

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

ADDENDUM NO.01 TO CONTRACT NO. 1502
For

31st Street Harbor-Coastal
3155 S. Lake Shore Drive
NEW CONSTRUCTION
PROJECT #11120

DATE: Wednesday, January 13, 2010

NOTICE OF CHANGES IN CONTRACT DOCUMENTS

The following changes are hereby made in the Contract Documents.

Changes to Book 1 PROJECT INFORMATION, INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS, AND EXECUTION DOCUMENTS:

Change 1: Book 1, Article III. Instruction for Bidders, Section K. Local Business Subcontracting Participation and Community Hiring, delete and replace to read as follows;

K. Community Hiring

In order to ensure that residents of the project communities are provided with the opportunity to benefit from Commission contracts, the Commission requires the following:

1. Community Residents Requirements. At least 7.5% of the project labor must be performed by residents of the Project Community as defined in the Contract documents.
 - a. Two-thirds of the 7.5% (or 5%) of the aggregate hours of Work to be performed by Contractor and Subcontractors under this Contract may be complied with through new hires or current employees of the Contractor who are construction trade workers and residents of the Project Community.
 - b. One-third of the 7.5% (or 2.5%) of the aggregate hours of Work to be performed by the Contractor and Subcontractors under this Contract must be new hires who are residents of the Project Community and may be comprised of construction trade workers or jobsite support positions, including, but not limited to, security, data entry clerks, schedulers, traffic monitoring personnel, field engineer, superintendent, project manager and site administrative support staff.

Change 2: Book 1, Article IV. **UNIT PRICE BID FORM**, delete and replace with revised **UNIT PRICE BID FORM**, dated January 13, 2010.

Change 3: Book 1, Article III. Instruction for Bidder, subpart U. Basis of Award change to read as follows:

U. Basis of Award

Award will be made to the responsible Bidder submitting the lowest Total Bid (Award Criteria plus Alternate 1 and Alternate 2) and otherwise responsive to all the requirements of the Contract Documents.

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Change 4: Book 1, Article V. Proposal Support Documents, change line 1. to read as follows:

Line 1. Base Bid, in figures (from line 15 of Bid Form)

Change 5: For Alternates 1 & 2, Bidders will need to achieve the following goals for employment of minority and female Journey Workers, Apprentices and Laborers. In accordance with Chapter 2-92-390 of the Municipal Code of Chicago, and in order to promote equality of opportunity for minority and female personnel in the Project, the Commission has established goals for the employment of minority and female Journey Workers, Apprentices and Laborers. Those goals, which are to be measured as a percentage of the total hours worked by construction workers employed on the Project.

Minority Journey Worker Goal: 25%
Minority Apprentice Goal: 25%
Minority Laborer Goal: 40%

Female Journey Worker Goal: 7%
Female Apprentice Goal: 7%
Female Laborer Goal: 10%

Change 6: Book 1, Section III. Delete in its entirety, Item **X. Licensing.**

Change 7: Book 1, Section II.B. Time of Completion, delete and replace as:

B. Time of Completion

Substantial Completion of the Work must be achieved no later than August 31, 2011.

Change 8: Book 1, Section II.D. Liquidated Damages, change box to read as:

Substantial Completion of Project	\$10,000 per Day
-----------------------------------	------------------

Change 9: Book 1, Section III.Y. 2 **Award of Contract; Rejection of Bids**, change February 16, 2010 to March 16, 2010

CHANGES TO BOOK 2 STANDARD TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS:

Change 7: Book 2, Article 3, Section 3.04.5, second sentence change one (1) day to read as five (5) days

Change 8: Book 2, Article 16. "Payments" Section 16.01 "Contract Price" delete and replace as follows;

Section 16.01 Contract Price

The "Contract Price" means the full amount of compensation to be paid for the Work to be performed by the Contractor as adjusted from time to time by Change Order. The Contract Price includes all costs of any kind to complete the Project, including but not limited to, labor, equipment, materials, permits, licenses and taxes necessary to perform the Work in accordance with the Contract's written terms and conditions. To the extent that the Contract was bid by line items with unit prices and estimated quantities, the City will pay Contractor unit prices for actual quantities

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

used. Lump sum bids and lump sum line items will be paid in accordance with the approved schedule of values.

Change 9: Book 2, Article 19, Section 19.07 "Suspension of Work", delete second sentence where it read as "The Contractor will not receive compensation for suspension of part of the Work".

CHANGES TO BOOK 3: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS:

Change 10: Book 3, Cover page "Supplemental Volume (For Reference Only)", delete and replace with revised Book 3A, Cover page "Supplemental Volume (For Reference Only)", dated January 13, 2010.

Change 11: Book 3, Cover page "Technical Specifications", delete and replace with revised Book 3, Cover page "Technical Specifications", dated January 13, 2010.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

Question 1: I noticed that the contract documents state that a total of 2% MBE/WBE is required for the base contract work, whereas Alternates 1 & 2 have 25% MBE and 5% WBE. Is this correct or should it be revised?

