is being installed 11-inches lower than what is shown on the drawings maintaining the design slope of 0.0062. MH#501 will be installed with the invert elevation of 7.58, as shown in the attached sketch.

Please confirm that this design is acceptable. Also, please provide a revised grade for the 24-inch VCP run from MH#207 (Minna St.) to MH#501.

Construct MH#207 per RFI-U100.

Construct the 24-inch VCP sewer from MH#207 (invert elevation 8.67 per RFI U-0100) at a continuous downward slope such that the invert elevation of the 24-inch VCP at MH#501 matches the invert elevation of MH#501 at elevation 7.58.

Based on discussions with Trinet in the field, Trinet reported 11-inches of sediment/sludge/dirt in the existing 3'x5' brick sewer. Please confirm that existing sewer in First Street was cleaned with high velocity hydro cleaning equipment per specification section 33 31 10 3.2 A prior to excavation.

---

**U-0110** **Joint Preconstruction Survey Requirement** **Closed** **03/02/2011** **03/12/2011** **03/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Derrick Cooper

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Specification Section 01 15 40, 1.5

Singer has been coordinating W/O access to the adjacent properties for W/O's subcontractors to complete their Joint Pre-Construction survey (Spec. 01 15 40, 1.5). Singer has informed W/O that they were instructed by TJPA Representatives to stop scheduling the joint surveys because TJPA will be conducting one overall survey, instead of having each individual contractor do them.

The surveys are a specification requirement for current and future subcontractors. Please clarify this specification, moving foward.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

TJPA will be conducting perconstruction surveys of adjacent property interiors. Singer will not be scheduling these surveys for W/O subcontractors.

---

**U-0111** **Minna St. Joint Trench Conflict with (E) 8" elbow and thrust block** **Closed** **03/04/2011** **03/14/2011** **03/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Reference drawing sheet U-3409 and attached sketch.

During our excavation for the joint trench on the east end of Minna St. (STA 9+29) Trinet encountered the (E) 8" water main in Trinet's trench line, approximately 1 foot from our termination point. The existing alignment is different from what is shown in the contract drawings. The drawings do not show the water line crossing the joint tranch. The alignment and grade of the water main changed in Trinet's excavation to avoid the adjacent catch basin. A 22.5 degree elbow is located in the center of the joint trench excavation. The elbow is rolled up to accommodate the grade change and there is a thrust block under the footing. Trinet does not believe that it would be safe to excavate under the water main for Trinet's duct bank without having the line shutoff. Extending the PG&E ducts to FOC will also place the connection point for PG&E's extension of the duct bank directly under the water main fittings and elbows. There is adequate clearance to install the 4" gas line above the water main and extend it out to FOC per contract. The top of the water main is 49" below FG at the south side of the joint trench, at the location of the ags line.

Trinet propses to terminate the concrete encased duct bank approximately 5 ft. back from FOC. This would allow adequate room for Trinet to mandrel the ducts after the joint trench is installed without undermining the water main. PG&E could then extend their duct bank under the water main to connect to Trinet's water main. Please advise.

Per request to Jason Dunne (W/O) via email on 3/4/11 please provide the following information for review:

Horizontal (from a known point i.e. FOC along First St.) and vertical location of "top of water main".
Horizontal (from a known point i.e. FOC along First St.) and vertical location of water line at "22.5 degree elbow".
Determine if the water main is mechanically restrained with tie rods at each bend in questions.
Approximate size of existing concrete thurst block a the "22.5 degree elbow".

---

**U-0111.1** **Minna St Joint Trench Conflict @ Existing Water Line Elbow** **Closed** **04/18/2011** **04/28/2011** **04/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please find the attached as built drawing of the Joint Trench @ the intersection of Minna St. and First St. where the (E) 8" W main elbow was encountered.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/20/2011: Please provide the information requested in RFI U-0111 response or confirm that the existing water line referenced in RFI U-0111 is mechanically restrained.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Construct Joint Trench to limit as indicated in Plans.

Refer to ASI-005 for the Joint Trench extension into First Street.

---

**U-0111.2** **Minna St Joint Trench Conflict @ Existing Water Line Elbow** **Closed** **04/25/2011** **05/05/2011** **04/28/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Eric Zagol 4/20/2011: Please provide the information requested in RFI U-0111 response or confirm that the existing water line referenced in RFI U-0111 is mechanically restrained.

Answer: The waterline is mechanically restrained.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/26/2011 Proceed pre RFI U-0111.1 response.

---

**U-0112** **Minna St. Joint Trench, AT&T Vault and Conduit Configuration** **Closed** **03/08/2011** **03/18/2011** **03/15/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3408

At the 02/03/2011 Joint Trench Pre-Construction meeting and field walk through, the AT&T inspector expressed concern with the configuration of the AT&T ducts connecting to the AT&T vault at Sta 3+71. The AT&T inspector was specifically concerned with the east side of the vault where all eight 4-inch ducts are shown entering the vault on the one side (north side) of the center line.

Trinet would like AT&T to review the duct configuration connection to the vault as depicted in the contract drawings and provide a revised drawing if they wish to make a change.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

AT&T has reviewed the information and has proposed revisions to the Joint Trench to accommodate the following:

1. Revised information from AT&T regarding 555 Mission St. service point of connection, and
2. AT&T preferred Minna St. AT&T vault conduit penetration locations

Attached SK-U-0009 is a markup of the AT&T Vault at STA 3+71 butterfly drawing indicating conduit penetrations and schematic diagram of conduit alignments. Revised Minna St. Joint Trench Plans are being prepared as part of ASI#3 to address these revisions as well as changes associated with RFI U-0088.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0113 | AWSS Cap on First St. at Howard | Closed | 03/08/2011 | 03/18/2011 | 03/10/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Drawing No. AWSS MA-5

On 03/08/2011, M Squared excavated and exposed the existing AWSS line and gate valve on First St. at Howard. Upon inspection of the existing gate valve, it appears that the gate valve does not have lugs on it. This means that M Squared cannot tie back the proposed 10-inch AWSS cap on the AWSS line.

Please advise on how you would like M Squared to proceed with the cap installation. An expedited response is requested.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Michael Smith (SFDPW BOE), AWSS Engineer of record, will provide response directly to PMPC/Turner.

---

03/10/2011 - Daphne Faulkner

Michael Smith (SFDPW BOE), AWSS Engineer of record provided response via email dated 3/9/11. See attached email, RFI response and AWSS Standard Dwg. III.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0113.1 | AWSS Strong Backs | Closed | 03/17/2011 | 03/27/2011 | 03/22/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference RFI #U-0113

On 3/16/2011, M Squared met with Dan Helminiak from SFWD and Michael Smith from BOE to proceed with the AWSS Cap work at First & Howard. As directed in the response to RFI#U-0013, M Squared installed the strong back provided to them. After the strong back was installed, Dan H. and Michael S. determined that the strong backs would not work due to the diameter of the existing valve bell.

M Squared requests direction on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

See attached file, "RFI U-0113.1 1490J Phase I First Street RFI No. 113.1 BOE Response 03 22 11," dated 03/22/11 for handwritten response per Michael Smith of SFDPW/BOE/Mechanical. Response below was copied into CW:

"- Proceed with installation without strong back and tie rods.

- A minimum of 100' of out-of-service AWSS main north of cap at First/Howard streets, and south of cap at Mission/First streets shall remain-in-place.

- Additionally the specified concrete thrust block shall be increased by 3 times the volume and encompass the existing abandoned-in-place line for a distance of 4' downstream of steel plate.

- Strong backs (2) shall be returned to CCSF."

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0114 | PG&E Abandonment Schedule for Natoma St. at Second St. | Closed | 03/09/2011 | 03/19/2011 | 05/07/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-1110 and U-2010

On 03/04/2011, M Squared met with a PG&E representative on site at Natoma and 2nd Street. The PG&E representative confirmed that none of their utilities had been abandoned in the area, and that the PG&E representative would be unable to provide a schedule for this abandonment.

Per note 2 on sheet U-1110, the services for 77 Natoma and 83 Natoma were to be terminated by Feb 2011. To date, this work does not appear to be completed.
In PG&E's letter to the TJPA regarding their schedule, there is no reference to work on Natoma Street at 2nd St.

M Squared is unable to proceed with their sewer and water utility installation on Natoma St. west of shoring wall until PG&E has completed abandonment of their existing utilities.

Please provide M Squared with an updated schedule for all PG&E's termination/abandonment work at 2nd and Natoma St.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 3/18/2011 ***5/5/11 UPDATE***

77 Natoma and 83 Natoma services have been terminated, refer to USR Nos. 11 and 13 as executed by W/O, Turner and PG&E on 4/21/11.

As of 5/4/11, PG&E estimates that Natoma Street will be de-energized by 5/21/11. Coordinate USRs for the remaining electric ducts with Turner and PG&E.

***3/18/11 RESPONSE***

Per demolition and construction sequencing shown on sheet U-1110, water and sewer work shall commence after PG&E has completed their Phase I relocations in First St., Natoma St. and existing electric ducts are abandoned by PG&E.

PG&E services to 77 Natoma and 83 Natoma have been terminated as part of the Existing Terminal & Ramps Demolition Project. USRs for these services are currently being prepared by the TJPA's Representative (Turner). The USRs shall indicate the service conduits and cables that are abandoned subject to demolition as indicated in sheet U-1110.

To facilitate schedule, AECOM has requested PG&E to de-energize Natoma St. to the extent possible in an effort to re-sequence construction of the sewer. PG&E's response and schedule of abandonment is forthcoming.

As shown on U-3110 the water line could be constructed prior to PG&E abandoning their facilities. Pothole to confirm the water line can be constructed as shown on U-3110.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0115 | AWSS Cap Work Sequence on First St | Closed | 03/07/2011 | 03/17/2011 | 03/15/2011 | Yes | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** **Answered By:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith — Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Refer to Sheets MA-5, MA-8

There are two caps that are required to be installed in order to shutdown the AWSS service on First St between Mission to Howard St. Per the construction schedule, both caps were supposed to be worked on simultaneously. Please confirm per a conversation in the field on 03/07/2011 with inspectors Michael Smith (SFDPW) and Dan Helminak (DPW), only one AWSS cap can be installed at a time.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The below response was copied into Constructware on behalf of Michael B. Smith SFDPW/BOE/Mechanical (see attached, "RFI U-0115 1490J Phase I First Street BOE Response 03 11 11")

"Installing/capping of the AWSS lines at two locations in sequence instead of simultaneously was a decision made by the SFWD/CCD together with SFFD. Please contact Dan Helminiak of SFWD/CDD at (415) 420-4821 for further information" - Michael B. Smith SFDPW/BOE/Mechanical dated 03/11/2011

---

03/14/2011 - Eric Zagol

Michael Smith from SFDPW BOE will respond to this RFI.

---

**U-0116** **Abandoned 6" Fire Water Service Thru 100 First St Basement Wall** **Closed** **03/18/2011** **03/28/2011** **03/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Refer to sheets U-1109 and U-3109

An abandoned existing 6" fire water service lateral was discovered while demolishing the old 8" water main running down Minna St. The 6" fire water service lateral was not shown on the plans and there were no existing water valve covers to indicate the existence of this line. The abandoned lateral penetrates the foundation wall entering the basement to 100 First St at Station 7+36.

Please provide direction for plugging the void that will be left after 100 First St management removes the 6" water lateral pipe. A roughly 1ft x ft x 1ft deep square opening will remain after the fire water lateral pipe is removed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Contractor had knowledge of existing abandoned 6-inch fire water service at STA ~7+35.

Existing abandoned 6-inch fire water service at STA ~7+36 was exposed and potholed by Trinet on 11/19/2010 and included in Submittal TG0405-024 Item No: UA0000-020630A01.0 as Pot Hole No. 29.

Cut and plug abandoned 6-inch fire water service in accordance with specification section 02 41 00 3.6 at face of curb along the North side of Minna St.

Please clarify why private property improvements are being requested.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0117 | Natoma St. Future Hydrant Location at Sta 11+79 | Closed | 03/21/2011 | 03/31/2011 | 03/24/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Nhi Tran **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference Sheet U-3113

Sheet U-3113 shows an 8in x 8in x 6in tee in the new 8-inch water main on Natoma at Sta 11+79. The note on the drawing makes reference to it being used as a future location for a fire hydrant. Sta 11+79 is in front of a loading dock and parking garage on Natoma Street.

Please confirm that it is intended for M Squared to install the tee in the water main line at this location.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

As discussed in the field on 3/21/11 with Noel (M Squared) and Dan Helminiack (SFWD), construct tee for future fire hydrant and lateral connection at STA 11+37 (4 ft min. west of existing street light).

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0118 | Minna Street Joint Trench, PG&E Duct Routing and Termination Points | Closed | 03/24/2011 | 04/03/2011 | 04/06/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please provide a routing drawing or written clairification of the routing for the PG&E Duct stub-outs in the Minna St. Joint Trench, between First St. and Second St. It is not clear from the plans in all cases where all the ducts extending from stub-outs terminate. Please expedite.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Please see the attached sketches clarifying where the ducts extending from stub-outs terminate (/originate).

Please note that the 2-2" conduits shown on U-3410 sections C, D, F and G terminate at "stub out reference A".

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0119 | Minna St. JT_ AT&T Reconfiguration and impact on (E) trees | Closed | 03/25/2011 | 04/04/2011 | 03/30/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The revised drawings for the Joint Trench alignment dated 3/16/2011 show the reconfigured AT&T ducts running through an existing tree well on the east side of the AT&T vault at Stn. 3+71. RFI U-0112 (Minna St, Joint Trench, AT&T Vault and Conduit Configuration) also shows the reconfigured AT&T ducts running through an existing tree well on the east side of the vault. This conduit layout in consistent with discussions with the AT&T inspector in the field was reflected in the shop drawings. The revised

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per discussions on site on 3/28/11 with Jack Kelliher (Trinet), Dave Olsen (AT&T), Dave Gibbons (AT&T) and Colin Azevedo (W/O), provide a 22.5 bend at conduit penetration for the 2-4" conduits on the south side of the east to avoid direct conflict. Remove tree grate and frame as required to construct conduit. Restore tree grate, fame, sidewalk curb and gutter. Protect tree and existing irrigation pipes in place.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

drawings do not address relocation and/or removal of the impacted trees and the related irrigation changes. Please review and advise.

---

**U-0120** **MH601 Locatio** **Closed** **03/28/2011** **04/07/2011** **04/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Sheet U-3022 shows MH601 @ Sta 0+70 on Fremont Street. This location is also in the middle of the crosswalk on Fremont Street. USA markings show the existing traffic signal conduits crossing thru the center of the manhole. By moving the manhole approx 8¿ north the conflict with the traffic signal conduits would be avoided and it would also avoid having a manhole cover in a crosswalk. Please advise on how you would like to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Move proposed sewer MH north to STA 77.56 to avoid existing Traffic Signal
conduit conflict as shown in SK-U-013 attached.
Construct 10-inch CB culvert lateral as shown SK-U-013 attached.

---

**U-0121** **AWSS Caps at Beale Street** **Closed** **03/31/2011** **04/10/2011** **04/06/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

1 - Current bid documents for Trade Group TG04.2R (AWSS system at Mission Street) call for capping of the AWSS system on Beale Street near the intersections with Howard Street and with Mission Street. Because of delays in the bid schedule for TG04.2R, the construction schedule dictates that these caps be completed well before the anticipated start of the TG04.2R field work. Please provide details so as to allow this capping work to be done in advance of the awarding of the TG04.2R scope of work.

2 - Please confirm whether the material required to do this work is available at the City of San Francisco.

3 - Please provide direction as to how this scope of work should proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Pothole the existing AWSS gate valve at the Beale at Mission street proposed cap location as shown on M-6 (Rev No. 1, 1/31/11) to determine if the existing gate valve has lugs. SFWD to inspect condition of gate valve once excavated, coordinate with SFWD inspector accordingly.

Details for the capping work at Beale and Mission, and Beale and Howard will be provided following gate valve inspection.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

This capping is near critical path on the current construction schedule. An expedited response is requested.

---

**U-0121.1** **AWSS Caps at Beale Street** **Closed** **05/02/2011** **05/12/2011** **05/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The AWSS valve at Mission and Beale was potholed on 4/29/2011 per response to RFI#U-0121. It was confirmed that the existing valve does not have lugs.

Please provide details for capping the AWSS line on Beale.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/4/2011 From Michael Smith (SFDPW BOE);

Refer to attached DWG M-6 Rev 1 with changes made on 05/04/11. Cap is to be tied back to (E) pipe with cast lugs.

Eric Zagol 4/5/2011 ***4/19/11 UPDATE***

In response to the numbered items above:

1. Refer to the attached markups of TG04.2R documents from SFDPW BOE that define the AWSS abandonment/capping scope for Beale Street; MA-6 for the work in Beale St. at Mission St., and MA-10 and MA-19 for the work in Beale St. at Howard St.

2. SFWD Inspector Daniel Helminiak has confirmed that the following materials are available at the SFFD Yard:

Beale at Mission Street

- 1 10-inch DI MJ spigot x GH spigot adapter

- 1 10-inch DI MJ flat cap

- 1 18-inch x 18-inch x 1-inch steel plate

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Beale at Howard Street

- 4 10-inch DI stop collar

- 2 10-inch DI bell collar

- 1 10-inch DI flat cap

Coordinate with SFWD Inspector for materials provided by SFWD.

3. Proceed with this work per direction from TJPA Representative. Coordinate the shutdown of existing AWSS main in Beale St. with SFWD prior to commencing the work.

4. Submit pothole data for review per RFI response provided on 4/5/11 as stated below.

**********

4/5/11 Response

Pothole the existing AWSS gate valve at the Beale at Mission street proposed cap location as shown on M-6 (Rev No. 1, 1/31/11) to determine if the existing gate valve has lugs. SFWD to inspect condition of gate valve once excavated, coordinate with SFWD inspector accordingly.

Details for the capping work at Beale and Mission, and Beale and Howard will be provided following gate valve inspection.

