Question: On the design drawings, the nails are specified to be a 28mm GEWI Plus threadbar but show all the details for a T40 hollow bar. Which one should we refer to?

Response: 28mm GEWI bar. I am not sure what details are being referring to?

Reference to "Self-drilling nails" (DWG ARO 0388-C01 to be removed), Reference to Proprietary product (TITAN) to be removed, Angle adapter reference to remove.

Background : Originally the site was designed with Self Drilling Anchors, but the GEWI bar alternative was  preferred initially and then replaced for GEWI bars as more geotechnical information became available

Question: Could you please clarify the following:  
The drawings specify that 28mm GEWI+ bars (yield grade 670/800MPa, minimum yield force 413kN) should be used for the soil nails. However, these bars are currently unavailable in the market and have a lead time of 15 weeks.  
Considering that the working load is 160kN, could 28mm GEWI bars (yield grade 500/550MPa, minimum yield force 308kN) be a suitable alternative? If not, please advise on the parameters that should be considered when selecting appropriate alternatives.

Response: A 28mm GEWI bar (yield =550/ 550MPa) can be used as a suitable alternative

Question: All trees marked to be retained are outside the works footprint

Response: Refer to DRWG ARO0388-C01:

Significant Trees are shown in the figure. there are no trees to be remove in section B (RED) and a singular tree in section B - which falls inside the area for rock placement. This tree is to be retained. The significant trees that exist in the upper portion of Section A (Blue) are to be retained

A blue and red diagram

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Question: The existing slope batter documented on Section B of ARO0388-CO3 is a correct presentation of the existing batter on site

Response: Refer to DRWG ARO0388-C01/ CO3:

The existing slope batter documented on Section B of DRWG ARO0388-CO3, is a cross-section extracted from the detailed survey of the site - taken at the location of Section B - as shown in, DRWG ARO0388-CO1. Additional information of the site can be interpreted from the information provided (including the contours as shown in the drawings). It is noted that the section is indicative. It can be noted from the plan view that the batter steepens in in places and flattens out a little in others, and that the number / rows of soil nails required vary along the profile of Section B.

A drawing of a staircase and steps

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Question: Excluding the trees marked for retention, all other vegetation is to be cleared and disposed off site.

Response: Section B (Red) - Correct

Section A (Blue) - Only that behind the rock-fill. The upper portions of the site can remain

Question: Do you have any further detailed cross sections along the length of the proposed stabilisation works identifying the location of the existing Don River as well as the actual shape of the eroded bank requiring stabilisation.

Response: The existing slope batter documented the drawings are from the detailed survey of the site - copies attached

Question: Do we need to reinstate the eroded embankment prior to geofabric and rock or does the rock fill up the void?

Response: Rockfill may be used to fill the void(s), geofabric to be installed to the rear.

Question: For the soil nails do we drill into the existing embankment as is after clearing and stripping?

Response:  The Clearing and stripping refers to local topsoil/ vegetation.

Item 3.02 of the Schedule allows for localised excavation of the batter face - this is to be used for the clearing and cleaning of the batter face In section B (Soil nails). Any loose/ failed material is to be excavated and removed from site, to leave the face clean and ready for the installation of soil nails and matting.

Question: The Geotech report mentions that these remediation works are not considered waterway barrier works. Please confirm this to be the case.

Response: There are certain exemptions to the waterway barrier works requirements - as is detailed in the link below.

[https://www.business.qld.gov.au/industries/farms-fishing-forestry/fisheries/development/waterways/barriers](https://url.au.m.mimecastprotect.com/s/8Ie5Cq71W0F051MUoTMcEWCke?domain=business.qld.gov.au)

Bank stabilisation works are not considered waterway barrier works if:

**Bank revetment or other bank stabilisation works** (both maintenance and new works) when they:

* fill minor erosion pockets to regularise the bank of the waterway
* are in waterways less than 50m wide at the main channel width and they do not:
  + extend into the waterway beyond the toe of the bank
* are in waterways greater than 50m wide at the main channel width and they do not:
  + extend beyond 10% of the width of the waterway (main channel width)
  + raise the bed level of the waterway above its natural profile.

**The current works meet the underlined requirements and are therefore not considered waterway barrier works**

Question: 1.2 Notifiable Project Fee – Is this not by BRC

Response: Tenderer’s to disregard – BOQ Updated (Attached)

Question: 1.3 PLSL – Is this not by BRC

Response: Annexure Part A Item 19A has “Principal” selected, Tenderer’s to disregard – BOQ Updated (Attached)

Question: 3.03 Where is the Principals property referenced located

Response: Item 3.03: 53.82 m3, generally within the bounds of site (Provisional Quantity item).