Answer 1: The MBE/WBE contract goals as stated in Book 1 are correct.
The MBE and WBE goals for the 31st Street Harbor Coastal Project were established in the context of overall Harbors Program goals of at least 24% MBE participation and at least 4% WBE participation. The 31st Street Coastal project goals recognize the limited and specialized work included in the package. MBE/WBE goals for the 31st Street Landside Project will be: 33% MBE and 5% WBE. Goals for the Gateway Harbor Project will be: 30% MBE and 5% WBE.

Question 2: Basis of award indicates that the Award will be based on the total bid amount after application of the Award Criteria canvassing formula. Will the PBC also consider adding the 2% Local Business Preference in the Award Criteria since the emphasis seems to be on Local Business throughout the documents? If so, please also consider the definition of Local Business as it applies to Joint Venture bid submittals.

Answer 2: No. The 2% Local Business Preference does not apply to this project.

Question 3: Project Information, section II, page 4, paragraph A(16) indicates specific MBE/WBE goals for the Project based on the Base Bid amount and each of the Alternates. Will the goals be monitored on the basis of the individual alternates or cumulatively for Alternates 1 & 2 since Alternate 2 is merely an extended warranty period cost? Since we have 3 different goals among the Base Bid and each alternate will we be required to submit three (3) Schedule D documents on bid day?

Answer 3: See NOTE 3 on revised Unit Price Bid Form

Question 4: Can you please re-issue a legible copy of Exhibit #3?

Answer 4: See attached EXHIBIT# 3 Community Area Map.

Question 5: The payments section of the Standard Terms and Conditions do not appear to address the timing of the approval and payment of the finalized progress invoice package once it is submitted on the target invoice date. Question: How many days will it take for approval and payment of a finalized progress billing after it is submitted?

Answer 5: Commission averages less than 30 days from approved pay application to payment.

Question 6: The Standard Terms and Conditions state that notice of a Differing Site Condition must be provided within 1 day after discovery. This time limit is not reasonable or normal for this type of work.

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Question: Can the contract terms be amended to allow ten (10) days to provide notice of a Differing Site Condition?

Answer 6: The number of days has been changed to five (5) days. See Change #7.

Question 7: Book 1, section III, page 9, par K (1) a-c, seems to indicate MANDATORY levels of subcontracting to Local Business entities. Will this percentage apply to the work that is intended to be subcontracted only or will it apply to the entire contract amount?

Answer 7: The Local Business Subcontracting Participation has been deleted. See Change #1.

Question 8: Could you explain what is meant or intended by the expanded bold language in the Standard terms and Conditions at Section 10.04 regarding liquidated damages? Is this stating that the Contractor is liable for consequential damages for late completion in addition to liquidated damages?

Answer 8: No. PBC does not intend that Contractor be liable for consequential damages for late completion in addition to liquidated damages.

Question 9: The insurance requirements in Exhibit #2 of Book 1 of the Bidding Documents include a requirement for the contractor to provide Builder's Risk Insurance for the Project. Our experience with Breakwater Projects is that since the work involves constructing a pile of rocks, Builder's Risk Insurance is typically not required as there is little, if any, risk to the work under construction. This insurance requirement is usually seen as adding unnecessary cost to the project.

Question: Does the Commission really want to require the Bidders to include providing Builder's Risk Insurance in their Bids?

Answer 9: The Contractor may provide a "stated value" policy with a limit of liability equal to the value under the agreement that has an exposure which would be insured under a traditional all risk builder's risk policy form. The determination of exposure is that of the Contractor and not the PBC." See revised EXHIBIT #2 Insurance Requirements.

Question 10: The Standard Terms and Conditions state at Section 19.07.1 that the Contractor is only entitled to compensation when the Owner suspends work on the entire project. The Owner may however suspend work on a portion of the Project that affects the Critical Path of the Project Schedule which would also increase costs for the Contractor. Question: Can the contract terms be amended to provide for additional compensation if the Owner suspends work on a portion of the Project that affects the Critical Path Schedule, and the associated Liquidated Damages if any?

Answer 10: See Change #9 Above.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
11	CE-C2.1	Page CE.C2.1 Note 2. Temporary fencing. Is there a standard detail with the PBC for temporary fencing?	Fencing must comply with Chicago Construction Site Ordinance requirements.
12	Coastal	Existing Conditions. What survey method was used to construct the hydrographic map and bathymetry shown on the drawings?	Sonar.
13	Coastal	Is the 31st Street Harbor project one that the specifications could be altered to accept Indiana Oolitic Limestone?	No.

