

1. S3.0 – Note 005 – Repair 3/S7.2 – Missing Width/Depth
For bidding purposes, assume a width of 2-in and a depth of 1/4-in. per exposed bar.
2. S3.0 – Note 008 – Repair 3/S7.2 – Missing Width/Depth
See response to question 1.
3. S3.0 – Note 011 – Repair 3/S7.2 – Missing Width/Depth
See response to question 1.
4. S3.2 – Note 010 and Note 035 – Repair 5/S7.2 – Please confirm that full length of railing and thru rod/wiring to be coated at all locations per Note 3 of detail 5/S7.2
(Note 010) Re-coat entire railing in work area per Note 3.

(Note 035) For bidding purposes, assume cleaning and recoating of four through-rods per span.
5. S3.2 – Note 038– Repair 1/S7.1 – Missing dimensions
For bidding purposes, assume 10 LF.
6. S4.0 – Note 002– Repair 5/S7.2 – Please confirm whether it is intended for full length of railing per Note 3 of detail 5/S7.2 or if possible, to provide the LF if intention is to touch up specific areas
See response to question 4.
7. S4.0 – Note 013– Repair 3/S7.2 – Missing dimensions
For bidding purposes assume 1/4" deep by 1" diameter every 6" along the perimeter.
8. S4.0 – Note 021– Repair 3/S7.3 – Missing dimensions
Corrosion staining on concrete from corroded through-rods – see response to question 4.
9. S4.1 – Note 001 & 007, – Repair 5/S7.2 – Please confirm whether it is intended for full length of railing per Note 3 of detail 5/S7.2 or if possible, to provide the LF if intention is to touch up specific areas
See response to question 4.

10. S4.1 – Note 008 – Do you happen to have a photo of this location?



The defect listed refers to 4 anchor bolts of a bollard baseplate. At least 2 nuts are not fully tightened.

11. S4.1 – Note 010– Repair 3/S7.2 – Missing Width/Depth

See responses to question 1.

12. S4.1 – Note 024– Repair 3/S7.2 – Missing Width/Depth

See response to question 1.

13. S4.1 – Note 027– Repair 4/S7.0 – Missing dimensions

Per Note 4 on Sheet S7.0, the Contractor must sound all previous repairs to determine if shotcrete is delaminated. Any observed delamination is included in other notes.

14. S4.2 – Note 001– Repair RRIK – Is the intention to remove/replace the base plate only or railing as well?

Replace the baseplate only.

15. S4.2 – Note 008– Repair 3/S7.2 – Missing Width/Depth

See response to question 1.

16. S4.3 – Note 003, 004 & 008– Repair 5/S7.2 – Please confirm whether it is intended for full length of railing per Note 3 of detail 5/S7.2 or if possible, to provide the LF if intention is to touch up specific areas

See response to question 4.

17. S4.4 – Note 001– Repair 3/S7.2 – Missing Width/Depth

See response to question 1.

18. S4.4 – Note 007 & 010– Repair 5/S7.2 – Please confirm whether it is intended for full length of railing per Note 3 of detail 5/S7.2 or if possible, to provide the LF if intention is to touch up specific areas

See response to question 4.

19. S4.5 – Note 001– Repair 3/S7.2 – Missing Width/Depth

See response to question 1.

20. S4.5 – Note 022– Repair 3/S7.2 – Missing Width/Depth

See response to question 1.

21. I also wanted to confirm that based on the walkthrough no alternates are to be included, just the base bid scopes on S3.0 – S4.5 and S6.0.

Correct. See Addendum 1 issued on May 7, 2026 for additional information.

22. I also wanted to add, for Detail 3/S7.1 would it be acceptable to substitute Sikaflex 1A for Sikaflex Concrete Fix?

Sikaflex 1A appears to be an appropriate substitute for Sikaflex Concrete Fix.

23. I was trying to request pricing from Delastic for the pourable deck joints and they are requiring the length, width and depth of every location in order to provide a material quote. Would it be possible to substitute Sika 2C SL? Do you happen to know the width/depth of these joints?

GEL takes no exceptions to Sika 2C SL.

Original plans appear to indicate 1” wide joints by up to 3” deep. For bidding purposes, assume up to 1.5” wide.

24. The products listed below are intended as equals to the specified Sika materials and have been selected based on comparable performance characteristics for the intended applications. Are these products acceptable?

Proposed Equivalent Product	Specified Product	Engineer's Response
Spec Chem Duo Patch	SikaTop 111 and 122 Plus	No Exceptions Taken
RepCon V/O	SikaTop 123 Plus, SikaQuick VOH	No Exceptions Taken
Spec Chem SpecPrep SB	Sika Armatec 110	No Exceptions Taken
Spec Chem RepCon 928	SikaQuick 1000	Rejected*
Spec Chem SpecPatch 15	SikaQuick VOH	No Exceptions Taken
Spec Chem SpecPoxy 1000	Sikadur Hi-Mod 35	No Exceptions Taken
Spec Chem SpecPoxy 2000	Sikadur Hi-Mod 32	No Exceptions Taken

*Spec Chem RepCon 928 is not considered an equivalent product to SikaQuick 1000 due to its minimum layer thickness of 1/2" for traffic bearing surfaces; the basis of design has a 1/4" minimum layer thickness.