---

**U-0122** **M Squared Submittals for TG04 Bid Packages** **Closed** **04/01/2011** **04/11/2011** **04/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Michelle Smith

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:** **SUGGESTION:** **ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please confirm the following:

Per previous discussions it has been agreed between the TJPA, AECOM, Turner Webcor/Obayashi and M Squared that material submittals approved for use by M Squared in individual bid packages will be considered acceptable for all bid packages M Squared is working on (TG04.1, TG04.3, TG04.4, & TG04.6).

These submittal include:

TG0434-002 - Excavation & Backfill Samples
TG0434-003 - Excavation & Backfill Test Reports
TG0434-004 - Excavation & Backfill Compaction & Warning Tape
TG0434-005 - Shoring Plan
TG0434-006 - Backfill Material
TG0434-007 - Water Utilities Distribution Piping & Valves
TG0434-010 - Asphalt Mix Design
TG0434-013 - Noise Mitigation Plan
TG0434-015 - CQC Plan
TG0434-016 - Health and Safety Plan and MSDS
TG0434-017 - SWPPP
TG0434-018 - Debris Management Plan
TG0434-025 - Cast in Place Concrete
TG0434-030 - Labor Rates
TG0404-001 - Sewer Package
TG0404-002 - Filter Fabric
TG0404-003 - Concrete Forming
TG0404-004 - Precast Concrete
TG0404-005 - Precast Concrete Catch Basin Base

Eric Zagol, 4/4/2011: AECOM suggests that the Construction Manager Oversight (Turner) confirms this RFI.

Guy Hollins, 4/5/2011: Confirmed for all submittals listed with the understanding that no deviations from the previously-approved submittal are allowed without the submission and approval of a separate and new submittal request.

Michelle Smith, 4/11/2011: TJPA has no objection to subcontractors using submittals that were submitted by their OWN company and approved for a previous TG04 Utilities Relocation trade package, as long as the application is the same as the application in the previous trade package.

---

**U-0123** **Unknown Fire Service @ 85 Natoma** **Closed** **04/04/2011** **04/14/2011** **04/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

While Excavating to install the water line on Natoma from the shoring wall to 2nd Street M Squared encountered an existing fire service going to 85 Natoma. This service is not shown on the drawings and is not in the specifications

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

SFPUC Customer Service Bureau data shows an active Domestic water, an active Fire water service, and 2 "killed" Domestic water services to 85 Natoma Street.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

as one of the connections to be made to the new line.
(See attached)
Please advise on how to proceed.

Coordinate with SFWD to confirm and locate the active Fire water line to 85 Natoma Street.

Provide information on location, size, and material for review.

---

**U-0123.1** **Fire Service @ 85 Natoma** **Closed** **04/11/2011** **04/21/2011** **04/18/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please note that on RFI #U-0123 the location of the fire service was incorrectly drawn. The fire service is actually located around Sta 2+35.

M Squared potholed at Sta 2+35 and discovered a 4¿ ductile iron pipe which is believe to be the active fire service for 85 Natoma Street.

Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/15/2011: Per response to RFI U-0123, coordinate with SFWD Inspector to confirm the 4" DIP is the active fire water service to 85 Natoma Street.

Once confirmed, provide and install 8"x8"x4" tee and 4" gate valve.

Connection to existing 4" DIP fire service by SFWD. Excavate and shore for connection in accordance with the contract documents. Coordinate with SFWD Inspector for connection by SFWD.

---

**U-0124** **Conflict Between New 24" Sewer and existing AWSS Line on Beale** **Closed** **04/07/2011** **04/17/2011** **04/28/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squared has confirmed that the 14" AWSS Line shown on sheet U-3024 is in conflict with the proposed 24" VCP on Beale Street. The AWSS line is shown on the plan view but not on the elevation view on sheet U-3024.
M Squared also shot the elevation of the existing sewer manhole. The elevation is 4.60, and not 4.70 as shown on the plans. The invert of the 14" AWSS is 6.2. (See attached)
Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/26/2011: Construct temporary 2-10" VCP and new SMH as shown on revised U-3024 (rev 2 4/26/11) and SK-U-0018. Construct SMH #701 to allow for future 24" VCP connection as indicated.

Relocate AWSS line in Howard St., not included in package. Design forthcoming potentially to be included in TG04.2R.

Following relocation of the AWSS line, construct 24" VCP sewer per contract documents.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**U-0124.1** **Conflict Between 24" Sewer and AWSS Line on Beale** **Closed** **07/07/2011** **07/17/2011** **03/27/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per the response to RFI#U-0124 a design to relocate the AWSS line @ Howard and Beale is forthcoming. Please advise the status of this design.

**SUGGESTION:**

Eric Zagol 7/20/2011 Design is being performed by SFDPW BOE and will be tracked and issued via a forthcoming ASI. Schedule will be discussed with SFDPW BOE on 7/22/11. An update will be provided in the RUP OAC on 7/26/11.

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

RFIs U-128.2 and U-124.1 were responded to in July of 2011 and provided temporary solutions to utility conflicts with a full resolution planned to come via future ASI. ASI 21, which addresses these issues, was uploaded to Constructware on 3/21/12 by Eric Zagol for design approval. A CR for this work will be issued in the near future.

---

**U-0125** **Precast Catch Basin Bases** **Closed** **04/08/2011** **04/18/2011** **04/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In lieu of a cast in place base per CCSF DPW Standards, M Squared would like to propose the use of a precast catch basin. The catch basin barrel is attached to the precast base and it comes as one single unit. Before installing the precast catch basin base with barrel, M Squared will place a minimum 6" compacted level layer of crushed rock as the sub base. The proposed material specifications are attached.
Please confirm if this method is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/12/2011 Precast catchbasin base is approved with conditions specified.
The 5 foot catchbasin barrel shall be attached to the base section to form a monolith structure with the same dimensions, compressive strength and reinforcement as the CCSF DPW Standard cast in place base.
Provide a minimum 6" level layer of uniform compacted crushed rock as the sub base.

---

**U-0126** **Existing Brick Man Hole @ Second and Natoma In Conflict With Joint Trench** **Closed** **04/11/2011** **04/11/2011** **04/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

While potholing the Second St. Joint Trench crossing

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/12/2011: Confirm existing abandoned

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Trinet encountered an existing brick sewer man hole which is in conflict with the joint trench alignment. The manhole is not shown on the plans and had been paved over. The manhole also appears to have been previously abandoned. See the attached sketch and photograph detailing the location of the manhole.

Please advise on how to proceed.

sewer manhole is filled with slurry grout to 4 feet below rim elevation.
Demolish and remove existing abandoned sewer manhole as required to construct the Joint Trench to an elevation 1-foot below bottom of Joint Trench. Backfill and restore in accordance with contract documents.

---

**U-0127** **Minna Street Sewer Manhole #201 in Crosswalk** **Closed** **04/11/2011** **04/21/2011** **04/13/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Plan Sheet U-3007 shows MH#201 to be installed in the center of the crosswalk @ Minna and Second Street. The City of San Francisco typically avoids locating manholes in crosswalks, whenever possible, for ADA considerations. Please advise if MH#201 should be installed outside of the crosswalk.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/13/2011: Sewer manhole location can not be adjusted due to an existing 8-inch Water and 4-inch HP Gas main. Construct manhole at the location per Plans.
In lieu of CCSF DPW Standard MH cover, provide an ADA complainant cover that meets the following specifications:
1. MATERIAL - The cast iron shall be in accordance with ASTM "Standard Specifications for Gray Cast Iron Castings" Designation A 48, Class 30. The tinsel strength shall be considered the primary test for qualification.
2. FINISH- STANDARD FINISH SHALL BE RAW, AS CAST, AND YIELD A MINIMUM COEFFICIENT FOR FRICTION OF .6 OR BETTER IN WET OR DRY CONDITIONS.
3. CASTINGS - SHALL BE FREE OF BLOW HOLES, FLASHING, GRIND MARKS, AND OTHER SURFACE BLEMISHES.
4. Cover shall incorporate a "pic-hole" for lifting purposes.
5. ADA COMPLIANCY- CASTINGS SHALL HAVE HOLES NO GREATER THAN ½" IN THE DOMINANT DIRECTION OF MOTION, NO VERTICAL RISE OF GREATER THAN ¼", IF THE RISE IS GREATER THAN ¼" THE RISE/RUN RATIO NEEDS TO BE 1;2 AND THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT SHALL BE 1/2".
6. Cover shall BE MADE TO FIT EXISTNG FRAMES

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

OR be MACHINED to FIT EXITING FRAMES PER SFDPW STANDARD PLAN 87,190.
7. Cover should be MADE of quality EQUAL TO OR GREATER then THE PRODUCTS MADE BY D&L Foundry or Equal, see attached product data sheet.

---

**U-0128** **AWSS Conflict with Sewer on Fremont** **Closed** **04/11/2011** **04/21/2011** **04/19/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

A pothole at Sta 0+52 has confirmed that the existing AWSS line is in direct conflict with the proposed sewer on Fremont Street. The drawings show a 4" HPW line at invert elevation 13.0. Measurements taken in the pothole reveal a 14" HPW line at invert elevation 8.4. At this elevation the HPW line is in direct conflict with the proposed VCP sewer.
Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/19/2011 A temporary connection between MH #601 and (E) MH in Howard Street is being considered as an option. Please confirm the invert elevation of the (E) MH at Howard St. (Fremont St. STA 0+29.5) is EL 6.4 as shown on U-3022.

---

**U-0128.1** **AWSS Conflict with Sewer on Fremont** **Closed** **04/11/2011** **04/21/2011** **04/26/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squared has confirmed the invert elevation for the existing manhole at station 0+29.5 Fremont St. is EL 6.4 as shown on U-3022.

Please adivse.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/25/2011: In reference to RFI U-0128 and U-0128.1, construct temporary 15" VCP from SMH #601 to existing SMH at STA 0+29.50 as shown on attached SK-U-0016 and SK-U-0017. Construct SMH #601 to allow for future 30" VCP connection as indicated in SK-U-0016.

Relocate AWSS line in Howard St., not included in package. Design forthcoming potentially to be included in TG04.2R.

Following relocation of the AWSS line, construct 30" VCP sewer per contract documents.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0128.2 | AWSS Conflict with Sewer on Fremont | Closed | 07/07/2011 | 07/17/2011 | 03/27/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per the response to RFI#U-0128.1 a design to relocate the AWSS line @ Howard and Fremont is forthcoming.
Please advise the status of this design.

**SUGGESTION:**

Eric Zagol 7/20/2011 Design is being performed by SFDPW BOE and will be tracked and issued via a forthcoming ASI. Schedule will be discussed with SFDPW BOE on 7/22/11. An update will be provided in the RUP OAC on 7/26/11.

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

RFIs U-128.2 and U-124.1 were responded to in July of 2011 and provided temporary solutions to utility conflicts with a full resolution planned to come via future ASI. ASI 21, which addresses these issues, was uploaded to Constructware on 3/21/12 by Eric Zagol for design approval. A CR for this work will be issued in the near future.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0129 | Sewer Conflicts @ Second and Natoma | Closed | 04/13/2011 | 04/25/2011 | 04/28/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squared is unable to excavate/shore/install the 18" VCP from the existing manhole at Sta 0+45 to MH#301 at Sta 0+81 as shown on sheet U-3010.
While excavating for the sewer installation M Squared encountered several unknown utilities which were unmarked and not shown on the contract drawings. Also, some of the known utilities are at different locations and elevations than indicated on the drawings. Due to the quantity and proximity of these utilities it is not possible excavate and shore between MH#301 and the existing MH at Sta 0+45.
Additionally PGE have yet to relocate their gas and electric utilities out of the area of the proposed MH#301.
See attached drawings illustrating M Squared's pothole findings.
Please advise on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/27/2011: AECOM has reivewed the information provided and requests a meeting with W/O and M Squared to review the data, review the demolition and construction sequencing shown in AECOM plans, and further understand why excavation and shoring is not possible.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0129.1 | Sewer Conflicts @ Second and Natoma | Closed | 05/02/2011 | 05/12/2011 | 06/03/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per response to RFI#U-0129 Webcor/Obayashi, M Squared and AECOM met on 4/29/2011 and discussed why the sewer line between MH#301 and the existing manhole at Sta 0+45 could not be installed with normal

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 6/2/2011 Revised contract documents will be provided via ASI 011 to address conflicts between MH#301 and STA 0+45.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

means and methods. M Squared remove the plates from their investigative pot hole trench on 5/2/2011 for AECOM to further review and understand the existing conflicts.

Please provide AECOM's findings from these meetings and provide direction on how to proceed with the sewer installation in this location.

Between MH #301 and MH #302:

1. Continue to perform subsurface investigations and submit location and elevation information for existing sewer laterals at the proposed connection to new sewer in accordance with Key Note 1 prior to construction.
2. Verify via pre construction TV inspection in accordance with Specification Section 33 31 10 that all active sewer laterals are shown on U-3010 and have been located in the field.

---

**U-0130** **Sewer Removal On First Street** **Closed** **04/15/2011** **04/25/2011** **04/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

During the weekly Utility Relocation OAC meeting on 04/12/2011 Eric Zagol with AECOM informed Webcor/Obayashi that new drawings for the removal of the existing sewer on First street had been issued on 04/08/2011. To date Webcor/Obayashi has not received these drawings.

Please advise the status of these drawings.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Kevin Chiu 4/21/2011: See CR U-022 transmitted on 4/18/2011 to W/O's document control email for ASI No. U-006 which contains the requested information.

---

**U-0131** **Minna St PG&E Duct Bank Termination Points** **Closed** **04/19/2011** **04/29/2011** **04/22/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Michelle Smith **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

PG&E has confirmed Trinet is to terminate the PG&E duct back 3' outside the east and west walls of manhole 1319. Please confirm that the termination points of the PG&E duct bank as described will fulfill Trinet's scope of work and the future completion of the duct bank will be performed by PG&E.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/21/201:1 Joint Trench termination points at EMH 1319 and 1318 are as follows:

1319 East wall; PG&E would like the conduit capped and left 3 feet short of the vault with concrete encasement 15 feet short of the vault.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please note terminating the duct bank 3' outside the west wall of MH 1319 will leave the end of the ducts directly under the 24" high pressure water main. This may create an issue with future access for complete the duct bank by PG&E.

Please advise.

1319 West wall; PG&E would like the conduit capped and left 6 feet short (or 1-foot clear of existing 24-inch water, whichever is greater) of the vault with concrete encasement 15 feet short of the vault.

1318 North wall; PG&E would like the conduit capped and left 3 feet short of the vault with concrete encasement 15 feet short of the vault.

The new termination points shall be considered as the limit of new conduit installation at EMH 1319 and 1318.

---

**U-0132** **Minna St Sewer Pressure Test** **Closed** **04/20/2011** **04/30/2011** **04/27/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The SFDPW inspector Jason Chin has advised Trinet that he will be requesting a pressure test of the newly installed 18" and 24" VCP sewer main. The contract specification and drawings to do not specify any form of testing for the sewer mains.

Please advise if pressure testing of the sewer main will be required.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/26/2011: Test sewers in accordance with the contract documents. See specification sections:

034010 3.1 E

CCSF DPW Standard Section 319 Low Pressure Testing per 333110 1.2 A.

333110 1.4 C

333110 3.7

333110 3.8 B

333110 3.9

Provide TJPA Representative and SFDPW inspector 72 hours of advanced notice prior to testing.

---

| *Number* | *Subject* | *Status* | *Date Created* | *Date Required* | *Date Answered* | *Cost Impact* | *Proceed* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **U-0132.1** | **Sewer Main Pressure Test** | **Closed** | **05/07/2011** | **05/17/2011** | **05/11/2011** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Trinet has been advised by Mission Clay (the VCP manufacture) that the hydrostatic test described in the SF Standard Specification Section 319.02 is primarily for cast iron or ductile iron pipe and is not recommended for clay pipe. The National Institute of Clay Pipe and Mission Clay recommend a low pressure air test in accordance with ASTM C 828. See attached copy of ASTM C 828. Trinet proposes using this low pressure air test in lieu of the 10psi hydrostatic test called for in the standard specifications. The low pressure air test will allow test on pipe runs with no service laterals ie: MH501-502, 206-207, 203-204, 202-201. Please advise if this is acceptable.

With regards to the three remaining pipe runs that have lateral connections, please provide direction of how to plug the laterals if required to test the main lines.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

=======UPDATE 5/23/2011========

Kevin Chiu 5/23/2011 Below are links to devices for testing newly installed sewer pipes, specifically for main lines with active lateral connections that have been suggested within conversations between SFDPW, SFPUC and AECOM

http://newsite.cherneind.com/pneumatic/Long_Test_Ball_MS2_Test_Ball/

http://www.munipipe.com/chemical_grouting.html

http://veoliaes-is.com/Services/Environmental-and-Waste-Management/Total-Sewer-Management/Chemical-Grouting

Whether or not the contractors decide to utilize these devices is still up to them, as these are suggestions, not specifically required devices to be used for testing. It is the contractor's responsibility to perform testing on newly installed main lines, laterals, and manholes with their own means and methods while still protecting new and existing utilities.

==========

Eric Zagol 5/10/2011 ASTM C828 air test is an acceptable method to test sewer pipe in lieu of hydrostatic testing.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **U-0133** | **Minna St Joint Trench Configuration and Alignment, Sta 2+24 to 1+62** | **Closed** | **04/20/2011** | **04/30/2011** | **04/26/2011** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

During the installation of the AT&T ducts between Sta 2+24 and 1+62 the AT&T inspector, Juan, instructed Trinet to remove two bends from the duct bank. AECOM

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/21/2011 Please provide the referenced "attached...revised AT&T duct routing" for review.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

was contacted and approved the layout in the field prior to Trinet proceeding. Attached is the revised AT&T duct routing required by the inspector.

Please confirm the revised joint trench alignment is acceptable.

---

**U-0133.1** **Minna St Joint Trench Configuration and Alignment, Sta 2+24** **Closed** **04/26/2011** **05/10/2011** **05/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

During the installation of the AT&T ducts between Sta 2+24 and 1+62 the AT&T inspector, Juan, instructed Trinet to remove two bends from the duct bank. AECOM was contacted and approved the layout in the field prior to Trinet proceeding. Attached is the revised AT&T duct routing required by the inspector.