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
14	Book 2	Question: Could you provide a list of the local permits for this Project that the Contractor will be required to obtain?	CDOT Harbor permit and IDNR/USACE joint agency permit applications are submitted. Chicago Park District Access Permit is not required. This project is not under the jurisdiction of the City of Chicago Department of Buildings; Other construction-related permits (such as for traffic maintenance or permitted loads) are the contractor's responsibility.
15	Book 2	The Standard Terms and Conditions state that stockpiled materials may only be invoiced after they have been paid for by the Contractor. This places an unnecessary burden on the Contractor and is usually billable if supported by a supplier invoice and conditional lien waiver. Question: Can the contract terms be amended to allow for invoicing for stockpiled material before actually being paid for by the Contractor?	Unit price items will be paid only for quantities in place.
16	Book 2	The contract terms and conditions stipulate Liquidated Damages for late completion at the rate of \$10,000 per day. Our experience has been when the penalty for not meeting the required completion date is this large, an incentive in the form of a Bonus stated as a Dollar Amount per day is also provided. This could be to apply for the entire project, or to certain critical portions of the work. Question: If completion of this project early (possibly up to several months early) would be of benefit to the Commission, could the contract terms be amended to provide for a Bonus Incentive for Early Completion?	No.
17	Book 3	The information we have received from the Quarries we have contacted is that they DO NOT have testing results for their stone that is less than 5 years old. In this case the testing specifications require tests that can take up to five months to complete. This severely impacts the production of stone for this project and thus the overall job schedule. Question: Considering the practicalities of the situation, can the specifications be amended to remove this problem?	No.

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
18	02100	Question: Are item 3.3 Clear & Grub and item 3.4 Stripping contained in Specification Section 02100 SITE PREPARATION AND DEMOLITION, applicable to the on-site office and laydown/materials storage areas?	Yes.
19	02100	Question: Is item 3.5 Demolition of Concrete contained in Specification Section 02100 SITE PREPARATION AND DEMOLITION, applicable to work on the Boat Landing?	Yes.
20	02200	At item 1.2.2.1 – Satisfactory Materials, of Specification Section 02200 – EARTHWORK, reference is made to “Select Fill”. The term “Select Fill” is used throughout Section 02200. Question: Should the term “General Fill” be used in place of “Select Fill”?	No - See revised specifications.
21	02200	Question: In Specification Section 02200 – EARTHWORK at 3.5.5.2 reference is made to “course aggregate”. Should this be “choke stone” as shown on the drawings?	No - See drawings for CA-7 placement locations
22	02458	Question: In Specification Section 02458 – STEEL PILES, at 1.4.A.1 it calls for pile driving logs to be prepared by a professional engineer. Is it necessary to employ a P.E. to count the blows of a pile driving hammer? Can it be amended to eliminate the requirement for a professional engineer to fill out the pile driving logs?	Per specification section 02548 parts 1.4.A.1 and 3.4.G, a Professional Engineer is required to attest to the records of pile installation. The Professional Engineer responsible for attesting to the records of pile installation will have to determine who will perform this duty.
23	02458	In Specification Section 02458 – STEEL PILES at item 2.3 it calls for Coal Tar paint(VOC's) which when cutting the pile to grade results in emissions, and conflicts with the intent of LEED requirements. Question: Should this painting requirement be reconsidered? Comment: If there is a concern about pile deterioration over the design life, it would cost less to provide a thicker pile section for corrosion loss, than it does to paint all six sides of an H-Pile.	Specification section will be updated to remove requirement for painting of steel piles. No change in the pile section is required in connection with this revision.

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
24	02458	<p>In Specification Section 02458 – STEEL PILES at item 3.1 it stipulates that the pile cannot be driven/installed until after the earthwork is done.</p> <p>Question: Why is this requirement present and how will marine access be achievable with this requirement in place?</p> <p>Comment: If the pile has the coal tar epoxy paint on it, it will come off of it as it is driven through the rock fill.</p>	<p>Timing of pile installation in relation to the earthwork is means and methods and should be planned by the contractor; specification section 02458 part 3.1.A will be updated. Per specification section 02458 part 3.4.D certain driving tolerances must be maintained. If the contractor chooses to install the piles prior to performing the earthwork, the location and plumb tolerances of the pile must still be maintained at the top of pile.</p>
25	02458	<p>Question: In Specification Section 02458 – STEEL PILES, at 3.4 it calls for pre-drilling certain pile locations, but the question is why is this required at these specific locations?</p>	<p>No pre-drilling sections are specified.</p>
26	02485	<p>Question: In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS, at 1.4.6 it calls for next day submission of the Stone Material Quality Control Inspection Reports, can this be amended to require weekly submission to the Commission Representative of these reports for the previous week?</p>	<p>No</p>
27	02485	<p>Question: In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS, at 1.4.6.H. it calls for rejected stone to be tracked, via reporting on disposition of that stone which is typically not done since the rejected stone would be reworked to remove the irregularity and reuse it for the other size classifications. This requirement of reporting disposition of rejected stones should be eliminated.</p>	<p>See revised specifications.</p>
28	02485	<p>Question: Can the requirement in Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS, at 1.6.2. be changed to allow for marking reject stones with a red dot instead of a "red x"? As stated above, rejected stones are reworked into other sizes and the "red x" may still be present on the reworked stone that is acceptable.</p>	<p>To be handled in Contractor's Quality Control plan.</p>
29	02485	<p>Question: In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS, at 1.7.1 it requires the SMCFS to be at the quarry at all times during stone production, handling, hauling or placement activities are going on. Is it necessary to have multiple full time SMC inspectors at the Quarry, at the loading location, during hauling to a dock, during barge delivery to the jobsite, and during onsite placement? This seems unnecessary if properly trained SMC inspectors are used. Can this requirement be eliminated or amended?</p>	<p>Add "as required" in addition to "at all times".</p>

