DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING SYSTEMS COMMAND PACIFIC
258 MAKALAPA DRIVE SUITE 100
PEARL HARBOR HI 96860-3134

Notice No. 9
3 Aug 2026

PRE-PROPOSAL QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

RFP N62742-26-R-1300
WON 1665555, FY24 AJJY183012 (P-012), PDI: NORTH AIRCRAFT PARKING RAMP, ANDERSEN AIR FORCE BASE, GUAM

NOTE: The following questions and answers are provided for INFORMATION ONLY. The RFP remains unchanged unless it is amended in writing on a Standard Form 30.

170. RFI Response #129 and #158:

RFI Response #129 States: Probing and grouting are not required for specific utility pits/vaults because "no such work is indicated on the drawings" and "Division 31 only requires probing and grouting where specifically shown on the plans."

RFI Response #158 States: Exploratory probing and grouting are "restricted to foundation areas only" and must follow the frequency/depth rules in Paragraph 3.1.1.1. It also directs the Contractor to show proposed locations relative to pavement areas on the Grouting Location Plan.

RFP Drawings: A comprehensive review reveals that no probing or grouting locations, limits, zones, or foundation frequencies are actually shown or marked anywhere on the contract drawing package.

Because RFI #129 establishes that work is only required "where specifically shown on the plans," but the plans show nothing, the exact scope cannot be quantified.

Please provide the following clarifications:

A) Please provide a revised drawing sheet explicitly marking the exact boundaries, foundations, or pavement zones where probing and grouting are contractually required.

B) If RFI #158 requires pavement areas to be shown on the plan, but restricts exploratory probing to "foundation areas only," please clarify if aircraft pavement subgrade requires any probing/grouting. If yes, please provide the required grid spacing and depth baseline.

C) In the absence of visual markings on the plans, please provide a mandatory baseline allowance (e.g., total linear feet of drilling or number of holes) for all bidders to price uniformly.

ANSWER:

A) Per the specifications, probing and grouting is not required in pavement areas, but is required beneath the footings, mat foundations, and concrete slabs of buildings.

B) Pavement subgrade does not require probing/grouting, see answer to Question 170, item A.

C) The Contractor can use the foundation drawings to determine where buildings with footings, mat foundations, and concrete slabs will be located, which will require probing and grouting. The Contractor can obtain the probe hole frequency, location, depth, and diameter requirements from the specification 31 33 10 and apply them to those drawings to obtain quantities. Specification subsections that may apply may include but not be limited to subsection 3.1.1.1 and 3.4.2.2.

171. All the 3 Concrete Supplier in Guam confirmed they are unable to provide a quote to bidders due to the following:

a) Specs Section 32 13 14.13, paragraph 2.11.1.1 Batching and Mixing Plant Location,

"Locate the batching and mixing plant on the project site as indicated on the drawings. Water and electrical power are available on the project site. Provide operable telephonic or radio communication between the plant and the placing site at all times concreting is taking place."

Concrete Suppliers are unwilling to provide On-site Plant due to the small volume of concrete.

Question 1: May we request the Government to reconsider having the Plant off-base?

ANSWER: See response to Question 154.

b) Specs Section 03 30 00, paragraph 2.3.1.1 Portland Cement

"a. Unless otherwise specified, provide cement that conforms to ASTM C150/C150M Type II/V where in contact with earth and Type I/II elsewhere."

Concrete Suppliers can not provide the Type II/V Cement.

Question 2: May we request that the Government reconsider the use of Type I/II?

ANSWER: See response to Question 30.

c) Specs Section 03 30 00, paragraph 2.3.3.1 Normal-Weight Aggregate

a. Conform to ASTM C33/C33M.
b. Obtain aggregates used in concrete from the same sources and have the same size range as aggregates used in concrete represented by submitted field test records or used in trial mixtures.
c. Provide sand that is at least 50 percent natural sand.

Concrete Suppliers are unable to provide the 50 percent Natural Sand.

Question 3: Can concrete suppliers use locally available manufactured sand in lieu of the requirement for 50 percent natural sand?

ANSWER: Response deferred.

d) Specs Section 03 30 00, paragraph 2.3.3.2 Recycled Aggregate Materials

"Use a minimum of 25 percent recycled aggregate, depending on local availability and conforming to requirements of the mix design. Recycled aggregate to include: recovered glass recovered concrete recovered porcelain recovered stone that meets the aggregate requirements specified. Submit recycled material request with the aggregate certification submittals and do not use until approved by the Contracting Officer."