Please confirm the revised joint trench alignment is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/2/2011 Alignment of the AT&T ducts is acceptable as shown in the sketch provided.

---

**U-0134** **Water Depatment Tie In Conflict at Howard and Beale** **Closed** **04/26/2011** **05/06/2011** **05/02/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The SF Water Department has determined they are unable to perform the water tie in at the south west corner of Howard and Beale because of a conflict with the existing sewer sludge force main. M Squared has pothole the line and confirmed it is the existing 10" concrete encased sewer sludge force main.

Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 4/29/2011: Cut and remove a section of the existing 10-inch sludge line to allow SFWD to perform the water main connection. Coordinate with SFWD to determine the extent of the existing sludge line to be removed.

Plug the ends of the existing 10-inch sludge line with concrete per 02 41 00 3.6 A.

The existing sludge line to the north will be demolished per TG04.6.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

The connection of the new sludge line to the existing sludge line (south) per TG04.6, shall be made south of the plug.

---

**U-0135** **4" Water Service @ 1st and Natoma** **Closed** **04/27/2011** **05/07/2011** **05/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

While excavating for the 6" service connection to the new water line on First Street at Sta2+25 M Squared located an additional 4" ductile iron service that is connected to the existing water main. This 4" line is not shown in the contract documents.

SFWD records show this to be a live service and would like for this to be tied into the new main.

There is now no point of connection on the new water line to receive this 4" service.

Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/2/2011 Retap the existing 4" service to 500 Howard St. Coordinate service location with SFWD inspector. Submit piping plan showing the 4", 6" and 1" services for review.

Kevin Chiu 5/4/2011 Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.

---

**U-0135.1** **4" Water Service at First and Natoma** **Closed** **05/09/2011** **05/19/2011** **05/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In response to RFI #U-0135, see attached piping plan, as requested in RFI response.

Once approved M Squared will coordinate with SFWD to perform the work.

**An expedited response is required as this is holding up all other water work on Natoma Street**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/10/2011 With the understanding that the 12" main, 12" GV, 6" service and 1" service are already installed, furnish and install 4" GV and DIP service and connect to 12" main per piping plan.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0136 | Existing Water Bypass @ Howard and Fremont | Closed | 05/03/2011 | 05/13/2011 | 05/05/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

While planning for the water tie in at Howard and Beale the Water Department discovered that there is an existing bypass line that will connect the existing water system (which is to be abandoned) to the new water system. This bypass is not shown on the plans. The Water department has requested that the existing bypass be excavated and plated so it can be cut and capped while they have the line shut down for the tie in on the new system at Howard and Beale the night of 05/04/2011.

Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/4/2011 RFI is not accruate and locations are incorrect.

Based on a field meeting with W/O ,SFWD Inspector and AECOM on 5/3/11, SFWD identified an unforeseen existing bypass pipe and gate valve that connects the existing 8-inch main in Fremont Street (to remain) to the existing 8-inch main in Howard Street (to be abandoned). The existing 8-inch main in Howard Street will be abandoned once the new 12-inch main is Howard is active.

Once the new 12-inch main in Howard Street is placed into service and the existing main is abandoned, the existing bypass and gate valve from the existing 8-inch active Fremont main will be connected to the abandoned Howard Street main. To mitigate the situation the SFWD proposes to cut and cap the existing bypass such that the existing Fremont main is not connected the abandoned main in Howard Street.

Coordinate with SFWD to locate existing bypass and define the limits of excavation required to cap the existing bypass.

Excavate to expose bypass. Shore and plate per specifications. Restore per specifications.

Cutting and capping of the existing bypass will be by SFWD.

Kevin Chiu 5/4/2011 Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0137 | Verizon Ductbank conflict w/MH 701 | Closed | 05/03/2011 | 05/13/2011 | 05/10/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

M Squared's sewer potholing on Beale (Sta 0+30) has indicated a conflict between an existing Verizon duct bank and MH# 701 on Howard Street. See attached drawing. The ductbank is approximately 18" wide x 18" deep. It is 2'4" to the top and it is slurry encased.
Verizon underground locators have confirmed that this is live and serves Charles Schwabb building south of Howard on Beale Street.
Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/10/2011 Unforeseen condition, Verizon utility not shown in existing utility survey.

As suggested by Noel of (M Squared) during a site visit on 5/3/11 with W/O and AECOM, based on Noel's discussions with Mike Roybal (Verizon Field Engineer) and confirmed by AECOM based on follow up discussions with Mike Roybal (Verizon) and Pam Brown (Verizon), coordinate with Verizon and remove existing concrete encasement from existing duct to expose conduit in area of conflict. As directed in the field by Verizon, remove concrete encasement around duct from area in conflict to adjacent Verizon manhole. Move and support exposed Verizon conduit as required and directed by Verizon to construct manhole.

Coordinate with Mike Roybal (Verizon) at (415) 716-6736 such that a Verizon representative is present during the Verizon duct concrete encasement removal, moving and support install.

Restore Verizon duct to match existing concrete encasement following completion of sewer manhole.

---

**U-0138** **Temporary Telecom Pole Layout in Lot N and N'** **Closed** **05/09/2011** **05/19/2011** **05/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Joanne Filipas **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Reference attached layout and submittal package#TG0406-014:

Due to the future use of lot N and N' prime, the temporary telecom poles must be relocated. The attached sketch indicates the proposed layout of these poles which has been coordinated with AECOM. Submittal Package#TG0406-014 has been submitted for formal approval of the pole locations.

Please confirm relocating the poles is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/10/2011 The pole alignment changes requested by CMGC along with additional requests from Telecommunications companies has required a pole and pole placement redesign. An ASI has been generated for the redesign with a CR forthcoming.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0139 | Existing Water Line on Beale in Conflict with New Sewer | Closed | 05/09/2011 | 05/09/2011 | 05/10/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Today while trying to execute the USAR for the existing 12" water line on Beale Dan Helminiak with SFWD informed Webcor/Obayashi and M Squared that the existing water line will remain active until the water tie in at First and Natoma is completed and the existing 8" is capped at First and Howard as shown on sheet U-3116.

The water tie in and capping of the existing line on First Street is currently being delayed by separate issues and it is unclear when this work will be completed.

Dan Helminiak suggested that the existing 8" water line running down Howard could be capped by the water department at one of the existing tees which would allow the decommissioning of the existing line on Beale.

Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/10/2011 Please clarify the question(s).

Subject states "Existing Water Line on Beale in Conflict with New Sewer". Per U-1124 Demolition and Construction Sequence order, Beale Street sewer is to commence after existing water main in Beale Street is abandoned. Please clarify where and what the conflict is.

Also, please confirm the following:

1. Is the new 12" main along Howard Street between First and Main streets active?
2. Is the new 12" main along Beale Street north of Howard Street active?
3. Is the new 12" main along Beale Street south of Mission Street active?

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0139.1 | Cap (E) Water on Howard @ Beale | Closed | 05/16/2011 | 05/26/2011 | 05/24/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

-New 12" water main along Howard between First and Main is active.
-New 12" water main along Beale Street North of Howard is active.
-New 12" water main along Beale Street South of Mission is active.

Per U-1124 Demolition and Construction Sequence order, Beale Street sewer is to commence after existing water main on Beale is abandoned.
- The old water line on Howard Streets and Beale Streets is currently not active because the valves on the line at First and Howard are currently shutdown. Dan from the water department has expressed his concern that anyone can just open these valves and fill the old line along Howard Street. He is also concerned that the valve is not 100% closed and that the SFWD cannot get a complete shutdown on the old line. This means when M Squared

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/23/2011 Coordinate construction of the cap on the old Howard St. main at the intersection of Main St. with SFWD as shown on U-3119.

Coordinate construction of the cap on the old Howard St. main at the intersection of First St. with SFWD as shown on U-3116 (latest rev per SK-U-0003 1/28/11).

Per discussions with SFWD inspector, the old Howard St. main has been capped at Main St, Beale St. (south of the cross) and at the Fremont St. by-pass connection by SFWD. Additionally, the two line gates at First and Fremont streets are closed and have been filled with concrete.

The caps at Main, Beale, Fremont in combination with the closed line gates at First St. will allow sewer installation on Beale St. to proceed.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

removes the old water line on Beale Street in order to install the new sewer, it is possible that there will be a constant flow of water in the old line.

The suggestion from Dan is to cap the old water line on Howard Street so that When M Squared removes the old line on Beale Street there will be no possibility of water flow. A cap on the line at Howard would also confirm for definite that the old line on Howard and Beale Street is "abandoned".

Please provide direction for capping the existing water line on Howard so the sewer installation on Beale can proceed.

---

**U-0140** **Proposed Changes by BLHP to S/L Conduit Run @ 2nd & Minna** **Closed** **05/11/2011** **05/21/2011** **05/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

During a field meeting on 5/10/2011 with Eric Zagol, AECOM and Robert Kawano, BLHP to discuss the alignment of the conduit run from 2nd St to the relocated S/L pole @ Stn 2+89, Robert Kawano asked that a splice box be installed in the sidewalk downstream from the connection point to PG&E¿s manhole. The box would serve as the connection point for BLHP to PG&E¿s power supply from 2nd St for the street light. Because of an existing sidewalk basement, which is located along the north side of Minna, east of 2nd St., it was agreed in the field that the splice box should be placed in the sidewalk just west of the new fire hydrant located @ Stn 0+93. There is already a pocket constructed in the sidewalk basement to accommodate the fire hydrant and Trinet will locate the splice box within this pocket structure. A sketch is attached depicting the proposed alignment of the conduit run and the additional splice box as discussed in the field. Please confirm this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/19/2011 Per BLHP's request, furnish and install a CCSF DPW precast pullbox, cover, and lid per CCSF DPW Standard Plans and Specifications between the PG&E supply point and the relocated street light pullbox along Minna Street east of Second Street.

Location; confirm that a sidewalk pullbox will fit in the knock out space above the 121-123 Second St. sidewalk basement adjacent to the newly installed fire hydrant prior to construction.

Maintain minimum bends in conduit run per Specification 33 71 00.

---

**U-0141** **Street Light Connection Point at Second and Minna** **Closed** **05/16/2011** **05/26/2011** **05/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In the response to our RFI # U-0016, Trinet was directed to connect the street lighting conduit on the west end of Minna into PG&E MH #1319 on 2nd St. At a field meeting on 5/10/1 with Eric Zagol and Robert Kawano, to discuss the alignment of the street lighting run for the relocated light on the west end of Minna, Eric advised that PG&E was contemplating a change in the connection point for this conduit run from MH 1319 to MH 1320. MH #1320 is located to the south of 1319 and further west towards the middle of 2nd St. Please confirm the connection point on 2nd St for the street lighting conduit.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

***5/26/11 UPDATE***

Supply point has been confirmed as PG&E EMH 1320. Coordinate connection location with PG&E Field Engineer.

Eric Zagol 5/19/2011 Related to Joint Trench changes and PG&E's de-energization of Minna Street after the response to RFI U-0016 was provided, PG&E has revised their electrical plans with respect to EMH 1319 and has indicated that the preferred location for new street light power would be EMH 1320.

In accordance with U-3201 Note 7, AECOM considers this RFI as the request to coordinate connections with BLHP and PG&E through the TJPA representative for new street light circuit connections. AECOM and the TJPA Representative are in the process of coordinating Street Light Service Orders with BLHP and PG&E. Once the Service Order is processed the final connection point will be provided.

---

**U-0142** **Concrete Specifications for Sidewalk Replacement @ 555 Mission** **Closed** **05/16/2011** **05/26/2011** **05/18/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The sidewalk concrete @ 555 Mission (on Minna) is not the typical San Francisco sidewalk mix design. It is a colored concrete with what appears to be a sandblasted finish. Please provide the concrete specifications for repair and/or replacement of the sidewalk in this area.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Kevin Chiu 5/18/2011 Sidewalks shall be constructed of a dark gray, Hi-con @ 5 lbs. per cubic yard carbon black based concrete finish, with 25 to 30 lbs. per 100 square feet of silicon carbide sparkle grains. The surface of the concrete shall be washed and rinsed using a stiff brush, and if necessary shall be sandblasted to remove the concrete surrounding the aggregate to minimum depth of 1/8 inch.

---

**U-0143** **Demolition of PG&E Duct Bank Alongside (N) 18" Sewer Main on Minna** **Closed** **05/16/2011** **05/26/2011** **05/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

During excavation and shoring for installation of the 18" Sewer main along Minna St., between the (E) electrical vault @ Stn 1+80 (demolished) and (N) manhole # 201, Trinet was unable to save the entire length of the existing PG&E duct bank (currently abandoned), which runs along the south side of the sewer trench. Between stations Stn 0+95 and 1+25 (approx.) the duct bank had veered into the sewer trench and had to be demolished - see attached sketch. Please review and advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/19/2011 U-1107 (rev 2 3/16/11) indicates that the existing 6-4" PG&E duct is to be protected in place.

2 of the 6 existing 4" conduits will be utilized by PG&E to provide temporary construction power to W/O Skids 1 and 2 along Minna Street.

Mandrel existing conduits east of STA 1+25 to STA 1+70 (where new conduit caps were to be installed per contract) to confirm that the existing conduits that were to be protected in place have no blockages.

Coordinate with PG&E as STA 0+95 is exposed to determine which 2 of existing 4" conduits will be utilized for temporary construction power.

Furnish and install 2-4" conduits concrete encased to replace those that were removed during sewer construction. Connect new conduits to existing that will remain to provide temporary construction power.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0143.1 | (E) PG&E Duct Bank from EMH #1320 to Demolished EMH #1355 | Closed | 06/14/2011 | 06/24/2011 | 06/14/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

After further investigation of the existing PG&E duct bank between EMH #1320 and demolished EMH # 1355 (@ Anchor & Hope), Trinet found that there is only one unobstructed conduit between the two manholes. The unobstructed conduit is the one that already had a pull rope in place. Trinet had demolished a section of this conduit during excavation for sewer MH # 201 because it was in conflict with the shoring. Trinet replaced the damaged section (approx. 8 LF) on Saturday 6/1, and reconnected the pull rope in the conduit run. A sketch of the conduit run, depicting the section replaced, is attached. Please review and advise if one 4" conduit will be adequate from EMH #1320 to the west end of

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 6/14/2011 PG&E plans to use the existing conduit package to provide temp power to Skids 1 and 2. Mike Balmy of PG&E was notified and has confirmed that only 1-4" unobstructed conduit is required between EMH1320 and the cap at demolished EMH1355 for future temp power service.

demolished EMH #1355.

---

**U-0144** **PGE Vault conflict with 24" VCP on Beale** **Closed** **05/17/2011** **05/27/2011** **05/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

PG&E confirmed the location of the inside of the east wall of PG&E manhole 1702 at Howard and Beale Street. Allowing for a 12" thick wall, the vault will be in conflict with the proposed alignment of the future 24" VCP, even with moving the alignment 1' further east as directed in RFI U-0124. The conflict could be avoided by moving the alignment another 6" further east. However this will cause a conflict between manhole #701 and the existing 14" AWSS. Additionally the Verizon duct bank conflict increases(RFI#U-0137).
Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/19/2011 As discussed in the field on 5/18/11 with Jason Dunne (W/O) and Noel McCarthy (MSquared) the exact location of the existing PG&E MH outside wall and the existing AWSS is currently unknown.

Adjust locations of MH#701, MH#702, MH#704 and sewer alignment east as required (~6" as mentioned) for the 24" VCP installation (new and future) to avoid the existing PG&E MH however not in conflict in conflict with the existing 14" AWSS line.

Note, the existing AWSS line will be abandoned North of Beale Street STA 1+10.

Confirm alignment (2-10" VCP and future 24" VCP) will clear existing AWSS valve at STA 0+70.

---

**U-0144.1** **PG&E Vault conflict with 24" VCP on Beale** **Closed** **06/30/2011** **07/10/2011** **07/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In response to RFI U-0144, please note that M Squared confirms the following:

2-10inch VCP and future 24inch VCP will clear existing AWSS Valve at Sta 0+70.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Kevin Chiu 7/1/2011 RFI does not request additional information.

---

| *Number* | *Subject* | *Status* | *Date Created* | *Date Required* | *Date Answered* | *Cost Impact* | *Proceed* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **U-0145** | **Sludge Main Conflicts with Existing Utilities** | **Closed** | **05/17/2011** | **05/27/2011** | **05/18/2011** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please see attached pothole results for the new sludge main on Mission Street. Due to the quantity and location of existing utilities, and utility vaults/manholes it will not be possible to install the new 12" sludge main on Mission Street as shown on the contract drawings.

Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/18/2011 Please indicate which utilities were marked via the USA ticket and or those identified by other means.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **U-0145.1** | **Sludge Main Conflicts with existing utilities** | **Closed** | **05/18/2011** | **05/28/2011** | **06/07/2011** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In response to RFI# U-0145, see attached with notes. M Squared has marked what utilities were located via USA markings and what ones have been located via the contract drawings. There are also several unknowns that could not be identified.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 6/7/2011 Revised contract documents will be provided via ASI 012 to address sludge line conflicts in Mission St.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **U-0146** | **Proposed Pavement Reconstruction Plan for Minna Street** | **Closed** | **05/17/2011** | **05/27/2011** | **05/23/2011** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please find the attached sketch detailing Trinet's proposed pavement reconstruction plan for Minna St., between 1St to 2nd Streets. Please review and advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/23/2011 AECOM has reviewed the sketch provided and has the following comments in accordance with Contract requirements:

Confirm existing utilities to be demolished as shown on Demolition Plans have been demolished per Plans prior to final street restoration.
Provide FULL street restoration, curb to curb, in Minna St. West of the CDSM shoring wall (~STA 2+25) to Second Street in accordance with Contract requirements (DPW ORDER NO. 178,940 [superseding DPW ORDER 176,707] per specification SECTION 32 12 17)
Construct Curbs in accordance with DPW Stnd. Plan 87,169

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Construct Driveways in accordance with DPW Stnd. Plan 87,171
Construct Joints for Concrete Pavement Base in accordance with DPW Stnd. Plan 87,174
Per Contract specification SECTION 32 12 17, reconstruct curb returns at Second and Minna Per DPW ORDER NO. 178,940 (superseding DPW ORDER 176,707) Regulations for Excavating and Restoring Streets in San Francisco Section 9.4 B. Excavation affecting curb returns, stated as follows:

1. Any excavation (including trenchless technology) encroaching upon any part of an angular corner requires the installation or reconstruction of curb ramp(s) at the affected corner to current standards by the Permittee. Permittee's are encouraged to contact BSM Inspection Division to determine if curb ramps within a project are compliant or must be replaced at least 45 days prior to the commencement of any work.