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
30	02485	In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS at 1.7.2.F. it calls for rejected stone to be removed from the site after marking as being rejected and not be mingled with accepted stone at any time. Again, typically this stone would be reworked and not just put to waste. Question: Can this requirement be amended or deleted?	Contractor's Construction Operations Plan and QC Plan must address use of rejected stone.
31	02485	In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS at 1.7.2.H. it calls for weighing trucks with stones to determine an average weight, which is not practical since multiple types of stones would typically be placed in a single truck to minimize shipping cost. Question: Can this requirement be amended to allow for weighing stones with Loader scales, which has been the normal procedure in the past and typical for the industry?	Loader scales are allowed. Contractor shall address in Construction Operations Plan.
32	02485	Question: Could you please supply clarification on item 2.1.2.2.1 of Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS with regard to the statement that “if test results are more than 5 years old, the Commission Representative may select samples from the demonstration stockpile or materials designated by the Contractor as proposed sources and direct the Contractor to have selected stones tested by a Commission Representative approved laboratory in accordance with the requirements of Table 1, below” considering the Wet/Dry and Freeze/Thaw tests take 5 months to complete?	See revised specifications.
33	02485	In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS at 2.1.2.3.2. it calls for A-Stone used above -2 LWD85 to be of the same type and color. By this requirement it means all of this type of stone must come from the same quarry. Question: Considering the time limits of this project and the quantities of stone required, can this requirement be amended in some way to allow for stone coming from two different quarries or even locations in the same quarry?	See revised specification.
34	02485	Question: In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS, at 2.2.6 it states that existing A7 stone shall be placed as General Fill or Core Stone, so is this saying that the A7 stone does not have to meet the gradation requirements for the General Fill or Core Stone?	See revised drawings for designated areas of A7 stone placement.

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
35	02485	<p>In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS at 2.3.1.1 covering the A Stone gradations it calls for 25% of each type to weigh less than a stated amount and 25% to weigh more than a stated amount in addition to minimum mean weight for each type. What has been normal over the years is to require that at least a specified % of the stones be above a stated weight and nothing more as long as the stone fits the overall weight/size parameters. These additional requirements are expected to greatly impede the production of stone resulting in additional costs and provide little benefit to the Project.</p> <p>Question: Can these gradation requirements for A Stone be amended to what is common in the industry?</p> <p>Comment: The Owner could recognize a considerable savings if; the number of A stone sizes were reduced from 6 to 3 or 4 sizes, and the B stone sizes were reduced from 4 to 2 sizes. As stated earlier, it is awkward to ship a barge load with multiple size products. As an example we may have a barge load of A1 being placed on the Lakeside of the structure. If we encounter a weather event, we would normally move to the inside (protected harbor side) of the breakwater and continue placing A1 stones. However this would not be possible because there aren't any A1 stones on the inside of the Breakwater. This will result in additional delays and costs.</p>	See revised specification
36	02485	<p>In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS at 2.6.2. it calls for visual inspection of all B stones. This would mean laying out and visually inspecting over 75,000 individual stones. Typically we inspect stockpiles of this type of stone.</p> <p>Question: Can this requirement for inspection of B stone be amended to allow for stockpile inspections?</p>	See revised Table 2 within specification
37	02485	<p>Question: In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS, at 2.6.2. it calls for stone rejected at the site to be promptly removed, but it is typical for such stone to be reclassified and used elsewhere in the Project if at all possible, so can this clause be amended to only state that such stone will not be used improperly in the work?</p>	Stone to be used if qualifies. See Q044
38	02485	<p>Question: In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS, the stone gradation testing table in item 2.4.1 calls for all of the A, B, and Core stone testing frequency to be at every 2,500 tons, which is very high and extremely high for Core stone. Can these frequencies be increased to more normal levels?</p>	See revised Table 2 within specification