Concrete Suppliers are unable to provide Recycled Aggregates. There are no Recycled Aggregates in Guam.

Question 4: May we request the Government to reconsider deleting the recycled aggregates requirement and use locally available aggregates?

ANSWER: As stated in Section 03 30 00, paragraph 2.3.3.2, "Use a minimum of 25 percent recycled aggregate, depending on local availability and conforming to requirements of the mix design." Therefore, use of recycled aggregate is dependent upon local availability.

172. There is only one Asphalt Supplier on Guam, and almost all Asphalt at AAFB has been performed by the one Supplier. The specifications as currently provided in the RFP may impede the Prime Contractor bidders' ability to provide bids if the Guam Asphalt Supplier cannot meet the specifications.

Below is from the only Asphalt Paving Contractor on the island:

Asphalt mixture gradation restrictions:
The restriction against using baghouse fines for modifying the gradations of asphalt mixtures is not feasible. The production process of our aggregate raw materials necessitates modifications at the asphalt plant level, which includes dust removal to ensure compliance with the specified gradations and volumetric properties.

Asphalt binder grades:
In Guam, the standard asphalt cement binder used conforms to ASTM D3381 viscosity grades AR-8000 and AR-16000 for both roads and airfield paving. The addition of two more types of Performance Grade 70-22 and 70-10 binders per ASTM D6373 would require a reconfiguration of our plant set-up, incurring additional costs and time. Furthermore, the temporary installation of tanks for these binders would be of no benefit to HRP after project completion.

May we request the Government to reconsider easing the above requirements and adopt specifications that have been acceptable within AAFB?

ANSWER: Bid per RFP.

173. Please clarify the Government's intended requirements for soils beneath proposed airfield pavement areas.

Specification Section 31 00 00 appears to require that only **GW or GP** materials may be used beneath airfield pavements and also appears to require removal of in-situ **CH, CL, MH, ML, and CL-ML** soils beneath pavements.

Based on the grading, approximately half of the proposed airfield pavement areas appear to be in cut and approximately half in **fill**. Please confirm:

1. For pavement areas in **fill**, does the requirement that only **GW or GP** may be used beneath airfield pavements apply to the entire fill section beneath pavement, or only to a defined upper zone/subgrade zone?

2. For pavement areas in **cut**, must the exposed subgrade be overexcavated and replaced with **GW/GP** material, and if so, to what depth or zone beneath the pavement section?

3. If the Government's intent is different, please clarify the acceptable soil classifications and applicable depth/zone requirements beneath airfield pavements in both cut and fill areas.

The contract documents, including the geotechnical boring logs at **BB103 through BB120**, do not appear to indicate sufficient onsite **GW/GP** material to satisfy a literal application of Section 31 00 00 beneath proposed airfield pavements. This issue appears to have significant cost implications because a literal application of Section 31 00 00

would imply substantial removal/disposal of onsite soils and replacement with imported **GW/GP** fill.

ANSWER:

1. For pavements located over cut or fill areas, specification section 31 00 00, paragraph 1.2.7 indicates in-situ soils classified as "CH, CL, MH, ML, and CL-ML must be removed in their entire[t]y" and replaced with GW or GP soils. Additionally, fill placement above these replaced soils must also be comprised of only GW or GP soils up to the pavement subgrade. Refer to the pavement section drawings for material types to use above pavement subgrade.

2. For pavements located over cut or fill areas, specification section 31 00 00, paragraph 1.2.7 indicates in-situ soils classified as "CH, CL, MH, ML, and CL-ML must be removed in their entire[t]y" and replaced with GW or GP soils.

3. RFP drawings and specifications provide requirements.

174. If the 1200 Pair, PE-89 24 AWG OSP cables with outside diameter ranging from 2.6" to 2.9" require MaxCell inner duct, please see Reference Drawing TS702, ID X3 (Amendment 0004). Based on this requirement, this cable alone requires its own 1-1/4" conduit and should not be shared with other cables. Please confirm this requirement.

ANSWER: Confirm that the 1200 pair PE-89 OSP cable will require its own conduit and should not be shared with any cables and does not require MaxCell inner duct in this case.