2. Curb ramps must be constructed in accordance with current City standards (Drawing Nos. 55,017 Rev. 3; 55,017.1, 55,018 Rev.3; 55,018.1; 55,018.2; 55,018.3 "Exception to Standard Curb Ramps") (Appendix 5).

---

**U-0146.1** **Proposed Pavement Reconstruction** **Plan for Minna Street** **Closed** **05/27/2011** **06/06/2011** **05/27/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Attached, please find a sketch detailing Trinet's revised pavement reconstruction plan for Minna St., between 1St to 2nd Streets, which incorporates Balfour Beatty's request that Trinet stop the new pavement section 5' north of centerline of the CDSM shoring wall (2' north of demarcation line).

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

*** 5/31/11 Revision ***

Restore entire width of Minna street using concrete road base and ACWS curb to curb in accordance with Contract drawings and DPW Order No. 176,707 (and latest revision 178,940) Section 11.

5/27/11 Response:

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please provide BBIIs traffic control plan and construction logistics plan for Minna St. during pre-trenching and CDSM shoring wall construction.

AECOM's specific questions are as follows:

1. What portion of Minna St. will be maintained for vehicular traffic during pre-trenching and CDSM wall construction? Please provide dimensions from face of north curb along Minna St.
2. Is a traffic barrier (k-rail or other) planned to be installed along Minna St. during pre-trenching and CDSM wall construction? Provide location, dimension from face of north cur along Minna St.
3. If a traffic barrier is planned, what is the schedule for the installation?
4. Once pre-trenching is complete will any of the pretrenching trench area be restored and used for vehicular traffic?
5. Once the CDSM shoring wall is constructed will the traffic barrier move south and the vehicular area be widened? If so by how much? Please provide a dimension from the face of north curb along Minna St.

This information is critical in order to provide a responses to this RFI as well as RFI U-147 and U-148 in an effort to determine how RUP will restore Minna St.; crowned or sloped, and how the Minna St. restoration conforms to the future Transit Center Minna St. design.

---

**U-0146.2** **Pavement Reconstruction Plan for Minna Rev 2** **Closed** **06/02/2011** **06/12/2011** **06/07/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please find attached a revised (Rev2) pavement Reconstruction Cross Section drawing for Minna St., which details Trinets understanding of the Engineer's latest response to RFI#U-0146.1 and RFI#U-0147. Please

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 6/7/2011 Street restoration detail is acceptable with the following corrections:

1. The southern extent (limit) of concrete base and

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

confirm pavement reconstruction can proceed per the attached detail..

ACWS between STA 2+30 and First Street shall be based on U-5101 Detail 6 and the limit of excavation required to do perform the Demolition and New utilities work in Minna Street. Conform to final saw cut lines as indicated in Detail 6.

---

**U-0147** **Existing Top-Of-Curb Grades @ Minna Driveways for 575 Mission Building** **Closed** **05/27/2011** **06/06/2011** **06/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The existing driveways entering the 575 Mission St building, are depressed between 2 ½" to 3" below the adjacent top-of-curb and sidewalk grades - see attached drawing depicting the driveways. This condition seems to be a consequence of repeated overlaying of Minna street, which has resulted in a curb height in many areas far less than the City standard of 6 inches. The street grade along the north side of Minna along the 575 Mission building ranges from 3 ½ to 4 ½ inches below top-of-curb grade.

Trinet has been directed in the field by Jason Chin, and by the Engineer in RFI #U-0146, to construct the new roadway with finish grade at curb line 6" below top-of-curb grade. This is consistent with City standard plan # 87,169. The new roadway grades will result in 3" to 3 ½" of exposed curb height at the driveways to 575 Mission, which is considerably deeper than the 1" called for in the San Francisco standard plans for driveway construction (plan # 87,171). It will also not be possible to raise the street grade at the driveways without impeding road runoff drainage and causing ponding.

Please review and advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 5/31/2011 Restore pavement along existing curbs and driveways along the north side of Minna St. in accordance with Contract drawings and DPW Order No. 176,707 (and latest revision 178,940) Section 12 to match existing flow line elevations at curbs and driveways shown on U-1001. 6-inch curb and driveways along Minna St. will be reconstructed at a later date as part of the Transit Center Project.

---

**U-0148** **Pavement Reconstruction Plan for West End of Minna Street - Stn 2+15 to 2nd St** **Closed** **05/27/2011** **06/06/2011** **06/07/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please provide a pavement reconstruction drawing, or typical cross section detail, for the west end of Minna St from Stn 2+15 to 2nd St. Trinet had planned to reconstruct the street in this area from curb to curb. We find however, that there is a grade difference of approximately 6 inches between top-of-curb on the north side of the street and the south side, with the south side being at the higher grade. The construction detail approved in RFI #U-0146 (Trinet #094) cannot be utilized in this area, because the street already has a cross slope of approx. 2% from south to north.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 6/7/2011 See response to RFI 146.2

---

**U-0149** **MH#701 Conflicts with existing utilities** **Closed** **05/27/2011** **06/06/2011** **06/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The 14" AWSS line west of MH#701 was found to be constructed thru the roof of the existing 3x5 sewer. Several bends were used in the AWSS line construction and these bends included lugs and tie rods. As a result of the presence of these tie rods and fittings we can now not move MH#701 any further west.
To install the new 24" VCP in a straight line (perpendicular to MH wall), and in order to get by the existing PGE MH we will have to pour the pipe wall and 2" of the internal diameter of the pipe into the west wall of MH 701.
Please advise on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 6/8/2011 Deflect VCP pipe joints in accordance with ASTM C425 (max 1.8 degrees per joint) to allow for 6" of deflection to avoid the existing PG&E MH and connect to MH#701 as shown in the attached SK-U-0019.

Confirm in the field that 6" deflection will allow the 24" VCP to be clear of the MH wall.

---

**U-0149.1** **MH#701 Conflicts with existing utilities** **Closed** **06/30/2011** **07/10/2011** **07/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In response to RFI U-0149, please note the following:

M Squared confirms that 6inch deflection of the VCP will allow the 24inch pipe to be clear of the manhole wall.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Kevin Chiu 7/1/2011 RFI does not request additional information.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0150 | Proposed Correction to Field Condition Report 40C | Closed | 05/31/2011 | 06/10/2011 | 06/01/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please see the attached detail from Trinet Construction Inc for their proposed solution to mitigate the incorrect installation of CB203 identified in Field Condition Report 40C.

Please advise if the proposed solution is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 6/1/2011 The proposed solution has been reviewed and approved by SFDPW BOE and is acceptable. Construct catch basin as shown in the Trinet proposed construction detail attached to CR40C. Construct the clean out on the cast iron trap such that it is accessible from above for maintenance via removal of the grate . Coordinate inspection during installation with DPW BCM inspector through the TJPA's Representative.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0151 | Additional Sewer Lateral Connection for 100 1st Street | Closed | 06/02/2011 | 06/12/2011 | 06/08/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Trinet has discovered an additional sewer lateral for the 100 1st Street building which was not connected to the new 24" sewer main - see attached sketch. The lateral is located at sta. 7+09 and services a single toilet and the rear of the building. This lateral was not shown on the plans and there was no vent in the sidewalk to indicate the existence of a lateral. Trient potholed the lateral in the sidewalk and a 4" cast iron lateral, a 4" cast iron trap and a 4" cast iron vent pipe capped 2' below grade. Please confirm Trinet is to tie the lateral into the new 24" sewer main on Minna. Also, please advise what is to be done with existing cast iron trap and vent pipe assembly which are not up to current DPW standards.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 6/8/2011 In accordance with U-3000 General Note 12, contractor was to verify that there are no active sewer lateral connections to the existing sewer prior to sewer demolition.

Please provide the elevation of the existing sewer lateral and the location of existing 4" cast iron vent pipe for review.

Renewal of this lateral will be discussed with TJPA and 100 First St. property owner, final direction forthcoming.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0151.1 | Additional Sewer Lateral Connection | Closed | 06/29/2011 | 07/09/2011 | 07/05/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

This is a follow-up to the request by the Engineer in his response to W/O RFI #U-0151 (Trinet RFI #097) for

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 7/5/2011 In reference to RFI-151 and 151.1:

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

additional information relating to the 2nd sewer lateral connection for the 100 1st St building. Trinet also clarifies the issue of the existing 4" trap on the line, which was raised in the original RFI.

The sewer lateral is located @ Stn. 7+09 and the invert elevation of the 4" cast iron sewer lateral pipe at face-of-curb is 14.6'. The elevation for the top of the new concrete encased ductbank @ Stn 7+09 is 13.85'. The sewer lateral was therefore not in conflict with the new joint trench utilities.

With regards to the existing 4" trap on the line, Trinet checked with the SF Plumbing department which adviced that a 4" cast iron trap was adequate for a 4" sewer lateral. The existing trap was therefore in compliance with the SF plumbing code. Trinet advised Jason Chin of this in the field and he agreed that the trap did not need to be replaced.

The 4" cast iron vent pipe for the trap did not extend to street level but was capped-off approximately 18" below grade. Per field discussions with Jason Chin, Trinet extended the trap vent piping to grade and installed a street vent frame & cover in the sidewalk.

1. Reconnect existing lateral to new 24" Minna St. sewer in accordance with SFDPW Standard Plan 87,196.
2. Extend fresh air inlet and air inlet cover to existing sidewalk grade.

---

**U-0152** **Alternate Manhole Testing Method** **Closed** **06/02/2011** **06/12/2011** **06/07/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Spec section 03 40 10 3.1 E directs the contractor to test all manholes hydraulically by exfiltration testing.
M Squared proposes the use of the vacuum method of testing manhole sections instead of the above method (See attached)
This vacuum method is in accordance with ASTM C1244.

Please advise if this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 6/7/2011 Vacuum method in accordance with ASTM C1244 is acceptable for testing of sewer manholes.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0153 | Concrete Slab and Rail Ties Conflict with Sludge Line on Howard | Closed | 06/03/2011 | 06/13/2011 | 06/21/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

While potholing for the sludge line alignment along Howard Street between Beale and Main at Sta 18+00 and Sta 19+42 M Squared discovered the presence of wooden rail ties and concrete slab (see attached photos).
These are possibly the same ties and slab that M Squared encountered while installing the water line on TG04.3.
They are in direct conflict with the proposed location of the new sludge line along Howard Street.
Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 6/21/2011

*** 6/21/11 Update ***

Based on follow up discussions with W/O and M2, and further understanding of the extents of the concrete slab and wooden rails ties found further West (Howard and Fremont streets TG04.3), remove and dispose of concrete and wooden rail ties as required to construct 12" sludge line.

Eric Zagol 6/8/2011 Pothole at STA 18+00 to determine the extents (southern and northern) of the concrete slab and wooden rail ties. Submit pothole data for review.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0154 | Electrical Service for Street Lights on Natoma | Closed | 06/08/2011 | 06/18/2011 | 09/01/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Chris Lotti

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per Sheet U-1120 the electrical service feeding the street lights on Natoma is to be demolished, see attached. This conduit has been exposed through the investigative trenching process on First, confirmed dead and remove. As a result the existing street lights on Natoma are without power. There are no details provided in the plans for reestablishing power to these street lights now that the demo is complete.

Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

Eric Zagol 6/20/2011 Natoma Street street light power renewal to be addressed via ASI 014 forthcoming.

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Change Request No. U-043R1 -Renew Natoma Street Light Power Supply (ASI No. 014) [30100.03] - Force Account issued 9/13/2011.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0155 | AWSS Cast In Place Concrete Testing | Closed | 06/20/2011 | 06/30/2011 | 06/28/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

The AWSS Specification section 03300-2, Cast-In-Place Concrete 1.5 C (Quality Assurance) states that the concrete testing will be performed by an agency employed by the TJPA.

However, 03300-10, 3.9 B (Field Quality Control) states that the concrete testing will be performed by the City Testing and Inspection Agency.

Please advise who will be preforming the cast in pace concrete testing.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Kevin Chiu 6/28/2011 The TJPA employed testing agency will provide concrete testing per 03300-2, 1.5C.

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "TJPA can have testing performed or set funding in place for testing by SFDPW's testing lab," dated and signed on 6/27/11 (see attached).

---

**U-0156** **Sink Hole under road base at MH#701** **Closed** **06/21/2011** **07/01/2011** **06/22/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

While excavating for MH#701 M Squared discovered what appears to be a large void under the street base adjacent to the west wall of the MH#701. We estimate the void to be approximately 3' wide and 12' long. This may be a hazard as the street base may collapse at some point in the future.

Please advise how you would like to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 6/22/2011 Unforeseen existing condition not clear if directly related to the Relocation of Utilities Project work.

AECOM suggests that the existing pavement be removed over the area of the sink hole and conditions be evaluated.

Once existing utilities are determined to be secure, backfill with a sand cement slurry and restore pavement in accordance with SFDPW Standard Plans and Specifications.

Kevin Chiu 6/22/2011 Coordinate repair of sink hole with TJPA representative. Repair work to be paid under CR U-039

---

**U-0157** **Pressure Testing for Sewer Manhole #'s 501 & 502 on 1st St.** **Closed** **06/28/2011** **07/08/2011** **07/08/2011** **Potentially** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

This RFI is a follow-up to discussions in the field with AECOM and the SFDPW Inspector and Trinet, regarding Trinet's inability to perform a pressure test on sewer manholes 501 & 502 on 1st St. due to field conditions. MH #502 is constructed around the existing 3x5 brick sewer on one side (per SF Standard Plan #87,184) and Trinet has no means of plugging the brick sewer effectively to withstand a pressure test.

In the case of sewer MH #501, the original design was similar to MH #502 and a pressure test would not have been possible. The revised design (see attached drawing) includes a temporary 24" corrugated PVC pipe stub extending south from the manhole and connecting to the existing 3x5 brick sewer. The inside of the temporary 24" pipe stub is also corrugated, and therefore cannot be sealed with an inflatable pipe plug, as would be required to perform a pressure test of the manhole structure.

Please confirm that a pressure test will not be required for sewer manholes 501 & 502 on 1st St.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 7/8/2011 Confirmed. Pressure tests for sewer manholes #501 and #502 are not required due to the restrictive conditions.

---

**U-0158** **MH #301 Location** **Closed** **07/15/2011** **07/25/2011** **07/20/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

During our sewer work at 2nd and Natoma M Squared discovered that the Telecom Vault shown on the drawings is in fact significantly larger in the field than is shown on the plans. In order to be able to shore for MH#301 construction M Squared has had to move the location of MH four (4) feet east along Natoma. As a result the jack and bore alignment is now a few inches south of what is shown on the plans.

Please confirm that these adjustments are acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 7/20/2011 Adjustments proposed are acceptable.

Since the adjustment pushes the MH and cover into the crosswalk path of travel, in lieu of CCSF DPW Standard MH cover, provide an ADA complainant cover that meets the following specifications:

1. MATERIAL - The cast iron shall be in accordance with ASTM "Standard Specifications for Gray Cast Iron Castings" Designation A 48, Class 30. The tinsel strength shall be considered the primary test for qualification.
2. FINISH- STANDARD FINISH SHALL BE RAW, AS

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

CAST, AND YIELD A MINIMUM COEFFICIENT FOR FRICTION OF .6 OR BETTER IN WET OR DRY CONDITIONS.
3. CASTINGS - SHALL BE FREE OF BLOW HOLES, FLASHING, GRIND MARKS, AND OTHER SURFACE BLEMISHES.
4. Cover shall incorporate a "pic-hole" for lifting purposes.
5. ADA COMPLIANCY- CASTINGS SHALL HAVE HOLES NO GREATER THAN ½" IN THE DOMINANT DIRECTION OF MOTION, NO VERTICAL RISE OF GREATER THAN ¼", IF THE RISE IS GREATER THAN ¼" THE RISE/RUN RATIO NEEDS TO BE 1;2 AND THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT SHALL BE 1/2".
6. Cover shall BE MADE TO FIT EXISTNG FRAMES OR be MACHINED to FIT EXITING FRAMES PER SFDPW STANDARD PLAN 87,190.
7. Cover should be MADE of quality EQUAL TO OR GREATER then THE PRODUCTS MADE BY D&L Foundry or Equal, see attached product data sheet.

---

**U-0159** **Unknown Concrete Structure In Conflict with Sludge Line on Mission** **Closed** **07/28/2011** **08/07/2011** **08/16/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

While potholing at the locations shown on the attached drawing M Squared discovered what appears to be a concrete wall under the parking strip. M Squared excavated both potholes 7' deep and at that depth the wall appeared to be continuing deeper. This concrete structure is in direct conflict with the proposed location of the new sludge main on Mission Street. The concrete curb on the north side of Mission St also extends 7' deep.

See attached pothole findings.

Please advise on how you would like to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 8/16/2011 In accordance with specification sections 000810 and 020630, please submit for review locations and findings for all potholes performed along Mission Street associated with the Sludge FM.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0159.1 | Conflict with Sludge Line Conflict on Mission | Closed | 08/26/2011 | 09/05/2011 | 09/13/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jacob Giannandrea **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In response to RFI U-159. See attached pothole findings from remaining potholes on Mission street. Also included is pothole data for Sta 17+28 and Sta 17+50.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

In response to RFI U-159 and 159.1:

For 12"Sludge FM on Mission at Beale St., information provided shows an existing unforeseen concrete wall 23" from the face of curb, the proposed 12" Sludge FM is shown 1' from the curb. Construct 12" Sludge FM between face of curb and existing concrete wall.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0159.2 | Unknown Concrete Structure Sludge Line Conflict | Closed | 09/15/2011 | 09/15/2011 | 09/21/2011 | Yes | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In response to RFI U-159.1
There is not adequate space between the face of curb and the unknown concrete structure in order for a welder to be able to weld the bells of each piece of pipe.
Please advise on how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 9/18/2011 Demolish existing unknown concrete structure south of proposed alignment between STAs 17+25 to 17+75 as required at joints to facilitate welding. Expose unknown structure at joints, identify sections to be demolished and coordinate with TJPA Representative prior to structure demolition.