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
39	02485	Question: In Specification Section 02485 – STONE MATERIALS, there is no LA requirement for the Core stone, is this correct?	Concrete may be used for Select Fill, but cannot meet specification for Core Stone. Requirement applies to all stone.
40	02486	Question: In Specification Section 02486 – STONE PLACEMENT with regard to item 3.3 Turbidity, can you provide the permit requirements for turbidity control and tell us if stone can be placed without turbidity curtains?	Turbidity curtains not required.
41	02486	In Specification Section 02486 – STONE PLACEMENT in item 3.8 Tolerances it calls for B stone be placed with a minus zero tolerance and core stone at a plus zero tolerance. This is just not realistic or normal for stone materials placed underwater. Question: Can these tolerances be changed to a more normal amount for the work being done?	See revised specification
42	02486	Question: In Specification Section 02486 – STONE PLACEMENT at 3.9.1 compaction is being required, but where is it required and to what compaction criteria?	No stone compaction required - see revised specification
43	02486	Question: In Specification Section 02486 – STONE PLACEMENT at 3.9.3.1. Five dive inspections are required but how often are they required and what areas must be covered in each dive?	Dive inspections required at completion of test section and at regular intervals, per Commission Representative.
44	02486	Question: In Specification Section 02486 – STONE PLACEMENT at 3.10.2. on Test Sections, is it anticipated that each stone be weighed that goes into the test section? What is meant with “using field measurements from weighed stone and surveyed test section”?	Tonnage at test section required. Added barge displacement in revised specification
45	02620	Question: In regard to Specification Section 02620 - SURGE PIPE, is the steel casing pipe suitable to handle the stress of the overlain rocks? If so, what is the purpose of the 36" diameter HDPE?	See revised drawings.
46	03151	Question: In regard to Specification Section 03151 – CONCRETE ANCHORS, can you please provide an explanation of how this relates to the information in item 1.1 Installation at Boat Ramp and 2.1 for the 360 degree contact with base material?	See drawing CE-C5.1
47	03307	Question: In regard to Specification Section 03307 – CAST IN PLACE CONCRETE, is land access available to bring in the concrete material?	Land access is available up to the existing shoreline revetment. Access onto the existing pier will not be permitted. Access via the Land side site must be coordinated with the land side contractor.

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
48	5502	Question: In regard to Specification Section 05502 – SHEET PILING, please provide an explanation of the intent of 3.3.2. with regard to placing a permanent waler and a minimum 2 vertical templates (maximum of 20' apart) when the piling is 8.5 feet long (+5.0 to +13.5)?	Walers and templates are not required and may not be needed for hydraulic barrier wall
49	CE-C2.1	Question: As shown on Drawing CE-C2.1, the office location does not connect to the staging area, so does this mean no truck delivery to the site?	No. Areas can be connected.
50	CE-C2.1	Question: As shown on Drawing CE-C2.1, there are no areas designated for access to the Pier at the North End, so does this mean no truck deliveries are possible to this location?	Land access is available up to the existing shoreline revetment. Access onto the existing pier will not be permitted.
51	CE-C2.3	On Drawing CE-C2.3 from Sta. 244+00 to 255+00 it shows removal of stone from the existing revetment to a required elevation of -6.0. Question: The boat ramp is being cut to -8.8, so should stone be removed to -10.0? In the revetment south of the boat ramp it should be noted that many sail boats have keels in excess of -6.0 which is the elevation specified for stone removal.	See revised drawings.
52	CE-C2.5	Question: Drawing CE-C2.5 calls for a Sheet Pile tie in at the 31st Street Pier, could you provide the details of the connection which is required?	See revised drawings.
53	CE-C4.18	Question: On Drawing CE-C4.18 Q at Section at Sta 501+00, is this section drawn correctly, or is there a different bedding stone shown below the Core Stone?	See revised drawings.
54	CE-C5.1	Question: For Drawing CE-C5.1 please provide detail on what the existing fill is below a -6.0 at the boat landing that needs to be removed?	See revised drawings.
55	CE-C5.1	Question: On Drawing CE-C5.1 it shows the Surge Pipe at 42" x 1/2", but the Specifications call for the Surge Pipe to be 42" x 5/8". Please clarify which is correct.	AECOM. 5/8" - See revised drawings.
56	LS1.01	Question: Drawing LS1.01 shows the Guard Wall ends at Sta 302+52. Drawing CE-2.5 and Section CE-C3.1 show the Guard Wall at Sta 600+00 to 602+53. Please clarify which is correct.	See revised drawings.
57	SST 0.1	Question: On Drawing SST 0.1 in the HP Notes it states Depth of Pile based on 100 ton static load test, or extend to bedrock at -48.6. In the Specification it requires static load, tension test, dynamic tests. Please clarify which is correct.	Steel H piles shall be driven to bedrock, which is at an approximate elevation of -48.6 based on soil borings in the vicinity of the pile locations. Testing of the piles is not required. Drawing SST0.1 and Specification Section 02458 will be updated as Addendum 2.