Jeff Thiel 9/21/2011 Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0160 | Location of Existing Sludge Force Main on Beale Street | Closed | 07/29/2011 | 08/08/2011 | 08/02/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squared has potholed for the sludge line on Mission Street at Beale at the location shown on the attached drawing. They have been unable to locate the existing 10" FM that they are to tie the new 12" sludge main into. The (E) Force Main is not in the location shown on the contract

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 8/2/2011 The existing 10" sludge FM in the vicinity bends down (~45+) to get under the existing 3'x5' sewer in Mission St. Record drawings show the depth of the 10" sludge FM where potholed at around 5', north of the 45 degree vertical bend.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

drawings.
See attached pothole findings.
Please advise on how you would like to proceed.

However, record drawings may not be reliable as was the case at Howard and Beale St. when excavating for the Beale St. water main connection where the 10" sludge FM was found at a location different than shown on the drawings.

Pothole for the existing 10" sludge FM at Beale St. STA 7+08 (10' north of current location) to ensure connection location is north of the vertical bend. Submit pothole data for review.

---

**U-0160.1** **Location of FM on Beale Street** **Closed** **08/05/2011** **08/05/2011** **08/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per response to RFI U-0160 M Squared continued its potholing at Sta 7+08 on Beale Street.
M Squared potholed 7' long x 4' wide and 8' deep and M Squared was still unable to determine the location of the existing FM.

See attached pothole findings.

Please advise how M Squared should proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 8/9/2011 Unforeseen mismarked existing utility via the USA process. Pothole for existing sludge FM at the location shown in the attached sketch.

---

**U-0160.2** **Location of FM on Beale Street** **Closed** **08/11/2011** **08/21/2011** **08/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squared potholed the location of the existing FM to the limits in the drawing provided in the response to RFI U-0160.1. M Squared located the FM within this pothole.

See attached pothole findings.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Unforeseen condition, location of existing Sludge FM in the field varied from that shown on the drawings. Refer to SK-U-0021 and SK-U-0022 attached showing the revised horizontal and vertical alignment to accommodate connection to Sludge FM as located in the field.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please direct M Squared how to proceed.

---

**U-0161** **Unknown Concrete Structure in Investigative Trench** **Closed** **07/29/2011** **08/08/2011** **08/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squared discovered an obstruction in the Beale Street investigative trench on station 2+55 approximately 25' west of centerline. The obstruction appears to be a 2'-3' thick concrete wall starting directly below the street base and extending down to an unknown depth. M Squared began demoing the obstruction yesterday believing it was part of a concrete encased PG&E trench. It is now known it is not part of any duct package.
Please advise on how you would like to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 8/1/2011 Unknown non utility structure. A similar structure was found in AECOM's subsurface investigation trench at Beale Street Station 2+80.52 as shown in Specification Section 020630 Appendix A.

Protect in place. Non utility structures (i.e. walls) within zone of CDSM shoring wall and Transit Center footprint are to be removed by Buttress/Shoring/Excavation (BSE) contractor.

---

**U-0162** **Manhole #602 Orientation** **Closed** **08/03/2011** **08/13/2011** **08/09/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The PG&E manhole at Station 2+55 is actually further south than is shown on the drawings. As a result of this the new water main on Natoma Street was installed in a different alignment than shown on the drawings. In order to excavate and shore for the new Manhole #602, without damaging the new water main M Squared will have to install the manhole at a different alignment than what is shown on the plans. M Squared will maintain the correct internal manhole dimensions per DPW standard drawings.

Please confirm this is acceptable.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 8/9/2011 Construct sewer MH #602 to avoid existing water main as shown in the sketch provided. Maintain internal manhole dimensions, wall thickness, and steel reinforcement per DPW Standard Plans #87,182.

---

**U-0163** **Utilities Demolition Plan** **Closed** **08/04/2011** **08/14/2011** **08/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The submittal TG04.4 - UG1020-024100B01 Utilities Demolition Plan was returned to M Squared marked "Revise & Resubmit".
The review note was: Please provide demo and sequencing plan per specification 02 41 00 Part 1.3A.

M Squared is unable to acquire the necessary utility abandonment schedules from the utility companies concerned.
Please provide us with a schedule showing when each of the utilities is to be abandoned by the relevant agencies. Once this has been provided M Squared will be able to provide the sequencing plan per the specifications.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The intent of the submittal comment was to reference specification section 024100 1.3A requiring the contractor to submit a utilities demolition and construction sequencing plan showing commencement, order, sequence and completion dates for approval prior to commencing with the demolition of existing utilities. The schedule submitted didn't include sequencing of the new work.

---

**U-0164** **Beale Investigative Trench Limits** **Closed** **08/09/2011** **08/19/2011** **08/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Sheet U-1008 shows the limits of the investigative trench on Beale Street (south of Mission St) to be 56' in total. 41.1' from center going west and 14.9' from center going east.
By going 14.9' from center with the eastern portion of the investigative trench M Squared will not encompass the existing water line and the existing AWSS line as they are outside the limits of the 14.9'.

Please direct M Squared how to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 8/9/2011 Excavate investigative trench in accordance with contract documents as shown on U-1008. Demolish, cap and plug existing 12-inch water and 10-inch HPW (AWSS) as shown on Sheet U-1125.

---

**U-0165** **Sewer Lateral to 92 Natoma** **Closed** **08/09/2011** **08/19/2011** **08/10/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jonathan Flaming **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

While installing the new sewer on Natoma Street from 2nd to the shoring wall M Squared noticed that the sewer lateral to 92 Natoma is a new VCP lateral and has been installed in the last 12 months.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 8/10/2011 It is acceptable to protect existing lateral and provide a permanent connection to the new 24-inch VCP main in lieu of replacing the lateral as shown on Plans.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

The contract drawings show M Squared replacing all sewer laterals on Natoma from 2nd to the shoring wall, however this lateral appears like it does not require replacing.
Jason Chin (BCM) has been made aware of this issue.

Please confirm it is acceptable to leave this lateral in place and perform permanent connection to the new 24'' VCP main.

Notes
Please provide credit for contract work not completed.

---

**U-0166** **Broken Culvert Pipe Encountered in Utility Demolition Trench on Fremont St.** **Closed** **08/19/2011** **08/29/2011** **08/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

During trenching for demolition of the electrical ductbank along the east side of Fremont St Trinet crossed a 10" culvert pipe (@ Stn 5+05) from the existing catch basin on the east side of the street at Stn 5+05. The section of clay pipe exposed is cracked in several places and half the bell of an exposed joint is missing. Please advise if the owner will need the broken pipe section replaced before the trench is backfilled.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Replace damaged pipe section per direction of SFPUC inspector prior to trench backfill.

---

**U-0167** **Culvert Run to MH#306** **Closed** **08/22/2011** **09/01/2011** **08/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jacob Giannandrea **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Service Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:** M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley

**REQUEST:**

See attached sketch.

Please confirm that it is acceptable to tie the 10" culvert run into the new MH#306 instead of running the culvert to the existing MH.

If this change is acceptable please advise if it is necessary to connect the existing 3'X5' sewer to MH 306 or if the existing sewer should be abandoned.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Connect new 10" SD culvert from CB#306 to SMH#306.

It is no longer necessary to connect existing 3'x5' brick sewer to SMH#306 as shown on U-5001 Detail 6. Abandon in place existing 3'x5' sewer and existing sewer MH at STA ~2+40 in accordance with CCSF DPW Standards.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0168 | TJPA Composite Utility Drawings | Closed | 08/31/2011 | 09/10/2011 | 10/05/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jacob Giannandrea **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Sheet MA - 12, Note 4 refers to TJPA Composite Utility Drawings for that area. M Squared currently has composite utility drawings for trade packages TG04.3, TG04.4, TG04.6, and TG04.1. M Squared does not have composite utility drawings for the TG04.2 project.

Please provide these drawings.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 9/15/2011 TJPA does not have existing utility composite drawings for this area. SFDPW BOE has information and records provided by utilities in response to a notice of intent that can be provided to the TJPA for use as reference.

Jeff Thiel 10/3/2011 SFDPW BOE has provided the documents referenced in Eric Zagol's original response to this RFI.

These documents have been uploaded to Constructware and can be found in the following File Director path: Sitework & Utilities\5 Program Coord\30 Utilities\Notice of Intent\...

If the files are too large to open in Constructware they can also be found on the FTP site by following this link:

ftp://ftp.tjpa.org/Document%20Control/11011824/

Log In Instructions

1. Enter case-sensitive Username (public) and Password (PublicFTP1)

2. Select View\Open FTP Site in Windows Explorer

3. Drag file(s) to your desktop

Note: Please do not open files while logged in the FTP

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0169 | CB#703 Location | Closed | 09/01/2011 | 09/01/2011 | 09/07/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

See attached photo showing conflict with location of new CB#703 and unknown underground concrete structures. They appear to be the same structures discovered in the investigative trenches on Beale Street.

Please confirm that it is acceptable to put the new CB in the same location as the existing CB which has been removed.

It is acceptable to construct CB#703 in the same location as existing.

Please coordinate the depth of the sewer culvert with proposed PG&E Phase II work as shown on U-2037. Submit proposed culvert profile with elevations of the existing PG&E electrical ducts as pot holed that are to be capped in Phase I (U-1125) and connected to in Phase II (U-2037).

---

**U-0169.1** **CB#703 Location** **Closed** **11/15/2011** **11/25/2011** **11/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

- CB#703 was constructed in the location of the existing catch basin.
- See attached profile with culvert elevations. Culvert was installed deeper as several utilities were lower than shown on the drawings.
- Per M Squared¡¦s response to comments made in the RFI #U-0181, one of the duct banks shown on the drawings could not be located and was not as shown on the drawings. The alignment of the other duct bank is also different than what is shown on the drawings. (See attached) The depth of this duct bank at the point where M Squared capped it (3' south of the unknown concrete structure) was 6' 8" to the top. Its location/alignment beyond that point are unknown.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Please provide the invert elevation of constructed 10" culvert at CB#703. Based on the sketch provided in the RFI169.1, the 10" culvert was reversed slope. A culvert with reversed slope is not acceptable.

---

**U-0170** **Duct bank Demo on Natoma** **Closed** **09/15/2011** **09/25/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:**

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squared has determined in the field that the duct bank highlighted which is to be demolished, is in fact

**SUGGESTION:**

Eric Zagol 9/18/2011 U-1110 indicates removal of existing PG&E duct to facilitate construction of the 8-

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

underneath the curb and gutter. In order to demolish it per the plans M Squared will have to remove the curb and gutter and possibly a portion of sidewalk. See attached.

Please confirm whether you would like the duct bank removed and repour the curb and gutter after demo, or leave the duct bank in place and repair the portion of curb and gutter damaged while locating the duct bank.

inch Water and Sewer MH #301 . If existing duct as highlighted is not in conflict with new utilities then the existing duct may be abandoned in place.

Cap existing duct at RUP/BSE demarcation line per ASI 15.

Provide photos showing location of duct, duct, and curb and gutter damaged at the area indicated for repair for review.

Jeff Thiel 9/19/2011 Pending approval by the TJPA, a CR will be issued.

---

**U-0170.1** **Duct Bank Demo on Natoma** **Closed** **09/21/2011** **10/01/2011** **10/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In response to RFI #U-0170, see attached photos. Approx 20' of curb and gutter to be repaired. Sidewalk remained undamaged and does not require repair. Please advise if M Squared is to repair this portion of curb and gutter.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 9/27/2011 Per response to RFI 170, please provide data (i.e. photos, survey and etc.) that supports the statement that the existing duct bank was found beneath the existing curb and gutter.

Contract plans show the existing duct south of the curb and gutter. The curb and gutter should have been protected in place during excavation. If curb and gutter to be protected in place was damage during the course of work please restore to match existing per 01 15 40 and contract documents.

---

**U-0170.2** **Duct bank Demo on Natoma** **Closed** **11/18/2011** **11/28/2011** **12/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squard has reviewed their photo logs and were unbale to locate any photos showing the ducktbank running under the curb and gutter. M Squared will proceed with providing a credit per CR U-027.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

***12/1/11 UPDATED RESPONSE***

Corresponding CR for this work is CR U-050. Proceed with providing credit per CR U-050.

***11/22/11 ORIGINAL RESPONSE***

RFI does not pose a question and will be considered closed. M Squared shall proceed with providing a credit per CR U-027.

---

**U-0171** **AWSS Ductile Iron Pipe** **Closed** **09/15/2011** **09/25/2011** **09/19/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please confirm that it is acceptable to use non-gauged ductile iron pipe for the AWSS system.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 9/19/2011 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response, "Use at contractor's discretion. Contractor will be responsible for pipe being inserted into pipe bell ends, AWSS fittings, etc. and passing hydrostatic tests," dated and signed on 9/19/11 (see attached).

---

**U-0172** **City Furnished Gate Valves** **Closed** **09/20/2011** **09/30/2011** **10/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Specifications direct the contractor to provide a clear distance between the pipe flanges that consists of the gate valves laying length plus ½" not including the thickness of the gaskets to be installed.
In order to do this M Squared will need the dimensions of all City furnished gate valves.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 10/4/2011 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"Please refer to attached manufacturer's drawings for laying lengths of gate valves. These laying length dimensions were confirmed on 10/04/2011."

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please provide cut sheets for all valves provided by SFWD for this project.

dated and signed on 10/04/11 (see attached).

---

**U-0173** **Valve control panel pick-up** **Closed** **09/24/2011** **10/04/2011** **10/05/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squared's supplier, Control Systems West, have been coordinating with SFWD regarding which of the City's panels will be used for the TG04.2 project.
Tom Reid with SFWD has designated 3 panels to be used for this project.
These panels are to be picked up at SFWD, transported to Control Systems West for testing, programming etc and then returned to the job for use at 3 of the valve locations.
As the panels have been selected M Squared would like to begin the process of getting the panels to their supplier so they can begin the work.

Please provide the name and contact information for the person with whom M Squared can coordinate the pick up of the 3 units.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 9/26/2011 Contact Bill Gunn at (415) 706 0688 or WGunn@sfwater.org

Per Section 01 10 40, Coordination, Article 1.6 C, this RFI does not fall under the acceptable uses for an RFI as it is not being used for an interpretation of the Contract Documents.

RFIs used for questions regarding coordination will be rejected in the future.

---

**U-0174** **AWSS Antenna location at Location 1** **Closed** **09/27/2011** **10/07/2011** **10/11/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

On drawing MA-20 regarding location 1 the antenna is shown to be mounted on a street light. However, on drawing MA-29 the same antenna is shown to be mounted on the enclosure.
Early conversations between Dick Borders (Control Systems West) and Kenny Chin (DPW) confirm that mounting the antenna on the enclosure is the preferred option.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 10/11/2011 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response:

"The antenna shall be mounted on the controller cabinet for location No. 1. Disregard any reference to the mounting of the antenna on the (E) light post as shown on drawing MA-20. Mounting of antenna on to the controller cabinet shall be performed by the

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please confirm the antenna mounting location.

controller cabinet manufacturer."

Dated and signed on 10/11/11 (see attached).

---

**U-0175** **Sludge line layout** **Closed** **09/27/2011** **10/07/2011** **11/08/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The 12" sludge line cannot be installed along Mission Street as shown on the revised drawings due to the elevation and location of existing utilities and other unknown subsurface obstacles. Please see attached pothole information.
Please advise how you would like to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 11/7/2011 Modifications to the 12" Sludge FM are currently being evaluated under ASI-018. Revised plans and specifications forthcoming following redesign and execution of ASI-018.

---

**U-0176** **AWSS Conflict @ Location 7** **Closed** **09/28/2011** **09/28/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:**

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Due to the location of existing utilities it will not be possible to install the AWSS valve vault at the location shown on sheet MA 18 of the AWSS drawings. See attached pothole drawings from 09/26/11 and
09/27/11.
Please advise how you would like to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

Follow up responce recieved 10-19-2011:
****10/19/11 UPDATE****

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"Meeting with M Squared, SFWD, and SFDPW on 10/18/11. Contractor to have area from intersection of First/Howard Streets to 100 feet West on Howard Street marked for utilities (USA). We will then meet at site to determine clear area over AWSS main to pot hole for valve vault."

Dated 10/19/11 (see attached)

initial response received 10-17-2011:

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

SFDPW to meet in the field with contractor and SFWD inspector to determine method to proceed. Will provide response with direction at this time.

NOTE: RB issued email 10-18-2011 requesting meeting.

---

**U-0176.1** **AWSS Conflicts at Location #7** **Closed** **11/18/2011** **11/28/2011** **11/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per the response to RFI #U-0176 a field meeting was attended by Michael Smith and M Squared.
M Squared received direction to perform additional potholes further west of First St on Howard St.
Please see attached pothole findings.
Please advise how you would like to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,
"Please refer to commnets on attached sheet.
SFDPW Response:
This conflict between the existing AWSS line and utilities at the original
design location are unforeseen field conditions due to incorrect information
being furnished to the City. Thus the motorized gate valve vault is being
relocated west of the original location. The contractor shall pothole 10-feet
west of Pothole No. 1B and 10-feet east of Pothole No. 1A to verify that there
is adequate clearance for installing a horizontal offset and motorized gate
valve vault the approximate location of Pothole No. 1A. Please notify the
engineer of the potholing schedule in order that we can request the majorutilities toattempt to identify the 4-inch steel pipe running parallel on Howard Street."
Signed and Dated 11/18/11 (see attached)

---

**U-0176.2** **AWSS Conflicts @ Location 7** **Closed** **01/18/2012** **01/28/2012** **02/16/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Per response to RFI#U-0176.1 M Squared performed additional potholing at Location 7.

Please see the attached pothole findings.

Please advise how you would like to proceed.

Note: The 4" Unknown Utility was confirmed to be an abandoned PG&E gas main. On 1/10/12 PG&E drilled the line and confirmed it to be abandoned.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 2/15/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) Response.

"Furnish and install horizontal offset as shown on the attached drawing in order to locate the proposed concrete valve vault with minimum 6-inches clearance to the existing electrical duct bank running on the North side of Howard Street. Adjust nipple lengths as required between elbows and to connect into the ends of the existing cast iron pipes. Concrete valve vault and placement of motorized gate valve shall otherwise be shown on drawings MA-22 and MA-25.

Work for installation of new concrete valve vault and gate as show on Drawing MA-18 shall be deleted from the scope pending installation of the new valve vault as shown on the attached drawing."

Signed and dated 2/13/12.

Christina Young 2/15/2012 Pending TJPA approval, a CR will be issued.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **U-0177** | **Ductbank Demo on Fremont St** | | **Closed** | **10/04/2011** | **10/14/2011** | **10/10/2011** | **Potentially** ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

See attached sketch.
The duct bank shown on Fremont Street to be demolished is in fact underneath the curb and gutter and portion of the sidewalk on Fremont St.
In order for M Squared to remove this duct bank it will require us to close the west sidewalk on Fremont St, demo and remove the sidewalk, remove the ductbank and then replace the sidewalk.
Currently the east sidewalk is closed also due to BBI activity.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 10/6/2011 Coordinate with PG&E to confirm the duct indicated in the M2 sketch is PG&E's 6-6" duct from PG&E's EMH 7605.

Demolish and remove the 6-6" duct segment between STA ~2+40 (at the gutter) and the demarcation line south of shoring wall. The intent is to remove the segment within Natoma Street. The segment south of STA 2+40 (STA 2+40 to STA 1+85) can be abandoned in place.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please advise how you would like to proceed.

Provide cap at STA 2+40 instead of STA 1+85 shown in the plans.

PG&E will break in and connect to the existing 6-6" duct at STA 1+85 as part of PG&E's Phase II relocations.

---

**U-0178** **Sludge line layout on Mission between Beale and Main** **Closed** **10/04/2011** **10/04/2011** **11/08/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Continued potholing on Mission Street between Beale and Main has revealed additional grade conflicts on the proposed alignment for the new 12" steel sludge line. Some of the utilities are not as shown on the drawings nor marked in the field by USAN. See attached sketches.

Please advise if M Sqaured is to continue potholing on Mission Street as it may be necessary to excavate the entire length of the trench between Beale and Main to locate and map all conflicts.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 11/7/2011 Modifications to the 12" Sludge FM are currently being evaluated under ASI-018. Revised plans and specifications forthcoming following redesign and execution of ASI-018.

---

**U-0179** **AWSS Main line conflicts at Location 7** **Closed** **10/05/2011** **10/15/2011** **11/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Some of the existing utilities are not shown on the drawings and have been installed on top of the existing 12" AWSS line. Due to the proximity and volume of these utilities it is not possible to even hand excavate down to the existing AWSS line to verify its location and depth. Please see attached pothole information.
Please adivse.

**SUGGESTION:**

the following response received 10-17-2011 does provide direction in this matter:
It shall be the contractor's responsibility per the Contract Documents to perform the required potholing in order to identify the existing AWSS facilitieis prior to actual excavation.
Background utility information was provided by

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

UPDATED RESPONSE (11/18/11)
Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,
Refer to comments on attached sheet. These comments supercede
response provided on 10/17/11.
SFDPW Response:
This conflict between the existing AWSS line and

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

TJPA/consultatns and shall be verified in the field by contacting Underground Service Alert (USA). Direct conflicts oted during potholing shall be directed to the utility owner(s) for relocation/removal as required to perform the contract work.
NOTE: email from Rick Buellesbach 10-18-2011 requests an answer to the question.

utilities are unforeseen field conditions due to incorrect information being furnished to the City.
There are no design alternates at this location due to the necessity of removing the existing cross that was capped on the First Street side outlet to accommodate the utility relocation work for the proposed transit center.
The engineer will contact the owners of the utilities in conflict with the AWSS facility for resolution." Dated 11/18/11 (see attached)

---

**U-0180** **Conflict with CB 305** **Closed** **10/10/2011** **10/20/2011** **10/17/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Richard Buellesbach

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

While excavating to install CB305 M Squared encountered a large unknown concrete structure. The concrete structure is in conflict with CB305. CB305 cannot be installed as planned. See attached photo.

Tsu-Ling with AECOM and Alberto with SFDPW reviewed the situation in the field and agreed the solution was to salvage the existing CB where CB 305 was to be installed. This work was performed on 10/7/2011 under the inspection of SFDPW.

Please confirm.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

As determined during a site visit on 10/7/11 with M Squared, AECOM, SFDPW and W/O; the existing unforeseen condition, a large concrete structure, is in conflict with CB 305 and the installation of a new catch basin would require an extensive amount of unforeseen demotion.

In lieu of installing a new catch basin barrel to replace existing, modify the existing catch basin as follows:

1. Clean interior walls and bottom.
2. Apply 1/2" think uniform layer of mortar on interior walls and bottom.
3. Install cast iron trap.
4. Install pipe culvert and connect to MH#305 as shown in Plans.

New culvert size and invert shall match existing culvert at catch basin. Use ductile iron pipe if depth of cover is less than 3 feet.

---

**U-0181** **Unknown subsurface structure on Beale** **Closed** **10/13/2011** **10/23/2011** **10/24/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

During M Squared's demo work on the West side of Beale Street at Sta 4+70 they uncovered an unknown subsurface structure. This structure appears to be an abandoned vault that has been filled with concrete. Please see attached photo.
M Squared ceased work on the removal of the six 6" electric duct banks 6' south of this structure. If they are to continue with the removal of this abandoned duct bank per sheet U-1125 of the contract drawings they will be forced to remove the subsurface structure.
Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 10/24/2011 Please provide a plan showing the location and extent of unknown structure identified. Also indicate what portions of the existing PG&E electrical duct has been demolished to date.

---

**U-0181.1** **Unknown subsurface structure at 301 Mission** **Closed** **11/18/2011** **11/28/2011** **11/23/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

See attached information as requested in response to RFI #U-0181.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Subsurface structure to remain. Cap locations as shown are acceptable. Please mark on as-built drawing as required by the contract documents.

---

**U-0182** **AWSS Conflict with AT&T Vault at Location 2** **Closed** **10/24/2011** **11/03/2011** **11/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor/Obayashi Joint Venture Jason Dunne **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

On the north east side of the Mission Street and 2nd intersection the existing AWSS line is running through the floor of the AT&T vault. The removal of the existing 12" pipe and installation of the new 16" AWSS pipe will require the floor vault to be demolished and re-poured.

Please provide a detail for this work or a new alignment for the AWSS line so as to avoid this vault.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"SFDPW Response:

This conflict between the existing AWSS line and utility vault are unforeseen field conditions due to incorrect information being furnished to the City.

The contractor shall pothole the alternate pipe alignment as shown on the attached sketch due to the existing conflict with the AT&T vault over/within the

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

present alignment of the AWSS pipe.

Notify engineer of pothole results for the proposed alternate pipe alignment."

Signed and Dated 11/18/11 (see attached)

---

**U-0182.1** **AWSS Conflict with AT&T Vault at Location 2** **Closed** **03/28/2012** **04/07/2012** **05/16/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The sketch provided in response to RFI U-0182 does not provide adequate information to perform additional potholing. Please provide additional information.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 3/29/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"Please refer to the attached sketch dated 3/16/12 for potholing the location shown in order to verify the existing AWSS main and that there there are no utility conflicts in the proposed vault location. The original loaction for the vault is impacted by utilites."

Signed and Dated (3/29/12)

---

**U-0183** **AWSS Valve Vault Conflict at Location 1** **Closed** **10/24/2011** **11/03/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:**

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The proposed valve vault at location 1 cannot be installed as per the plans due to utility conflicts encountered during potholing. See attached pothole info. These utilities are not shown on the contract drawings.
Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

Jeff Thiel 10/27/2011 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"Per your preliminary excavation results, please schedule a site visit with SFDPW and SFWD at site. At site visit, we will provide direction for vault installation."

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Signed and Dated 10/26/11 (see attached)

Kevin Chiu 10/27/2011 When final direction is provided via on site meeting per the RFI response, please submit a follow up RFI to confirm direction provided in the meeting.

---

**U-0183.1** **AWSS Valve Vault Conflict at Location 1** **Closed** **11/16/2011** **11/26/2011** **11/18/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per the response to RFI#U-0183 a site visit was held with SFDPW and SFWD on 11/2/2011 to review the conflicts at location 1. Please provide direction based on this meeting.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"Refer to comments on attached sheets. These comments supercede comments provided on 10/26/11 for RFI U-0183.

SFDPW Response:

Motorized gate valve vault: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 2 and the provided information, verify 2 1/2-inch steel for ownership and request owner should there not be adequate space to install vault due to the existing electrical duct bank shown in Pothole No. 3 drawing. Notify engineer to provide revised drawing(s) for AWSS fittings should vault need to be moved west. Notify engineer should vault interior dimensions need to be reduced after providing a minimum of 3-inches clearance with other utilities and the vault constructed with 12-inch thick walls.

Controller cabinet: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 7 and the provided information, install the controller cabinet concrete foundation at this site. Notify MCI that either their conduit can remain with the

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

controller foundation installed over the conduit with 4-inches clearance or that they can relocate their conduit as required. Modify bottom of controller foundation to accommodate a clearance of 4-inches should the conduit not be relocated.

Battery vault: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No.6 and the provided information, field verify the installation of the battery vault by locating the northern edge of the vault 2-feet towards the curb."

Signed and Dated 11/15/11 (see attached)

---

**U-0183.2** **AWSS Valve Vault Location 1** **Closed** **12/02/2011** **12/12/2011** **12/15/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please see the attached letter regarding the response to RFI#U-0183.1.

Please provide direction.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"Please see attached for revised response - U-183.2.

SFDPW Response:

Motorized Gate Valve Vault: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 2 and the provided information, verify 2 ½ inch steel for ownership and request owner to relocate the line outside of the valve vault footprint with 12-inches clearance. Should the valve vault still be in conflict with the existing electrical duct bank shown in Pothole No. 3, move vault location West along Market Street until valve vault has a minimum 12-inches clearance with the existing electrical duct bank.

Notify engineer to provide revised drawing(s) for AWSS fittings should valve vault need to be moved West.

Notify engineer should vault interior dimensions need

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

to be reduced after providing a minimum of 3 inches clearance with other utilities and the vault constructed with 12-inch thick walls."

Signed and dated 12/14/11 (see attached)

Turner will verify 2 1/2 steel for ownership.

---

**U-0183.3** **Valve Vault Conflict at Location 1** **Closed** **01/23/2012** **02/02/2012** **02/08/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Per the response to RFI #U-0183.2, M Squared Construction performed further potholing on the valve vault location on Market Street.
Please see attached findings of these potholes.
Please advise on how you would like M Squared to proceed with the vault construction/installation.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 2/6/2012
Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,
"-Install concrete valve vault in locations as show on pothole No. 3A. Relocate 1 1/4" copper pipe as necessary during vault placement.
-Resubmit concrete vault drawings with dimensions to suite location and 9" thick walls for walls adjacent to other utilities. Provide minimum 6" clearance to water line and 4" to ductbank."
Signed and dated 02/06/12 (see attached)

---

**U-0184** **AWSS Connection Point at Location 2.** **Closed** **10/24/2011** **11/03/2011** **11/01/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The existing AWSS line at the connection point on 2nd Street north of Mission is a 10" pipe not a 12" as shown on drawing MA-13.
Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 10/27/2011 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,
"The line on Second Street North of Mission Street is a 10" CI line. Please update drawings. Drawing MA-21 in the contract package indicates the line as a 10" line."
Signed and Dated 10/26/11 (see attached)

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0184.1 | AWSS Connection Point at Location #2 | Closed | 12/02/2011 | 12/12/2011 | 12/14/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please see the attached letter regarding the response to RFI#U-0184.

Please provide direction.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Per Michael Smith's response to RFI U-0188 SFDPW is preparing revised AWSS drawings to include stationing information provided by AECOM. These revised drawings will address the issue raised in RFI U-0184 and provide clear direction. The drawings will be issued in the near future packaged with other revisions.

Jeff Thiel 3/22/2012 - RFI U-184.1: The response on 12/14/11 indicated that resolution would be provided via a revised AWSS drawing. This change was included on the stationed drawings provided under ASI 19.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0185 | Existing Lateral to CB701 | Closed | 10/28/2011 | 11/07/2011 | 11/01/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Sheet U-3024 shows and existing storm drain lateral connecting the back side of the existing catch basin which was replaced by CB #701. The details for CB #701, C/U-3033, do not show this existing lateral to be connected to CB #701. CB #701 has been installed per plan and the existing lateral was abandoned in place. It has been discovered that the abandon lateral in servicing an active catch basin in Lot N. See attached sketch.

Please advise.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 10/31/2011 Lateral connections to CCSF catch basin barrels from property outside of the public right of way are prohibited . Owner/occupant of Parcel shall manage runoff in parcel and discharge to main sewer in accordance with CCSF regulations.

Coordinate with TJPA's field representative and occupant of Parcel.

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0186 | AWSS Conflict with Elec. Duct Banks & Vault @ Location 2 | Closed | 11/01/2011 | 11/01/2011 | 11/18/2011 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Due to the proximity of the electrical vault and the electrical concrete duct banks it is not possible to remove the existing 18" AWSS line and reconnect to the existing tee as shown on drawings MA-3 and MA-13. Please see

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,
"SFDPW Response:
This conflict between the existing AWSS line and utility vault/duct bank are unforeseen field conditions

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

attached pothole drawing. The restraining lugs on the east side of the tee are cast into the base of the electrical vault. The concrete duct bank on top of the AWSS line at the connection point combined with the electrical vault will not allow enough room for the plumber to burn out the old lead joint and cast the new one.
Please advise.

due to incorrect information being furnished to the City.
There are no design alternates at this location due to the necessity of removing theexisting 18"x10" reducer at this location in order to install the 16" fittings to maintain the proposed 16" pipe size upgrade on Mission Street. The engineer will contact the owner of the utility in conflict with the AWSS facility for resolution."
Signed and Dated 11/18/11 (see attached)

---

**U-0187** **Conflicts with Controller Cabinet Foundation & Battery Enclosure at Location 1** **Closed** **11/18/2011** **11/28/2011** **11/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Daniel Foudy

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please confirm that M Squared it to install the control cabinet enclosure foundation (3'W x 3'L x 2'D) on top of the existing 10" and 8" steel lines shown on the attached sketch of pothole #6.
Please confirm that M Squared is to install the fiberglass battery enclosure on top of the utilities shown on the attached sketch of pothole #7. It will be necessary to hand dig around the existing utilities to install drain rock beneath the enclosure per the specifications.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,
"Refer to SFDPW response provided on 11/16/11 to RFI U-0183.(1)."
Signed and Dated 11/18/11 (see attached)
RFI U-0183.1 Response included below-
"SFDPW Response:
Motorized gate valve vault: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 2 and the provided information, verify 2 1/2-inch steel for ownership and request owner should there not be adequate space to install vault due to the existing electrical duct bank shown in Pothole No. 3 drawing. Notify engineer to provide revised drawing(s) for AWSS fittings should vault need to be moved west. Notify engineer should vault interior dimensions need to be reduced after providing a minimum of 3-inches clearance with other utilities and the vault constructed with 12-inch thick walls.
Controller cabinet: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 7 and the provided information, install the controller cabinet concrete foundation at this site. Notify MCI that either their conduit can remain with the controller foundation installed over the conduit with 4-inches clearance or that they can relocate their conduit as required. Modify bottom of controller foundation to accommodate a clearance of

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

4-inches should the conduit not be relocated.
Battery vault: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No.6 and the provided information, field verify the installation of the battery vault by locating the northern edge of the vault 2-feet towards the curb."

---

**U-0187.1** **Conflicts with Controller Cabinet Foundation and Battery Enclousure at Location # Closed** **12/02/2011** **12/12/2011** **12/15/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please see the attached letter regarding the response to RFI#U-0187.

Please provide direction.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"Please see attached for revised response - U-187.1.

SFDPW Response:

Controller Cabinet: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 7 and the provided information, install the controller cabinet and the concrete foundation at this site instead of the battery vault assembly that was shown here originally in the Contract Documents.

Notify MCI that either their conduit can remain with the controller foundation installed over the conduit or MCI has the option to relocate their conduits away from the concrete foundation footprint. Should MCI not want to relocate, reduce thickness of concrete foundation over MCI conduit to provide a minimum of 4-inches clearance between the conduit outside diameter and the bottom of the foundation.

Battery Vault: Per the preliminary excavation at Pothole No. 6 and the provided information, install the battery vault at this site instead of the controller cabinet that was shown here originally in the Contract Documents.

Field verify (pothole) 2-feet from face of existing curb to determine if the Northern edge of the battery vault can be installed approximately 2-feet from curb

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

instead of 5-feet from curb in order to provide clearance with 8-inch steel line. Notify engineer of pothole results prior to installation."

Signed and Dated 12/14/11 (see attached)

Turner will notify MCI.

---

**U-0187.2** **Conflicts with Controller Cabinet and Battery @ Location 1** **Closed** **01/23/2012** **02/02/2012** **03/21/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Steve Cunningham

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In response to RFI # U-0187.1 (Revised Response to RFI# U-0187 ON 12/14/11)
- See attached pothole data from additional potholing at this location.
- During initial discussions with MCI/Verizon M Squared informed them of the intent to install units on their utility. They requested a letter from the owner highlighting the intent. Please confirm if it is acceptable to install a unit on their utility.
Please provide direction on the locations of the battery vault and controller cabinet taking into consideration all current utilities in place.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 3/16/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"Please see attached wording for letter to owner of utility.

Locate North most edge of battery vault cover 24" from face of curb or back from face of curb to remain in "brick" area."