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
58	SST 1.2	Question: On Drawing SST 1.2 for Concrete Steps/Ramps, the Drawing does not show Guard Wall Sta 600+00 to 602+53. (Same as Drawing LS1.01, different than Drawing CE-C2.5 and CE-C3.1). Please clarify.	Drawing SST1.2 shows the correct configuration.
59	SST 2.1	Question: On Drawing SST 2.1 Pile Foundation Detail, typical sections call for Choke Stone, Specifications don't specify choke Stone. Please clarify, should the Drawing depict "CA-7" instead of Choke Stone?	The choke stone gradation is shown on sheet SST0.1.
60	CE-3.3 and 3.4	Question: On Drawing CE-3.3 and 3.4, the stone size requirements shown are different than the stone size requirements contained in the Section 02485 Stone Materials of the Specifications. Which one takes precedence?	See revised drawings and specifications.
61	Book 3	The purchase of the job site trailer, as discussed by Mr Leeb, is to be purchased by the Contractor, charged to the PBC (included in the overall total bid for the prime job) and turned over to the PBC or Park District at the completion of the project! Correct?	See revised specifications.
62	Book 3	If so, will there be a more detailed description of the desired trailer provided?	See revised specifications.
63	01550	Book 3, section 01550, page 2, article 1.3 (J) indicates a "construction staging & maintenance of traffic" drawing in the plans. This was not included in our documents.	Use Sheet CE-C2.1
64	CE-C2.1	Can the owner provide water and sewer hook-up locations?	Existing utility locations will be within the landside contractor's priority access area. For temporary facilities, contractor is encouraged to use a service, rather than connect to existing utilities. Beach House utilities are not available.
65	CE-C3.1	Section "A": Special stone placement should be designated to extend across the entire crest of all sections.	See revised drawings.
66	CE-C3.1	The layer thickness of A2 stone in Section A should be 5.8'.	See revised drawings.
67	CE-C3.2	Section "C-1": Tip elevation of SSP should be specified or a minimum provided. It should not be left up to Contractor.	See revised drawings.
68	CE-C3.2	Sections "D1" and "E1": Place three armor stones on crest and maintain consistent "B" stone layer beneath.	See revised drawings.
69	CE-C3.2	Section "E-1": Why are there two layers of armor stone when corresponding similar Sections "B" and "F" have a single layer and are more exposed? Where does the transition exist in crest elevation between sections "F" and "E"?	See revised drawings.

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
70	CE-C3.3	Section "F": Show 1.5 slide slopes on A7 placement. Does A7 stone require QA/QC review prior to placement in the core? Do not allow A7 for use as alternative toe stone on lakeward side on any sections.	See revised drawings and/or specifications.
71	CE-C3.3	Special stone placement should extend across the entire width of the crest as well as down the landward single stone layer slope for all sections on this sheet.	See revised drawings.
72	CE-C3.3	W50 for A6 and should be 14.7.	See revised drawings and/or specifications.
73	CE-C3.3	W50 for B1 should be 1.6.	See revised drawings and/or specifications.
74	CE-C3.3	W50 for A6 should be 14.7.	See revised drawings and/or specifications.
75	CE-C3.3	W50 for B3 should be .83.	See revised drawings and/or specifications.
76	CE-C3.3	Note: In bottom of cross-section "F", seems to allow the replacement of A1 stone with A7 stone. This is not in accord with the Note 2 on drawing CE-C3.5 which requires the gradation of the A7 stone to have the same gradation as the stone it replaces. This also does not conform to specification section 02485-2.2.6.	Yes, must meet gradation requirements
77	CE-C3.4	Section "J" and "K": Indicate the possible use of A7 stone in the core.	Added within a portion of the stub groin
78	CE-C3.4	A7 stone could be utilized for armor stone on the Stub Groin; however, if a color difference exists between A7 and the new stone supply, A7 should be utilized below the water line to maintain a consistent stone color/appearance.	Added within a portion of the stub groin
79	CE-C3.4	WD50 for B3 and B4 should be 0.83 T and 0.35 T respectfully.	See revised drawings and specifications.
80	CE-C3.4	In the transition zone the larger section stone materials should be used, true for all transitions.	See revised drawings and specifications.
81	CE-C3.4	WD50 for B4 should be 0.35	See revised drawings and specifications.
82	CE-C3.5	Assuming that A7 is removed to -6.0 to provide navigation for proposed docks. Is it the intent to leave the remaining A7 stone there in the event we need to put a revetment back in the project in the future? Or is the Contractor allowed to remove all the A7 stone for use in the project? If we are holding them to -6 only, we should provide a maximum removal depth.	Removal beyond that shown on revised drawings is not permitted.
83	CE-C3.7	Remove A7 stone between 256 and 258 where the proposed stub groin will be placed to ensure that the design section "J" can be placed per plan and specification for both B3 and A4 stone.	See revised drawings and specifications.