Signed and Dated 2/14/12 (Letter Wording) and 3/15/12 (Battery Placement)

The attached letter addressed to MCI/Verizon was sent to Pam Brown on 3/14/12.

---

**U-0188** **Control Stations on AWSS Drawings** **Closed** **11/18/2011** **11/28/2011** **11/21/2011** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Kevin Chiu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

At present M Squared has set up control points along

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Mission Street. These stations were based on a continuation of survey points used on Mission Street for the TG04.6-Sludge Line Project.
The City designed AWSS Drawings do not have these stations on them. Please provide an updated set of AWSS Drawings with the project stations marked on them so it will allow M Squared to accurately document field conditions and as built the necessary information.

"SFDPW is currently preparing revised AWSS DWGS with stationing information as provided by AECOM. We anticipate the final set of stamped/signed DWGS prior to the end of November 2011."
Signed and Dated 11/18/11 (see attached)

Jeff Thiel 3/22/2012: RFI U-188 included a request for stationed drawings. It was responded to on 11/18/11 and resolved by ASI 19 when the stationed drawings were provided.

---

**U-0189** **First & Howard Utility Conflicts, Location 7 Complete Pothole Data** **Closed** **12/02/2011** **12/12/2011** **07/03/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

While potholes #2 & #3 have been addressed in a previous RFI (RFI#U-0176), other potholes carried out in Location 7 exposed various utilities that are not shown on the contract documents. Other utilities were not in the locations indicated on the contract documents.

See attached pothole data from potholes #1 through #11 at location 7.

Please clarify if the utilities will be removed, protected in place or relocated.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

The issues outlined in the attached pothole data have been addressed and resolved via coordination meetings, CRs, and other RFI responses.

The CRs include U-080R1, U-088, and U-088A as well as RFIs U-0176, U-0176.1, U-0176.2, U-0179, U-0197, U-0197.1, U-0197.2, U-0199, U-0200, and U-0200.1.

---

**U-0190** **Fire Hydrant Location on Mission @ First** **Closed** **01/10/2012** **01/20/2012** **01/19/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

While potholing for the new Hydrant and associated piping in the sidewalk on Mission Street (see attached), M Squared's crews damaged the roof of the basement to Portico Restaurant, 88 First Street (see attached photos). This basement structure was not noted on the plans and is

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

-Repair of sidewalk at pothole location: Refer to attached directions from William Liang- SFPDW/EST for repair method.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

a differing site condition.

The roof of the basement will now need to be repaired. Please provide direction and repair details for this work.

It is not possible to locate the fire hydrant in this area due to the presence of the basement. The existing hydrant has a column poured into the structure of the basement (see attached).

Please advise on how you would like to proceed.

-New Hydrant lateral shall be located in the (E) hydrant alignment. (E) Hydrant is located in an areaway. Refer to AWSS standard drawings for details. SFDPW will provide revised drawing for (N) lateral prior to construction.

Signed and Dated 01/18/12

Response for Concrete Repair per William Liang (SFDPW) .

Chip out concrete inside of saw-cut area; do not damage (E) rebars.
If (E) rebars are found to have been cut during the saw-cutting process, chip out enough concrete around the cut rebars for installation of Lenton Quick-Wedge Splicing system at both ends; splice new rebars with size to match (E). If (E) rebars are found to be intact, proceed to Step 3.
Install keyway around perimeter of opening (keyway shall be a minimum 1.5 (below top of slab), install swellable water stop (Greenstreak Hydrotite CJ -0725) in keyway.
Form and pour with Emaco S66 CI by BASF. Perform surface preparation and provide curing in accordance with manufacturers recommendations. Note: continuous special inspection shall be provided for the concrete pour."

---

**U-0190.1** **Fire Hydrant Location on Mission @ First** **Closed** **01/25/2012** **02/04/2012** **01/26/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

On 1/24/2012 M Squared began repairing the basement roof per the response to RFI U-0190. SFDPW engineer William Liang came out and review the progress that day and provided alternate direction in the field. Please provide this direction in writing so work may resume.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

No alternate direction was given at 1/24/12 site visit by SFDPW engineer. SFDPW provided information and direction to supplement the direction given in response to RFI U-0190 based on his observations in the field. Existing rebar was found to be uncut but lacking

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

sufficient concrete cover. Please see supplementary instruction below.

Per William Liang of SFDPW,

1. Chip out concrete inside of saw-cut area; do not damage (E) rebars,

2. (E) main rebars are found to be intact but have insufficient bottom concrete cover; (E) wire-mesh above the main rebars are found to have been cut during the sawcut process. Install 3-#4 dowels @ 12"o.c. max set in epoxy along three sides w/ 6" embedment into (E) concrete (see attached photo), maintain 6" max from corners, epoxy shall be SIMPSON SET-XP or HILTI HIT-RE500-SD.

3. Install swellable waterstop (Greenstreak Hydrotite CJ-0725) above installed dowels, provide min 1.5" concrete cover.

4. Form and pour w/ Emaco S66 CI by BASF (see attached cut sheets). Perform surface preparation and provide curing in accordance w/ manufacturer's recommendations.
Note continuous special inspection shall be provided for the dowel installation and concrete pour.

ORIGINAL RFI U-0190 RESPONSE FOR REFERENCE

1. Chip out concrete inside of saw-cut area; do not damage (E) rebars.
2. If (E) rebars are found to have been cut during the saw-cutting process, chip out enough concrete around the cut rebars for installation of Lenton Quick-Wedge Splicing system at both ends; splice new rebars with size to match (E). If (E) rebars are found to be intact, proceed to Step 3.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

3. Install keyway around perimeter of opening (keyway shall be a minimum 1.5" below top of slab), install swellable water stop (Greenstreak Hydrotite CJ -0725) in keyway.
4. Form and pour with Emaco S66 CI by BASF. Perform surface preparation and provide curing in accordance with manufacturers recommendations. Note: continuous special inspection shall be provided for the concrete pour."

---

**U-0191** **Power Source at Location #1, #2 & #7** **Closed** **01/16/2012** **01/26/2012** **02/27/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Jeff Heath

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

In order for the controller enclosures for the motorized gate valves at Location #1, #2 and #7 to be operational a power source will need to be provided at each enclosure location.

Please confirm that the owner has applied to PG&E for the power sources at these locations and advise on the status of these connections.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Revised Responce 2/27/2012

Jeff Thiel 2/23/2012 The TJPA has completed its application to SFPUC for power to AWSS facilities. The SFPUC has requested a minimum of four (4) weeks to make these connections. Sub contractor to coordinate meeting with SFPUC and PG&E prior to start of work.

Below is the MOP for coordinating power source connection as confirmed by Mathew Ho of the SFPUC.

1. Contractor to schedule coordination meeting with PG&E, PUC (Mathew Ho or Michael Mack) and Turner. Contractor to provide a construction schedule and set up Pre-con with PG&E (Per SFPUC request to inform them when Contractor expects to trench for electrical service and have the power pedestals installed)
2. Contractor to schedule PG&E trench inspection which is needed after contractor installs conduit but before closing the trench so that PG&E can prove the conduit via mandrel test (30days notice needed, Call PG&E inspection # 415-695-7519 and provide PM# located on drawing and provide PG&E job owner

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

contact as Matt Herron)
3. PG&E to pull cables
4. Schedule a DBI inspection of the meter pedestal (Dave Green DBI 415-558-6654, forward PG&E a copy of the DBI green tag)
5. Once green tag is applied, PG&E to set up meter and then energize.
==========
==========
Origanal Response 1/26/2012

The TJPA has completed its application to SFPUC for power to AWSS facilities.
The SFPUC has requested a minimum of four (4) weeks to make these
connections. Sub contractor to coordinate meeting with SFPUC and PG&E prior
to start of work.

---

**U-0191.1** **Power Source at Location #1, #2 & #7** **Closed** **03/21/2012** **03/31/2012** **05/01/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Cory Traylor

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Recent meeting on the AWSS project resulted in the response to RFI#U-0191 being revised to include a procedure to be followed once the controller cabinets were ready to accept power. However, what was sent in the revised response was a new scope of work followed by the mentioned procedure.

The contract drawings show M Squared's work beginning at pull boxes and going to the controllers. M Squared's interpretation of the drawings sent in the revised response to RFI#U-0191 is the scope of work that goes from the pull boxes to PG&E manholes. This is unclear because the PG&E drawings are not comparable with the contract drawings.

Please clarify the intent and scope of the PG&E drawings. Please clarify how the PG&E drawings correlate with the contract drawings.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Cory Traylor 5/1/2012 In accordance with PG&E Greenbook standards and practices, power connections for motorized gate valve equipment shall be installed at the referenced locations per the attached PG&E sketches, directions and requested equipment requirements. Work not outlined in the attached documents shall take place per contract drawings.

Final coordination for connections shall take place in the field per note 7 on drawings MA-29 and MA-31.

Connecting for power per the attached PG&E sketches/direction has been approved by SFDPW-Bureau of Engineering.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0191.2 | Amperes Interrupting Capacity (AIC) at AWSS Location #1 (Market St.) | Closed | 05/23/2012 | 06/02/2012 | 06/21/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Transbay PMPC Cory Traylor

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please refer to RFI U0191.1 and the attached drawings MA-1, MA-29 and MA-31.

1. As per response to RFI U-0191.1, the SFDPW-Bureau of Engineering sketches and letter for the AIC only addresses the motorized gate valve number 21 at Location #7. As new power service will be required at gate valve number 2, Location 1, please provide an AIC letter for this location.

2. Please provide a conformed drawing of the the PG&E clarification sketches provided in RFI U-0191.1 by revising the drawing sheet MA-29 and MA-31, respectively. It is unclear from the PG&E sketches whether the scope from the original contract drawings (MA-29 and MA-31) have changed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Request 1. - Please see attached file for Location 1 labeled "555 Market St. AIC.pdf" letter.
Request 2. - Please see attached PDF file "comments_transbay.pdf" containing comments from Matt Herron of PG&E clarifiying the scope of work for the PG&E power connection points at locations #1 and #7.
Also, please see information on location of manhole #5414 below per PG&E Matt Herron below;"The Vault 5414 is in the South Side, sidewalk of Market St. about 10' East of the West Property of 555 Market St. There are large vaults IFO 555 Market St. identified as 7300-P/7301-P/7302-P, Vault 5414 is roughly 30' West of those vaults."

Please contact Matt Herron of PG&E when sub-contractor is ready for a PG&E crew to mark the location for the core. Also, Please give Matt Herron two weeks notice when sub-contractor would like to core drill into the vault. This two weeks notice is to allow PG&E to set up and schedule a crew to standby for the core.

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0191.3 | Amperes Interrupting Capacity (AIC) at AWSS Location #1 (Market St.) | Closed | 06/28/2012 | 07/08/2012 | 07/16/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu

**Co-Author:** M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley

**REQUEST:**

The response to RFI #U-0191.2 does not answer the question posed in the RFI.

As mentioned in the previous RFI there appears to be a difference in the PG&E drawings provided in the original response and the contract drawings.

See attached M Squared's interpretation of these PG&E drawings. Please confirm if this interpretation is correct.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

7/16/2012 Kenny Chin's (SFDPW) response,

"The interpretation of MA-31 is correct. The contractor shall route the conduit from the meter enclosure to vault 1813. The interpretation of MA-29 is correct. The contractor shall route the conduit from meter enclosure to vault 5414 but the contractor shall find out with PG&E which one is the exact vault 5414."

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U-0192 | AWSS Strong Backs | Closed | 01/18/2012 | 01/28/2012 | 02/08/2012 | Potentially | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Current project drawings show that this project requires two (2) 14¿ Strong Backs and two (2) 10¿ Strong Backs to be used at different locations.
Olympic Foundry does not produce strong backs and were unable to include them in the order to M Squared. M Squared has contacted several sources trying to locate the strong backs but have yet to find a supplier.
Please advise if it is possible to purchase these from the City stock.
If this is not possible M Squared will have no other option but to have them manufactured at a steel mill and this may take a considerably long time due to the lead time in the specialized steel.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 2/3/2012 Response per Michael Smith (SFDPW),

-"We have been advised that the SFWD does not have the requested strong backs in their inventory.

-Typically strong backs were torch cut at local machine shops that handle larger fittings. Suggest contacting other contractors who have performed AWSS work for sources."

Signed and dated 02/01/12

---

**U-0193** **2nd to 1st St - Various Conflicts** **Closed** **03/08/2012** **03/18/2012** **03/21/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Steve Cunningham

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

See attached sheet which details the conditions discovered in the potholing operations between 2nd Street and 1st Street.
Please use Submittal TG04.2-024.1 for reference.
Please provide direction on how to proceed at each location.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 3/20/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"Please see response on attached sheets for conflicts at particular station numbers as listed in this RFI."

Signed and Dated (3/20/12)

---

**U-0194** **AWSS Strong Back Dimensions** **Closed** **03/13/2012** **03/23/2012** **03/21/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Steve Cunningham

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

On the detail for the strong backs on the San Francisco Standard AWSS Plans M Squared has discovered an error in the dimensions for the 14" strong back. Dimension C (outside diameter) is smaller than dimension B (inside diameter). See attached.

M Squared believes the OD should be 27.37". Please confirm.

Jeff Thiel 3/14/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"M Squared is correct. Thank you for pointing this out. We will update our drawing."

Signed and dated 3/14/12. (See Attached)

---

**U-0195** **Parking Sensors on Mission** **Closed** **03/13/2012** **03/23/2012** **04/16/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

M Squared has discovered that either SF Park or MUNI have installed what appear to be sensors in the street surface along Mission Street. See photo attached.

They existing between Fremont and Beale in particular.

As the AWSS line is installed along Mission St from 2nd to Main these sensors will be in conflict. Please confirm these sensors will be removed prior to trenching.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 4/12/2012 Per email conversation with Alex Demisch of the SFpark Project (SFMTA), any parking sensors found on Mission Street from 2nd Street to Main Street are inactive. SFPark's vendor plans to remove these parking sensors late April or early May of this year 2012. SFPark realizes TJPA plans to conduct AWSS construction work in the upcoming months and has asked if it was possible to for the TJPA sub-contractor, once AWSS construction begins, to separate the parking sensor equipment from other construction debris so that SFPark may dispose electronic waste properly if there are any parking sensors still remaining. However, if the parking sensors cannot be separated then SFPark understands they will end up being demolished from TJPA AWSS construction work.

---

**U-0196** **AWSS Pipe Bedding Material** **Closed** **04/02/2012** **04/12/2012** **04/09/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Section 02225-2 2.2 specifies that the bedding material for the new AWSS piping shall be crushed rock, however section 02723-18 2.12 contradicts this by specifying the bedding shall be pea gravel.
Please clarify.

Jeff Thiel 4/9/2012 Refer to submittal package TG0402-029 - Pipe Bedding Pea Gravel for approved AWSS pipe bedding material.

---

**U-0197** **AWSS/PG&E Phase 2 Duct Conflict** **Closed** **04/05/2012** **04/16/2012** **04/16/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

See attached photo. M Squared discovered a conflict on 4/4/12 at 11.10am while excavating to remove the existing AWSS Main at Howard and First.

PGE's new Phase 2 duct package is sitting directly on top of the existing AWSS main at First and Howard intersection. The top and sides of the duct bank are encased in concrete however the PVC conduits are not encased on the bottom and the PVC Conduits are currently touching the AWSS Main at this location.

As a result M Squared is unable to remove the existing AWSS main from this point east.

Please advise on how you would like to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 4/12/2012

Please confirm that the Phase 2 PG&E duct package that is in conflict with the AWSS main was installed at the correct elevation per the approved Phase 2 Utility plans.

---

**U-0197.1** **AWSS/PG&E Phase 2 Duct Conflict Location 7** **Closed** **04/16/2012** **04/26/2012** **04/17/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The Phase 2 PG&E plans only provide minimum depths and clearances. It appears the Phase 2 ducts were installed in accordance with the minimum depth requirement but not the minimum clearance requirement. Please confirm this with PG&E.

Regardless, the AWSS main can not be reinstalled per

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"Per a site inspection this morning with SFWD, M2, Turner, and Webcor/Obayashi, the clearance conflict between the recently installed PG&E duct bank and the existing 12-inch cast iron AWSS main was confirmed. The duct bank conduits are in direct

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

plan and maintain minimum clearance required in the AWSS specification. Please advise how M Squared is to proceed.

contact with the existing AWSS pipe.

The two options to rectify this situation include:

1.) Request that PG&E or their contractor vertically relocate the recently installed duct bank in order that there is the required 12-inch clearance between the two utilities.

2.) Realign the proposed replacement AWSS main either over or under the PG&E duct bank by the installation of a vertical offset.

Should option No. 2 be selected, please advise as soon as possible since revision drawing(s) for the vertical offset will need to be prepared prior to the installation of the vertical offset."

Signed and Dated 4/11/12.

The phase two duct bank was not installed per PG&E Green Book requirements for minimum clearance between utility services, and the contractor failed to properly coordinate utility installation.

Work related to this RFI response shall be performed at no additional cost to the owner.

---

**U-0197.2** **AWSS-PG&E Phase 2 Duct Conflict** **Closed** **04/23/2012** **05/03/2012** **05/02/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Through detailed analysis and discussions with PG&E during the weekly AWSS coordination meetings it has

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 4/23/2012 Michael Smith¿s (SFDPW) response,

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

been determined that it would be infeasible to relocate the PG&E duct bank as requested in option one in the response to RFI#U-0197.1.

Please provide details for realigning the AWSS main referenced in option two in the response to RFI#U-0197.1.

"The contractor shall install a vertical offset under the PG&E duct bank using four (4) 22 ½ - degree elbows as required to maintain a minimum 16-inches vertical clearance between the new 12-inch ductile iron AWSS main and the recently installed PG&E duct bank. Please refer to the attached sketch."

Signed and dated 4/16/12

This work shall be performed at no additional cost to the TJPA.