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
84	CE-C3.7	Do not remove A7 stone or revetment section south of approximately 258 following the installation of the Stub Groin.	See revised drawings and specifications.
85	CE-C3.8	Extend special stone placement across the entire crest on all sections CE-C4.8 to 18.	See revised drawings and specifications.
86	CE-C3.8	Indicate possible use of A7 on all sections CE-C4.8 to 18.	See revised drawings and specifications.
87	CE-C5.3	Are navigation lights, location, and elevation Coast Guard approved? Consider large flat concrete anchor blocks. Do not allow chinking of BI stone. Include solar panel and battery requirements. Should bar rungs be allowed on the stub breakwater navigation light pole? Possible pedestrians vandalism issue. Is Section "B" coordinate consistent with the plan view drawings?	See revised drawings. AECOM sent off a plan and had discussions with the USCG (Jon Grob, BOSN2 Coast Guard Sector Lake Michigan, Waterways Management and Aids to Navigation) prior to preparing the final plans and details. They agreed with the location, color, height of the lights, and gave us the flash pattern. A formal application identifying these lights is being put together at this time, to go to the USCG for their final approval.
88	02458	The Bid Schedule calls for a Unit Price for Steel Piles but the specification does not include an M&P Section. We understand that the Bid Schedule has been revised.	See revised specifications.
89	02485-1.6.2	The title of this Article includes Type A and Type B but requires a demonstration stockpile of only armor stone.	See revised specifications.
90	02485-2.3.1	We should expect considerable push back on the stone gradations for A and particularly for B stone from the stone suppliers.	See revised specifications.
91	CE-C2.1	Who's work takes priority when there is confrontation - Coastal or Landside? (Establish priority of access to work zones on G3.1)	Provision covering access priority has been added to drawing CE-C2.1.
92		Do we need to brace the revetment SSP if we remove the toe stone?	No. See revised specifications.

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
93	CE-C2.1	Will the Landside contractor provide a fence at their work limits?	Coastal GC to provide fencing plan in proposed Construction Operations Plan.
94	CE-C2.1	Where is the employee parking to be located?	Parking located at trailer area.
95	CE-C2.1	Can the staging area and office trailer areas to connected?	Yes.
96	02485	Do the criteria/quality requirements listed in the stone spec cover all stone? (Revise location of footnote 5)	See revised specifications.
97		Can crushed concrete be used as core stone? (90% set: allowed. 100% set: not allowed.	No.
98		Can the color discrepancy for the breakwater stone be more accurately defined?.	See revised specifications.
99		We want to not mark rejected stones, since we'll be splitting them to use for other grades of stone, and the red "X" will make it be rejected as well.	To be handled in Contractor's Quality Control plan.
100		Is a 30 day cure required for all stone?	See revised specifications.
101		Can an average stone size be used throughout entire breakwater?	See revised specifications.
102		You may be better off eliminating the middle stone size and increasing other sizes to aid in availability, handling, time, and expense.	See revised specifications.
103		Do 300 of 2500 tons need to be tested? Seems like too much testing. Lab testing takes 5 months.	See revised specifications.
104		Do all sizes need to be tested if it is all the same stone?	No.
105		Do stone sizes "B" and "C" need to be individually inspected?	See revised specifications.
106		Do weights need to be marked on the "B" stones?	No.
107		Can previously quarried stone be used?	Yes.
108		If previously quarried stone can be used, what are the curing requirements and documentation requirements?	Previously-quarried stone must meet all specification requirements.
109		Are there separate requirements for Granite or are the requirements waived for Granite?	Requirements not waived.
110		Is a stone inspector, SMCFS, to be with the stone at all times per the stone specs? On site everyday, during install, loading, etc.?	See revised specifications.
111		Does the stone need to be loaded at 6 points on the barges or will four points be sufficient?	6 points required.
112		Will trucking tickets be required at the site?	All materials must have tickets if by truck.
113		What sort of bathymetric survey was done of the site; Can Owner confirm there aren't existing erratics that the contractor will be blamed for?	Sonar used for bathymetric survey and data provided in supplemental documents; Contractor to confirm existing site conditions.

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

Item	DWG NO./ SPEC SECTION No.	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
114		Can the fairway areas be swept prior to construction to identify existing rock, junk, etc.	GC required to confirm existing site conditions.
115		Can the contractor be paid for stored material? (Stone material will need to be placed before payment will be issued)	Unit Price material will only be paid for when in place.
116		The requested boat should be steel not fiberglass.	See revised specifications.
117		Is the boat to be turned over to the PBC at the end of the project?	See revised specifications.
118		Who will be driving the boat after April 1?	See revised specifications.
119		Under the earthwork spec, should "select" be "general" fill instead? Clarify difference.	No - see specifications
120		Is a professional engineer required to count the piles?	Per specification section 02548 parts 1.4.A.1 and 3.4.G, a Professional Engineer is required to <i>attest</i> to the records of pile installation.
121		Is the flushing pipe to be of HDPE or steel?	Steel - see revised specifications.
122		To what depth does the stone at the boat ramp need to be removed to?	See revised drawings.
123		Can the all the existing toe stone at the boat ramp be removed and reused?	See revised drawings.
124		Are there any suspension windows that may create a scheduling problem?	None anticipated.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS:

Revised Unit Price Bid Form, dated January 13, 2010

Revised EXHIBIT #2- Insurance Requirements, dated January 13, 2010

EXHIBIT #3-Community Area Map

Revised Book 3 Cover page "Technical Specifications", dated January 13, 2010

Revised Book 3A, Cover page "Supplemental Volume (For Reference Only)", dated January 13, 2010

SPECIFICATIONS:

02100

02200

02485

02486

02620

DRAWINGS:

CE-C0.1

CE-C1.1

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

CE-C2.1
CE-C2.2
CE-C2.3
CE-C2.4
CE-C2.5
CE-C3.1
CE-C3.2
CE-C3.3
CE-C3.4
CE-C3.5
CE-C4.1
CE-C4.2
CE-C4.3
CE-C4.4
CE-C4.5
CE-C4.6
CE-C4.7
CE-C4.9
CE-C4.10
CE-C4.11
CE-C4.12
CE-C4.13
CE-C4.14
CE-C4.15
CE-C4.16
CE-C4.17
CE-C4.18
CE-C5.1
CE-C5.2
CE-C5.3
[Landscape]
[Civil]
[Structural]

END OF ADDENDUM NO.1

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

UNIT PRICE BID FORM

Item No.	Description of Work (Furnish and Place)	Unit(s)	Estimated Quantity	Unit Price	Proposal amount
Main Breakwater (Sta. 300+76 to 327+71), Peninsula Park Breakwater (Sta. 404+00 to 407+00 and Sta. 300+00 to 302+76), and Stub Groin					
1	Core Stone	Tons	226,000	\$	\$
2	Type A1 Stone	Tons	112,000	\$	\$
3	Type A2 Stone, Select Placement	Tons	45,000	\$	\$
4	Type A4 Stone	Tons	16,300	\$	\$
5	Type B1 Stone	Tons	99,000	\$	\$
6	Type B3 Stone	Tons	7,800	\$	\$
7	Surge Pipe	LS	1	\$	\$
8	Navigation Lights	LS	1	\$	\$
9	Subtotal Items 1-8				\$
10	Removal and Placement of Existing Type A7 Stone	Tons	22,700	\$	\$
11	Subtotal Item 10				\$
12	Boat Landing Extension	LS	1	\$	\$
13	Mobilization & Demobilization	LS	1	\$	\$
14	Subtotal Items 12-13				\$
15	Base Bid (Items 9, 11, and 14; Enter on Line 1 of Award Criteria Formula)				\$
Alternate 1: Peninsula Park (Sta. 404+00 to 407+00 and Sta. 300+00 to 302+76)					
16	ADD Core Stone	Tons	11,000	Use Unit Price #1	\$
17	DEDUCT Type A1 Stone	Tons	2,000	Use Unit Price #2	\$
18	DEDUCT Type A2 Stone, Select Placement	Tons	8,000	Use Unit Price #3	\$
19	DEDUCT Type B1 Stone	Tons	6,000	Use Unit Price #8	\$
20	Select Fill	Tons	26,000	\$	\$
21	General Fill	CYD	16,500	\$	\$
22	Filter Fabric	SFT	27,000	\$	\$
23	Steel H-piles per section 02458	LF	6,565	\$	\$
24	Lump Sum Additional Peninsula Park	LS	1	\$	\$

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF CHICAGO

25	Subtotal Alternate 1 (Items 16-24)	\$
<p style="text-align: center;">Alternate 2: Additional one (1) year Landscape Warranty Period, including Maintenance, added to base one (1) year Landscape Warranty Period, per specifications Section 02900 1.2, 1.9, 1.10 and 3.6 and Section 02920 1.3, 1.10, 1.11 and 3.7**</p>		
26	ADD Landscape Maintenance & Warranty Period	LS 1 \$ \$
27	Subtotal Alternate 2 (Item 26)	\$
28	Award Criteria Figure (Line 15 of Award Criteria Formula)	\$
29	TOTAL BID (Award Criteria Figure plus Alternates 1 and 2 (Items 25, 27, and 28))	\$

NOTE 1: The Contract Price is determined, at the time of award, by addition of Bid Form line items 20, 25 and 27 above.

NOTE 2: The Commission's option to accept the Alternates 1 and or Alternate 2 shall expire on April 30, 2010 unless a unilateral Change Order evidencing its election to accept the Alternates is executed by the Executive Director and delivered to the Contractor.

NOTE 3: If Commission accepts Alternate 1 and or Alternate 2, Bidder shall within 5 business days of notice from the Commission submit a MWBE Plan (Schedule D's and Schedule C's) evidencing its commitment to meet or exceed the Project goals of 25% MBE and 5% WBE participation in the Work of the Alternates.

Revised UNIT PRICE BID FORM, dated January 13, 2010

Mayor Richard M. Daley, Chairman

Erin Lavin Cabonargi, Executive Director