---

**U-0198** **Vault Drainage** **Closed** **04/09/2012** **04/09/2012** **04/16/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

1. On sheet MA-26 the 1" discharge piping inside the manhole is labeled as stainless steel in the detail drawings but is described as type K copper tube in the manhole construction note #7. Please confirm what type of material is required.
2. Spec Section 02728-23 Paragraph E. calls for the use of ball float valves as shown on the construction drawings. However the float valves are not shown on the drawings. Please confirm if these ball float valves are required.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 4/11/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

1.) The piping within the sewer manhole shall be Type 304 stainless steel.

2.) The contractor shall disregard the installation of the ball float valves for the three (3) concrete motorized gate valve vaults in this contract due to the installation of electrical sump pumps to be installed at all three (3) locations.

Signed and Dated 4/10/12

---

**U-0199** **PG&E Vault Conflict with North East Tie In @ Location 7** **Closed** **04/16/2012** **04/26/2012** **04/23/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Today while setting up to remove and cast the new lead joint at the North East tie in at location 7 it was discovered that the existing PG&E vault adjacent to the tie in is too close and E. Mitchell would not be able to properly caulk the lead joint.
Please advise how M Squared is to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 4/20/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) repsonse,

"The contractor shall request PG&E to relocate their facilities in order that there is the required 12-inches minimum clearance between the AWSS main and the PG&E electrical vault.

Should PG&E not be able to relocate their facilities, the contractor shall excavate approximately 12-feet east on Howard Street to the next existing pipe joint (GHB joint from the 12"x10" cast iron GHBxGH spigot reducing adaptor for the 10-inch gate valve) in order to connect the new ductile iron AWSS main to the existing cast iron main. The contractor shall locate any new bell and spigot pipe joints before after the concrete vault wall."

Signed and dated 4/16/12

---

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **U-0200** | **AT&T Vault Conflict at Location 7** | **Closed** | **04/16/2012** | **04/26/2012** | **04/23/2012** | **Potentially** | ☐ |

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

It has been discovered that the AT&T vault near the North West tie in of Location 7 is in conflict with the new AWSS pipe and tie rods to be installed at this location.

Please advise how M Squared is to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 4/20/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"The contractor shall request ATT to relocate their electrical vault or remove portion of the vault wall as required in order that there is the required 12-inches minimum clearance between the AWSS main and the ATT electrical vault. "

Signed and dated 4/16/12 (see attached)

Contractor to document all coordination with AT&T regarding this conflict.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

---

**U-0200.1** **AT&T Vault Conflict at Location 7** **Closed** **04/24/2012** **05/04/2012** **04/24/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Colin Azevedo **To:** Turner Construction Compan Jeff Thiel **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

The response to RFI#U-0200 did not properly document the coordination efforts and course of action. Please provide a revised response.

See attached email chain for additional information.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 4/24/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) original response to RFI U-0200,

"The contractor shall request ATT to relocate their electrical vault or remove a portion of the vault wall as required in order that there is the required 12-inches minimum clearance between the AWSS main and the ATT electrical vault"

Signed and Dated 4/16/12 (See attached)

A Coordination meeting was held on 4/18/12 with ATT, MSquared, W/O and Turner. It was agreed that M Squared would attempt to deal directly with the utility company. If an agreement could not be made the TJPA would be notified.

---

**U-0201** **AWSS - Countersunk Bolts in 14-Inch Ductile Iron Pipe Strong Back Plate** **Closed** **05/04/2012** **05/14/2012** **05/08/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:** M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley

**REQUEST:**

Please reference attached excerpt from the AWSS STANDARD DRAWING III, drawing No. AWSS 3.

The sizing chart for 14" diameter pipe require the use of Strong Back Type B. The Type B Strong Back

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 5/7/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"-The proposed change is acceptable.
-The Contractor shall field verify the actual pipe

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

configuration requires the use of a countersunk bolt and nut to adjoin connecting DI pipe. The countersunk bolts are a special order product and will have to be fabricated specifically for each piece.

Please confirm it is acceptable to use the typical 316 Stainless Steel bolt and nut without the countersink, similar to what is used and shown in Type A for all 14" diameter DI pipe.

outside diameter at each location prior to having strong back fabricated due to differing pipe diameters in use."

Signed and date 5/7/12 (See Attached)

---

**U-0202** **SLUDGE LINE - Unknown Subsurface Structure at 301 Mission** **Closed** **06/07/2012** **06/17/2012** **06/12/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** AECOM Technical Servic Eric Zagol

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please refer to attached detail 3/U-5001.

Detail 3 on sheet U-5001 which shows the connection detail for 12" HDPE to existing 10" steel, uses a 10" steel to 12" sleet reducer and then using a 12" steel to 12" HDPE Coupling in order to connect new sludge main to existing sludge main.

Our preference is to use a 10" steel to 10" HDPE coupling and then install a 10" HDPE to 12" HDPE Reducer. As the O.D of the existing sludge is unknown it will cause significant delay in the ordering of the 10" steel to 12" steel reducer as we will have to get the OD at the connection point and then order the material. Even with this piece of material, it will be extremely difficult to get a welder into the trench to weld the reducer on to the exiting pipe as a result of the amount of utilities which were discovered in potholing.

The use of the 12" HDPE to 10" HDPE reducer eliminates the need for a welder in the trench.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Proposed modification is acceptable.

---

**U-0203** **AWSS - Compaction Method for Trade Package TG04.2** **Closed** **06/08/2012** **06/18/2012** **06/11/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Steve Cunningham **Answered By:** City and County of San Fr Michael Smith

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Specification section 02225 Section 3.7 C forbids the use of flooding or jetting in order to gain the necessary levels of compaction in the AWSS pipe trench.

However due to the amount of utilities and duct packages in the trenches it will not be possible to gain the necessary levels of compaction under and around these utilities by utilizing the methods referenced in the specifications. By not gaining the necessary compaction around utilities it is possible that voids will occur over time causing the utility to be come unsupported and the street surface to sink.

We are requesting the use of jetting (as described in Section 703.08 of the City and County of San Francisco Standard Specifications) as a method to gain the necessary levels of compaction for the AWSS trenches. Jetting has previously been utilized as a successful method of gaining compaction levels on several other Transit Center Utility Relocation packages.

Please confirm that this proposed method is acceptable for use on this trade package. If not, please provide an alternative method for gaining the necessary compaction.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

6/11/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response:

"Water jetting to compact soil will be approved for locations where there are adjacent utilities that prevent compaction by vibratory methods. Use vibratory compaction once the backfill is clear of utilities and up to finish grade under road base/paving."

---

**U-0204** **SLUDGE LINE - Compaction Method for Trade Package TG04.66** **Closed** **06/22/2012** **07/02/2012** **06/22/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Specification section 33 34 10 (3.1, C¿]7) forbids the use of flooding or jetting in order to gain the necessary levels of compaction in the HDPE pipe trench. However due to the amount of utilities and duct packages in the trenches it will not be possible to gain the necessary levels of compaction under and around these utilities by utilizing the methods referenced in the specifications. By not gaining the necessary compaction around utilities it is possible that voids will occur over time causing the utility to be come unsupported and the street surface to sink.

M Squared is requesting the use of jetting (as described in Section 703.08 of the City and County of San Francisco

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Void. See RFI U-0206 for response.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Standard Specifications) as a method to gain the necessary levels of compaction for the AWSS trenches.

Jetting has previously been utilized as a successful method of gaining compaction levels on several other Transit Center Utility Relocation packages (see RFI0203).

Please confirm that this proposed method is acceptable for use on this trade package. If not, please provide an alternative method for gaining the necessary compaction.

---

**U-0205** **SLUDGE LINE - HDPE Hydrostatic Testing** **Closed** **06/22/2012** **07/02/2012** **07/05/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please refer to spec section 33 34 10-3.1 H

The method of HDPE pipe testing listed in the contract documents differ from the testing methods provided by the pipe manufacturer: The specifications call for the pipe to be filled 24hrs in advance and then the pipe pressurized to 115psi for a duration of 4hrs, The manufacturer's method involved filling the line with pressure for 3 hrs to allow expansion etc. in the pipe and then adding additional water, per Table 2 of the attached document. Once this additional water has been added the pressure can hold for the duration listed. Or alternatively allowing a 5%fluctuation in the pressure target for the test over 1 hour.

Please see attached pipe manufacturer's data attached and provide direction. M Squared believe that the testing method in the specifications is not suitable for HDPE due to its flexibility and would be more suited to steel pipe.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 7/3/2012 It is acceptable to perform HDPE Hydrostatic Testing per HDPE pipe manufacturer's recommendations. The test phase shall be performed based on the specified "Test Phase - Alternate 2" in manufacturer's data sheet for 3-hour test.

---

**U-0206** **SLUDGE LINE - Compaction Method for Trade Package TG04.6** **Closed** **06/22/2012** **07/02/2012** **07/05/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**REQUEST:**

Specification section 33 34 10 (3.1, C-7) forbids the use of flooding or jetting in order to gain the necessary levels of compaction in the HDPE pipe trench. However due to the amount of utilities and duct packages in the trenches it will not be possible to gain the necessary levels of compaction under and around these utilities by utilizing the methods referenced in the specifications. By not gaining the necessary compaction around utilities it is possible that voids will occur over time causing the utility to be come unsupported and the street surface to sink.

M Squared is requesting the use of jetting (as described in Section 703.08 of the City and County of San Francisco Standard Specifications) as a method to gain the necessary levels of compaction for the Sludge Line trenches.

Jetting has previously been utilized as a successful method of gaining compaction levels on several other Transit Center Utility Relocation packages (see RFI0203).

Please confirm that this proposed method is acceptable for use on this trade package. If not, please provide an alternative method for gaining the necessary compaction.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Zagol 7/5/2012 Flooding or water jetting is not an acceptable method of compaction for HDPE pipe trench backfill.

In limited areas, under and around adjacent utilities, consider using a low strength, low water content concrete fill material. Submit proposed alternate backfill material and mix design for review.

---

**U-0206.01** **SLUDGE LINE - Compaction Method for Trade Package TG04.6** **Closed** **07/05/2012** **07/15/2012** **07/17/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:** M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley

**REQUEST:**

See attached previously approved backfill mix designs in submittal package TG0434-006.

Please clarify if either of these can be used as a backfill material mentioned in the response to RFI U-0206.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Eric Zagol 7/17/2012 Provide mix design with 28-day compressive strength no greater than 100 psi.

Jeff Thiel 7/17/2012 If a concrete fill material is to be used, submit mix design for approval.

---

**U-0207** **AWSS - Connection on Market Street** **Closed** **07/10/2012** **07/20/2012** **07/11/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Transbay Joint Powers Au Jennifer Tongson

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Co-Author:** M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley

**REQUEST:**

While excavating to expose the existing AWSS Main on Market Street M Squared's crew discovered that a portion of the existing cast iron main had already been abandoned in place. They then discovered a ductile iron main that is running parallel to the cast iron pipe.

The ductile iron main is the portion of pipe that is live and this is the line we should now be connecting to in order to proceed with the work. See attached photos. Please note that additional costs will be incurred, as a result of this unforseen condition.

Please advise on how M Squared is to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

7/11/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"-The contractor shall connect the new 14" DI pipe to the (E) 14" DI pipe on the East end of the excavation to the nearest pipe joint to the original CTEL location.

-Where possible, please deflect new pipe joints 1 degree to compensate for (E) joint deflection at CTEL joint."

Signed and dated 7/11/12. (See Attached)

Pending TJPA approval, a CR for additional cost is forthcoming.

---

**U-0208** **AWSS - Clearance Issues with Domestic Water Line on Market Street** **Closed** **07/10/2012** **07/20/2012** **07/11/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Transbay Joint Powers Au Jennifer Tongson

**Co-Author:** M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley

**REQUEST:**

While excavating west of the gate valve vault location on Market Street M Squard's crew discovered an 8-inch cast iron water line sitting on top of the existing AWSS main to be removed. This 8-inch line also appears to be leaking slightly.

1. As a result of this line M Squared is unable to install the new AWSS with the necessary clearances. Aside from the clearance issues M Squared can no longer install the 14-inch reducer where it is required. M Squared will be able to relocate the reducer which will then require a longer spool piece.

Please advise how M Squared is to proceed.

2. This 8-inch line also has three concrete kickers on the pipe that make it impossible to install the pipe and fittings at this vault location. Please confirm that it is acceptable to remove these kickers temporarily, as they are already restrained with tie rods, for construction purposes. The

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

7/11/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"-The Contractor shall request the SFPUC SFWD relocate their (E) 8" low pressure water piping in order to maintain a 12" clearance between their own two utilities.

-Please coordinate with SFWD prior to removing the (E) concrete thrust blocks on the SFWD line. Support SFWD line as required to prevent movement."

Signed and Dated 7/11/12 (See Attached)

Pending TJPA approval, a CR for additional cost is forthcoming.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

kickers can be reinstalled once the work in this location has been completed.

---

**U-0208.01** **AWSS - Clearance Issues with Domestic Water Line on Market Street** **Closed** **07/24/2012** **08/03/2012** **08/03/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:** M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley

**REQUEST:**

Per the response to RFI # U-]0208, M Squared met with SFWD engineers on site to discuss the relocation of the domestic 8-inch line.

As a result of this coordination, SFWD agreed that relocating the 8-inch line was the best possible resolution to this issue. M Squared has excavated and shored for SFWD crews to perform the repairs.

As of 7/23/12 no relocation work has been performed by SFWD.

Please provide M Squared with a schedule for this relocation.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 8/2/2012 Per Dan Helminiak of the SFWD, the SFWD is scheduled to relocate the 8" water line on the morning of Monday 8/6/12.

---

**U-0209** **AWSS - Misison and Anthony Valve Vault** **Closed** **07/26/2012** **08/05/2012** **08/07/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:** M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley

**REQUEST:**

See attached documents and photos.

M Squared has potholed this location for the AWSS valve vault. It has been confirmed that the gas line is abandoned and can be removed and that the 12" water is also abandoned.

In order for the vault to be constructed here M Squared will need to remove the abandoned 12" line; however, removing the 12" line will significantly weaken the live 8" line that runs on Anthony as the 90 degree bend on the 8"

**SUGGESTION:**

Have SFWD restrain the existing 90 degree bend so that the abandoned lines and redwood plug can be removed. UPon completion of the valve vault M Squared can our a new concrete kicker if required by SFWD.

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 7/30/2012 Response per Chi Yu of SFWD,

" The redwood plug is for the abandoned line to stop any residual water in the pipe and does not serve as a kicker. The live 8" main was built quite recently using a field-lok gasket restraint joint. No kicker is required. Remove the 12" and 8" abandoned lines together with the redwood plug. Provide adequate vertical support for the live 8" main."

See attached email from Chi Yu dated 7/30/12.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

line is supported by a redwood block resting against the abandoned line.

Please advise on how M Squared is to proceed.

---

**U-0210** **AWSS - 12" Water Conflict at 1st and Mission Street** **Closed** **07/26/2012** **08/05/2012** **08/10/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:** M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley

**REQUEST:**

While performing the preliminary excavation across 1st and Mission street Intersection, M Squared's crew exposed a 12" water line that is running on top of the AWSS line for approx half of the intersection. Due to other utilities being present we are unable to excavate down to the AWSS main.

M Squared met with SFWD crews on site and they have confirmed that the line is active, despite them agreeing with M Squared that the line sounded very hollow (an indication that it may be dead)

M Squared believes that despite the presence of many unknown utilities they will still be able to remove and replace the existing AWSS main if this 12" water line can be abandoned or relocated.

Please advise on how M Squared is to proceed.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 8/10/2012 Chi Yu's (SFWD) response,

"SFWD will cut and cap both ends of the 12" line that is on top of the AWSS Main and restore the 12" main at the same location after the new AWSS line is in place."

SFWD will require two weeks advance notice prior to starting this work.

---

**U-0211** **AWSS - Valve Vault at Sta 9+05** **Closed** **08/06/2012** **08/16/2012** **08/14/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:** M Squared Construction, Inc. Aidan Foley

**REQUEST:**

Please refer to that attached photo and schematic of current condition.

M Squared has identified the space at Sta 9+05 as the only viable location for the gate valve in that area.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Request known utilities to relocate as required to install AWSS valve vault and piping.

Request site to be remarked for assistance in determining remaining unknown lines.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

However several utilities remain in conflict with this location:

- The MCI lines are plastic and the correspondence has already began with MCI to move these lines 2' south during AWSS Main installation
- The 3 x 2" Steel Electrical lines have been confirmed active by PGE representatives
- All remaining lines are unknown.

Please advise on how you would like M Squared to proceed.

Michael B. Smith SFDPW/JDC/EME - 08-13-12

---

**U-204** **AWSS - Compromised Lead Joint on Howard Street** **Closed** **06/15/2012** **06/25/2012** **06/18/2012** **Potentially** ☐

**From:** Webcor Construction LP Jackson Tukuafu **To:** Turner Construction Compan Gary Krutsch **Answered By:** Turner Construction Comp Jeff Thiel

**Co-Author:**

**REQUEST:**

Please reference the attached COMM0999 provided to TCCO on Friday, June 6, 2012.

As outlined in M Squared's letter dated 6/8/12, M Squared realigned the AWSS main on Howard Street and repacked the lead joints (time card attached for reference). During the Hydrostatic Test by SFWD, the lead joint leaked and failed to hold the test eventhough it was repacked.

As a result, it has become apparent that the AWSS joints have been compromised. Please provide direction on how M Squared is to proceed the with next course of action.

**SUGGESTION:**

**ANSWER:** **Accept Suggestion:** ☐

Jeff Thiel 6/18/2012 Michael Smith's (SFDPW) response,

"The Contractor shall remove two (2) additional 12' sections of (E) cast iron pipe on the East end of the horizontal offset. F/I ductile iron pipe with restraints at all joints except for the MJxGH adaptor fitting. Pour new lead joint at Ctel."

Signed and Dated 6/18/12.

| Number | Subject | Status | Date Created | Date Required | Date Answered | Cost Impact | Proceed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

*END OF REPORT*

Report Parameters

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project: | 30100 | Status Class: | C |
| Sent To: | | Run Date: | 08/21/2012 |
| Restrict Value of: | C | Run Time: | 09:14 AM |
| From Date: | | Operator: | NTRAN |
| To Date: | | Report Code: | PM3012 |
| Status: | CLOSED | | |